

B.A (Arts) POLITICAL SCIENCE (HONOURS)

AS PER CBCS MODEL SYLLABUS

# WESTERN POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Core-XI  
Fifth Semester

Author  
Dr. Jayanta Kumar Dash



ଦୂରନିରନ୍ତର ଶିକ୍ଷା ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦେଶାଳୟ, ଉତ୍କଳ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟ  
DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE & CONTINUING EDUCATION  
UTKAL UNIVERSITY

# SYLLABUS

## **UNIT-I : Text and Interpretation: Antiquity**

(i) Plato

(ii) Aristotle

## **UNIT-II**

(i) Machiavelli

(ii) Hobbes

## **UNIT-III**

(i) Locke

(ii) Rousseau

## **UNIT-IV**

(i) J. S. Mill

(ii) Karl Marx

## **Unit-I**

### **Plato**

- 1.0: Objectives
- 1.1: Introduction
- 1.3: Features of Greek Political Thought
- 1.4: Introducing Plato
  - 1.4.1: Plato's Work: A historical Background
  - 1.4.2: Influences on Plato's Thought
  - 1.4.3: Political Philosophy of Plato
  - 1.4.4: Concept of Justice
  - 1.4.5: Platonic view
  - 1.4.6: Concept of education
  - 1.4.7: Rule of Philosopher king
  - 1.4.8: Theory of Communism
  - 1.4.9: Concept of ideal state
  - 1.4.10: Organic theory of the state:
- 1.5: The idea of intrinsic worth in state of Plato
- 1.6: the idea of soul in platonic idea
- 1.7: Virtue in the individual
- 1.8: The philosopher is the king of the society
- 1.9: Doing well to all is the main domain of knowledge
- 1.10: Plato's theories of government
- 1.11: Concept of Plato's idealism
- 1.12: Relevance of Plato
- 1.13: Let's summaries
- 1.14: Some of the key concepts
- 1.15: Possible questions
- 1.16: Further readings

#### **1.0: Objectives**

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- To know about the origin and development of Greek political thought and the contribution of Plato to Greek political thought.
- To encourage the students to know about the western political thought
- Discuss the philosophical ideas of Ancient Greece
- Discuss the fundamental ideas accessible in the works Plato
- Explain the political philosophies of Plato
- Explain Plato's Ideal state and the role of the philosopher King
- Explain Plato's Republic

#### **1.1: Introduction**

A society is a place where every individual would like to live in. In any society, knowledge, information and acquaintance are the beginning of all philosophy. The philosophy is the base and

central to each and every part of knowledge of the society. Philosophy is the mother of all sciences. Philosophy has interpreted man and his various activities in a widespread comportment. It helps to harmonize the various activities of the individuals and the society. Philosophy is the other name of experience. It is a prolonged practice which helps us to understand the significance of all human experience. It is also an exploration of the basic sources and aims of life from the ancient period. It asks and tries to answer the earnest parts to life. On the one hand, it clarifies life and the basic values of life. This clarity is very essential because it provides a great wisdom and perception in order to face the challenges of life. On the other hand, every single individual, in his or her life, has thought about the kind of society they would like to live in. For those, who become seriously interested in the field; have looked towards the theories of political philosophers through the ages to give coherence to their own ideas on society. Thus, it would not be an exaggeration to state that from Aristotle to Marx, the thoughts of great political thinkers on subjects as varied as liberty, justice, the state, law and property have provided the foundation for the shaping and the development of human society. Moreover, knowledge and wisdom is the supreme instrument in the hands of man in the struggle for his successful existence.

Philosophy is the amalgamation of two Greek words such as 'Philo' and 'Sophia'. The word 'philo' means love and 'Sophia' means knowledge. So philosophy refers to the love of wisdom. There are rational human beings in the society. Man is a rational animal. Desire for knowledge arises from this rational nature of man. Philosophy is an attempt to satisfy this very reasonable desire. Philosophy signifies a natural and necessary urge in human-beings to know themselves and world in which they live, move and have their being. It is impossible for man to live without a philosophy. The choice is not between metaphysic and no metaphysic it is between a good or high-quality metaphysic and bad or low quality metaphysics.

In the words of Aristotle, 'philosophy arises from wonder'. From time immemorial, human civilization has been experiencing rains and drought, storms, clouds, lightening etc. At times, he is greatly terrified. Then the events of life and death confounded them. They started observations and experiments over the events. The sun, moon and the stars appear to him wonderful and beautiful. As a result of his reflection, they thought that the events can be explained by powers similar to man. He proposes to control them by means of magical spells. This magic gives way to science, philosophy and religion in due course. Magic becomes science when natural events were explained and controlled with the help of natural points of view. The religion when the powers are taken to be super natural beings. The same magic flowers into philosophy with the explanation of nature and natural phenomenon. It is the rational attempt to have a world-view. It endeavors to reach a conception of the entire universe with all its elements and aspects and their interrelations to one another. It is not contented with a partial view of the world. It seeks to have a synoptic view of the whole reality: it tries to have a vision of the whole. The different sciences deal with different departments of the world. Mathematical sciences deal with numbers and figures. Physics deals with heat, light, motion, sound, electricity and magnetism. Chemistry deals with chemical phenomena. Psychology deals with the phenomena of mental life. Sociology deals with the structure and growth of the society and its institutions. Economics deals with welfare and wealth of man. Politics deals with the structure and functions of the State and its various organs. Thus sciences give us a sectional view of the world. But philosophy harmonizes the highest conclusions of the different sciences, coordinates them with one another, and gives a rational conception of the whole world. It investigates the nature of the fundamental concepts of matter, time, space, life, mind, and the like and interrelates them to one-another. It enquires into the nature of the universe, its stuff or material, its Creator or God, its purpose, and its relation to man and his soul. It is the art of thinking all things logically, systematically, and persistently. It is the art of thinking rationally and systematically of the reality as a whole.

The main branches of the philosophy are given as under

1) **Epistemology**:- on the basis of epistemology, Philosophy is the search for knowledge. This search is critical. Hence, the first problem which arises before a philosopher is about the nature of knowledge and its limitation. Therefore, epistemology is the most fundamental branch of philosophy. It discusses philosophically truth and falsehood, validity of knowledge, limits of knowledge and nature of knowledge, knower and known, etc.

2) **Metaphysics**: - Metaphysics is the main branch of philosophy. It is the science of reality. Its main problems are; what is Reality? Is the world one or many? What is space? What is the purpose of creation? Is there a God? In brief metaphysics discusses the three aspects of Reality, via, the world, the self, and the God. Its scope includes ontology, philosophy of self, cosmogony, cosmology and theology

3) **Axiology**: - This branch of philosophy philosophically studies value. It has been divided into the following three branches; Ethics: It discusses the criteria of right and good. Aesthetics: It discusses the nature and criteria of duty. Logic: It studies truth. The subject matter of logic includes the methods of judgment, types of propositions, hypothesis, definition etc

### **1.2: Introducing Political Philosophy**

Western political philosophy can be traced back with the advent of philosophy in Greece, where political philosophy started with Plato's Republic in the 4th century BC. Ancient Greece was dominated by city-states. Greek society was plagued by violence and selfishness among the ignorant and incompetent politicians. The fierce spirit of factionalism often created instability of government in the city state. The society exhibited high degree of conservatism. There was hardly any consideration for reason. Citizenship was confined to rich make population. Slaves were an important component of Greek economy. Slavery was an essential feature of Greek civilization, since the labour of the slave gave the citizen the needful leisure for the performance of his civic functions. The belief in the superiority of race influenced the thought of the period. Greeks thought of themselves as differing from other people in degree rather than in kind of excellence. In the political realm, lottery was used to political office. Politics was used to economic gain. Plato experimented with various forms of political organization into four forms such as Timocracy, Tyranny, Democracy and Oligarchy. Important classical works of Plato's political philosophy are the Republic, the statesman, the law. Political philosophy in Ancient India was with the Hindu text Manusmriti or Laws of Manu and Chanakya's Arthashastra. In political philosophy, Aquinas introduced four different kinds of laws:

1. God's cosmic law
2. God's scriptural law
3. Natural law or rules of conduct universally applicable within reason
4. Human law or specific rules applicable to specific circumstances.

Medieval political philosophy in Europe was heavily influenced by Christianity. The thinkers developed the idea that a king who is a tyrant is no king at all and could be overthrown. During the Renaissance, secular political philosophy emerged after a century of theological political thought in Europe. Most of the influential works during the time were Niccolo Machiavelli's The Prince(1532) , The Discourses etc. Thomas Hobbes, theory of the social contract, expanded the view at the beginning of the 17th century during the English Renaissance. Machiavelli and Hobbes did not believe in the divine right of kings. They believed in the inherent selfishness of the individual and adopted a strong central power to bring integration in society. Something strange happened in the Greek colonies of the Aegean Sea some twenty-five hundred years ago. Whereas the previous great cultures of the Mediterranean had used mythological stories of the

gods to explain the operations of the world and of the self, some of them discovered new ways of explaining these phenomena. Instead of reading their ideas into, or out of, ancient scriptures or poems, they began to use reason, contemplation, and sensory observation to make sense of reality. The story as we know it began with the Greeks living on the coast of Asia Minor (present-day Turkey). Pythagoras turned to the nature of form itself rather than the basic stuff that takes on a particular form. With Socrates, the pursuit of knowledge turned inward as he sought not to understand the world, but himself. He called to “know thyself,” together with his uncompromising search for truth, inspired generations of thinkers. With the writings of Plato and Aristotle, ancient Greek thought reached its zenith. These giants of human thought urbanized all-embracing systems to explain both the nature of the universe and the humans. All these lovers of wisdom, or philosophers, came to different conclusions and often spoke disrespectfully of one another. Some held the universe to be one single entity, whereas others insisted that it must be made of many parts. Political philosophy has been experienced for as long as human beings have regarded their collective arrangements not as immutable and part of the natural order but as potentially open to change, and therefore as standing in need of philosophical justification. It can be found in many different cultures, and has taken a wide variety of forms. There are two reasons for this diversity. First, the methods and approaches used by political philosophers reflect the general philosophical tendencies of their epoch. Developments in epistemology and ethics, for instance, alter the assumptions on which political philosophy can proceed. But second, the political philosopher's agenda is largely set by the pressing political issues of the day. In medieval Europe, for instance, the proper relationship between Church and State became a central issue in political philosophy; in the early modern period the main argument was between defenders of absolutism and those who sought to justify a limited, constitutional state. In the nineteenth century, the social question - the question of how an industrial society should organize its economy and its welfare system - came to the fore. When we study the history of political philosophy, therefore, we find that alongside some perennial questions - how one person can ever justifiably claim the authority to govern another person.

### **1.3: Features of Greek Political Thought**

The commencement of Greek philosophy can be traced back to the sixth century BC. It was the time when the human beings first attempted to use reason and logic in order to enlighten the whole world. Before the time, all explanations were based on mythologies, cosmogonies, and theologies of the poets, writers and in the writings of the historians, philosophers etc. The Greeks are, therefore, praised for their scientific temperament because many vague concepts become precise in their hands. The development of western philosophy is largely attributed to free and independent style of Greek thinking which is without, any supernatural reference. The West considers the Greek philosophers to be the founders of science because it was in their hands that the idea of an independent and free inquiry into the nature of things without any religious compulsions first materialized. All their inquiries are structured on the proposition that nature must be explained based on the principles of nature. This tendency is largely reflected in the works of pre-Socratic philosophers as well as in Aristotle's. So we can say that Greek philosophy highlights man's capacity to think and inquire independently, and it is with the Greeks that one finds a gradual departure from religion and religious influences.

The western intellectual tradition was started from Thales. He is regarded as the first Western philosopher. From Thales to the Stoics and Skeptics, ancient Greek philosophy opened the doors to a particular way of thinking that provided the roots for the Western intellectual tradition. Here, there is often an explicit preference for the life of reason and rational thought. One may unearth or discover the proto-scientific explanations of the natural world in the intellectual thinkers, and we hear Democritus conjecture atoms indivisible and invisible units such as the basic stuff of all

matter. With Socrates comes a sustained inquiry into ethical matters as an orientation towards human living and the best life for human beings. With Plato comes one of the most creative and flexible ways of doing philosophy, which some have since attempted to imitate by writing philosophical dialogues covering topics still of interest today in ethics, political thought, metaphysics, and epistemology. Plato's student, Aristotle, was one of the most prolific of ancient authors. He wrote treatises on each of these topics, as well as on the investigation of the natural world, including the composition of animals. The Hellenists, Epicurus, the Cynics, the Stoics, and the Skeptics developed schools or movements devoted to distinct philosophical lifestyles, each with reason at its foundation.

With this preference for reason came a critique of traditional ways of living, believing, and thinking, which sometimes caused political trouble for the philosophers themselves. Xenophanes directly challenged the traditional anthropomorphic depiction of the gods, and Socrates was put to death for allegedly inventing new gods and not believing in the gods mandated by the city of Athens. After the fall of Alexander the Great, and because of Aristotle's ties with Alexander and his court, Aristotle escaped the same fate as Socrates by fleeing Athens. Epicurus, like Xenophanes, claimed that the mass of people is impious, since the people conceive of the gods as little more than superhumans, even though human characteristics cannot appropriately be ascribed to the gods. In short, not only did ancient Greek philosophy pave the way for the Western intellectual tradition, including modern science, but it also shook cultural foundations in its own time.

Greek philosophy is grouped into three prominent periods such as:

- (i) The pre-Socratic phase (the founding stone or the base of Greek political philosophy)
- (ii) The classical Greek philosophy or Athenian School of thought (such as the philosophies of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle).
- (iii) The Hellenistic philosophy (Developed after the bereavement of Alexander the Great and with the emergence of Roman Empire)

### **Pre-Socratic phase of Thought**

Pre-Socratic philosophy is the philosophy of ancient Greek philosophy before Socrates. In Classical viewpoint, the Pre-Socratic philosophers were called as physiologies because they sought natural explanation of all the phenomena. Historically, the Greek philosophy may be traced back its beginning from the pre-Socratic phase of thought. It is also called as the Ionic period or era. This name is derived from the fact that the prominent philosophers of this period namely Thales, Anaximettes and Anaximander were belonged to Ionia, a kingdom in the coast of Asia Minor. All the philosophers of this period engaged themselves in explaining the phenomena with reference to natural principles, rather than by appealing to mythical beings. The primary focus of their inquiry was on the nature of thing of which the world is made. They attempted to answer this question on the basis of sense-perception. Some said it was substance, and tried to explain the universe in terms of a single principle. They thus advocated monism. This was the position of Thales, Anaximander, and Anaximander. Others particularly the Pythagoreans focused not so much on sense-perception as on the relations between existing things, uniformity, and harmony in the world. They used numbers to express all these and consequently assumed numbers to be underlying at the base of everything. There were yet others like Heraclitus who pointed out to the fact of change, and claimed that since nothing was permanent in the world, change or becoming was the only cause behind all phenomena. As opposed to them the Eleatics and among them Parmenides held that a thing could not be something other than what it originally was. Hence, he advocated permanence, not change, as the significant characteristic of reality. With a difficult analysis, the Pre-Socratic thought brings the following expectation. First, the texts we are left with are primarily fragmentary, and sometimes, as in the case of Anaxagoras,

we have no more than a sentence's worth of precisely words. Even these purportedly verbatim words often come to us in quotation from other sources, so it is difficult, if not impossible, to attribute with certainty a definite position to any one thinker. Moreover, 'Pre-Socratic' has been criticized as a misnomer since some of the Pre-Socratic thinkers were contemporary with Socrates and because the name might imply philosophical primacy to Socrates. The term 'Pre-Socratic philosophy' is also difficult since there is no record of Pre-Socratic thinkers ever using the word 'philosophy'. Further, Pre-Socratic thought marks a decisive turn away from mythological accounts towards rational explanations of the cosmos. Indeed, some Pre-Socratic explicitly condemn and ridicule traditional Greek mythology, while others simply explain the world and its causes in material terms. This is not to say that the Pre-Socratics abandoned belief in gods or things sacred, but there is a definite turn away from attributing causes of material events to gods, and at times a refiguring of theology altogether. The foundation of Pre-Socratic thought is the preference and esteem given to rational thought over mythologizing. This movement towards rationality and argumentation would pave the way for the course of Western political traditions.

### **1-Thales (624-545BC)**

Thales is generally considered to be the 'first philosopher' and founding father of all philosophers. As the first and earliest philosopher, he represented the earliest school of philosophy in the history of Greece. The importance of Thales lies in the fact that he attempted to answer philosophical questions without any reference to mythology. He said that the water is the most fundamental element out of which the universe has been created. His inference was based on the interpretation that all the essential elements of life contain moisture. First, all things seem to derive nourishment from moisture. Next, heat seems to come from or carry with it some sort of moisture. Finally, the seeds of all things have a moist nature, and water is the source of growth for many moist and living things. Some assert that Thales held water to be a component of all things, but there is no evidence in the testimony for this interpretation. It is much more likely, rather, that Thales held water to be a primal source for all things, perhaps the *sine qua non* of the world. Hence, he maintained that universe is basically water because only water can be converted into vapour, liquid, and solid. In other words water explains all the three states of matter. Consequently, he believed that nature is much alive, moving, and changing all the time.

### **2-Anaximander (611-547 BC.)**

Like Thales, Anaximander also explained a source for the cosmos, which he called the boundless space filling mass. That he did not, like Thales, choose a typical element such as earth, air, water, or fire but shows that his thinking had moved beyond sources of being that are more readily available to the sanity. He might have thought that, since the other elements seem more or less to change into one another, there must be some source beyond all these, a kind of background upon or source from which all these changes happen. Indeed, this everlasting principle gave rise to the cosmos by generating hot and cold, each of which 'separated off' from the boundless. How it is that this separation took place is unclear, but we might presume that it happened through the natural force of the boundless. The universe, though, is a continual play of elements separating and combining. In poetic fashion, Anaximander says that the boundless is the source of beings, and that into which they perish, 'according to what must be: for they give recompense and pay restitution to each other for their injustice according to the ordering of time'. In this context, the air expands and breaks up the sphere of fire that appear like wheel shaped rings. These rings have openings through which the fire comes out and takes the form of heavenly bodies and with the force of the surrounding air they start moving around the earth. Subsequently, the sun is the highest body in the heaven followed by moon, the fixed stars, and the planets.

### **3-Anaximettes (588-524 BC)**

Like Anaximander, Anaximenes thought that there was something unlimited, boundless, unrestricted, and unrestrained which signifies all other things. Unlike Anaximander, Anaximenes made this boundless thing something definite that is air. For Anaximander, hot and cold separated off from the boundless, and these generated other natural phenomena. For Anaximenes, air itself becomes other natural phenomena through condensation and rarefaction. Mysterious air becomes fire. When it is condensed, it becomes water, and when it is condensed further, it becomes earth and other earthy things, like stones. This then gives rise to all other life forms. Furthermore, air itself is divine. Both Cicero and Aetius said that for Anaximenes, air is God. Air, then, changes into the basic elements, and from these all other natural phenomena are achieved and generated. Thus from the above, it is depicting that Anaximenes considers air as the first principle of the cosmos or world. It is because of its mobility, inner liveliness and strength. He explains that the air or breath is the only life giving element in human beings. Therefore, it is one of the important principles of the universe or the world. The main idea is that the way our soul binds us together, similarly air surrounding the world, holds it together. It is all-encompassing, comprehensive, extended infinitely throughout the world as a whole. In his view, it is clear that the air is regulated by the principles of expansion, contraction and solidity. The same air when rarefied becomes fire and on condensation it becomes wind, water, cloud, and even earth and stone. From the above, it is clearer that the views of Thales, Anaximander, and Anaximenes were used to analyze the importance of substance in the formation of the universe. Apart from substance, as we have mentioned above, the pre-Socratic philosophers also brought in the role of numbers and the ideas of change and permanence in order to explain the universe. We will try to understand how each of these philosophers and their theories has influenced both Plato and Aristotle in shaping up their respective philosophies. As far as number is concerned, we will mainly talk about Pythagoras followed by the views of Heraclitus and Parmenides.

### **4-Pythagoras and Pythagoreans (570 BC to 490 BC)**

Ancient thought was left with such a strong presence and legacy of Pythagorean influence, and yet little is known with certainty about Pythagoras of Samos. Many people know Pythagoras for his eponymous theorem the square of the hypotenuse of a right triangle is equal to the sum of the squares of the adjacent sides. Whether Pythagoras himself invented the theorem, or whether he or someone else brought it back from Egypt, is unknown. He developed a following that continued long past his death, on down to Philolaus of Croton, a Pythagorean from whom we may gain some insight into Pythagoreans. Moreover, the Pythagoreans followed a particular doctrine is up for debate, but it is clear that, with Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans, a new way of thinking was born in ancient philosophy that had a significant impact on Platonic thought. The Pythagoreans believed in the transmigration of souls. The soul, for Pythagoras, finds its immortality by cycling through all living beings in a 3,000-year cycle, until it returns to a human being. Xenophanes tells the story of Pythagoras walking by a puppy that was being beaten. Pythagoras cried out that the beating should cease, because he recognized the soul of a friend in the puppy's howl. What exactly the Pythagorean psychology entails for a Pythagorean lifestyle is unclear, but we pause to consider some of the typical characteristics reported of and by Pythagoreans.

Plato and Aristotle were intended to correlate the holiness and wisdom of number and along with this, harmony and music and with the Pythagoreans. Perhaps more basic than number, at least for Philolaus, are the concepts of the limited and unlimited. Nothing in the cosmos can be without limit, including knowledge. Imagine if nothing was limited, but matter was just an enormous heap or morass. Next, suppose that you are somehow able to gain a perspective of this morass. Presumably, nothing at all could be known, at least not with any degree of precision, the most

careful observation notwithstanding. Additionally, all known things have number, which functions as a limit of things insofar as each thing is a unity, or composed of a plurality of parts.

### **5- Heraclitus(540 BC 480 BC)**

Heraclitus of Ephesus stands out in ancient Greek philosophy not only with respect to his ideas, but also with respect to how those ideas were expressed. His aphoristic style is rife with wordplay and conceptual ambiguities. Heraclitus saw reality as composed of contraries as a reality whose continual process of change is precisely what keeps it at rest.

Fire plays a significant role in his picture of the cosmos. No God or man created the cosmos, but it always was, is, and will be fire. At times it seems as though fire, for Heraclitus, is a primary element from which all things come and to which they return. At others, his comments on fire could easily be seen metaphorically. What is fire? It is at once need and satiety. This back and forth, or better yet, this tension and distension is characteristic of life and reality a reality that cannot function without contraries, such as war and peace. A road up and down is one and the same. Whether one travels up the road or down it, the road is the same road. In his *Cratylus*, Plato quotes Heraclitus, via the mouthpiece of Cratylus, as saying that ‘you could not step twice into the same river’, comparing this to the way everything in life is in constant flux. This, according to Aristotle, supposedly drove Cratylus to the extreme of never saying anything for fear that the words would attempt to freeze a reality that is always fluid, and so, Cratylus merely pointed. So, the cosmos and all things that make it up are what they are through the tension and distention of time and becoming. The river is what it is by being what it is not. Fire, or the ever-burning cosmos, is at war with itself, and yet at peace it constantly wants fuel to keep burning, and yet it burns and is satisfied.

### **6- Parmenides and Zeno (515 BC to 450 B.C)**

For Heraclitus life thrives and even finds stillness in its continuous movement and change and for Parmenides of Elea life is at a standstill. Parmenides was a pivotal figure in Pre-Socratic thought, and one of the most influential of the Pre-Socratics in determining the course of Western philosophy. Mc Kirahan interpreted Parmenides as the inventor of metaphysics the inquiry into the nature of being or reality. While the tenets of his thought have their home in poetry, they are expressed with the force of logic. The Parmenidean logic of being thus sparked a long lineage of inquiry into the nature of being and thinking. He recorded his thought in the form of a poem. In it, there are two paths that mortals can take the path of truth and the path of error. The first path is the path of being or what is. The right way of thinking is to think of what is, and the wrong way is to think both what is and what is not. The latter is wrong, simply because none being is not. In other words, there is no non being, so properly speaking; it cannot be thought that there is nothing there to think. We can think only what is and, presumably, since thinking is a type of being, thinking and being are the same. It is only our long entrenched habits of sensation that mislead us into thinking down the wrong path of non-being. The world, and its appearance of change, thrusts itself upon our senses, and we erroneously believe that what we see, hear, touch, taste, and smell is the truth. But, if non-being is not, then change is impossible, for when anything changes, it moves from non-being to being. For example, for a being to grow tall, it must have at some point not been tall. Since non-being is not and cannot therefore be thought, we are deluded into believing that this sort of change actually happens. Similarly, what-is is one. If there were a plurality, there would be non-being, that is, this would not be that. Parmenides thus argues that we must trust in reason alone. As Daniel Graham says, while Parmenides argues for monism, Zeno argues against pluralism. Zeno seems to have composed a text wherein he claims to show the absurdity in accepting that there is a plurality of beings, and he also shows that motion is impossible. Zeno shows that if we attempt to count a plurality, we end up with an absurdity. If there were a plurality, then it would be neither more nor less than the number that it would have

to be. Thus, there would be a finite number of things. On the other hand, if there were a plurality, then the number would be infinite because there is always something else between existing things, and something else between those, and something else between those, ad infinitum. Thus, if there were a plurality of things, then that plurality would be both infinite and finite in number, which is absurd.

The most enduring paradoxes are those concerned with motion. It is impossible for a body in motion to traverse, say, a distance of twenty feet. In order to do so, the body must first arrive at the halfway point, or ten feet. But in order to arrive there, the body in motion must travel five feet. But in order to arrive there, the body must travel two and a half feet, ad infinitum. Since, then, space is infinitely divisible, but we have only a finite time to traverse it, it cannot be done. Presumably, one could not even begin a journey at all. The Achilles Paradox similarly attacks motion saying that swift-footed Achilles will never be able to catch up with the slowest runner, assuming the runner started at some point ahead of Achilles. Achilles must first reach the place where the slow runner began. This means that the slow runner will already be a bit beyond where he began. Once Achilles progresses to the next place, the slow runner is already beyond that point, too. Thus, motion seems absurd.

### **7-Anaxagoras (500 BC. to 428 B.C)**

Anaxagoras of Clazomenae had what was, up until that time, the most unique perspective on the nature of matter and the causes of its generation and corruption. Closely predating Plato, Anaxagoras left his impression upon Plato and Aristotle, although they were both ultimately dissatisfied with his cosmology. He seems to have been almost exclusively concerned with cosmology and the true nature of all that is around us. Before the cosmos was as it is now, it was nothing but a great mixture everything was in everything. The mixture was so thoroughgoing that no part of it was recognizable due to the smallness of each thing, and not even colors were perceptible. He considered matter to be infinitely divisible. That is, because it is impossible for being not to be, there is never a smallest part, but there is always a smaller part. If the parts of the great mixture were not infinitely divisible, then we would be left with a smallest part. Since the smallest part could not become smaller, any attempt at dividing it again would presumably obliterate it. The most important player in this continuous play of being is mind. Although mind can be in some things, nothing else can be in it mind is unmixed. We recall that, for Anaxagoras, everything is mixed with everything. There is some portion of everything in anything that we identify. Thus, if anything at all were mixed with mind, then everything would be mixed with mind. This mixture would obstruct mind's ability to rule all else. Mind is in control, and it is responsible for the great mixture of being. Everlasting mind the most pure of all things is responsible for ordering the world.

Anaxagoras left his mark on the thought of both Plato and Aristotle, whose critiques of Anaxagoras are similar. In Plato's *Phaedo*, Socrates recounts in brief his intellectual history, citing his excitement over his discovery of Anaxagoras' thought. He was most excited about mind as an ultimate cause of all. Yet, Socrates complains, Anaxagoras made very little use of mind to explain what was best for each of the heavenly bodies in their motions, or the good of anything else. That is, Socrates seems to have wanted some explanation as to why it is good for all things to be as they are, Aristotle, too, complains that Anaxagoras makes only minimal use of his principle of mind. It becomes, as it were, that is, whenever Anaxagoras was unable to give any other explanation for the cause of a given event, he fell back upon mind. It is possible, as always, that both Plato and Aristotle resort here to a straw man of sorts in order to advance their own positions. Indeed, we have seen that Mind set the great mixture into motion, and then ordered the cosmos as we know it. This is no insignificant feat.

### **8-Democritus and Atomism**

Ancient atomism began a legacy in philosophical and scientific thought, and this legacy was revived and significantly evolved in modern philosophy. In contemporary times, the atom is not

the smallest particle. Etymologically, however, atoms are that which is uncut or indivisible. The ancient atomists, Leucippus and Democritus, were concerned with the smallest particles in nature that make up reality particles that are both indivisible and invisible. They were to some degree responding to Parmenides and Zeno by indicating atoms as indivisible sources of motion.

Atoms the most compact and the only indivisible bodies in nature are infinite in number, and they constantly move through an infinite void. In fact, motion would be impossible, says Democritus, without the void. If there were no void, the atoms would have nothing through which to move. Atoms take on a variety, perhaps an infinite variety, of shapes. Some are round, others are hooked, and yet others are jagged. They often collide with one another, and often bounce off of one another. Sometimes, though, the shapes of the colliding atoms are amenable to one another, and they come together to form the matter that we identify as the sensible world. This combination, too, would be impossible without the void. Atoms need a background out of which they are able to combine. Atoms then stay together until some larger environmental force breaks them apart, at which point they resume their constant motion. Why certain atoms come together to form a world seems up to chance, and yet many worlds have been, are, and will be formed by atomic collision and coalescence (Graham 551). Once a world is formed, however, all things happen by necessity the causal laws of nature dictate the course of the natural world.

### **9-The Sophists**

Much of what is transmitted to us about the Sophists comes from Plato. In fact, two of Plato's dialogues are named after Sophists, Protagoras and Gorgias, and one are called simply, The Sophist. Beyond this, typical themes of sophistic thought often make their way into Plato's work, not the least of which are the similarities between Socrates and the Sophists (an issue explicitly addressed in the Apology and elsewhere). Thus, the Sophists had no small influence on fifth century Greece and Greek thought.

Broadly, the Sophists were a group of itinerant teachers who charged fees to teach on a variety of subjects, with rhetoric as the preeminent subject in their curriculum. A common characteristic among many, but perhaps not all, Sophists seems to have been an emphasis upon arguing for each of the opposing sides of a case. Thus, these argumentative and rhetorical skills could be useful in law courts and political contexts. However, these sorts of skills also tended to earn many Sophists their reputation as moral and epistemological relativists, which for some was tantamount to intellectual fraud.

On the other hand, Protagoras' statement could be interpreted as species-relative. That is, the question of whether and how things are, and whether and how things are not, is a question that has meaning only for human beings. Thus, all knowledge is relative to us as human beings, and therefore limited by our being and our capabilities. This reading seems to square with the other of Protagoras' most famous statements: "Concerning the gods, I cannot ascertain whether they exist or whether they do not, or what form they have; for there are many obstacles to knowing, including the obscurity of the question and the brevity of human life" (F3). It is implied here that knowledge is possible, but that it is difficult to attain, and that it is impossible to attain when the question is whether or not the gods exist. We can also see here that human finitude is a limit not only upon human life but also upon knowledge. Thus, if there is knowledge, it is for human beings, but it is obscure and fragile.

Along with Protagoras was Gorgias another sophist whose namesake became the title of a Platonic dialogue. Perhaps flashier than Protagoras when it came to rhetoric and speech making, Gorgias is known for his sophisticated and poetic style. He is known also for extemporaneous speeches, taking audience suggestions for possible topics upon which he would speak at length. His most well-known work is on Nature, or on What-Is-Not wherein he, contrary to Eleatic philosophy, sets out to show that neither being nor non-being is, and that even if there were

anything, it could be neither known nor spoken. It is unclear whether this work was in jest or in earnest. If it was in jest, then it was likely an exercise in argumentation as much as it was a gibe at the Eleatics. If it was in earnest, then Gorgias could be seen as an advocate for extreme skepticism, relativism, or perhaps even nihilism

## **10- Socrates (469 BC to 399 B C)**

Socrates wrote nothing, so what stories and information we have about him come to us primarily from Xenophon and Plato. Both Xenophon and Plato knew Socrates, and wrote dialogues in which Socrates usually figures as the main character, but their versions of certain historical events in Socrates' life are sometimes incompatible. We cannot be sure if or when Xenophon or Plato is reporting about Socrates with historical accuracy. In some cases, we can be sure that they are intentionally not doing so, but merely using Socrates as a mouthpiece to advance philosophical. Xenophon, in his *Memorabilia*, wrote some biographical information about Socrates, but we cannot know how much is fabricated or embellished. When we refer to Socrates, we are typically referring to the Socrates of one of these sources and, more often than not, Plato's version.

Socrates was the son of a sculptor, Sophroniscus, and grew up an Athenian citizen. He was reported to be gifted with words and was sometimes accused of what Plato later accused Sophists that is, using rhetorical devices to "make the weaker argument the stronger. Indeed, Xenophon reports that the Thirty Tyrants forbade Socrates to speak publicly except on matters of practical business because his clever use of words seemed to lead young people astray. Similarly, Aristophanes presents Socrates as an impoverished sophist whose head was in the clouds to the detriment of his daily, practical life. Moreover, his similarities with the sophists are even highlighted in Plato's work. Indeed, Socrates' courtroom speech in Plato's *Apology* includes a defense against accusations of sophistry.

While Xenophon and Plato both recognize this rhetorical Socrates, they both present him as a virtuous man who used his skills in argumentation for truth, or at least to help remove himself and his interlocutors from error. The so-called Socratic Method, or *elenchus*, refers to the way in which Socrates often carried out his philosophical practice, a method to which he seems to refer in Plato's *Apology*. Socrates aimed to expose errors or inconsistencies in his interlocutors' positions. He did so by asking them questions, often demanding yes-or-no answers, and then reduced their positions to absurdity. He was, in short, aiming for his interlocutor to admit his own ignorance, especially where the interlocutor thought that he knew what he did not in fact know. Thus, many Platonic dialogues end in *emporia*, an impasse in thought a place of perplexity about the topic originally under discussion. This is presumably the place from which a thoughtful person can then make a fresh start on the way to seeking truth.

Socrates practiced philosophy openly, did not charge fees for doing so and allowed anyone who wanted to engage with him to do so. Xenophon says: Socrates lived ever in the open; for early in the morning he went to the public promenades and training-grounds; in the forenoon he was seen in the market; and the rest of the day he passed just where most people were to be met: he was generally talking, and anyone might listen.

The talking that Socrates did was presumably philosophical in nature, and this talk was focused primarily on morality. Indeed, as John Cooper claims in his introduction to *Plato: Complete Works*, Socrates denied that he had discovered some new wisdom, indeed that he possessed any wisdom at all, contrary to his predecessors, such as Anaxagoras and Parmenides. Often his discussions had to do with topics of virtue justice, courage, temperance, and wisdom. This sort of

open practice made Socrates well known but also unpopular, which eventually led to his execution.

Socrates' elenchus, as he recognizes in Plato's *Apology* from *apologia*, defense, and made him unpopular. Lycon, Anytus, and Meletus, a poet, accused Socrates of not worshipping the gods mandated by Athens and of corrupting the youth through his persuasive power of speech. In his *Meno*, Plato hints that Anytus was already personally angry with Socrates. Anytus has just warned Socrates to "be careful" in the way he speaks about famous people Socrates then tells Meno, I think, Meno, that Anytus is angry, and I am not at all surprised. He thinks that I am slandering those men, and then he believes himself to be one of them. This is not surprising, if indeed Socrates practiced philosophy in the way that both Xenophon and Plato report that he did by exposing the ignorance of his interlocutors.

Socrates claims to have ventured down the path of philosophy because of a proclamation from the Oracle at Delphi. Socrates' enthusiastic follower, Chaerephon, reportedly visited the Oracle at Delphi to ask the god whether anyone among the Athenians was wiser than Socrates. The god replied that no one was wiser than Socrates. Socrates, who claims never to have been wise, wondered what this meant. So, in order to understand better the god's claim, Socrates questioned Athenians from all social strata about their wisdom. In Plato's *Apology*, Socrates claims that most people he questioned claimed to know what they did not in fact know. As a result of showing so many people their own ignorance, or at least trying to, Socrates became unpopular. This unpopularity is eventually what killed him. To add to his unpopularity, Socrates claimed that the Oracle was right, but only in the respect that he had "human wisdom," that is, the wisdom to recognize what one does not know, and to know that such wisdom is relatively worthless.

Xenophon, too, wrote his own account of Socrates' defense. Xenophon attributes the accusation of impiety to Socrates' daemon, or personal god much like a voice of conscience, who forbade Socrates from doing anything that, would not be truly beneficial for him. Both Xenophon and Plato claim that it was this daemon that prevented Socrates from making such a defense as would exonerate him. That is, the daemon did not dissuade Socrates from his sentence of death. In Xenophon's account, The Oracle claimed that no one was freer than or more just, or more prudent. Xenophon's version might differ from Plato's since Xenophon, a military leader, wanted to emphasize characteristics Socrates exuded that might also make for good characteristics in a statesman. At any rate, Xenophon has Socrates recognize his own unpopularity. Also, like Plato, Xenophon recognizes that Socrates held knowledge of oneself and the recognition of one's own ignorance in high esteem.

Socrates practiced philosophy, in an effort to know himself, daily and even in the face of his own death. In Plato's *Crito*, in which Crito comes to Socrates' prison cell to persuade Socrates to escape, Socrates wants to know whether escaping would be just, and imminent death does not deter him from seeking an answer to that question. He and Crito first establish that doing wrong willingly is always bad, and this includes returning wrong for wrong. Then, personifying Athenian law, Socrates establishes that escaping prison would be wrong. While he acknowledges that he was wrongly found to be guilty of impiety and corrupting the youth, the legal process itself ran according to law, and to escape would be to "wrong" the laws in which he was raised and to which, by virtue of being a life-long Athenian, he agreed to assent.

Plato's *Phaedo* presents us with the story of Socrates' last day on earth. In it, he famously claims that philosophy is practice for dying and death. Indeed, he spends his final hours with his friends discussing a very relevant and pressing philosophical issue that is the immortality of the soul. Socrates is presented to us as a man who, even in his final hours, wanted nothing more than to

pursue wisdom. In Plato's *Euthyphro*, Socrates aims to dissuade Euthyphro from indicting his own father for murder. Euthyphro, a priest, claims that what he is doing prosecuting a wrongdoer is pious. Socrates then uses his *elenchus* to show that Euthyphro does not actually know what piety is. Once he is thoroughly confused and frustrated, Euthyphro says, it is a considerable task to acquire any precise knowledge of these things. Nevertheless, Euthyphro offers yet another definition of "piety." Socrates' response is the key to understanding the dialogue: "You could tell me in far fewer words, if you were willing, the sum of what I asked. You were on the verge of doing so, but you turned away. If you had given that answer, I should now have acquired from you sufficient knowledge of the nature of piety. It is, in other words, the very act of philosophizing—the recognizing of one's own ignorance and the search for wisdom that is piety. Socrates, we are told, continued this practice even in the final hours of his life

#### **1.4: Introducing Plato**

Plato was one of the greatest ancient Greek philosophers. He was the disciple of Socrates and teacher of Aristotle. He is regarded as the first systematic political thinker in the western political thought. He was the son of Athenian aristocrats. Born in Greek and not a barbarian, freedom not a slave, man not a woman, but above all that Plato was born in the age of Socrates. He was born in Athens in 427 BC to a well-established aristocratic family. His father was Ariston and mother was Perictione. Plato also had two brothers, Glaucon and Adeimantus. They were described in his masterpiece, 'The Republic'. As a young, energetic and man of dedication, Plato, was groomed for a life of public service. He grew up in a time of great disturbance in Athens, especially at the conclusion of the Peloponnesian war, when Athens was conquered by Sparta. In the words of Debra Nails "Plato would have been 12 when Athens lost her empire with the revolt of the subject allies; 13 when democracy fell briefly to the oligarchy of Four Hundred...; 14 when democracy was restored". The time when he met Socrates was not sure. Although ancient sources report that he became Socrates' follower at the age of 18, he might have met Socrates much earlier through the relationship between Socrates and Plato's uncle, Charmides, in 431 BC. He might have known Socrates, too, through his musical education, which would have consisted of anything under the purview of the muses, that is, everything from dancing to reading, writing, and arithmetic. He also seems to have spent time with Cratylus, the Heraclitean, which probably had an impact primarily on his metaphysics and epistemology.

Moreover, Plato was an aristocrat by both birth and temperament was born in democratic Athens, in a period of turmoil between Athens and Sparta, they both were engaged in the deadly Peloponnesian war which sustained for about 28 years and resulted in the fall of Athens. The dates of Plato's life are usually based upon Eratosthenes' calculations, from these sources, he was born in 428-427 B.C. and died at the age of eighty or eighty-one at 348-427 B.C. Plato came from one of the wealthiest and most politically active family in Athens. One of Plato's uncle Charmides was a member of the disreputable 'Thirty Tyrants' who overthrew the Athenian democracy in 404 B.C. Charmides' own uncle, Critias, was the leader of the Thirty. However, his stepfather Pyrilampes was apparently a close associate of Pericles. Plato's real name was Aristocles, after his grandfather. 'Plato' seems to have started as a nickname. As a young man, Plato had political ambitions and aspirations, but he became a disciple of Socrates, accepting his essential philosophy and dialectical style of debate; the pursuit of truth through discussions and dialogues. On his father's side, Plato traced his descent from Codrus, who was the last tribal kings of Africa. Plato was a child, when his father, Ariston, died, and his mother Perictione married Pyrilampes, an associate of Pericles, who was a statesman. Plato was disheartened the way things were going around. Plato greatly came under the influence of Socrates and deeply influenced by his method of inquiry and questioning. This method was known as 'eristic' exercise, introduced in Athens by Protagoras. Eristic exercise was a kind of debate in which the aim was to pull down the opponent's

position by divulging logical or other laws by arguments. In 399 BC Socrates was found guilty of both corrupting the young and believing in false Gods. Apart from Plato, Socrates had many young followers. He was sentenced to death, and took his own life by poison while in the company of his colleagues and friends. Plato left Athens after this incident and went on to travel to Cyrene, Italy, Sicily and perhaps Egypt after the death of Socrates. Plato returned to Athens in 386 BC and set up a school, known as the Academy which is often described as the first university of the ancient world. It was free, depending entirely on donations. True to his ideals, Plato also permitted women to attend. The Academy would become the center of Greek learning for almost a millennium. In fact, he identifies the ideal with God and perfect goodness. God creates the world out of material such as raw material, matter, etc. and shapes it according to his 'plan' or 'blueprint'. If the world is not perfect, it is not because of God or the ideals, but because the raw materials were not perfect. According to Plato there are three levels of pleasure, happiness and enjoyment. The first is sensual or physical pleasure, of which sex is a great example; the second is sensuous or esthetic pleasure, such as admiring someone's beauty or enjoying one's relationship in marriage; the third is occupying the highest level that is the ideal pleasure, i.e. pleasures of the mind. Here the example would be Platonic love, intellectual love for another person unsullied by physical involvement. These are the three souls paralleling with reason, spirit and appetite. The three are strong together by the cerebrospinal canal. He described Appetite as a wild and very powerful horse, Spirit as thoroughbred, refined, well trained and directed power, reason as the charioteer, goal directed, steering both horses in his will. In *The Republic*, he designs a society in order to discover the meaning of justice. He compares elements of his society to the spirit, strength, courage and soul.

If one starts from the philosophical life of Plato, than one may be manifest and noticeable by the practice of dialectic, a method of discussion involving ever more profound insights into the nature of reality, and by cognitive confidence, anticipation, expectation, confidence, hopefulness and a belief in the capacity of the human mind to attain the truth and to use this truth for the rational and virtuous ordering of human affairs. Plato believed that conflicting interests of different parts of society can be corresponding, harmonized, synchronized and coordinated. The best, coherent, cogent, balanced and righteous, political order, which he proposes, leads to a pleasant, sounding, congenial unity of society and allows each of its parts to flourish, but not at the expense of others. Plato's writings were in dialogue form. He was the celebrity in all writings except in the laws was none but his teacher, Socrates. In his context of dialogues philosophical ideas were sophisticated, discussed and criticized in the context of conservation, protection, safeguarding, maintenance continuation preservation and perpetuation.

#### **1.4.1: Plato's Work: A historical Background**

Plato was born in 427 B.C. in a noble Athenian family. He was born in a period of great historical importance. He was died in 347 BC. Since the time of his birth and throughout his youth, the Peloponnesian war, that is the war between the city states of Athens and Sparta, was in full development which ultimately resulted in the defeat of Athens. That eventually led to the decline of Athens' power in the Mediterranean world. The defeat was attributed to the democratic structure of government which accentuated the death of Socrates for whom Plato had unfathomable entrenched affection and respect. He had earlier hoped to contribute to Athenian politics, as he was dissatisfied with the political scenario of Athens. There were several changes in the form of government as he was growing up. The democratic government, the rule of many, was taken over by the oligarchic government, the rule of a chosen few, and was again replaced by the democrats. Plato was quite disturbed by all this, particularly by the inappropriate functioning of the government to protect the interests of its subjects. But, it was the death of Socrates that changed his career plans. He felt that it was ridiculous for civil war and corruption to stop unless

people could understand the purpose of life and of society. Although he grew up during Athen's great experiment with democracy during the period of fifth Century, it was certainly evident at this time that democracy was deteriorating, and that required some changes in the political system of the country.

In his political thought, Plato tries to reflect in all the philosophies of succeeding times from the perspective of ancient, medieval and modern times. He became a disciple of Socrates, the father of western philosophy around the age of twenty. Socrates' obstinate technique of idealistic examination earned him a number of powerful enemies. In 399 BC he was tried on the charges of impiety and corruption of the city's youth, found guilty, and eventually forced to take poison in his own life. The influence of Socrates on Plato's philosophical career cannot be understated. Plato was so taken by the character and ideas of Socrates that he used Socrates as the central figure in all his philosophical dialogues, and made considerable use of Socrates' method during his early part of his career. Therefore, in order to teach philosophy, he founded the Academy in 386 BC. The purpose of his Academy was to produce philosopher king. For the rest of his life he lived at his school. The most outstanding student of the Academy was Aristotle. It is mandatory at this point to have some idea of the philosophical influences on Plato. In his life, Plato was deeply influenced by Pythagoras, Parmenides, Heraclitus, and Socrates. He was deeply influenced by the life and teachings of Socrates. He got his belief of immortality from Pythagoras. The other worldliness concepts such as the smile of the cave, the tendency to connect intellect with mysticism and spirituality etc were also obtained from him. He acknowledged the belief that reality is everlasting, endless, perpetual, unending, permanent, interminable, unchanging, and timeless and, logically speaking, all change must be illusory from Parmenides. He took that nothing is permanent in the sensible world from Heraclitus. After that, He combined both Parmenides and Heraclitus to conclude that knowledge is not derived from senses, but only gained by the intellect. In the end his fascination and principled problem and teleological enlightenment of the world are borrowed from Socrates' knowledge and experience. Plato's work includes 35 dialogues and 13 letters. We may divide the dialogues in to three parts such as early, middle, and later period of composition. The earliest represents Plato's attempt to communicate the philosophy and the dialectical style of Socrates. Socrates encountering someone who claims to know much professes to be unaware and seeks support from the one who knows. When Socrates began to ask questions, it was clear that the one presumed to be wise really does not know what Cephalus, Polemarchus and Thrasymachus discussed on justice. Socrates emerges as the wiser one because he at least knows that he does not know. This awareness is the commencement of knowledge which can be understood from the following dialogues. Charmides- An attempt to define temperance; Lysis- A discussion on friendship; Leaches- A pursuit of meaning of courage ; Protagoras- A defence of the thesis that virtue is knowledge and can be taught; Euthyphro- A consideration of the nature of piety ; A discussion of justice in the book 1 of the republic. In the middle and later period the dialogues focus his philosophical development. Gorgias- A consideration of several ethical questions; Meno- A discussion of the nature of knowledge; The Apology- Defense of himself as his trial against the charges of atheism and corrupting Athenian youth; Crito- Defense of obedience of obedience to the laws of the state; Phaedo- The death scene of Socrates in which he discussed the theory of forms, the nature of the soul, and the question of immortality; The Symposium- His outstanding dramatic achievement containing several speeches on beauty and love; The Republic- His supreme philosophical achievement and the nature of justice are the writings of the middle period. The Statesman, the Theaetetus –A denial that knowledge is to be identified with sense perception; Promenades- A critical evaluation of the theory of forms; Sophists- the theories of ideas and forms; Philebus- A relation between pure and good; Timaeus- His view on natural science and cosmology; the laws- Analysis of political and social issues are the magnetic achievements of Plato of the later period. He also established **the Academy** in the year 386 B.C., wrote the Statesman in 360 B.C. and **the**

**law** in 347 B.C. The republic of Plato is the greatest of all his works. It is not simply a treaty in politics but the dialectics of all the aspects of human life which deals with the idea of the good, virtue of human soul, education, Politics, the philosophy, economy and communism of properties and families.

As a Greek philosopher, Plato is regarded as one of the most resourceful, inventive, creative, imaginative, inspired ingenious and powerful thinkers in western political thought. A great deal of writings on Plato has appeared from time to time. He was described as the real intellectual founder of Christianity, 'a Christian before Christ', a Marxian socialism, a revolutionary, a radicals, a reactionary, a fascist during the time. The Athens was regarded as the greatest of Greek "poleis" "the educator of Hellas". Sophocles was then at the height of the powers. Aristophanes was beginning to entrance the Demos. The Parthenon had been finished. But it was in Athens from which virtue was passing he grew up. He was mercilessly satirized with the strain of Peloponnesian war. He was a school boy when the great expedition sailed to disaster at Syracuse. His modern critics include C.M. Bowra, W. Fite, R.H. Crossman A.D. Winspear, Plato's thought, and Karl Popper. Plato's admirers include R.R. Levinson and John Wild. The descriptive and interpretative, and yet sympathetic account of Plato can be traced back in Ernest Barker (Greek Political Theory: Plato and His Predecessors,(1918) and Ricliard Lewis Nettleship (Lecthrdes on the Republic of Pluto, 1929). This is merely a brief reading of works on about Plato intended to introduce the great philosopher. Plato's works are mostly obtainable in the form of dialogues among Socrates, Plato and others existing thinkers of the time. In other words, Plato uses Socrates as his representative and it is through him that he presents his ideas on various topics. One finds frequent use of analogies and myths that makes his literature rich and successful one. Since Plato wrote dialogues, there is a fundamental difficulty with any effort to identify the thought of Plato. Plato never appears in the dialogues as an interlocutor. If he was articulating any of his own thoughts, he did it through the representatives of particular characters in the dialogues, each of which has a particular historical context. Thus, any statement, pronouncement and declaration about this theory of this or that must be tentative at best. Notwithstanding, with all the literary sources of Plato or speaking of his creation, he stands before it all as the reader does; he puts before us, the readers, and before himself as well, ideas, arguments, theories, claims, etc. for all of us to examine carefully, reflect on, follow out the implications of in sum, to use as a springboard for our own further philosophical thought. Plato's works are broadly divided into early and middle periods, but a few of them could be taken as his late works. In the early dialogues, the focus is exclusively on ethical questions, but the tone is pessimistic in the sense that one is unsure about the answers. These include Plato's works like the *Apology*, *CriTo*, *Euthyphro*, *Meno*, and *Protagoras*. The dialogues are typically between Socrates and an interlocutor who assumes that he understands common evaluative concepts, like courage and faithfulness. But after being questioned repeatedly by Socrates, he fails to answer what these concepts mean. Therefore, before going to understand and explain Plato's work, it is very important to distrustful of committing Plato in any comprehensive approach to a meticulous examination. So let us go to explain them as under.

## **1- Metaphysics**

The most renowned of Plato's metaphysical concepts is his notion of forms or ideas. The Greek words such as the form or idea is *adios* and *idea*. Both of these words are rooted in verbs of 'seeing'. Thus, the *adios* of something are its look, shape, or form. Subsequently, Plato manipulates his word and has it refer to immaterial entities. Why it is that one can recognize that a maple is a tree, an oak is a tree, and a Japanese fir is a tree. What is it that unites all of our concepts of various trees under a unitary category of Tree? It is the form of tree that allows us to understand anything about each and every tree, but Plato does not stop there. The forms can be

interpreted not only as purely theoretical entities, but also as immaterial entities that gives being to material entities. Each tree, for example, is what it is insofar as it participates in the form of Tree. Each human being, for example, is different from the next, but each human being is human to the extent that he or she participates in the form of Human Being. This material and immaterial emphasis seems directed ultimately towards Plato's epistemology. That is, if anything can be known, it is the forms. Since things in the world are changing and temporal, one cannot know them; consequently, forms are unchanging and eternal beings that give being to all changing and temporal beings in the world, if knowledge is to be certain and clear. In other words, we cannot know something that is different from one moment to the next. The forms are therefore pure ideas that unify and stabilize the multiplicity of changing beings in the substancehumankind, humanity and the world as a whole.

For Plato, the forms are the definitive authenticity, and this is shown to us in the Allegory of the Cave. In discussing the importance of education for a city, Socrates also produces the metaphor of the Cave in Plato's Republic. It is very interesting to envision a cave in which lifelong prisoners inhabit and settle. These prisoners do not know that they are prisoners since they have been held captive their entire lives. They are shackled such that they are incompetent of turning their heads. Behind them is a fire, and small puppets or trinkets of various things such as horses, stones, people, and so forth and are being moved in front of the fire. Shadows of these trinkets are cast onto a wall in front of the prisoners. The prisoners take this world of shadows to be reality since it is the only thing they ever see in the world. The perception of 'forms' is criticized in Plato's Parmenides. This dialogue shows the vision of a young Socrates, whose understanding of the forms is being challenged by Parmenides. Parmenides first challenges the young Socrates about the scope of the forms. It seems absurd, thinks Parmenides, to suppose stones, hair, or bits of dirt of their own form. The forms are supposed to be unitary. The multiplicity of large material things, for example, participate in the one form of expansiveness, which itself does not participate in anything else. Parmenides argues against this unity. In short, Plato is uncertain about what is now considered his most important theory. Indeed. The forms are beyond words or, at best, words can only approximately reveal the truth of the forms. Yet, Plato seems to take it on faith that, if there is knowledge to be had, there must be these monotonous, unending, interminable, everlasting, perpetual being.

## **2-Epistemology**

Plato's epistemology holds that knowledge of Platonic ideas is innate, instinctive and natural. For that learning is development of ideas buried deep in the soul, often in the midwife like guidance of an interrogator. In several dialogues by Plato, the character Socrates presents the view that each soul existed before birth with the form of the good and a perfect knowledge of ideas. Thus, when an idea is 'learned' it is actually just 'recalled'. The knowledge we have of the world comes to us directly through our senses and impresses. It is itself upon the blank slate of our minds. The naked information that comes to us via the senses allows us to know objects, but our judgments of those objects can lead us into error. As Hadot says about these so-called objective presentations, "They do not depend on our will; rather, our inner discourse enunciates and describes their content, and we either give or withhold our consent from this enunciation". There might be a problem lurking here regarding the standard of truth, which, for the Stoics, is simply the correspondence of one's idea of the object with the object itself. If it is true that the correspondence of our descriptions of the object with the actual object can bring us knowledge, how can we ever be sure that our descriptions really match the object? After all, if it is not the bare sense impression that brings knowledge, but our correct description of the object; it seems that there is no standard by which we can ever be sure that our description is correct.

For Plato, there is no knowledge which is not based on virtue. The knowledge must be based on eternal, everlasting, unending, interminable, unchanging things. The world is constantly a process of changing. Thus, Plato said 'it seems absurd that one's ideas about changing things are on a par with one's ideas about unchanging things'. Moreover, Plato reserves the forms as those things about which one can collect true and better understanding with appropriate knowledge and acquaintance.

### **3-Plato's Epistemology and the Theory of the Forms**

Plato's theory is as a response to some of the philosophical problems raised by the Presocratics i.e. the problem of the one and the many, the problem of appearance, form and reality, the problem of change, alter and transform. Heraclitus and Parmenides were both concentrating on one aspect of these problems but ignoring other aspects. Each was concentrating on just one side of what has been called the dilemma of change. Heraclitus, since he saw that difference must be admitted, rejected identity and tried to explain everything in terms of flux. Parmenides, realizing that whatever changes must be identical throughout its change, took identity as the basic concept and was forced to deny change. Both Plato and the Sophists were responding to the dilemma presented by this conflict between Heraclitus and Parmenides. Plato ends up arguing that both are right because they are talking about different types of objects. He described about two ideas. One is the world of Becoming and the second is the world of Beings. The world of Becoming includes the concepts like nothing is permanent, everything changes; the realm of particulars; Tangible; Visible; mere copies or imitations of the ideal forms; we gain access through the senses; the realm of mere opinion; the realm of the body; mortal. The World of Being includes the concept like eternal; immutable; universal; invisible; ultimate reality; we gain access through reason; the realm of true knowledge; the realm of the soul; immortal.

Further, in the state of 'forms' are the most unavoidable beings which are most probably collected is the experience and knowledge. Thus, Plato offers another image of knowing in his Republic. True understanding is of the forms. Below this, there is thought, through which we think about things like mathematics and geometry. Below this is belief, where we can reason about things that we sense in our world. The lowest stair of the ladder is imagination, where our mind is engaged with mere shadows of the physical world.

### **4- Psychology**

Plato is renowned for his theory of the tripartite soul, and his theory of psychology is clearly described in his book the Republic. The soul is at least logically and if not also ontologically, separated into three parts they were reason, spirit and appetite. Reason is responsible for rational thought and will be in control of the most ordered soul. Spirit is responsible for spirited emotions, like anger. Appetites are responsible not only for natural appetites such as hunger, thirst and sex, but also for the desire of excess in each of these and other appetites. In the words of Plato, the distinction between three parts of the soul rests upon the Principle of Contradiction.

Socrates viewed, 'It is obvious that the same thing will not be willing to do or undergo opposites in the same part of itself, in relation to the same thing, at the same time. So, if we ever find this happening in the soul, we will know that we are not dealing with one thing but many'. For example, the appetitive part of the soul is responsible for someone's thirst. Just because, however, that person might desire a drink, it does not mean that she will drink at that time. In fact, it is believable that, for whatever reason, she will restrain herself from drinking at that time. Since the Principle of Contradiction entails that the same part of the soul cannot, at the same time and in the same respect, desire and not desire to drink, it must be some other part of the soul that helps

control in the desire. The rational part of the soul is responsible for keeping desires in check, denying the fulfillment of desires when it is appropriate to do so. Why is the spirited part different from the appetitive part? To answer this question, Socrates relays a story he once heard about a man named Leontius. Leontius “was going up from the Piraeus along the outside of the North Wall when he saw some corpses lying at the executioner’s feet. He had an appetite to look at them but at the same time he was disgusted and turned away” Despite his disgust with his desire, Leontius reluctantly looked at the corpses. Socrates also cites examples when someone has done something, on account of appetite, for which he later reproaches himself. The reproach is rooted in an alliance between reason and spirit. Reason knows that indulging in the appetite is bad, and spirit, on reason’s behalf, becomes angry. Reason, with the help of spirit, will rule in the best souls. Appetite, and perhaps to some degree spirit, will rule in a disordered soul. The life of philosophy is a cultivation of reason and its rule. In proposing a tripartite soul, Plato acknowledges and seeks to explain the facts that we all experience inner conflict from time to time. We would be justified seeing this theory as the starting point for psychology. However, Plato’s theory seeks not only to explain inner conflict but also to present the rational part of the soul as superior. Philosophy is essentially the practice of refining and foregrounding our rationality.

## **5-Ethics and Politics**

Plato’s philosophy is closely associated with his ethics. In his view, the best life is the life of philosophy which is depicting a life full of love and wisdom and a life full of engaging movements. The philosophical life is also the most outstanding life since it is the benchmark, yardstick, hallmark and touchstone of true virtue and true knowledge. Without wisdom, there is only a gloominess, murkiness, darkness and obscurity, imitation of virtue, anonymity and such lives are still dominated by passion, desire, emotions and different types of attitudes. Plato’s Republic centers on a simple question that ‘Is it always better to be just than unjust?’ To answer this question, Socrates takes a long way around, sketching an account of a good city on the grounds that a good city would be just and that defining justice as a virtue of a city would help to define justice as a human being. Socrates is finally close to answering the question after he characterizes justice as a personal virtue at the end of Book Four, but he is interrupted and challenged to defend some of the more controversial features of the good city he has sketched.

Plato’s Republic begins with the subject of the true justice. From Socrates to, Glaucon, Adeimantus, it is seen that justice is more clearly in the individual if they take a look at justice writ large in a city, presumptuous with the intention of an individual is in some way corresponding to a city. So, Socrates and his interlocutors hypothetically generate a superlative city, which has three communal strata guardians, auxiliaries, and crafts people farmers. The guardians will rule, the auxiliaries will defend the city, and the crafts people and farmers will produce goods and food for the city. The guardians will also be philosophers since only the wisest should regulate. In this way, this tripartite city mirrors the tripartite spirit and essence. When the guardians philosophers rule properly, and when the other two classes do their proper work and do not do or attempt to do work that is not properly their own the city will be just, much as a soul is just when reason rules. Further, how it is that auxiliaries and crafts people can be kept in their own proper position and be prevented from an ambitious quest for upward pressure group associations which is maintaining social order depends not only upon intelligent judgment, subsequently also upon the Noble stretch out. The Noble stretch out is a legend that the gods mixed in various metals with the members of the various social stratum. However, the guardians were mixed with gold, the auxiliaries with silver, and the farmers and crafts people with iron and sculpture. In view of the fact that the gods intended for each person to belong to the social class that whoever presently does, it would be an offense to the gods for a member of a social class to attempt to become a member of an unusual collective group of individuals. However, the above ideas of Plato remind that even the

philosopher is embodied and, at least to some extent, enjoys that embodiment, even though reason is to imperative exceeding all as well.

From the above, it is clear that from the dialogue called *Euthyphro*, the interlocutor Euthyphro refers that his father's prosecution, trial and action are not an irreverent act. But when questioned by Socrates he fails to point out a single common feature by virtue of which an act can be acknowledged as religious and spirituality. Therefore, in his confession Socrates admits his wisdom is in his recognition that he knows little. Thus, in the early dialogues Socrates fails to establish a justifiable theory that would justify the use of normative terms. However, one observes a change in *Meno*, wherein the question raised is once again about virtue, and there is no persuasive answer to it. Here, for the first time the issue of attitude, style and methodology which was brought in by Plato? Where he acclaims that even if one does not know, it is possible for him to learn through questioning. This is because he explains that our soul is already in acquisition of knowledge before it enters the body. So, while we learn, we actually summon up what we already knew once and have beyond. Therefore, he appears more confident in the *Meno* than in the *Apotogy*. Further, Plato becomes more self-assured, self-opposed and self-confident taking the concept like the immortality of spirit, essence, strength, courage, fortitude and the soul which is reflected in *Phuedo*, *Phaedrus*, and the *Republic*. These constitute his works in the middle periods. What is noticeable in these works is how Plato takes support of the metaphysical considerations regarding the ability of soul to learn, in order to support and explain the idea of goodness and how people should strive for it in whatever they do in life. He tries to show that Socratic questions can be resolved if we analyze ethical enquiries in metaphysical terms. In this regard Plato writes 'the *Phaedo*', in which he discusses the existence of intangible, abstract, theoretical, substances of the society. These nonfigurative substances are Plato's forms or ideas which he claims to have independent existence and are not provided by our judgment. Further these substances are eternal and enduring and also incorporeal and intangible. In fact, Socrates in his dialogues presupposes these forms. In an example one may refer the concept such as 'back to Euthyphro' where *Socrates* explains the common between two pious acts. He says that both or rather all such acts participate in the form of piety. Plato in all the words of the language refer to some form or the other, though they represent different sorts of objects at the level of sensation and perception.

#### **1.4.2: Influences on Plato's Thought**

Every thought or philosophy is the spirit and outcome of the time. The time compels the philosopher to prepare a blueprint of his or her time. The thoughts of the time and situations are reflected in the thought of a philosopher. Like this Plato had a tremendous influence from differences sources of his time. His thought and his philosophy was considerably discriminatory and significantly prejudiced and influenced by the contemporary cerebral climate and more particularly by the ideas of his predecessors like Pythagoras, Parmenides, Heraclitus and Socrates. During Plato's period, there were war and struggle in Athens, the citizen's of Athens surrounded by absolute disregarded tradition and customs. However, Plato was being influenced by the thoughts of Socrates and others which are given as under:

- Socrates in his earlier career, served in army. He always acted and behaves according to his conscience, rationality, principle and ethics. He maintained his own self-determination, freewill and liberty in the work place. He was executed for defying the order of Thirty-Tyrants to arrest Leon of Salamis. Subsequently he was saved because these Thirty-Tyrants were overthrown before they could fulfill their designs. After that when Democratic party came to power and Socrates became the philosopher- educator the rulers suspected that he was undermining their authority by motivating the young youth to

question all sorts of authority. They awarded him death sentence on the ground that he did not recognize gods that the city recognized and sought to introduce other new divinities and also corrupted young men. This event had a profound impact on the young mind of Plato who then turned to most vigorous pursuit of philosophy. Plato sought to immortalize Socrates by developing his basic ideas into a full-fledged philosophy. Socrates had not produced any writings, but it was his disciple Plato who wrote many dialogues in which Socrates embodies the chief spokesperson of the philosophy. Further, Plato had paid a rich tribute and esteem by saying the words 'I thank God that I was born Greek and not barbarian, freeman and not slave, man and not woman; but above all, that I was born in the age of Socrates.'

- The heartbreaking and tragic end of Socrates filled Plato's mind with the disrespect for democracy. He realized that when ineffectual people had become rulers merely through the skills of speechifying they did not hesitate to execute the wisest man of their land only to save their dishonest position. He was convinced that in order to save the state from all its evils democracy should be replaced by the rule of the wisest and the best. Soon he left Athens and proceeded to see the world for himself and searched a place for the expansion of his and his teacher's philosophy for the benefit of the people of the world. It is said that in Egypt where he saw a princely class ruling the land quite smoothly. This experience strengthened his faith that only the learned persons are fit to rule in spite of the ignorant one. Therefore, he probably visited Sicily and Italy. In Italy he saw a small ruling group, devoted to scholarship, leaving a private life despite the possession of power. Then he visited many other countries. It was a matter of supposition, whether he also visited India, because of his scheme of organization of citizens into three classes like Scholars, philosophers, Soldiers and Traders.
- Plato returned to Athens after twelve years at the mature age of forty. By this time he had turned to be a great philosopher and he started writing his monumental work 'The Republic'. The Republic is the master piece of his great philosophy. The Republic covers a wide range of philosophical ideas which flourished before him, during his times and even in later ages. Will Durant in his Book "The Story of Philosophy" expresses that The Republic of Plato is a complete treatise.....Here we shall find his metaphysics, his theology, his ethics, his psychology, his pedagogy, his politics and his theory of art. Here we shall find problems reeking with modernity and contemporary savagery; communism and socialism, feminism and birth-control and eugenics, Nietzschean problems of morality and aristocracy, Rousseauian problems to return to nature and libertarian and education, Bergsonian *elan vital* and Freudian psychoanalysis- everything is here". At last Plato came to a conclusion that "Until philosophers are kings, or the kings and the princesses of the world have the spirit and power of philosophy, and political greatness and wisdom meet in one ... cities will never have rest from evils... nor the human race. "
- In 387 BC Plato received an invitation from King Dionysius of Syracuse. Capital of Sicily, to renovate his empire into the ideal state. Plato accepted this invitation, but his effort to train a tyrant to become a genuine and indisputable philosopher king failed. This led to a bitter conflict between the king and Plato. It is said that the king condemned Plato to become a slave. These experiences of Plato are reflected in his later works the 'Statesman' and the 'Laws'. These represent an effort to combine his ideal state with the real world. Further, he proceeds to foresee a 'sub-ideal state' i.e. 'the second best' or which would be ruled by the laws not by men. This state would be far inferior to the ideal state, yet it would be acceptable for its practicability. Shortly, in the absence of philosopher kings,

supremacy of true knowledge in Plato's sub-ideal state which would be established through the rule of laws.

- Plato returned to Athens in 387 BC. After this he founded the famous 'Academy' which produced many brilliant philosophers including Aristotle.
- He was greatly influenced by Pythagoras teachings. The teachings include wisdom as the contemplation of the spirit and the idea was the chief essence behind all material things and forms. He also picked up the idea of transmigration of souls from Pythagoras which was later picked up from the Hindu philosophy.
- Plato was also influenced by Heraclitus view that life is a continuous change and there was nothing permanent in the world. Heraclitus also emphasized that one must look into the nature of things should discover the universal law which could be achieved if one identifies himself with god.
- Plato learned the idea that change and motion are illusions for the senses and that reality is eternal from Parmenides. However, after uniting the views of Pythagoras, Heraclitus and Parmenides, he attempted to specify knowledge. He said knowledge was a virtue which could be achieved only through intellect.
- In this regard Prof. Barker said 'Though Plato borrowed basic ideas from Socrates but he unfolded these ideas in his own way and reached his own conclusions. While reaching the conclusions he further admitted that the image of his teacher never faded from his mind and he actually represents the greatest legacy bequeathed by Socrates to mankind.'
- **The Socratic Method-** Socrates engaged a unique method of argumentation or eliciting truth. He enters into conversation with a person on a topic and initially pretends knowing very less about it. He proceeds by asking questions and insists for clear definitions and explanations from his partner. In this process he makes his partner contradict, as such persistent questioning will expose their confusions. After that, they realize that Socrates is the master of the situation. Plato later developed this technique into a systematic philosophical method and his dialogues actually demonstrate how it works as an effective method of Aspects of Western Philosophy. Plato deals with a variety of themes in his dialogues, which have Socrates as the protagonist, who ceaselessly engages in conversation with theirs. All of them follow the same method which emphasizes on conversation and dialogue.
- **Theory of Forms or Ideas-** Gilbert Ryle makes an interesting observation about Plato's theory of ideas. He says that it originated out of several different and partly independent features of the general ideas or notions that constituted the recurrent themes of dialectical disputations that include definitions, standards of measurement and appraisal, immutable things, timeless truths, one over many, intellectual knowledge, conceptual certainties, and ontology of forms. Bertrand Russell states that, Plato's theory of ideas is partly logical and partly metaphysical. It is logical, as it deals with the meaning of general words like manness, cattiness etc. It is metaphysical as it projects an ontology of essences which is constituted of a domain of reality corresponding to the general world we experience. About the logical part, Russell elaborates: The logical part has to do with the meaning of general words. There are many individual animals of which we can truly say this is a cat. What do we

mean by the word "cat" Obviously something different from each particular cat? An animal is a cat, it would seem, because it participates in a general nature common to all cats.....something which is not this or that cat, but some kind of universal cattiness. This is not born when a particular cat is born, and does not die when it dies. In fact, it has no position in space or time; it is "eternal." This is the logical part of the doctrine. The Metaphysical part of the Theory of Ideas is explicated as: The word cat "means a certain ideal cat, "the cat," created by God, and unique. Particular cats partake of the nature of the cat, but more or less imperfectly; it is only owing to his imperfection that there can be many of them. The cat is real; particular cats are only apparent. According to Plato, the ideas are objects of the intellect, known by reason alone and are objective realities that exist in a world of their own. Russell observes that there are as many ideas as there are common names and every common name designates an idea. Let us consider some common examples. Socrates, Parmenides and Heraclitus are all men. Here what is common is the fact that they are all men. What is common to all of them is the type, the essence or idea of man, which according to Aspects of Western philosophy. Plato is an objective reality that exists in an independent ontological domain. Again, we see several beautiful things around us beautiful flower, beautiful poem, beautiful painting etc. In such cases, we can isolate the idea of beauty as an essence. In the examples of a moving car, moving man, moving cycle, motion is the idea. Plato asserts that all these ideas exist in an abstract universal realm of essences, which alone is real. All the particular objects, events and instances of these ideas are therefore unreal and are mere appearances. Plato's theory of universal essences now raises another important question. In our formal experience, we see beautiful things, but not , beauty as such, we see moving bodies, not the Idea of movement. We may wonder where these generalizations. Plato affirms that the general ideas can be approached only through reason, as they are not perceived by the senses. One has to properly employ one's reason to comprehend the ideas, which are real, and for this purpose, reason needs to be properly trained. The philosopher knows that the world of senses is a constantly fleeting realm of entities which cannot be considered as real in the absolute sense of the term; that which is universal, imperishable and transcendental. Reality is changeless and eternal and hence it needs to be searched not in the world of senses, but in the intelligible world. Plato here challenges the commonly held views about sense objects and general ideas, which assume that they are mental copies of the sensible objects. According to this latter view, general ideas, which are copies, depend on the objects. Moreover, they are not real but exist only in the individual's mind and hence cannot be communicated completely. Countering this perspective Plato affirms that ideas are the models or the originals and individual objects are the copies. Plato holds that the real must be more stable and static and hence they must be eternal. On the other hand, individual objects and instances may come and go and they are not real. The Idea is what the individual expresses and without the idea it expresses, the individual cannot exist. The idea is an absolute entity and is completely independent of the mind, which has it. The objects of the phenomenal world are therefore, subject to change and destruction and are not absolute realities. They depend on time, place and the person who experience them. In other words, everything in the world of phenomenal beauty is relative, fleeting, and uncertain. On the other hand, the essences or Ideas are ever-lasting, as they have neither beginning nor end. They are neither subjected to any changes, nor are they relative to any external factor. They are real transcendental realities. In other words, the ideas are absolutely real entities, which are more real than the objects of empirical experience. Plato holds that, they alone can be real, being the eternal patterns after which the things of sense are made. On the other hand, the phenomenal world and its objects

have a borrowed existence, as they are mere copies of the world of Ideas. They receive their reality from ideas. They exist, not in themselves, but as reflections of their Ideas. They have no reality other than that which they receive from these ideas.

### 1.4.3: Political Philosophy of Plato

Plato has evoked the admiration, approbation, reverence and criticism approbation in the entire history of political thought which no other thinker had gained in the history of political thought. Despite all these admiration, reverence and criticism Plato has left behind many important works. The important of them are the Republic, (380-370BC), the Statesman (360 BC) and the Laws (350BC). His works were of perennial interest to all those interested in the history of political ideas. Plato has been generally regarded as the founder of philosophical idealism. His idealism is based on virtues of his conviction. The conviction deals with the universal idea in the world of eternal reality beyond the world of the senses. He was the first to originate and characterize political ideas within a larger construction and framework of a philosophical idea of Good.

He was quite anxious about human life, soul and nature, and the real question in it is how to live best in the state within the European intellectual traditions. He found the disorders and crises of the actual world. By this he demonstrated his readers as a vision of an advantageous political order. These orders are still fascinating by his admirers and detractors. He has been described as a poet of ideas, a philosophy or academic of beauty and the true originator of the cult of melodious and harmonious living. He has been praised for his condemnation and denunciation of materialism, covetousness, acquisitiveness and violent self-centeredness. In this regard, Voltaire and Nietzsche demonstrated Platonism or platonic philosophy as the rational and intellectual side of Christianity. Further, John Ruskin and William Morris were attracted by Plato's concern for human perfection and excellence. Further, Plato, along with his follower Aristotle has been credited for laying the foundations of Greek political theory which is the base of the western political tradition. With a lot of enthusiasm, Plato and Aristotle have oriented, explored, acknowledged, analyzed and covered a wide range of perspectives and issues in the philosophical outlook.

Political philosophy of Plato is contained in his writings and dialogues. However, it is his idea or dialogues which acknowledge us about the ample idea of his philosophy. The dialogues were the real doctrine of his lectures. He used to explain the dialogues in the 'academy'. The dialogues were more valuable expressions of his philosophy. The dialogues are treaties of popular nature of principles, ethics, logic, metaphysics etc. However, in a regrettable situation, they were not in a methodical, organized and systematic manner which suffered from many inconsistencies. At a glance there are only forty two dialogues which is magnifying his political philosophy. These dialogues fall into three groups are

- The Apology and Crito,
- The Meno,
- The Protagoras and Gorgias.

Most of his works are coming under his creation 'the Republic, the Phaedrus and the Phaedo'. He had created these works during the age of thirty four to sixty. In these works he tries to institute some of the encouraging principle with the help of falsehood. In the later part of his life, he wrote Politicus or Statesman, the Philebus, the Critias and the Laws. His political philosophy concentrates mainly in his three works. I.e. The Republic, The States man and The Law. The problem of individual and the state are discussed in the Apology and Crito. Plato saw stasis,

unrighteousness, uncontrolled unfairness, inequality, and wrongness, injustice, enthroned in the contemporary world. He originated ignorance as the supreme and parading up and down in the guise of knowledge in each and every society. The entire society was ill-advised and miss utilized by the quandary and predicaments where people found not what they sought, but confusion, commotion, turmoil, strife, agony and death because of their very nature. Plato desired that all men must be good for men that which would make them happy. But people looked for happiness in wrong places. They sought it in pleasures, health, long life, wealth, power etc. They choose evil for the good for them. The two great states man, Themistocles and Pericles failed to make their people better and gentler. At the end people embarrassed and honored them and there was the failure of the government. Pericles filled the city with harbors and dockyards, and walls and such trash, not with the good man. All goods realize the instances beauty and wisdom, limited as for power and wealth in the society. The most important instant point is that the society should not be governed by the ignored ones.

#### **1.4.4: Concept of Justice**

Plato in his political philosophy emphasized on the concept of justice. Therefore he titled his book 'The Republic' which is even subtitled as 'the concerning justice' that shows the extraordinary importance which Plato attached to justice. In many respect 'The Republic' is the crown of Plato's work. It is also the greatest of his dialogue. In the words of Plato, justice is the quality of individual, the individual mind. It can be understood by studying the mind of man, its function, qualities or virtues. Mind is not homogenous but heterogeneous, and in fact, has three elements such as appetite, spirit and reason and works accordingly. Plato wanted to bring to an end the prevailing degenerated conditions and political selfishness rampant in Athens, in order to save his beloved Athens from decay and ruin. He saw in justice the only panacea of saving Athens from degradation and decay and propounded his theory of justice. The fundamental issue raised by Plato in his book 'The Republic' is the definition of justice. To understand the Plato theory of justice, it is essential to mention definitions of justice given by some early Sophists, which Plato narrated in his Republic and the grounds on which Plato rejects them.

##### **1- Traditional Theory**

Polemarchus supports this Cephalous definition of justice by saying that justice means helping one's enemies. This theory was propounded by Cephalous and his son Polemarchus. They said that justice as speaking the truth and paying what was due to gods and men. It also contended that justice should be so administered that good is done to the friends and harm to the enemies. It considered justice as an art. Plato rejects this theory by importunate that justice means doing well to all and harm to none. Similarly it is difficult to distinguish ones true friends from enemies because appearances are often deceptive and it is immoral and injustice to harm someone without proper inquiry. Another defect of this theory is that it treats justice as an individualistic rather than a social concept. In reality, justice cannot vary from individual to individual and should have worldwide application. Lastly, this theory by treating justice as an art makes it a handmaid of those in power or ruler or the elitists section and leaves sufficient scope for its misuse.

##### **2- Radicalist Theory**

The radicalists theory was attached, associated and preached by Sophists and propounded by Thrasymachus. Thrasymachus regards justice as the interests and sovereign power of the stronger. The principle of radical theory was based on the principle of 'Might is Right'. For while, every man acts for himself and tries to get what he can, the strongest is sure to get what he wants and as in a state the Government is the strongest, it will try to get, whatever it wants for himself. Thus, for Thrasymachus justice means personal interest

of the ruling group in any state. It is also called as 'another's good'. Laws are made by the ruling party in its own interest. Those who violate such laws are punished because violation of such laws is treated as violation of justice. Socrates criticizes the definition of justice given by Thrasymachus and he says just as physician studies and exercises his power not in his interest but in the interest of a patient, the government of any kind shall do what is good for the people for whom it exercises its art. But Thrasymachus advances some more arguments in support of his concepts justice and injustice. The slogan 'An unjust is superior to a just in character and intelligence. Injustice is a source of strength. Injustice brings happiness' is criticized by Socrates. Against this background he said that 'justice implies superior character and intelligence while injustice means deficiency in both respects. Therefore, just men are superior in character and intelligence and are more effective in action. An injustice implies ignorance, stupidity and badness. It cannot be superior in character and intelligence. A just man is wiser because he acknowledges the principles of limit. Unlimited self-assertion is not a source of strength for any group organized for common purpose, unlimited desire and claims lead to conflict. Life of just man is better and happier. There are always some kinds of specific virtue in everything, which enables it to work well. If it is deprived of that virtue, it works badly. The soul has specific functions to perform. It has also specific excellence or virtue; it cannot possibly do its work well. The soul which is more virtuous or in other words more just is also the happier soul. Therefore, just men live happy. A just soul, in other words a just man, lives well; an unjust cannot. However, Plato rejects the above concept of justice which was propounded by the radicalists. He said that justice can never be the interest of the stronger. The government is an art and it must aim at the perfection of the material that is the subjects rather than its own perfection. A ruler is absolutely unselfish in his dealings as a ruler, and must work for the improvement of the governed. Further, justice is always better than injustice because a just man is wiser, stronger and happier than an unjust man and knows his limitation. He tries to operate within limits and performs his appointed functions. In the same way Plato also condemned the extreme individualism of the sophists and holds that individual is not an independent unit but a part of an order. In this regard, there cannot be two standards of justice such as justice for the ruler and justice for the subjects. In the words of Thrasymachus does not give any rational justification as to why be just for the ruler to get his own way and at the same time it is unjust for others to act in the like manner. However, these views have non- universal application.

### 3- **Pragmatic Theory**

This theory of justice is propounded by Glaucon. In the words of Glaucon 'justice is an artificial thing, a product of the social convention, a child of fear, and is based on the necessity of the weak'. In the pre-civil society, there was no justice and it is the weaker sections of people who joined hand to create the state. Therefore, justice is not the interest of the stronger but necessity of the weak. Plato criticizes this theory because it assumes that justice is something external or an importation. On the other hand, he holds that justice is rooted in the human mind. It is an intrinsic virtue which does not depend for its origin upon a chance convention. Glaucon treats justice as an artificial thing, a product of social convention. This theory is the precursor of the social contract theory. In the state of nature there was no justice, or state. Many weaknesses combined together and created the state. Justice is the child of fear and is based on the necessity of the weaker and not the interest of the stronger. Plato criticizes it on the ground that it considers justice as something external or an importation. He holds that justice is rooted in human mind. Though it is located in both, the individual and the state, but encompasses it in larger quantity and in visible form.

### 1.4.5: Platonic view

As a perfect dialectician, Plato contrasts the three elements of state, viz., rulers, soldiers and farmers with three elements of human mind, viz., reason, spirit and appetite each representing the three attributes of human mind. This led Prof. Barker to remark "this triplicate of the soul, whatever its source is the foundation of much of the republic". Justice for the society can be realized if each group performs the function; it is best suited to perform without interfering in the affairs of others. Thus justice implies a sort of specialization and the principle of non-interference and harmony. Justice is the bond which holds a society together, a harmonious union of individuals, each of whom has found his life work in accordance with his natural fitness and his training. It is both a Public and Private virtue because the highest good both at the state and its members is hereby conserved.

The Basic Principles of Theory of Justice are as under:

1. It means functional specialization. In it each component of the state performs the functions, it is best suited to perform, and justice can be ensured in the society.
2. It implies non-interference. Only when no component of the state interferes with the sphere of other's duty that unity can be ensured moreover, only by doing so a society can benefit from the work of an individual
3. It implies a principle of harmony. Three human virtue, viz., wisdom, courage and temperance representing three classes are harmonized by the justice.

Plato in his philosophy gives very important place to the idea of justice. He used the Greek word "Dikaisyne" for justice which comes very near to the work 'morality' or 'righteousness'; it properly includes within it the whole duty of man. It also covers the whole field of the individual's conduct in so far as it affects others. Plato contended that justice is the quality of soul, in virtue of which men set aside the irrational desire to taste every pleasure and to get a selfish satisfaction out of every object and accommodated themselves to the discharge of a single function for the general benefit. Plato was highly dissatisfied with the prevailing degenerating conditions in Athens. The Athenian democracy was on the verge of ruin and was ultimately responsible for Socrates's death. Plato saw in justice the only remedy of saving Athens from decay and ruin, for nothing agitated him in contemporary affairs more than amateurishness, needlessness and political selfishness which was rampant in Athens of his day in particular and in the entire Greek world in general. In addition, Sophistic teaching of the ethics of self-satisfaction resulted in the excessive individualism also induced the citizens to capture the office of the State for their own selfish purpose and eventually divided "Athens in to two hostile camps of rich and poor, oppressor and oppressed. "Evidently, these two factors amateur needlessness and excessive individualism became main targets of Plato's attack. The attack came in the form of the construction of an ideal society in which "Justice" reigned supreme, since Plato found in justice the remedy for curing these evils. Thus, we are to inquire in this study the nature of justice as propounded by Plato as a fundamental principle of well-order society.

It is to be noted that before Plato many theories of justice were prevalent. The inquiry about justice goes from the crudest to the most refined interpretation of it. It remains therefore to inquire what the reasons for which he rejected those views were. Thus before discussing Plato's own concept of justice, it is necessary to analyze those traditional theories of justice were rejected by him. Cephalus who was a representative of traditional morality of the ancient trading class established the traditional theory of justice. According to him 'justice consists in speaking the truth and paying one's debt. Thus Cephalus identifies justice with right conduct. Polemarchus also holds

the same view of justice but with a little alteration. According to him "justice seems to consist in giving what is proper to him". The simple implication of this conception of justice may be that "justice is doing well to friends and harm to enemies." This is also a traditional maxim of Greek morality.

The views propounded by Cephalus and Polemarchus were criticized by Plato. The view point of Cephalus was criticized on the ground that there may be cases in which this formula may involve the violation of the spirit of right and his formula does not admit of being taken as a sound universal principle of life. It is not right to restore deadly weapons to a man after he has gone mad. And the contention of Polemarchus was condemned by Plato on the ground that it was only easy to speak of giving good to friend and evil to enemies. But if the friends only a friend in seeming and an enemy in reality, then what will happen? Then under such circumstances whether we should rigidly follow the definition and do his good or we may use discretion and do him evil? But to do evil to anybody, including one's enemy was inconsistent with the most elementary conception of morality. Thus, this conception of justice regulated the relations between individuals on individualistic principles and ignores the society as a whole.

Thrasymachus who represented the new and critical view, propounded the radical theory of justice. He defines justice as "the interest of the stronger". In the other words, might is right. For while, every man acts for himself and tries to get what he can, the strongest is sure to get what he wants and as in a state the Government is the strongest, it will try to get and it will get, whatever it wants for itself. Thus, for Thrasymachus justice means personal interest of the ruling group in any state or we can further define it as "another's good". Laws are made by the ruling party in its own interest. Those who violate such laws are punished because violation of such laws is treated as violation of justice. Socrates criticises the definition of justice given by Thrasymachus and he says just as a physician studies and exercises his power not in his interest but in the interest of a patient, the Government of any kind shall do what is good for the people for whom it exercises its art. But Thrasymachus advances some more arguments in support of his concept of justice and injustice.

*'An unjust is superior to a just in character and intelligence.  
Injustice is a source of strength.  
Injustice brings happiness.'*

Socrates attacks these points of Thrasymachus and throws light on the nature of justice. Justice implies superior character and intelligence while injustice means deficiency in both respects. Therefore, just men are superior in character and intelligence and are more effective in action. As injustice implies ignorance, stupidity and badness, It cannot be superior in character and intelligence. A just man is wiser because he acknowledges the principle of limit. Unlimited self-assertion is not a source of strength for any group organized for common purpose, unlimited desire and claims lead to conflicts.

Life of just man is better and happier. There is always some specific virtue in everything, which enables it to work well. If it is deprived of that virtue, it works badly. The soul has specific functions to perform. When it performs its specific functions, it has specific excellence or virtue. If, it is deprived of its peculiar virtue, it cannot possibly do its work well. It is agreed that the virtue of the soul is justice. The soul which is more virtuous or in other words more just is also the happier soul. Therefore, a just man lives happy. A just soul, in other words a just man, lives well; an unjust cannot.

At this juncture the new point of view is stated by Glaucon and he put Forward a form of what was later to be known as a social contract theory, arguing we are only moral because, it pays us or we have to be. Glaucon describes the historical evolution of the society where justice as a

necessity had become the shield of the weaker. In the primitive stage of society without law and government, man was free to do whatever he likes. So the stronger few enjoyed the life at the sufferance of the weaker many. The weaker, however, realized that they suffered more injustice. Faced with this situation they came to an agreement and instituted law and government through a sort of social contract and preached the philosophy of just. Therefore, justice in this way something artificial and unnatural. It is the "product of convention". It is through this artificial rule of justice and law that the natural selfishness of man is chained. A dictate of the weaker many, for the interest of the weaker many, as against the natural and superior power of the stronger few.

Plato realizes that all theories propounded by Cephalus, Thrasymachus and Glaucon, contained one common element. That one common element was that all the them treated justice as something external "an accomplishment, an importation, or a convention, they have, none of them carried it into the soul or considered it in the place of its habitation." Plato proves that justice does not depend upon a chance, convention or upon external force. It is the right condition of the human soul by the very nature of man when seen in the fullness of his environment. It is in this way that Plato condemned the position taken by Glaucon that justice is something which is external. According to Plato, it is internal as it resides in the human soul. "It is now regarded as an inward grace and its understanding is shown to involve a study of the inner man." It is, therefore, natural and no artificial. It is therefore, not born of fear of the weak but of the longing of the human soul to do a duty according to its nature.

Thus, after criticising the conventional ideas of justice presented differently by Cephalus, Polymarchus, Thrasymachus and Glaucon, Plato now gives us his own theory of justice. Plato strikes an analogy between the human organism on the one hand and social organism on the other. Human organism according to Plato contains three elements-Reason, Spirit and Appetite. An individual is just when each part of his or her soul performs its functions without interfering with those of other elements. For example, the reason should rule on behalf of the entire soul with wisdom and forethought. The element of spirit will sub-ordinate itself to the rule of reason. Those two elements are brought into harmony by combination of mental and bodily training. They are set in command over the appetites which form the greater part of man's soul. Therefore, the reason and spirit have to control these appetites which are likely to grow on the bodily pleasures. These appetites should not be allowed, to enslave the other elements and usurp the dominion to which they have no right. When all the three agree that among them the reason alone should rule, there is justice within the individual.

Corresponding to these three elements in human nature there are three classes in the social organism-Philosopher class or the ruling class which is the representative of reason; auxiliaries, a class of warriors and defenders of the country is the representative of spirit; and the appetite instinct of the community which consists of farmers, artisans and are the lowest rung of the ladder. Thus, weaving a web between the human organism and the social organism, Plato asserts that functional specialization demands from every social class to specialize itself in the station of life allotted to it. Justice, therefore to Plato is like a manuscript which exists in two copies, and one of these is larger than the other. It exists both in the individual and the society. But it exists on a larger scale and in more visible form in the society. Individually "justice is a 'human virtue' that makes a man self-consistent and good: Socially, justice is a social consciousness that makes a society internally harmonious and good."

Justice is thus a sort of specialization. It is simply the will to fulfill the duties of one's station and not to meddle with the duties of another station, and its habitation is, therefore, in the mind of every citizen who does his duties in his appointed place. It is the original principle, laid down at the foundation of the State, "that one man should practice one thing only and that the thing to which his nature was best adopted". True justice to Plato, therefore, consists in the principle of

non-interference. The State has been considered by Plato as a perfect whole in which each individual which is its element, functions not for itself but for the health of the whole. Every element fulfils its appropriate function. Justice in the platonic state would, therefore, be like that harmony of relationship where the Planets are held together in the orderly movement. Plato was convinced that a society which is so organized is fit for survival. Where man are out of their natural places, there the co-ordination of parts is destroyed, the society disintegrates and dissolves. Justice, therefore, is the citizen sense of duties.

Justice is, for Plato, at once a part of human virtue and the bond, which joins man together in society. It is the identical quality that makes good and social. Justice is an order and duty of the parts of the soul, it is to the soul as health is to the body. Plato says that justice is not mere strength, but it is a harmonious strength. Justice is not the right of the stronger but the effective harmony of the whole. All moral conceptions revolve about the good of the whole-individual as well as social.

Lastly, regarding the third point Socrates again uses antagonizes to show that the just man is happier than the unjust one. He uses the idea of 'function' to prove his point. He explains that everything has a function. For instance, we cannot see with anything but eyes, cannot hear with anything but ears. Thus, sight and hearing are exclusively the functions of eyes and ears, respectively. Likewise, he claims that a function of a man is to live. This is promised by a good mind and justice is a peculiar excellence of the mind whereas injustice is the defect of the mind. Therefore, only a just man with a just mind will have a good life and so be happy. Thus, he concludes by proving to Thrasymachus that 'injustice never pays better than justice.

#### **1.4.6: Concept of education**

Education for Plato was one of the great things of life. Plato view of education is for the good of the individual and for the safety of the state. The aim of education, according to Plato, is the welfare of both the individual and the society. His guiding principle is that, "Nothing must be admitted in education which does not conduce to the promotion of virtue. Moreover, Plato's treatment of education in the "Laws" is different from that of his "Republic". Education in the "Laws" is to be universal and not restricted, as in the "Republic", to the guardian class and is to be compulsory. Children should come to the school not only if their parents please, but there should be compulsory education. Education was an attempt to touch the evil at its source, and reform the wrong ways of living as well as one's outlook towards life. According to Barker, education is an attempt to cure a mental illness by a medicine. The object of education is to turn the soul towards light. Plato once stated that the main function of education is not to put knowledge into the soul, but to bring out the latent talents in the soul by directing it towards the right objects. This explanation of Plato on education highlights his object of education and guides the readers in proper direction to unfold the ramifications of his theory of education.

Plato regards education as a means to achieve justice, both individual justice and social justice. According to Plato, individual justice can be obtained when each individual develops his or her ability to the fullest. In this sense, justice means excellence. For the Greeks and Plato, excellence is virtue. According to Socrates, virtue is knowledge. Thus, knowledge is required to be just. From this Plato concludes that virtue can be obtained through three stages of development of knowledge: knowledge of one's own job, self-knowledge, and knowledge of the Idea of the Good. According to Plato, social justice can be achieved when all social classes in a society, workers, warriors, and rulers are in a harmonious relationship. Plato believes that all people can easily exist in harmony when society gives them equal educational opportunity from an early age to compete fairly with each other. Without equal educational opportunity, an unjust society appears

since the political system is run by unqualified people; timocracy, oligarchy, defective democracy, or tyranny will result. Modern education in Japan and other East Asian countries has greatly contributed to developing their societies in economic terms. Nevertheless, education in those countries has its own problems. In particular the college entrance examination in Japan, Korea, and other East Asian countries caused serious social injustices and problems: unequal educational opportunity, lack of character education, financial burden on parents, and so on. Thus, to achieve justice, modern society needs the Platonic theory education, for Plato's philosophy of education will provide a comprehensive vision to solve those problems in education. There is also some controversy about the relationship between education and economics. It is a popular view common in East and West that businesses should indirectly control or even take over education to economically compete with other nations. However, Plato disagrees with this notion since business is concerned mainly with profit whereas a true education is concerned with the common good based upon the rational principle of individual and social justice.

Plato was, in fact, the first ancient political philosopher either to establish a university or to introduce a higher course or to speak of education as such. This emphasis on education came to the forefront only due to the then prevailing education system in Athens. Plato was against the practice of buying knowledge, which according to him was a heinous crime than buying meat and drink. Plato strongly believed in a state control education system. He held the view that without education, the individual would make no progress any more than a patient who believed in curing himself by his own loving remedy without giving up his luxurious mode of living. Therefore, Plato stated that education touches the evil at the grass root and changes the whole outlook on life. It was through education that the principle of justice was properly maintained. Education was the positive measure for the operation of justice in the ideal state. Plato was convinced that the root of the vice lay chiefly in ignorance, and only by proper education can one be converted into a virtuous man. The main purpose of Plato's theory of education was to ban individualism, abolish incompetence and immaturity, and establish the rule of the efficient. Promotion of common good was the primary objective of platonic education.

Plato in his famous book "The Republic" has suggested appropriate kind of education for the ruling and the military classes of community, but he does not mention anything about the education of the industrial class. Plato prescribes a general type of Greek education for both the military and governing classes. It includes the two main divisions of Greek education-music and gymnastics. He says that the first (i.e. music) is necessary for the training of soul and the other (i.e. gymnastics) for the training of the body. Plato also asserts that we should begin education with music and go on to gymnastics afterwards, mental education is thus to precede physical education. Plato was greatly influenced by the Spartan system of education, though not completely. The education system in Athens was privately controlled unlike in Sparta where the education was state-controlled. The Spartan youth were induced to military spirit and the educational system was geared to this end. However, the system lacked the literacy aspect. Intriguingly, many Spartans could neither read nor write. Therefore, it can be stated that the Spartan system did not produce any kind of intellectual potentials in man, which made Plato discard the Spartan education to an extent. The platonic system of education is, in fact, a blend of Athens and the organization of Sparta. This is because Plato believed in the integrated development of human personality.

### **Plato's View of Curriculum**

Plato prescribed a general type of curriculum prevailing in Greece at that time. The curriculum for the early training, that occupied first seventeen years of life, was comprised of music and gymnastics. The word music was used in a much broader sense than we use it today. It included poetry, drama, history, oratory and music in its more limited sense.

The education of these two subjects aimed at producing an improved soul and a healthy body. Even moral results were obtained through them. Music helped the child to grow gentle, graceful and harmonious. Gymnastics helped him to develop, courage, patience, reason, consideration, and temperance and whole mindedness. At the first stage of life i.e. before the age of seven years, the child should not be educated formally. He should stay with his mother or nurse and be educated in their company. At this stage the mother or the nurse should tell him the authorized tales about the gods and heroes of the nation to develop the trait of noble character in them.

For the early education, Plato recommends the inclusion of dances, hunting and field exercises in gymnastics.

For higher education he emphasizes the study of numbers and geometry. This will sharpen the minds of students. Astronomy is another subject recommended by Plato for higher education. Lastly, music was also included.

### **State-controlled Education:**

Plato believed in a strong state-controlled education for both men and women. He was of the opinion that every citizen must be compulsorily trained to fit into any particular class, viz., ruling, fighting or the producing class.

Education, however, must be imparted to all in the early stages without any discrimination. Plato never stated out rightly that education system was geared to those who want to become rulers of the ideal state and this particular aspect attracted widespread criticism.

### **Plato's Scheme of Education:**

Plato was of the opinion that education must begin at an early age. In order to make sure that children study well, Plato insisted that children be brought up in a hale and healthy environment and that the atmosphere implant ideas of truth and goodness. Plato believed that early education must be related to literature, as it would bring out the best of the soul. The study must be mostly related to story-telling and then go on to poetry.

Secondly, music and thirdly arts were the subjects of early education. Plato believed in regulation of necessary step towards conditioning the individual. For further convenience, Plato's system of education can be broadly divided into two parts: elementary education and higher education.

### **Elementary Education:**

Plato was of the opinion that for the first 10 years, there should be predominantly physical education. In other words, every school must have a gymnasium and a playground in order to develop the physique and health of children and make them resistant to any disease.

Apart from this physical education, Plato also recommended music to bring about certain refinement in their character and lent grace and health to the soul and the body. Plato also prescribed subjects such as mathematics, history and science.

### **Higher Education:**

According to Plato, a child must take an examination that would determine whether or not to pursue higher education at the age of 20. Those who failed in the examination were asked to take up activities in communities such as businessmen, clerks, workers, farmers and the like.

Those who passed the exam would receive another 10 years of education and training in body and mind. At this stage, apart from physical and mathematical sciences, subjects like arithmetic, astronomy, geometry and dialectics were taught. Again at the age of 30, students would take yet another examination, which served as an elimination test, much severe than the first test.

Those who did not succeed would become executive assistants, auxiliaries and military officers of the state. Plato stated that based on their capabilities, candidates would be assigned a particular field. Those who passed in the examination would receive another 5 year advanced education in dialectics in order to find out as to who was capable of freeing himself from sense perception.

The education system did not end here. Candidates had to study for another 15 years for practical experience in dialectics. Finally at the age of 50, those who withstood the hard and fast process of education were introduced to the ultimate task of governing their country and the fellow beings. These kings were expected to spend most of the time in philosophical pursuits. Thus, after accomplishing perfection, the rulers would exercise power only in the best interests of the state. The ideal state would be realized and its people would be just, honest and happy.

Plato, in his proposed scheme of education, accepts certain assumptions; (i) soul, being initiative and active, throws up, through education, the best things that are latent in it; (ii) education moulds the character of the growing young; it does not provide eyes to the blind, but it does give vision to men with eyes; it brings soul to the realms of light; it activates and reactivates the individual; (iii) each level of education has a pre-assigned function: the elementary education helps individuals give direction to their powers; middle level education helps individuals understand their surroundings; and higher education helps individuals prepare, determine and decide their course of education; and (iv) education helps people earn a living and also helps them to become better human beings. Plato does not want to make education a commercial enterprise.

He wants, as Sabine tells us, that education must itself provide the needed means, must see that citizens actually get the training they require, and must be sure that the education supplied is consonant with the harmony and well-being of the state. "Plato's plan, Sabine states, "is therefore, for a state-controlled system of compulsory education. However, these subjects must be taught by smoothing them into verse and songs and must not be forced on children. This is because, according to Plato, knowledge acquired under compulsion has no hold on the mind. Therefore, he believed that education must not be forced, but should be made a sort of amusement as it would enable the teacher to understand the natural bent of mind of the child. Plato also emphasized on moral education.

#### **1.4.7: Rule of Philosopher king**

In the Republic, Plato argues that kings should become philosophers or that philosophers should become kings, or philosopher-kings, as only philosophers possess the knowledge required to rule justly and successfully. This assertion has been highly controversial since Plato first articulated it as it is one of the most exemplary examples of political idealism. Indeed, Plato meant it to be a harsh critique on the contemporary Athenian democracy of his time. Nevertheless, Plato created some of the most enduring political metaphors of western thought including the Ship of State and the Allegory of the Cave, among others in defending his assertion. In constructing their ideal, just city, Socrates argued that the city must be ruled by those who are ruled by the rational part of their soul, as opposed to the appetitive or spirited parts. Later on, Socrates asserts that the appetitive-led rulers become tyrants (Book IX, 575c-579e) while the spirited-led rulers become oligarchs (Book VIII, 547c-548c). Instead, rationally-led rulers are said to be the only solution:

In his Republic of (Book V, 473c-e) he stated that "Unless the philosophers rule as kings or those now called kings and chiefs genuinely and adequately philosophize, and political power and philosophy coincide in the same place... there is no rest from ills for cities, my dear Glaucon, nor I think for human kind, nor will the regime we have now described in speech ever come forth from nature". Plato, through Socrates, asserts that only when philosopher-kings rule will good governance be possible; their ideally just city would be impossible without such rulers in place. Plato stated that philosophers are the most intellectuals of the society and they should be the best rulers to govern the people.

### 1.4.8: Theory of Communism

Plato's theory of communism was certainly a corollary of his conception of justice. Plato's theory of communism is just opposite to Marxian theory of communism that seeks to eventually establish a classless and hence stateless society, as according to it the state is instrument of the domination in the hands of ruling classes. Plato's theory of communism that is used as one of instruments of consolidation of the hierarchically 'well ordered' state through perpetuating class-division and class-domination, the other instrument being the education. Plato's Republic seeks to establish justice, i.e. the ideal state where the philosophers, selflessly, rule over the masses involved in the material production of the society, with the help of the armed auxiliaries. Plato's theory of communism is based on his belief of corrupting influences of family and property over people holding the public offices that remains a historic fact and continuing norm. It is aimed at freeing the ruling classes, i.e. the philosophers and the warriors from the institutions of family and property. The vast producing masses are kept out of the realm of communism that applies to only ruling classes – the philosophers and the warriors. The longings for family and property make the rulers self-seeking, indulgent, greedy and hence corrupt that is a diversion from and impediment to appropriate performance of their duty to rule not in their own but in public interest.

Plato believed that without communism there would be clash of ideas and interests between reason and appetite. Plato's communism is based on the premise that property, family instincts and private interests would distract man's attention from his obligations to the community. He strongly opined that family and property are always impediments not only to philosopher king, but also to a commoner in his discharge of duties. As property and family relationships seemed to be the main source of dissension in the society, Plato stated that neither of them must be given any recognition in an ideal state. Therefore, a sort of communism of family and property was essential to offset the consequences of Plato's design of ideal state.

Plato strongly believed that an economic division between the citizens of a state is the most dangerous political condition. This belief was mainly due to the widespread and frank opinions expressed by the Greeks that economic motives are very influential in determining political action and political affiliations. Long before The Republic was written, Euripides had divided citizens into three classes, viz., the useless rich who are always greedy for more, the poor who have nothing and are devoured by envy, and finally the middle class a strong body of men who saves the state. An oligarchical state to a Greek meant a state governed by, and in the interest of the well-born whose possession of property was hereditary, while a democratic state was governed by and for the many who had neither hereditary birth nor property. These economic differences were the key to the political institutions and it was no new idea, which the Greeks were following since ages. The cause for unrest that Plato was experiencing in Athens was mainly due to the troubles present since the days of Solon a statesman reforms in Athens. This situation convinced Plato that wealth has a very pernicious effect on the government, but was dismayed at the fact that there was no way to abolish the evil except by abolishing the wealth itself. To cure greed among the rulers, there is only one way and that was to deny them any right to call anything their own. Devotion to their civic duties admits no private rival. The example of Sparta, wherein the citizens were denied the use of money and the privilege of engaging in trade, undoubtedly influenced Plato in reaching this conclusion. The main reason for Plato to emphasize on communism of property was to bring about greater degree of unity in the state.

Plato was equally vehement about the institution of marriage and opined that family affections directed towards a particular persons, as another potent rival to the state in competing for the

loyalty of rulers. He stated that anxiety for one's children is a form of self-seeking more dangerous than the desire for property, and the training of children at homes as a poor preparation for the whole and sole devotion, which the state has the right to demand. Plato was, in fact, appalled by the casualness of human mating which according to him would not be tolerated in the breeding of any domestic animal. The improvement of the race demands a more controlled and a more selective type of union. Finally, the abolition of marriage was probably an implied criticism of the position of women in Athens, where her activities were summed up in keeping the house and rearing children. To this, Plato denied that the state serve half of its potential guardians.

Moreover, he was unable to see that there is anything in the natural capacity of women that corresponds to the Athenian practice, since many women were as well qualified as men to take part in political or even military duties. The women of the guardian class will consequently share the work of the men, which makes it necessary that both shall receive the same education and strictly be free from domestic duties. Plato's argument about breeding of domestic animals refers to the sexual relations between men and women. It is not that he regarded sex casually, but he demanded an amount of self-control that has never been realized among any large populations. According to him, if the unity of the state has to be secured, property and family stand in the way, therefore, they both must be abolished.

#### **Forms of Communism:**

Plato's communism is of two forms, viz., the abolition of private property, which included house, land, money, etc., and the second, the abolition of family, through the abolition of these two, Plato attempted to create a new social order wherein the ruling class surrendered both family and private property and embraced a system of communism. This practice of communism is only meant for the ruling class and the guardian class.

However, Plato did not bind this principle on the third class, namely, the artisans. In other words, they were allowed to maintain property and family, but were under strict supervision so that they do not become either too rich or too poor. Though Plato structured the society in this manner, he never made any attempt to work out his plan that ensured such a system to function.

The following is a brief description of each form of communism:

#### **Communism of Property:**

Plato's communism of property is in no way related to the modern communism or socialism because there was no mention of socialization of the means of production. Plato's approach was mainly concerned with one factor of production, that is, property that has to be socialized. The gist of Plato's communism is deprivation of all the members of the ruling classes, the guardians and soldiers from having any private property including private house, land or gold and silver their survival needs shall be taken care by the commodities collected from the producing classes in the form of taxes. They shall live in the state managed barracks and eat in the common mess. Plato's communism is ascetic and aristocratic simultaneously. As has been already mentioned, the communism applies for only ruling classes and not for producing masses. The private ownership of property by ruling classes is to be replaced by their collective ownership of property and collective domination over the producing masses under the direction of philosopher king with the coercive apparatus of the armed auxiliaries. The ruling classes are forced to leave the longing for gold and silver and also of private wives in the larger interest of the state. According to him those classes which have the qualities of gold and silver within, need not external silver or gold. They are the servants of the people and not the masters, a contradiction in terms. This duality of theory and practice continues in modern democracies as the ruling parties and leaders despite their all kinds of uses and misuses of power claim to be servants of the people. They shall be paid no salary or allowances, their essential needs shall be taken by the state. The longing for property corrupts the rulers and makes them greedy and selfish that would lead to instability of the state.

Also involvement of rulers into economic activities shall be a deviation from their role and commitment to the justice, i.e. to serve the people by way of maintaining the class-divided social order. Also, in his opinion, family and property were the chief sources of disunity and social tension. The land and its products were in the hands of the farmers. So, only the guardians were deprived of property. Plato deprived them of all valuables such as gold and silver, and was told that the diviner metal is within them, and therefore there is no need for any ornaments as it might pollute the divine thoughts.

The guardians were paid salaries just right enough for their maintenance. They were expected to dine at common tables and live in common barracks, which were always open. Thus, Plato's communism was ascetic in character. Plato's communism existed only for the governing class. Therefore, it was political communism and not economic communism.

### **Communism of Wives:**

Plato's scheme of communism deprived the guardian class not only of property, but also a private life or a family because family introduced an element of thing and mine. He believed that family would destroy a sense of cooperation that forms the basis for a state. To destroy family, it is important to destroy selfishness. Plato wanted the rulers of an ideal state not to get distracted from their work and get tempted towards self-interests.

Plato opined that family was the great stronghold of selfishness, and for this reason it has to be banned for the governing class. This situation brings about a question of 'Did Plato deny his guardians class a normal sex life?' For this, Plato stated that mating was encouraged between those who can in the best possible manner produce children of the desired quality.

Another question that was raised was related to those children who were born out of this union. According to Plato, they would be the property of the state. Immediately after their birth, they would be taken to a nursery and nursed and nurtured there. This method would make sure that no parent would have any affection upon one child, and thus love all the children as their own. Further, the guardians, instead of caring for the welfare of their progeny, would thrive for the welfare of all. Thus, guardians of the state would constitute one great family wherein all children would be treated equal and common. Bound by common joys and sorrow, there is personal or exclusive relation to one family and in the process the entire state.

Plato further specified the age for both men and women for begetting children. He stated that the proper age for begetting children women should be between the age of 20 and 40 and men between 25 and 55 because at this time, the physical and intellectual vigor is more. If anybody flouted the rules, they were treated as unholy and unrighteous beings. Thus, Plato's communism of wives provided social, political and psychological bases for the ideal state. Plato believed that such a communism of family would remove the conflict between the personal interests and the objectives of the state. Thus the concept of justice occupies the most important part of Plato's *The Republic*. Sabine says: "The theory of the state in *The Republic* culminates in the conception of justice." He has treated justice as the bond which holds a society together. Hence it is the true principle of social life. *The Republic* deals with the bond and true principle of social life.

### **1.4.9: Concept of ideal state**

Plato was greatly influenced by his master Socrates dictum “virtue is knowledge”. He believed that only wise people should rule. This leads him to outline a scheme of ideal state where in only few are allowed to rule after rigorous training. It may be un-pragmatic in the sense that there is no correlation between various elements of ideal state and vast majority in the outside political sphere. But Plato conceives himself to be defining the universal nature which every state possesses in some degree. He quote “A state I said, arises as I conceive out of the needs of the mankind no one is self-sufficing ,but all of us have many wants, can any other origin of a state be imagined”. Since individuals have many wants, they need many acquaintances to accomplish them. When these associates gathered together in one habitation the state came into existence. Exchange is the medium through which one receives and gives to other. Through it, individual may unite to form a state. State was also created out of the idea of necessity. The necessity of food dwelling and clothing incorporates the workers, farmers, builders, weavers to entertain the goal of the context. So we need a number of individuals related with each other by a peculiar bond. What is the bond uniting individual in a state? It is the mutual economic dependence which arises from the limited capacity of an individual to supply his own wants with the natural diversity and to supply one wants to other. Plato tried to establish a good society with justice. The good is possible only through the state. Society is a natural institution. Man is essentially a social and political animal. The state exists for the sack of good life. The aim of good society is neither freedom, nor economic wellbeing rather the aim of the good society is justice what Plato observed. A true state must be conformed to justice. The state does not decide what justice is. Justice is an object of knowledge. Therefore a philosopher must lead the state. In *Politicus* Plato propounded the idea that the judgment of the perfect ruler is superior to any of the written Laws. He said an ideal state could be realized not by Laws but by the perfect ruler. The ideal state in platonic republic describes that just are to lead a happy life and reverse to the rest. He examined the just state in three stages such as---

- i. The guardians- leaders, noble class
- ii. The auxiliaries- the military class
- iii. The artisans- the working class

**The guardians-** The guardians or leaders of the state must be philosophers for they are to arrange the life of the state and determine the principles of education and allot the various tasks in the state to its different members .so they must have a knowledge of what is really true and good. The primary duty of public authorities is to prevent the ruin of the morality of the members of the state as it can be maintained. The leader of the state will be selected from the guardian class. They must be best person of the guardian class, intelligent, powerful, and careful only of the state. The interest of the state must be identified with their own. Therefore those chosen must be observes all throughout childhood and adolescence. Those who always do that which is best for the state and never have deserted this line of conduct will be chosen as rulers.

**The auxiliaries-** They are devoted exclusively to the conduct of war. Members of this class must be courageous and intellectually gifted. They must be philosophic; for they must know who are the true enemies of the state and must be very well educated.

**The artisans-** They are the weavers, farmers, artisans, musicians, poets, tutors, cooks, shoemakers, carpenters, nurses, smiths etc.

However in his most celebrated book “the Republic” Plato gives the theory of an ideal state and how to build an ideal commonwealth, who should be the ruler of the ideal state and how to achieve justice in the ideal state. Plato finds the state as the more suitable place to discuss about the morality of an individual, because everything is easier to see in the large than in the small. The element that make up a city correspond the element that constitute the individual human soul. There is not one morality for the individual and another for the state. Every state has three parts which are in three classes. The element that constitute the human soul are –

1. Bodily appetite

2. Spirited element
3. Reason

There is the producing class, military class and ruling class. In order to meet the various challenges of the people, the political institution was created. In the beginning there was only one class, i.e. the producing class, then emerged the guardian and ruling class. In a state the producer class will consist of those people to whom the bodily appetites are dominant and who live for money. The producer class is made up of farmers, blacksmith, fisherman, carpenter, shoemaker, weaver, labourer, merchants, retailer, and bankers. The life of the producer class is much easier than the life of the rulers or the guardians. The life of the producer class follows the old familiar pattern of home and property, family and children, work rest and recreation. By nature the producers have money. The military class will be drawn from that type of men to whom the spirited element is dominant and who live for success in hostile and courageous acts. The member of the ruling class will be drawn from that type of man to whom reason is foremost and who lives only for the truth. A state should be ruled by the elite group of the most rational. In an ideal state each of the three classes will perform a vital function on behalf of the organic totality of the state. The ruling class possesses natural intellectual capacity in an ideal state. Women as well as men possess that an ideal state will be governed by a person who is highly educated has passion for truth and has achieved the greatest wisdom of knowledge of the good. The ruler of the ideal state is called the philosopher king. Both the military class and the ruling class are forbidden to possess any private property or any money. They must live men and women like soldiers in barracks with the common meals and sleeping quarters. Their food, clothing, equipment will be provided by the producers.

#### **4.2 Nature of the state-**

In the nature of the state Plato identifies the intellect within the guardians, the spirit of emotions with the auxiliaries and the bodily appetites with the producers. Therefore an individual is courageous if his or her spirit is courageous and an individual is wise if his or her intellect is wise. Temperance occurs when the emotions are ruled over by the intellect and the bodily appetites are ruled over by the emotions and especially the intellect. An individual may be said to be just when the bodily appetites and emotions are not only ruled over by the intellect, do so willingly without the threat of force.

A state is composed of individuals in relation with each other in a peculiar bond. If we take a pair of compass and describe a circle at random upon the map of Europe the circular area would include the collection of individuals related to one another by geographical proximity but this collection would not form a state then what is the bond uniting individual in the state. It is a bond of mutual economic dependence that arises from the limited capacity of an individual to supply his own wants together with natural diversity and individual capacity. Plato emphasized on the economic institutions and the material needs by the system of division of labour. He interpreted virtue of men in the nature of the state. In the primitive society Glaucon characterized state as city of swine which has no complete model. It always needs another completion then the mere multiplication and refinement of its wants. It is driven to aggression by its failure to supply its own wants for itself. Aggression may occur with the failure of economic, self-sufficiency, constituting the poor health of original state. But it is the effect and symptom of a disordered not of a healthy constitution.

#### **1.4.10: Organic theory of the state:**

The organic theory of the state is a kind of political collectivism which maintains that the state transcends individuals within the state in power, right or property. It is often traced to ancient thinker. Plato who was strongly influenced in soviet Russia, Nazi Germany, and Communist China and the political thought of Woodrow Wilson in the American New deal. The state is such type of animal body where all parts are functionally related and none can exist in isolation. It has a natural unity like a social group. The animal body is composed of cells. State is composed of

several individuals and the relation of the hands of the body or the leaves of the tree is quite similar in relation to man to society. Men exist in society and society in him. Plato compared the state to a man of great structure and conceived a resemblance in their functions. He said that the best ordered commonwealth was one whose structural organizations resembles most nearly in the principle to that of the individual.

### **State as a means to the good:**

In this context Plato emphasized on the innate and inherent qualities of the soul. Soul is a matter of birth which varies from person to person. It is the state which can only bring balance in it. The widest all-embracing and lifelong education would be necessary force to stimulate the state as a means to the good. No other thing is more typical of Plato than this insistence that it is the state that makes the man. Moreover this type of the constitution produces its own type of man. Individual gets knowledge from the influence of the state not the teaching of private individuals but it is not the state that helps men to achieve the balance in souls. Rational soul may be less good than it might be and may more evil than expectations. Society could not be developed without the rational soul. It needs necessary steps for the full developments of its philosophic nature. If in the existing society the very vitality of the rational soul is added than it may lead to danger. . In an example we may say that for the proper growth plant needs nourishment, climate, soil etc. Likewise the good state must not only be properly led, must be properly defined.

### **Characteristics of a good state:**

Firstly the good state is that in it power will be given to those not who wants it must but who desires it least. It must be concentrated to the philosophers who will nevertheless exercise it best. Secondly characteristics of a good state will be the presence below the guardians, in whose hands supreme power is concentrated, of a class of professional soldiers. They are regarded as guards and courage is the main virtue. They must be keen to see, swift to catch and strong to destroy the enemy. They must combine two contradictory qualities—mildness to their friends and ferocity towards their enemies. Thirdly the good state must be properly fed. There should be class of producers below the philosopher king and the guards which must be enshrined by the human excellence.

Proper leadership, protection and provision are indispensable to the good state. It accepts human nature as it does not take all men to the ideal one type. The guardian should have the satisfaction of knowledge, contemplation of the idea and must be developed to mould others. The best should rule and each should occupy the place and do the work for which he is best suited. All should do the best to be the good state. The unlimited power may lead to abuse, but plato in his republic acknowledged that the minds of the philosophers must be so directed to be good and strengthened against evil that they will not wish to misuse the power. Mr Atlee spoke in UNESCO “since war begins in the minds of men, it is the minds of men that we must seek to prevent them”. To develop character and to train the mind for the creation of a good state in platonic republic is the business of education.

### **Class state, democracy and communism**

From the elementary form of society there was the introduction of two superior classes such as the auxiliaries and the rulers. They completed city with these two classes superimposed upon it; for that organization of supply and exchange which form the constitution of the entire original city must be held to be preserved in the completed city as the constitution of others.

The earlier society of platos Republic is not a state. The society was developed into a tripartite society to form a state. It is the government which stimulates the state. Plato believed about the confined functions to a special class, because nature has confined the capacity of performing it. There are two distinguishable elements of platonic theory.

- The function of government is essential to the state
- The function must be exercised exclusively by a special class.

The modern theory of democracy repudiates the function of the few by a special class of man. It accepts platonic doctrine of the state that encroach equality and enumerates equal right in exercising the governmental functions. The Marxian theory repudiates the function of the government is essential to a state, what Plato assumed it to be namely the natural and eternal form of human society. It propounds a society where the state shall have withered away and there will be dictatorship of the proletariat. In this stage there is the existence of the state to control the function of the government. Marxism is the reversal process by which the platonic state had developed from the primitive society and a trophy of the functions that the guardian class was formed.

The state is the picture of an ideal. In no state there exists a class of men wise enough to comprehend the public interest unreservedly and unselfishly. In an ideal state some degree may be realized. In every state there is always a ruler, a government, a ruling class to comprehend the organization with some purposive measure.

However, the three different views of justice symbolized the individual positions of Cephalus, Polemarchus. and Thrasymachus. Socrates uses another approach to appreciate this concept of justice. This is based on his assumption that it is always easier to study things on a larger scale and then apply them to analyze the relevant particular cases. With this assumption, he makes an attempt to first study justice within the context of state and subsequently applies it to understand the same with regard to the individuals and then he moves on to frame the economic structure of the society. He starts by making a somewhat strange comparison. He says, given that we are all short-sighted people, if we are made to read something, which in one place is written in small letters and in another place written in large letters, it will always be easier and better for us to read the one written in large letters. Using the above analogy, he declares, that it would be easier for us to discover the meaning of justice, first in the context of state and then in that of the individual. 'Let us suppose we are rather short-sighted men and are set to read some small letters at a distance; one of us then discovers the same letters elsewhere on a large scale and larger surface: won't it be good send to us to be able to read the larger letters first and then compare them with the smaller. He explains that justice can be distinguished both of an individual as well as the state or community. And since a community is larger than an individual, he seems confident to '...find justice on a larger scale in the larger entity.... I accordingly propose that we start our inquiry with the community, and then proceed to the individual and see if we can find the conformation of the smaller entity anything similar to what we have found in the larger'." But the question that arises here is that how would Socrates explain the existence of a society. To this he replies by proclaiming that when individuals realize that they are not self-sufficient to fulfill their respective needs, they come together to form a society. He says, 'Society instigates, then.... Because the individual is not independent, but has many needs which he can't supply himself.' These needs are threefold, i.e. food to keep us alive followed by shelter, and clothing. Now, Socrates suggests that in order to fulfill these needs we have to have primarily a farmer, a builder, and a weaver apart from a few others to provide for other needs. Therefore, the state or metropolitan must have at least four to five men. Thus the first constituent of the economic structure is formed in the sense of producers including both agricultural and industrial producers. Once this import export business gets established, Socrates foresees the need of a market, 'and a currency as the medium of exchange.' But to run this market properly, there would be the need of retail traders. 'And so this requirement produces a class of retailers in our state....,' says Socrates. Thus, the fourth step is framed. Besides, he also realizes the importance of physical labour and adds one last class to the above list, namely the class of 'wage-learners' who may not be intellectually strong but market their physical strength to earn wages. With these categories of classes, the 'component of citizens' is completed in the ideal state. But another issue arises: how does one trace justice and injustice within this structure? Adeimantus suggests that it could be traced from the mutual relationship

between these elements. As a result Socrates starts visualizing how the citizens so equipped would live in his Utopia. He imagines they would produce crops and wine and clothes and also build houses for themselves. They would adorn clothes subject to the weather and climate. Further, they would indulge in great food along with their children and also confine their families within their means for fear of war and so on. At [his point Glaucon raises his objection. He is not particularly happy with such a picture of the state as it appears quite primitive. He, in fact, says that such a society is not suitable for men but for the pigs! "...that's just the fodder you would provide if you were founding a community of pigs! Glaucon's intension is to divert Socrates attention from the mundane necessities of people to their comforts, luxuries, and entertainments too so that citizens are satisfied with their standard of living. Socrates complies with the former's proposal and proceeds to work on a 'civilized' state. He goes beyond the five existing classes and now adjoins artists, poets, painters, musicians, and servants, including tutors, cooks, nannies, cosmeticians and also ladies maids. However, he cautions at the same time that with all these new luxuries the citizens might get over-indulgent and eventually fall sick. This would give rise to the need of a class of doctors in the state. What is more, according to Socrates, is that with all these new additions to make the state 'civilized' the territory of the state might have to be extended. This would enforce people to 'cut a slice of our neighbor's territory'. And in response they 'will want a slice of ours too'. Thus, the inevitability of a war must not be ruled out. So, to safeguard the citizens and their possessions Socrates brings in the soldier class and declares them to be 'guardians' of the state. Since the guardian class has the responsibility of the entire state they ought to be efficient and so need to be carefully selected and trained- In other words, they must have some special qualities. What are these qualities then? According to Socrates, they should have the natural qualities of a watch dog. The watch dogs, have a keen perception, are courageous, and highly spirited. Here. Glaucon points out that these qualities may make the guardians aggressive not only to each other but towards the rest of the community which could lead to a dangerous situation. Socrates agrees and suggests that they should be gentle towards fellow citizens but dangerous only to their enemies in order to prevent any untoward situation in the community. But how would they get such a sense of discrimination? To this, Socrates replies that the guardians must have the 'disposition of a philosopher' in addition to their high spirits. In order to explain his idea he points to a 'remarkable quality' in the watch-dog which tends to get annoyed on seeing a stranger and welcomes the one it is familiar with thus displaying a sense of discrimination.

Socrates, however, is a little doubtful here and wonders if each of these men should produce enough for a common consumption or should they produce for their own families and disregard the others. Adamantssupport the first alternative saying that 'The first alternative is perhaps the simpler.' To this Socrates adds that the best and efficient way of satisfying our needs is to make different individuals practice different trades according to their capabilities. He expresses, 'We have different natural aptitudes, which fit us for different jobs. ...Quantity and quality are, therefore, more easily produced when a man specializes appropriately on a single job for which he is naturally fitted...'<sup>28</sup> This thought leads to the requirement of more than four to five citizens. For instance, he says that the farmer would be in demand of an expert to make his ptough or other agricultural implements and the same would apply with the builder and the weaver. Moving ahead, he says that in order to enhance production the slate may be in need of some imports, which in turn would command another class or unrestricted, 'to fetch for it what it needs from abroad'. But in exchange of what weimport. Socrates suggests that we ought to have a substantial production so that we make a good export too. This is how he forms the second part of the economic structure, namely the merchant class who could 'handle the export and import of goods'.

However, the state would now comprise of three classes of citizens, namely the rulers, the auxiliaries, and the craftsmen. The last of the classes refer to all those citizens who are not involved in governing the state, like doctors, farmers, artists, and poet. But, how does one ensure

that these classes do not interfere with each other's affairs thereby destroying the peace and harmony of the state? Socrates evolves a technique to handle such a possibility. This has been famously termed as the Myth of the Metals.<sup>34</sup> According to the myth; all citizens are taken to be brothers as they are produced by God from the same stock. However, some of them are gifted with gold in their veins (rulers), others have silver running through their veins (auxiliaries), and the remaining have iron and bronze. Now the off-springs of respective would be expected to have similar metals in their veins too. But once in a while, the orders of the metals in the children may change. In that case, Socrates suggests that they be taken away from their parent class and transported to the class to which they belong. Although he is apprehensive about peoples' belief in such a myth, he is nevertheless hopeful that the lessons ensuing from the myth would increase the royalty of the citizens for their community. To end it all, Socrates further recommends that the rulers and auxiliaries lead a simple life with best of education, without private property, and a family-life as these factors mislead men to pursue their personal interests and neglect the public whom they are meant to serve. He says that they must be educated in such a way so that they have strong and stable minds and characters. He also debars them from reading books or poetries that would generate negative feelings and emotions in them, thus making them weak. In other words, they are to be educated to become brave hearts. Adeimantus who had been listening till now is not particularly happy with the proposed life style of the rulers as he finds it quite rigorous and Spartan. He feels that they must have magnificent houses and gold and silver and must also benefit from their position or else they would be an unhappy lot. Socrates answers by explaining to Adeimantus that happiness is not to be looked for in material possessions because these are external things. Instead, he tries to argue that it is to be located for the sake of the community as a whole. He maintains '...our purpose in founding our state was not to promote the particular happiness of a single class, but, so far as possible, of the whole community.' Thus, he succeeds in convincing Adeimantus.

### **1.5: The idea of intrinsic worth in state of Plato**

Socrates viewed that the state is the ideal and perfect state because it has the qualities of wisdom, courage, justice, and punishment. These qualities are also termed as the four cardinal virtues. To use Socrates words, 'If we have founded it properly, our state is presumably perfect'. Such a state will have 'the qualities of wisdom, courage, self-discipline and justice'. He starts with the quality of wisdom but the question is where to locate it in the state. As we know wisdom is directly linked with one's knowledge and judgment, so it may be asked whether it is to be traced in the judgment of the carpenter who has perfect knowledge of woodwork and is also excellent with his designs. The answer is no. Neither can it be looked for among the farmers for their wisdom regarding agricultural matters. According to Socrates, it can be found only in the guardian's knowledge. Thus, he explains that we can find wisdom '... With those we call guardians in the full sense' and they 'atone of all others deserve the area of wisdom'-<sup>15</sup>. Therefore, he concludes that a state ruled by the godparents is a wise state because it has a quality of good decisions and understanding. In his theory of quality of courage, he tries to find out those environments under which the state can be called a valiant state. He observes that this can be done only '....With sole reference to the part which defends it and campaigns for it'. He explains that the members of no other classes have the power to make the state cowardly or brave other than the soldier or the auxiliary class. So the quality of courage is tomcatted in the auxiliary class. In the self-discipline, he first defines it and then tries to identify the quality with one of the three classes. This is because self-discipline is not as simple a quality like wisdom and courage to be identified with a particular class. So he

explains, 'Self-discipline is surely a kind of order, a control of certain desires and appetites. So people use "being master of oneself and similar phrases as indications of it.' It follows according to Socrates that the phrase 'master of oneself' implies that the same person is both the master and subject of his own self. This further means that there is a better and a worse element in each individual's personality. The former controls the latter and when this happens a man is praised. If it is the other way round, he is criticized. In other words, the best part (his reason) keeps a check on the worst part (his desires). He applies this anatomy to the new founded state and says that such a state is a master of itself because '...in our state the desires of less respectable majority are controlled by the desires and wisdom of the superior minority.' Here 'less respectable majority' refers to children, women and slaves and their desires, and by 'respectable minority' he means a select few who have moderate desires guided by reason and right decision. This indicates that discipline of a state is not to be traced in a single class but in the way all the classes are connected and integrated with one another. The concept of intrinsic value has been characterized above in terms of the value that something has "in itself," or "for its own sake," or "as such," or "in its own right." The custom has been not to distinguish between the meanings of these terms, but we will see that there is reason to think that there may in fact be more than one concept at issue here. For the moment, though, let us ignore this complication and focus on what it means to say that something is valuable for its own sake as opposed to being valuable for the sake of something else to which it is related in some way. Perhaps it is easiest to grasp this distinction by way of illustration.

Supposing that somebody to ask you whether it is good to help others in time of need. Unless you suspected some sort of trick, you would answer, "Yes, of course." If this person were to go on to ask you why acting in this way is good, you might say that it is good to help others in time of need simply because it is good that their needs be satisfied. If you were then asked why it is good that people's needs be satisfied, you might be puzzled. You might be inclined to say, "It just is." Or you might accept the legitimacy of the question and say that it is good that people's needs be satisfied because this brings them pleasure. But then, of course, your interlocutor could ask once again, "What's good about that?" Perhaps at this point you would answer, "It just is good that people be pleased," and thus put an end to this line of questioning. Or perhaps you would again seek to explain the fact that it is good that people be pleased in terms of something else that you take to be good. At some point, though, you would have to put an end to the questions, not because you would have grown tired of them (though that is a distinct possibility), but because you would be forced to recognize that, if one thing derives its goodness from some other thing, which derives its goodness from yet a third thing, and so on, there must come a point at which you reach something whose goodness is not derivative in this way, something that "just is" good in its own right, something whose goodness is the source of, and thus explains, the goodness to be found in all the other things that precede it on the list. It is at this point that you will have arrived at intrinsic goodness (cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1094a). That which is intrinsically good is no derivatively good; it is good for its own sake. That which is not intrinsically good but extrinsically good is derivatively good; it is good, not (insofar as its extrinsic value is concerned) for its own sake, but for the sake of something else that is good and to which it is related in some way. Intrinsic value thus has a certain priority over extrinsic value. The latter is derivative from or reflective of the former and is to be explained in terms of the former. It is for this reason that philosophers have tended to focus on intrinsic value in particular.

The account just given of the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic value is rough, but it should do as a start. Certain complications must be immediately acknowledged, though. First, there is the possibility, mentioned above, that the terms traditionally used to refer to intrinsic value in fact refer to more than one concept; again, this will be addressed later. Another complication is that it may not in fact be accurate to say that whatever is intrinsically good is no derivatively good;

some intrinsic value may be derivative. This issue will be taken up (in Section 5) when the computation of intrinsic value is discussed; it may be safely ignored for now. Still another complication is this. It is almost universally acknowledged among philosophers that all value is “supervening” on certain no evaluative features of the thing that has value. Roughly, what this means is that, if something has value, it will have this value in virtue of certain no evaluative features that it has; its value can be attributed to these features. For example, the value of helping others in time of need might be attributed to the fact that such behavior has the feature of being causally related to certain pleasant experiences induced in those who receive the help. Suppose we accept this and accept also that the experiences in question are intrinsically good. In saying this, we are (barring the complication to be discussed in Section 5) taking the value of the experiences to be no derivative. Nonetheless, we may well take this value, like all value, to be supervening on something. In this case, we would probably simply attribute the value of the experiences to their having the feature of being pleasant. This brings out the subtle but important point that the question whether some value is derivative is distinct from the question whether it is supervening. Even no derivative value (value that something has in its own right; value that is, in some way, not attributable to the value of anything else) is usually understood to be supervening on certain no evaluative features of the thing that has value

Let us now see whether this still rough account of intrinsic value can be made more precise. One of the first writers to concern him with the question of what exactly is at issue when we ascribe intrinsic value to something was G. E. Moore. In his book *Principia Ethica*, Moore asks whether the concept of intrinsic value (or, more particularly, the concept of intrinsic goodness, upon which he tended to focus) is analyzable. In raising this question, he has a particular type of analysis in mind, one which consists in “breaking down” a concept into simpler component concepts. (One example of an analysis of this sort is the analysis of the concept of being a vixen in terms of the concepts of being a fox and being female.) His own answer to the question is that the concept of intrinsic goodness is not amenable to such analysis (Moore 1903, ch. 1). In place of analysis, Moore proposes a certain kind of thought-experiment in order both to come to understand the concept better and to reach a decision about what is intrinsically good. He advises us to consider what things are such that, if they existed by themselves “in absolute isolation,” we would judge their existence to be good; in this way, we will be better able to see what really accounts for the value that there is in our world. For example, if such a thought-experiment led you to conclude that all and only pleasure would be good in isolation, and all and only pain bad, you would be a hedonist.[3] Moore himself deems it incredible that anyone, thinking clearly, would reach this conclusion. He says that it involves our saying that a world in which only pleasure existed—a world without any knowledge, love, enjoyment of beauty, or moral qualities—is better than a world that contained all these things but in which there existed slightly less pleasure (Moore 1912, p. 102). Such a view he finds absurd. Unrelatedly of the merits of this isolation test, it remains unclear exactly why Moore finds the concept of intrinsic goodness to be unanalyzable. At one point he attacks the view that it can be analyzed wholly in terms of “natural” concepts—the view, that is, that we can break down the concept of being intrinsically good into the simpler concepts of being A, being B, being C..., where these component concepts are all purely descriptive rather than evaluative. He argues that any such analysis is to be rejected, since it will always be intelligible to ask whether (and, presumably, to deny that) it is good that something be A, B, C..., which would not be the case if the analysis were accurate (Moore 1903, pp. 15–16). Even if this argument is successful (a complicated matter about which there is considerable disagreement), it of course does not establish the more general claim that the concept of intrinsic goodness is not analyzable at all, since it leaves open the possibility that this concept is analyzable in terms of other concepts, some or all of which are not “natural” but evaluative. That is to say it involves all the three classes and must therefore be the characteristic both of the ruler and the ruled. Thus, he

justifies his definition of self-discipline as a kind of concord, 'because unlike courage and wisdom, self-discipline stretches across the whole scale. It produces harmony between its strongest and weakest and middle elements ...and so there is a natural concordance between higher and tower...'Next, Socrates ventures into finding justice in the individual following the same pattern and lines of argument. But for this purpose, first he has to demonstrate that the soul or the mind of individuals is also made up of three parts because after all the state or community is composed of individuals. He concludes his theory concerning the three parts of the soul from the fact that individuals often display a conflict of their motives. It is after a proper analysis of the three parts of the soul that Socrates makes an attempt to trace virtues in the individual.

However in the end Socrates explores the fourth quality namely justice, but again is faced with the challenge of locating a class to represent it. After anticipating for a while Socrates realizes that justice is right at the base of his ideal state. For instance, he proposes that it is the duty of rulers to administer justice, which is another way of asserting that 'justice is keeping what is properly one's own and doing one's own job.' The same idea is asserted, once again by arguing in the opposite manner. He holds that the worst thing that could happen to his ideal state is the assortment of the three classes with each other's business as this would generate the worst of evils. He maintains that 'interference by the three classes with each other's jobs and interchange of jobs between them, therefore, does the greatest harm to our state, and we are entirely justified in calling it the worst of evils' which is nothing but injustice. The worst of evils for one's own community is injustice.' Thus, Socrates proves that justice would prevail in his state if and only if the three classes did not interfere with each other. 'And contrariwise, when each of the three classes does its own job and minds its own business, which, by contrast is justice and makes our state just.' This is how Socrates suggests justice in the state. He expresses that it is the foundation of all qualities because unless a man is just he can't exercise wisdom, courage, and self-identity.

### **1.6: The idea of soul in Platonic idea**

Plato believed that humans could be broken down into the parts that are the body, the mind and the soul. The body is the physical part of the body that is only concerned with the material world, and through which we are able to experience the world we live in. it wants to experience self-gratification. It is mortal, and when it dies, it is truly dead. The mind is directed towards the heavenly realm of Ideas, and is immortal. It is with our minds that we are able to understand the eternal world of the Forms. When it 'dies' it returns to the realm of Ideas. The soul is the driving force of the body, that it is what gives us our identity.

The body and the inclinations are mortal but transmigrate into animals, but the intellect is immortal. He believes that the intellect represents the most divine part of the soul, and so after death it leaves the inferior physical body to join the world of Ideas. Plato's dualism was a combination of the key ideas from both Materialism and Idealism. His theory that we had both a physical body, and a soul and mind and that the soul that mind is a thinking being, complete in itself, and capable of living without the body.

However, the Strength of Plato's Dualism conveys that it says there is more to living than just what we are always aware of, as just because the physical world seems hard, there are other ways of living. Strength is that he doesn't deny the existence of the physical world as an idealist might, but just says that the physical world isn't as importance, that we should be seeking to understand the world of Forms. Neither does he deny the spiritual world, and says that it's important, so if we

can understand the world of Ideas then we can understand Good. However, Plato's Theory of Ideas is not a subject at all. Plato himself renounced from making it the direct theme of any of the twenty-five or more dialogues which he wrote. Instead, the ideas appear in the context of conversation, incidentally, and in scattered places. He gives the reason directly in a letter: We have seen in the previous section that in order to arrive at an understanding of the concept of justice, Socrates offers to analyze it in the context of a larger field and in the process the ideal state was founded. Now, having established the ultimate virtue of the state in terms of justice he makes an attempt to transfer the same findings to the individual to discover the virtues of the latter. As far as the state is concerned, we remember, he concluded that '...a state was just when its three natural constituents were each doing their job. And that it was self-disciplined and brave and wise. Similarly, he is hopeful to find three elements in an individual's personality corresponding to the three parts of the state. He says, '...we shall expect to find that the individual has the same three elements in his personality'<sup>1</sup>. The interesting point here is the way in which he divides the soul into three parts parallel to the three classes of his ideal state.

Socrates begins with the general observation that one and the same thing can never have two opposites at the same time and further it cannot do two opposite things simultaneously. He says, 'Clearly one and the same thing cannot act or be affected in two opposite ways at the same time in the same part of it and in relation to the same object'<sup>4</sup>. He supports his claim by asking Glaucon if it is possible for a thing to be at rest and in motion at the same time and in the same part of itself. Glaucon answers in negative. But using his argumentative skills he tries to be precise so as to avoid any kind of ambiguity and in the process puts forward that couple of cases that show the reverse of the observation he has cited above. He says, for example, that if we are told about man who is standing still but moving his hands and head and so is at rest and in motion simultaneously then this is not to be accepted as the proper statement of the case. He suggests that we have to say that a part of him is standing still and another part of him is in motion. Similarly, he cites a more authentic case by arguing that a top spinning around its own axis is both at rest and in motion as a whole. But even in this case he argues that it is not the same parts that are at rest and in motion. In order to state the case clearly, one will have to say that the axis of the top is at rest and the circumference is in motion. He thus tries to emphasize that the two different parts of the same thing can be said to be behaving in opposite ways. With reference to these examples, Socrates explains that the human mind and body can also behave in a manner whereby different parts perform opposite functions at the same time. He expresses that we sometimes want to do something and still don't want to do it. For example, when we feel thirsty we look for a glass of plain water first. At the same time if we are offered any other drinks we don't like (do not take it) irrespective of the fact that we are thirsty. This is because, according to Socrates, one part of our mind pushes us in one direction and the other part pushes us just in the opposite direction. 'Music we do not say that there is one element in their minds which bids them drink, and a second which prevents (them and masters the first?'. The former is attributed to the reflective element of the mind while the latter is assigned to the element of irrational appetite. 'We can call the reflective element in the mind the reason, and the element with which it feels hunger and thirst and the agitation of sex and other desires the element of irrational appetite closely connected with satisfaction and pleasure'. Thus, the two parts of the mind and soul are clearly defined by Socrates and their clash is often termed as 'mental conflict'. In the final part, he says that it is that in which one feels resentment and repugnance. Here conflict is between desire and disgust. For example, he refers to Leontion. Son of Aglaion, who once saw some corpses lying on the ground. He wanted to go and touch them, but at the same time held him back in disgust. The part of the mind which feels is termed by Socrates as the emotional or the spirited part. It always sides with the reason when there is a clash between reason and desire. However, Socrates shows that one soul has three different elements, namely reason, emotion, and desire. These three elements correspond to three classes of state -

reason correspond to the rulers; emotions or spirit to the auxiliaries of the state; and requirements to the statesman.

### **1.7: Virtue in the individual**

Virtues are widespread and documented by all philosophies as basic potentials necessary for the well-being and happiness of the society as well as the individuals. It is indispensable because when we practice virtues and build the atmosphere, we will attract what may have been missing in our life such as fulfilling relationships, achievement of meaningful goals, and happiness. Virtue is naturally becoming more focused, determined, and courageous, leading us to success. It is very often known that it takes perseverance to reach our goals, and we still never get there. One can know if one tries and does forgive someone then he may not be as angry and uptight, and one may know it takes courage to accomplish great things. So why then, if we know what to do, do we still stay stuck? Because we have not yet consciously and boldly applied a virtue to a given situation so as to alter its outcome, from what has always been to what can be. Here are some examples where practicing a virtue in a given situation shapes an outcome:

Kindness towards someone who is having a bad day can make him or her smile and build rapport. Creativity can result in an idea that changes how people relate to one another such as social media. Trust in a relationship fosters dependability and intimacy, creating valuable, meaningful relationships. Service to others can change lives, better neighborhoods and create stronger nations. Becoming More Virtuous People. We know we are becoming more virtuous people, not only because of the results above, but also because of the way other people respond to us. Our friends, families, co-workers and neighbors will trust and rely on us. They will come to us for guidance and help, and will want to be around us because we inspire them to be better people. We will be known as people with exceptional character who make the right choices and strive for excellence in all we do. Can life be lived any better? However, the practice of virtues allows us to develop our potential, and live a more purposeful, better life; a life not ordinary but extraordinary. Becoming more virtuous people attracts great things to us; it's a certainty. He holds 'so justice is produced by establishing in the mind a natural relation of control and subordination among its constituents, and injustice by establishing an unnatural one'. With this anatomy the definition of justice is completed, and Socrates also provides us with a workable account of injustice. But at this point, Glaucon and others ask him to prove how justice pays better than injustice in all situations and circumstances. Socrates is now faced with a fresh task of explaining injustice. But no sooner than he starts doing that, he is interrupted once again by Polemarchus Adeimantus, who express their eagerness to learn more about the life in the idea state, especially about family lives and private possessions of the Guardians and the Auxiliaries. As a result he has to postpone his deliberations on injustice and take up the issue of women and children.

He begins with the position of women in the state with the assumption that sexual difference is not the criterion of difference of occupation and social function. The difference between men and women according to him is only of physical function. Other than this, he is quite positive that women are capable of any range of occupations and functions. So he feels that even women are fit to be guardians and so they deserve to be educated in the same way as men. And if it happens, the society will have the best of both. So he expresses, '...it's a good plan to let women come on stage now after men have played their part' and declares, '...if the only difference between them is that the female bears and the male begets, we shall not admit that this is a difference relevant for or purpose, but shall still maintain that our male and female guardians ought to follow the same occupations.'

In other words, according to him a man will be courageous if he has it in the emotional or the spirited part of his personality. But this is not enough. He makes it very clear that as in the case of the state, so in the case of the individual too, the latter will be acknowledged a just man if and only if the different parts of his personality perform their own jobs without mixing up with the others. Socrates tells Glaucon thus, '...we shall also say that the individual man is just in the same way that the state is just and further that '...The state was just when the three elements within it each minded, their own business. So, it seems to follow that in a man his reason must rule as it has wisdom and foresight, and the spirit should obey the reason. Socrates insists, 'So the reason ought to rule, having the wisdom and foresight to act for the whole, and the spirit ought to obey and support it'. He explains that such coordination between the reason and spirit is maintained through a combination of intellectual and physical training. The reason is tuned up by training in rational argument and higher studies, whereas the spirit is toned down by harmony and rhythm. The two parts thus trained, must take charge of the appetite according to Socrates, for the simple reason that man tends to give in to his appetite that includes his physical pleasure and other desires thus messing up his life.

So, Socrates strongly feels that man's appetite needs to be controlled by reason and spirit. He considers these to be the '...best defense mind and body have against external enemies' with mind doing body providing courage to carry on with the orders of the former. However, if and when the three elements interfere with each other or when one of them rebel against the others just to take over them, it disturbs the mind causing confusion therein, and Socrates says that this is what leads to injustice, confusion, and all sorts of wickedness in the individual. He concludes, 'It must be some kind of civil war between these same three elements, when they interfere with each other ... or when one of them rebels against the whole to get control when it has no business to do ... This sort of situation, when the elements of mind are confused, ... is what it constitutes injustice, indiscipline ... in short, wickedness of all kinds.' He elucidates his claim finally by drawing an analogy between the justice, bodily health, and sickness. He draws parallel between justice and good health.

However, saying there is no pursuit of the administrators of a state that belongs to a woman because she is a woman or to a man because he is man. But the natural capacities are distributed alike among both creatures, and women naturally share in all pursuits and men in all.' So it is made clear that both men and women can be guardians. But now the question is if women are to be guardians then they must share the same life-styles like their male counterparts. In other words, the institution of family has to be abolished. This would naturally lead to some practical difficulties, particularly concerning the fulfillment of their sexual desires and reproduction. So as an alternative, Socrates suggests 'marriage festivals' to be organized in the state from time to time that would be manned essentially by the rulers. That is to say, the rulers must decide which couple is to be mated so that one can ensure good future citizens. He says, '...if we are to have a real pedigree herd, mate the best of our men with the best of our women as often as possible... and bring up only the offspring of the best. And no one but the rulers must know what is happening...'. Since all guardians won't be the best, therefore, he suggests that inferior men must mate inferior women only and the rulers must check that this is done rarely. The ensuing question is how the children are to be raised since the state will have children of the best as well as the inferior parents. Socrates propounds that 'the officers will take the children of the better guardians to a nursery and put them in charge of nurses living in separate part of the city: the children of the inferior guardians, and any other defective child, will be quietly and secretly disposed of. It is evident that such an arrangement is made not only to have the best possible breed of children but also to continue the practice of infanticide as was done in Sparta. With the above mentioned arrangement is the common ownership of property, women, and children. Plato regards it to be 'much the

bestarrangement' as this is one way of attaining 'cohesion and unity' in society. He argues that if there are no families there are no distractions pertaining to family royalties, affections, and interests. Everyone's interests would be focused on the community at large. The vocabulary of people will not consist of words like 'mine' or 'yours'. In other words, 'mine' and 'not mine' will be used in the same sense for the same things by as many people as possible. This thought is further elaborated when he says that, 'In our society of all societies citizens will refer to the success and misfortunes of an individual fellow-citizen as 'my success' or 'my misfortune'. This means that in the ideal state every citizen will share each other's feelings and would be devoted to a common interest. He insists that such a tendency must cater mostly to women and children of the guardian class. Thus, Plato said Virtues are widespread and documented by all philosophies as basic potentials necessary for the well-being and happiness of the society as well as the individuals. It is indispensable because when we practice virtues and build the atmosphere influence, we will attract what may have been missing in our life such as fulfilling relationships, achievement of meaningful goals, and happiness.

### **1.8: The philosopher is the king of the society**

In the Republic of Plato, there is a systematic inquisitorial of being, as The Republic itself is an attempt to answer a problem in human behavior justice. To deal with the problem of justice, Plato considers the ideal polis, a collective unit of self-government, and the relationship between the structure of the Republic and the attainment of justice. Plato argues that philosopher kings should be the rulers, as all philosophers aim to discover the ideal polis. The 'kallipolis', or the beautiful city, is a just city where political rule depends on knowledge, which philosopher kings possess, and not power. Although theoretically it would be ideal if the Republic and the modern state were ruled by knowledge, and not power, power is crucial in the make-up of political activity. This is one of the flaws of Plato's argument, which the essay will discuss. The question of who should rule emerges, to which the essay will conclude by saying that, in terms of Plato's argument, the philosopher kings should not be the rulers, as Plato is advertising an undemocratic political system led by a benevolent dictator. At the same time, it is inevitable to pick out some features of the modern state congruent to those of the ideal polis. The definition of democracy is key in understanding Plato's argument for rule by philosophers. Nowadays, most modern states are democratic, in the sense that people have a say in the running of the state. Since Plato's time there has been a debate regarding what democracy is: whether it is the idea of majority rule, or what has come to be known as the 'Madisonian view' that democracy involves the protection of minorities. To Plato, it all boils down to what democracy means, literally. Democracy is 'the rule by the demos', where 'demos' can be understood as 'the people', and as "'the mob'...the unfit" (Wolff; 2006, 67). As Wolff argues, "Making political decisions requires judgement and skill. It should, Plato urges, be left to the experts." (Wolff; 2006, 67). To further emphasize this, Plato uses the 'craft analogy', drawing on the allegory of the ship. In Plato's The Republic, Socrates sets out an example of a ship led by men ignorant of navigation, who don't understand that a true captain must pay attention to the seasons of the year, the sky, the stars, the winds, and all that pertains to his craft, if he's really to be the ruler of a ship. And they don't believe that there is any craft that would enable him to determine how he should steer the ship, whether the others want him to or not, or any possibility of mastering this alleged craft or of practicing it at the same time as the craft of navigation. Don't you think that the true captain will be called a real stargazer, a babbler, and a good-for-nothing by those who sail in ships governed in that way?" (Plato; 2007, 204). Plato's idea of specialization is also linked to justice, which he considers to be structural, as political justice is a result of a structured city, where individual justice is a result of a structured soul, and where each member of the polis has a "specific craft for which he has a natural aptitude" (Reeve; 2009, 69). "Ruling ... is a skill" (Wolff; 2006, 68), which requires special training available to few. At the same time, philosophers must possess qualities that enable them to rule; for instance, they must be able to recognize the difference between friend and foe, good and bad. Above all, philosophers

must “love wisdom. (Nichols; 1984, 254), as the rule of the wise leads to the reigning of justice, as philosophy becomes sovereign. Justice is a virtue, as is knowledge, which requires understanding. Understanding refers to goodness, and thus, knowledge and goodness are one. The philosopher kings have virtue as they have knowledge, and thus, according to Plato, their rule is justified. Plato also argues that a specific education, available to few, will allow these few to become philosophers, but again this would create a ruling class that is not representative of the ruled. At the same time, it is hard to find a government that is 100% representative of its population. Take the members of the Chamber of Commons, many of whom have attended elite schools such as Eton and Oxford: they are not representative of the population, but are those running the United Kingdom. Nevertheless, Plato’s argument has transcended time, as the Chamber of Lords, as well as the Senate, in bicameral systems, is an arena of experts who check and amend laws made by members of Parliament. Arguably the real experts are those who are aware of the people’s interests, and voting will indicate these interests, since, as Mill argued, “the fallacy here is to think of the people as a homogenous mass with a single interest...we are not like this”

### **Critiquing Plato’s Disagreement**

Plato’s argument is very much in line with what he defines as democracy, the rule of the unfit. His argument may be valid, in the sense that he explains that these philosophers have “capacity to grasp the eternal and immutable” (Plato; 2007, 204), while common men are blind as they have “no true knowledge of reality, and no clear standard of perfection in their mind to which they can turn” (Plato; 2007, 204-205). Nevertheless, this argument is not persuasive or realistic in contemporary politics and the modern state, for a number of reasons. Plato argues that “there will be no end to the troubles of states... humanity itself, till philosophers become kings in the world... and political power and philosophy thus come into the same hands” (Plato; 2007, 192). Perhaps, Plato’s argument for a group of knowledgeable persons who have the ability to bring about happiness and justice in the Republic is ideal, but extremely unrealistic. As Aristotle argued, man is a political animal and it is inevitable for us all, not just for an elite of old men, to be interested and have a say in politics, as it is a force which inevitably affects us all. Plato’s argument is asking us not only to be disinterested in the political process, but also to leave our rights and opinions in the hands of a benevolent dictator. For this reason his argument is not only unpersuasive but is also unrealistic. However, in the beginning, it perhaps most prominently, all modern states stress that today democracy is defined as “government ‘of the people, by the people, and for the people’. Therefore, all states have not only become supporters of the representative model of democracy, whereby voters determine who will represent them at governmental level, but have also adopted a pluralist attitude towards politics. In fact, the state is, in theory, no longer an instrument in the hands of an elite, or in the hands of Plato’s philosophers, but a public and neutral arena where interest groups come together to argue and discuss policies, which are “mainly economic” . Ideally, these interest groups should have the necessary knowledge to bring about political change, but it is very hard to determine and quantify the necessary knowledge to bring about such change. As Wolff argues, “no one can be absolutely certain about anything at all. All claims of knowledge...are fallible” . Also, being a philosopher, and knowing about logic, ethics, metaphysics and political philosophy, does not necessarily make you an expert on the interests of the people. It is the people who, in theory, rulers are aiming to represent and support. Plato is obviously not concerned with a representative form of rule, but nowadays it is necessary, though difficult, to ensure that all the ruled are represented, at least to a certain extent, by their rulers. Finally, the main flaw in Plato’s argument, which renders it highly unpersuasive, is the fact that he is describing and arguing in favour of what Voltaire defined as a “‘benevolent dictatorship’, where an enlightened despot, without the need to consult people, would nevertheless govern in their interests” (Wolff; 2006, 62). In terms of the modern state, where people are continuously asking for a greater say in the running of government, and with a negative view

towards totalitarianism due to the happenings of the 20th century, Plato's argument becomes increasingly inapplicable. As Karl Popper argued, it is wrong to place political power in the hands of an elite. Nevertheless, it is also unrealistic to claim that an elite does not exist today, as, for instance, there are always several main political parties who take turns running governments.

Thus, the emphasis in the Platonic notion of the philosopher king lies more on the first word than the second. While relying on conventional Greek contrasts between king and tyrant and between the king as individual ruler and the multitudinous rule of aristocracy and democracy, Plato makes little use of the notion of kingship per se. That he had used the word, however, was key to the later career of the notion in imperial Rome and monarchical Europe. To the Stoic Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius (reigned 161–180), what mattered was that even kings should be philosophers, rather than that only philosophers should rule. To François Fénelon, the Roman Catholic archbishop charged with the moral education of Louis, duc de Bourgogne, the grandson of Louis XIV, the crucial issue was that kings should possess self-restraint and selfless devotion to duty, rather than that they should possess knowledge. The enlightened despots of the 18th century, such as Frederick II the Great of Prussia and Catherine II the Great of Russia, would pride themselves on being philosopher kings and queens. But philosophy by then had left behind Plato's focus on absolute knowledge, signifying instead the free pursuit of knowledge and the implementation of reason.

Meanwhile, in the Islamic world, the medieval philosopher Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī had championed the notion of a religiously devout philosopher king. More than 1,000 years later the notion of such a figure acting as the interpreter of law inspired the Ayatollah Khomeini and the revolutionary state that he shaped in Iran. Finally, and more broadly, the notion of the philosopher ruler has come to signify a general claim to domination by an unaccountable, if putatively beneficent, elite, as in certain forms of Marxism and other revolutionary political movements. To achieve this end, he at times tends to become very insensitive and harsh towards the guardian class in particular, including its men, women, and children. Although his proposal sounds attractive, Glaucon, Adeimantus and others raise their doubts whether such a state is practically possible or not. Hence, they request Socrates to demonstrate the practical possibility of his state.

Socrates defines a philosopher as one who loves wisdom of any kind without any distinction. 'So a philosopher's passion is for wisdom of any kind without any distinction.' He adds that anyone who is fussy about what he studies and does not know what is good or not so good is not fit to be called a philosopher. Such a man according to Socrates can be compared to a poor eater and not a food lover because he is fussy about his food and has no passion for eating. Thus He holds that a philosopher is one 'who is ready to taste every branch of learning and is never satisfied - he is the man who deserves to be called a philosopher'. At this point Glaucon drives his attention towards many such people who are passionate about things and are not satisfied. For instance he refers to music and theatre lovers and says that these people run around the city all the time not to miss any festival, but they certainly cannot be called philosophers. He asks what is there in a philosopher that these people lack. Moving ahead, he says that any individual who only recognizes beautiful things without believing in beauty itself is said to be in a dreaming state, whereas a man who sees beauty itself as well as all the particular things participating in it can be said to be very much awake. He writes, 'the man who contrariwise believes in beauty itself and can see both it and the particular things which share in it... is much awake.' This person according to Socrates is someone who knows, whereas the former only expresses his opinions. He says, "...

and so because he knows we can rightly call his state of mind one of knowledge; and that of the other man who holds opinion only, opinion'. Thus, he makes it clear that 'knowledge is related to what is, it knows what is as it is'. On the other hand, ignorance is counted as 'what is not'. But there must be something lying between these two extremes and that he calls 'opinion'<sup>1</sup>. He clarifies the difference between opinion and knowledge, and says that they have different correlations soiling their respective faculties. According to him each of them has their own field and capacity. The field of knowledge is 'what is' and that of opinion is 'something other than what is'. One needs to locate its place, and according to Socrates opinion is -intermediate between them'. Having made the distinction between knowledge, opinion, and ignorance clear, he next attempts to explain what is meant by beauty in itself. This is because many people around him deny that there is anything as beauty in itself. To such people, he expresses that 'those then who have eyes for the multiplicity of beautiful things but are unable.... to see beauty itself and justice itself may be said.... to have opinions....,' and he continues, on the other hand 'those who have eyes for the eternal unchanging things surely have knowledge and not opinion'. He claims that philosopher belongs to second category. To quote, '... those whose hearts are fixed on true being of each thing are to be called philosophers and no lovers of opinion'. It follows thus that philosophers are knowledgeable people who are always keen to know the truth. But the question arises, what qualities a philosopher must have in order to become a good ruler or king. Socrates says that 'one trait in philosopher's character we can assume is his love of any branch of learning that reveals eternal reality... unaffected by... change and decay.' So a philosopher as a ruler must be in love with the whole of reality including its significant fragments but he must also have some further characteristics, like truthfulness, self-control, good memory, and sense of proportion.

He explains that philosopher as a king should not have both 'love of wisdom' and 'love of falsehood'<sup>1</sup> in his character. In other words, he should be truthful and never willingly to tolerate anything that is not true. So, a man who has a real love of learning will yearn for the whole truth from the earliest years. He ought to be self-controlled in the sense that he should not desire money and crave for physical pleasure. Moreover, he should have a balanced state of mind and need not be afraid of death. Socrates says that 'he won't think of death as anything to be afraid of... and so mean and cowardly nature can't really have any dealings with true philosophy.' He also includes the demand of a good memory in the character of a philosopher king because a forgetful man is not qualified to be a philosopher. Finally, there must be sense of proportion in him as it is related to truth. 'So we want in addition.... a mind with a grace and sense of proportion that will naturally and easily lead it on to see the form of each reality'. Combining these traits, one can easily predict that the philosopher king must have all the virtues of wisdom courage discipline and justice, and this would qualify him to rule the state. He declares that one can never find any fault with the working of such a person because he will already be educated and matured. To quote, "Can you possibly find fault with an occupation for the pursuit of which a man combine in his nature good memory, readiness to learn, breadth of vision and grace, and be a friend of truth, justice, courage, and self-control?" At this point, Adeimantus raises an objection. Though he agrees with the above description of a true philosopher and also acknowledges the qualification that would make him an ideal ruler or king, he nevertheless declares that the philosophers could not possibly make good rulers. His observations are accepted by Socrates. He blames the society for not respecting the knowledge and wisdom which are the only assets that a philosopher is expected to have. He explains to Adeimantus that in his existing state politicians are respected not because they have knowledge and wisdom but because they succeed in satisfying the desires and instincts of citizens. Thus Plato expresses that in such a society it is quite even for the philosopher to turn into a villain but is also hopeful that a philosopher may gain political power some day and leech people the value of knowledge and wisdom. However, he strongly feels that the philosopher ruler needs to go through a full-Hedged training which must be based on the highest form of knowledge. Such knowledge will not simply comprise the knowledge of forms, justice, beauty, etc., but also the

knowledge of good that is goodness itself. In oilier words, the philosopher must be trained to understand that the good constitutes the ultimate object of knowledge."

However, from the above it is clear that a philosopher as one who loves wisdom of any kind without any distinction. 'So a philosopher's passion is for wisdom of any kind without any distinction.' He adds that anyone who is fussy about what he studies and does not know what is good or not so good is not fit to be called a philosopher. He who becomes the greatest lover of wisdom and knowledge must be the king of the Republic.

### **1.9: Doing well to all is the main domain of knowledge**

Plato believed that the Forms were interrelated, and arranged in a hierarchy. The highest Form is the Form of the Good, which is the ultimate principle. In Plato's hierarchy of forms, he explains that like the Sun in the Allegory of the Cave, the Good illuminates the other Forms. We can see that Justice, for example, is an aspect of Goodness. And again, we know that we have never seen, with our senses, any examples of perfect goodness, but we have seen plenty of particular examples which approximate goodness, and we recognize them as 'good' when we see them because of the way in which they correspond to our innate notion of the Form of the Good. By Plato's logic, real knowledge becomes, in the end, knowledge of goodness; and this is why philosophers are in the best position to rule. The one who has philosophical knowledge of the Good is the one who is fit to rule. Plato's belief in the fitness to rule of the philosopher is sometimes referred to as the 'Philosopher King'. Plato developed his Theory of Forms to the point where he divided existence into two realms. There is the world of sense experience here nothing ever stays the same but is always in the process of change. The preceding section is considered to be most abstract part of the *Republic*. As we have seen, it is concerned with abstract qualities like beauty, justice, and good, and appeals the readers to know is the idea of beauty in itself, good in itself, and so on. Plato terms these abstract qualities as forms. From here develops what is acknowledged as one of his best philosophical doctrines namely the theory of forms. He tries to convey that these abstract qualities not only exist in the things but also have an independent existence. In the latter sense, one calls them absolute beauty, good, and so on. So these are forms which, according to Plato, cannot be seen or touched yet they are eternal and changeless and therefore 'real'. According to Plato, the objects of ordinary of life which exemplify these forms are mere 'images'. He claims if we restrict ourselves only to the images we can never have the knowledge of the 'real'. Reverting to the philosopher king, Socrates now deals with their training so that they can grasp what is good because in the final analysis he wants to show that all the qualities of philosopher king must be based on the latter's knowledge of good. He insists on an intellectual training of the philosopher king, besides their training in literature, music, and military tricks. This is because he wants to check whether the intellectual training 'has the endurance to pursue the highest form of knowledge'. Here, Glaucon expresses his ignorance about such knowledge, and Adeimantus too raises his doubt about the highest by asking 'if there is anything higher than justice and other qualities'. Socrates clarifies that highest form of knowledge is much above the knowledge of beauty, justice, etc. It is, he says, knowledge of his form of the good. To quote, '...the highest form of knowledge is knowledge of the form of the good from which things that are just and so on derive their usefulness and value'. He adds that our knowledge of (the good is inadequate and if we are ignorant of it the rest of our knowledge can be of no benefit to us just as it's no use possessing if you can't get any good out of it'. He basically wants to convey to Glaucon and Adeimantus that until one knows the good he will not even understand why justice, beauty, etc. are good qualities. Now, the most important question that he faces is that what is good? He refers people's opinion and says that for some people good is knowledge while for others it is only pleasure. '... Most ordinary people think that pleasure is the good, while the more sophisticated think it is

knowledge'. With the help of 'the simile of the sun', Plato tries to draw some parallels between the faculty of sight and the faculty of knowledge. To begin with, he specifies that particular objects belong to the visible worlds and the forms belong to the intelligible world. He explains that in the visible world if we have to see things then we must have the power of sight and also the visible objects to be seen. Apart from these two elements a third element is also required to illuminate the objects. This element is the light which comes from no other heavenly body than the sun. Thus, the light comes from the sun and makes the object visible to us, 'If the eyes have the power of sight.... And if object have contour yet he will see nothing and the contours will remain invisible unless a third element is present which is specifically adapted for the purpose'. This element is light of the sun. Thus, even though the sun does not constitute the sight it is the cause of sight. Coming to the other side of the simile, he explains that if we have to know anything we must have the power of thought as well as the objects of knowledge, i.e. the forms. These objects of knowledge in order to become intelligible have to be true and this truth would come from goodness itself. He says that 'when we turn our eyes to objects whose contour are no longer eliminated by daylight....they appear to be blind but when we turn them on things on which the sun is shining then they are sees clearly...' Likewise he maintains that "... when the mind's eye is fixed on objects illuminated by truth and reality, it understands and knows them, and its possession of intelligence is evident; but when it is fixed on the twilight world of change and decay, it can only form opinions...and it seems to lack intelligence.' Continuing further he says, 'Then what gives the objects of knowledge their truth and the knower's mind the power of knowing is the form of the good. It is the cause of knowledge and truth.' He says that though knowledge and truth seem to be good, yet the position of the good must be ranked 'lighter. The simile does not clearly give an insight into what goodness is. At the most we come to know from it how goodness stands in relation to other intelligible or knowable things. In itself, it is only a form but it is not like other forms, such as beauty, truth, etc. He concludes by saying that 'The good therefore may be said to be the source not only of the intelligibility of the objects of knowledge, but also of their being and reality; yet it is not itself that reality, but is beyond it and superior to it in dignity and power'.

Plato explains those equate good with knowledge argue in a circle and when asked what sort of knowledge they mean by good they reply 'knowledge of the good'. This, therefore, is not a proper definition and gives rise to absurdity. On the other hand, those who identify good with pleasure are compelled to admit that there are bad pleasures also. In other words they admit that the same things are both good and bad. '...They, thus find themselves admitting that the same things are both good and bad'. It seems that that good or goodness is 'highly controversial' Experience of it gives rise to opinions. There is also a world which is outside space and time, which is not perceived through the senses, and in which everything is permanent and perfect or ideal - the realm of the Forms. The empirical world shows only shadows and poor copies of these Forms, and so is less real than the world of the Forms themselves, because the Forms are eternal and immutable the proper objects of knowledge. Socrates himself fails to explain the good. At the most he describes it by expressing that it is '... the end of all endeavor, the object on which every hut is set....at any role a man will not be a very useful guardian of what is right and valuable if he does not know what I heir goodness consists in'. Thus, it is obvious that the guardians must possess a knowledge of goodness which Socrates himself is not able to explain in clear terms. Nevertheless, he is asked to give his own opinion on the issue but he decides to use an anatomy to illustrate its function and importance. The anatomy is famously known as 'the simile of the sun' wherein a comparison is made between the form of good and the sun.-"

Accordingly, Socrates is requested by Glaucon to complete the anatomy but he comes up with a sequel to the simile of the sun. This is known as 'the anatomy of the divided line. The idea is to further illustrate the relation between the two orders of reality namely the visible world and

the intelligible world. He attempts to apprehend these two realms with reference to various states of mind. The states of mind are primarily knowledge and opinion. The former deals with forms whereas the latter deals with ordinary physical objects. He also makes use of the fact that images represent object of knowledge in the physical world. He makes a further division in these two states of mind, and tries to show that there are two levels for each of knowledge and opinion. The highest level of knowledge is the knowledge of goodness followed by the second level, i.e. knowledge of the forms. In the case of opinion the first level is that of physical things, followed by the level where one sees only shadow and images. Referring to knowledge and opinion as two powers, he holds that "one of them is supreme over everything in the intelligible region, the other over everything in the visible region". He explains (he anatomy of (he divided line by making two unequal divisions of the line and further dividing the two parts in the same ratio in order to represent the visible and the intangible realms. Plato summarizes the four divisions of the line in the following manner: There are two subdivisions, in the tower of which the soul uses the figures given by the former division as images; the enquiry can only be hypothetical, and instead of going upwards to a principle descends to the oilier end; in the higher of the two. he soul passes out of hypotheses, and goes up to a principle which is above hypotheses, making no use of images as in The former case, but proceeding only in and through his ideas themselves.'

However, Socrates keeps the option open that the prisoner will slowly get used to it. He says that it would be easier to look at shadows first, next at the reflections of men and other objects in water and later on at the objects themselves. In other words, it will only gradually that he would finally be able to see the trees and mountains in full daylight and recognize them as the real things than the shadows in the cave. He would also realize that the sun is the cause of changing seasons and years, and it is again the sun that controls everything in the visible world. Once he realizes the truth of the matter he would be in a self-congratulatory mood and consider himself fortunate. However, at the same time he would be sorry about his fellow prisoners inside the cave. Now, if he is asked to return back to the cave his eyes would be unaccustomed to the darkness "... because he had come in suddenly out of the sunlight.<sup>1</sup>and he will not be able to discriminate between the shadows with respect to the other prisoners. His fellow beings would consider his visit to the upper world to be responsible for ruining his sight and this ascent would seem worthless to them even to attempt. Given a chance they would like to kill him. With the help of this anatomy, Socrates attempts to explain the relation between the prisoners' world inside the cave and the daylight world outside the cave. He expresses that the cave corresponds to the visible world which is the realm of opinion, whereas the daylight world represents the intelligible world which is the realm of knowledge. The sun symbolizes the form of goodness. To use his words: 'The realm revealed by sight corresponds to the prison, and the light of the fire in the prison to the power of sun. And you won't go wrong if you connect the ascent into the upper world and the sight of objects there with the progress of the mind into the intelligible region.' He admits that each move from the lower realm of belief to the higher realm of knowledge will be fraught with pain and difficulties; nevertheless it will be worth the pain. He also holds that one who has lasted this knowledge and seen the form of goodness may be reluctant to even involve himself with human affairs. If, however, he is made to do so, he may appear to be a fool to anyone who has never stepped outside the world of belief.

There is an indispensable magnitude that ensues from this discourse on knowledge, according to Socrates, is that no society can be successfully governed either by the uneducated or by those who are completely dedicated to intellectual pursuits. So he suggests that the best minds, i.e. the philosophers (liberated prisoner) in the given simile must be compelled to return back to the cave not only to share his divine experiences with those inside the cave but also to guide them

to identify the ultimate good. This means that the philosopher will not be a good ruler until he returns to his fellowmen and applies the knowledge he has gained on them. In doing so, he will have a better understanding of the shadows than what he had known when he was living inside the cave. In other words, he will know what the shadows actually are and will be able to guide his fellow prisoners in the right direction. At this point an objection is raised by Glaucon who claims that it would be unfair to ask our philosophers to return to the world of belief, '...that will not be fair. We shall be compelling them to live a poorer life than they might live.' But Socrates reminds him that the rulers are not supposed to be made happy: instead the whole community is to be made happy. He reiterates what he expressed earlier to Adimantus that 'The object of our legislation is not the special welfare of any particular class in our society but of society as a whole; and it uses persuasion and compulsion to unite all citizens and make them share together the benefits which each individually can confer on The community'.

Thus, Plato agrees with Glaucon that we should not be unfair to the philosophers, but he maintains that we can be fair to them only 'when we compel them to have some care and responsibility for others.' Therefore, if philosophers are to be good rulers they must be made responsible for the good of the community. He says if the rulers deliver their duties with least enthusiasm then we will have the 'best and the most tranquil government' since they would 'approach the business of government as an unavoidable necessity'. He says, 'The truth is that if you want a well governed state to be possible you must find for your future rulers some way of life They like better than government, for only then will you have government by the truly rich, i.e. whose riches consist not of gold but of the true happiness of good and rational life....' It seems to follow then that 'true philosophy ... looks down on positions of political power.' Socrates concludes by expressing that men who deserve power are those who do not love power at all. Thus, he succeeds in proving that only the philosophers have the capability to become the guardians of the state. Glaucon agrees. There is no one else. Having settled down with the fact that philosophers are the suitable candidates to become guardians of the state, Socrates deliberates a little on their education. He meditates upon a course of study that would provoke their minds to think. In other words the rulers must study mathematics, and he claims that it is only through mathematics that they would learn about the practical aspects of ruling a state. He lists five mathematical disciplines which the philosopher ruler must study. These are arithmetic, plane geometry, solid geometry, astronomy, and harmonics.

### **1.10: Plato's theories of government**

Plato tells us that everything decays and therefore, forms of government also decay. The best form of government deteriorates into a less perfect form and then an even lesser appreciated form. Likewise, the form of government diminishes in character and integrity to become the worst of all forms. Although, Plato uses the number four for his stages of governance or forms of government in the Republic, he actually talks about five particular forms. He starts with the best and shows us how one stage transforms into another stage of governance because of deterioration. The first stage of political governance is the best form of government according to Plato. It is called aristocracy or government of the best. The ruler has to be the best of philosophers and the best at war as mentioned earlier. Excellence and education is a priority and equality is observed under the rule of an aristocrat.

It is generally believed today that democracy, "government of the people by the people and for the people," is the best and only fully justifiable political system. The distinct features of democracy are freedom and equality. Democracy can be described as the rule of the free people who govern

themselves, either directly or through their representatives, in their own interest. Why does Plato not consider democracy the best form of government? In the Republic he criticizes the direct and unchecked democracy of his time precisely because of its leading features (557a-564a). Firstly, although freedom is for Plato a true value, democracy involves the danger of excessive freedom, of doing as one likes, which leads to anarchy. Secondly, equality, related to the belief that everyone has the right and equal capacity to rule, brings to politics all kinds of power-seeking individuals, motivated by personal gain rather than public good. Democracy is thus highly corruptible. It opens gates to demagogues, potential dictators, and can thus lead to tyranny. Hence, although it may not be applicable to modern liberal democracies, Plato's main charge against the democracy he knows from the ancient Greek political practice is that it is unstable, leading from anarchy to tyranny, and that it lacks leaders with proper skill and morals. Democracy depends on chance and must be mixed with competent leadership. Without able and virtuous leaders, such as Solon or Pericles, who come and go by chance, it is not a good form of government. But even Pericles, who as Socrates says made people "wilder" rather than more virtuous, is considered not to be the best leader. If ruling a state is a craft, indeed statecraft, Plato argues, then politics needs expert rulers, and they cannot come to it merely by accident, but must be carefully selected and prepared in the course of extensive training. Making political decisions requires good judgment. Politics needs competence, at least in the form of today's civil servants. Who then should the experts be and why? Why does Plato in the Republic decide to hand the steering wheel of the state to philosophers?

In spite of the idealism with which he is usually associated, Plato is not politically naive. He does not idealize, but is deeply pessimistic about human beings. Most people, corrupted as they are, are for him fundamentally irrational, driven by their appetites, egoistic passions, and informed by false beliefs. If they choose to be just and obey laws, it is only because they lack the power to act criminally and are afraid of punishment (Republic, 359a). Nevertheless, human beings are not vicious by nature. They are social animals, incapable of living alone. Living in communities and exchanging products of their labor is natural for them, so that they have capacities for rationality and goodness. Plato, as later Rousseau, believes that once political society is properly ordered, it can contribute to the restoration of morals. A good political order, good education and upbringing can produce "good natures; and [these] useful natures, which are in turn well educated; grow up even better than their predecessors" .Hence, there are in Plato such elements of the idealistic or liberal world view as the belief in education and progress, and a hope for a better future. The quality of human life can be improved if people learn to be rational and understand that their real interests lie in harmonious cooperation with one another, and not in war or partisan strife. However, unlike Rousseau, Plato does not see the best social and political order in a democratic republic. Opinions overcome truth in everyday life. Peoples' lives and the lives of communities are shaped by the prevailing beliefs. If philosophers are those who can distinguish between true and false beliefs, who love knowledge and are motivated by the common good, and finally if they are not only master-theoreticians, but also the master-practitioners who can heal the ills of their society, then they, and not democratically elected representatives, must be chosen as leaders and educators of the political community and guide it to proper ends. They are required to counteract the destabilizing effects of false beliefs on society. Are philosophers incorruptible? In the ideal city there are provisions to minimize possible corruption, even among the good-loving philosophers. They can neither enjoy private property nor family life. Although they are the rulers, they receive only a modest remuneration from the state, dine in common dining halls, and have wives and children in common. These provisions are necessary, Plato believes, because if the philosopher-rulers were to acquire private land, luxurious homes, and money themselves, they would soon become hostile masters of other citizens rather than their leaders and allies. The ideal city becomes a bad one, described as timocracy, precisely when the philosophers neglect music and physical exercise, and begin to gather wealth.

To be sure, Plato's philosophers, among whom he includes both men and women, are not those who can usually be found today in departments of philosophy and who are described as the "prisoners who take refuge in a temple" (495a). Initially chosen from among the brightest, most stable, and most courageous children, they go through a sophisticated and prolonged educational training which begins with gymnastics, music and mathematics, and ends with dialectic, military service and practical city management. They have superior theoretical knowledge, including the knowledge of the just, noble, good and advantageous, but are not inferior to others in practical matters as well. Being in the final stage of their education illuminated by the idea of the good, they are those who can see beyond changing empirical phenomena and reflect on such timeless values as justice, beauty, truth, and moderation. Goodness is not merely a theoretical idea for them, but the ultimate state of their mind. If the life of the philosopher-rulers is not of private property, family or wealth, nor even of honor, and if the intellectual life itself seems so attractive, why should they then agree to rule? Plato's answer is in a sense a negative one. Philosophical life, based on contemplative leisure and the pleasure of learning, is indeed better and happier than that of ruling the state. However, the underlying idea is not to make any social class in the city the victorious one and make it thus happy, but "to spread happiness throughout the city by bringing the citizens into harmony with each other ... and by making them share with each other the benefits that each class can confer on the community". Plato assumes that a city in which the rulers do not govern out of desire for private gain, but are least motivated by personal ambition, is governed in the way which is the finest and freest from civil strife. Philosophers will rule not only because they will be best prepared for this, but also because if they do not, the city will no longer be well governed and may fall prey to economic decline, factionalism, and civil war. They will approach ruling not as something really enjoyable, but as something necessary.

Oppositions in contradiction of the government of philosopher-rulers can be made. Firstly, because of the restrictions concerning family and private property, Plato is often accused of totalitarianism. However, Plato's political vision differs from a totalitarian state in a number of important aspects. Especially in the *Laws* he makes clear that freedom is one of the main values of society (701d). Other values for which Plato stands include justice, friendship, wisdom, courage, and moderation, and not factionalism or terror that can be associated with a totalitarian state. The restrictions which he proposes are placed on the governors, rather than on the governed. Secondly, one can argue that there may obviously be a danger in the self-professed claim to rule of the philosophers. Individuals may imagine themselves to be best qualified to govern a country, but in fact they may lose contact with political realities and not be good leaders at all. If philosopher-rulers did not have real knowledge of their city, they would be deprived of the essential credential that is required to make their rule legitimate, namely, that they alone know how best to govern. Indeed, at the end of Book VII of the *Republic* where philosophers' education is discussed, Socrates says: "I forgot that we were only playing and so I spoke too vehemently" (536b), as if to imply that objections can be made to philosophical rule. As in a few other places in the dialogue, Plato throws his political innovation open to doubt. However, in Plato's view, philosopher-rulers do not derive their authority solely from their expert knowledge, but also from their love of the city as a whole and their impartiality and fairness. Their political authority is not only rational but also substantially moral, based on the consent of the governed. They regard justice as the most important and most essential thing (540e). Even if particular political solutions presented in the *Republic* may be open to questioning, what seems to stand firm is the basic idea that underlies philosophers' governance and that can be traced back to Solon: the idea of fairness based on difference as the basis of the righteous political order. A political order based on fairness leads to friendship and cooperation among different parts of the city.

For Plato, as for Solon, government exists for the benefit of all citizens and all social classes, and must mediate between potentially conflicting interests. Such a mediating force is exercised in the ideal city of the Republic by the philosopher-rulers. They are the guarantors of the political order that is encapsulated in the norm that regulates just relations of persons and classes within the city and is expressed by the phrase: “doing one’s own work and not meddling with what isn’t one’s own” (433a-b). If justice is related to equality, the notion of equality is indeed preserved in Plato’s view of justice expressed by this norm as the impartial, equal treatment of all citizens and social groups. It is not the case that Plato knew that his justice meant equality but really made inequality, as Karl Popper (one of his major critics) believed. In the ideal city all persons and social groups are given equal opportunities to be happy, that is, to pursue happiness, but not at the expense of others. Their particular individual, group or class happiness is limited by the need of the happiness for all. The happiness of the whole city is not for Plato the happiness of an abstract unity called the polis, or the happiness of the greatest number, but rather the happiness of all citizens derived from a peaceful, harmonious, and cooperative union of different social classes. According to the traditional definition of justice by Simonides from Book I, which is reinterpreted in Book IV, as “doing one’s own work,” each social class receives its proper due in the distribution of benefits and burdens. The philosopher-rulers enjoy respect and contemplative leisure, but not wealth or honors; the guardian class, the second class in the city, military honors, but not leisure or wealth; and the producer class, family life, wealth, and freedom of enterprise, but not honors or rule. Then, the producers supply the city with goods; the guardians, defend it; and the philosophers, attuned to virtue and illuminated by goodness, rule it impartially for the common benefit of all citizens. The three different social classes engage in mutually beneficial enterprise, by which the interests of all are best served. Social and economic differences, i.e. departures from equality, bring about benefits to people in all social positions, and therefore, are justified. In the Platonic vision of the Republic, all social classes get to perform what they are best fit to do and are unified into a single community by mutual interests. In this sense, although each are different, they are all friends.

The poor majority will soon come together to form an even worse form of government, democracy. This is the form of government in which everyone wants to be rich, Plato believed. Democracy takes birth when rich have made the poor loathe them and love of revolution begins to spring amongst poor. Therefore some revolutionists rise and either kill or exile the rich rulers, forming a new, just government with freedom as their priority. In a rule like this one there is no compulsion for anything. You can choose to not join the army even if you are competent. The insatiable desire of freedom forms a nation where teachers fear students and children fight parents. Hence, people start disregarding all laws and nobody wants to be ruled. Although, someone obviously does rule and they are slightly richer than all the other population. The common people start taking their rulers as oligarchs. This is when someone stands up as the defender of democracy.

This is where another form of government and the worst of all, comes to existence. The defender of democracy makes all sorts of promises and pretends very kind in the beginning. He overthrows the rulers and when he has defended democracy and is no longer required, he keeps bringing fake problems to make the people feel that they need him. When the people discover he is not needed and they stand for that, the true face unleashes and we find that the defender of the democracy is a tyrant. This is how the fifth, most repulsive stage of governance, tyranny, comes to being. Now one way to put down Plato’s five stages of governance were to simply name and describe them. But, I believe, this is not how Plato wants us to know them. He wants us to know them in the form he writes, as to show which form deteriorates to which and which one is the best. Aristocracy is the best and it keeps deteriorating from timocracy to oligarchy to democracy and then to the worst, tyranny.

It can be contended that the whole argument of the Republic is made in response to the denial of justice as a universal moral value expressed in Thrasymachus' statement: "Justice is nothing else than the interest of the stronger." Moral relativism, the denial of the harmony of interests, and other problems posed by this statement are a real challenge for Plato for whom justice is not merely a notion relative to the existing laws instituted by the victorious factions in power. In the Laws a similar statement is made again, and it is interpreted as the right of the strong, the winner in a political battle. By such interpretation, morality is denied and the right to govern, like in the "Melian Dialogue" of Thucydides, is equated simply with might. The decisions about morals and justice which we make are for Plato "no trifle, but the foremost thing". The answer to the question of what is right and what is wrong can entirely determine our way of life, as individuals and communities. If Plato's argument about justice presented in both the Republic and the Laws can be summarized in just one sentence, the sentence will say: "Justice is neither the right of the strong nor the advantage of the stronger, but the right of the best and the advantage of the whole community." The best, as explained in the Republic, are the expert philosophical rulers. They, the wise and virtuous, free from faction and guided by the idea of the common good, should rule for the common benefit of the whole community, so that the city will not be internally divided by strife, but one in friendship. Then, in the Laws, the reign of the best individuals is replaced by the reign of the finest laws instituted by a judicious legislator. Throughout this dialogue Plato's guiding principle is that the good society is a harmonious union of different social elements that represent two key values: wisdom and freedom. The best laws assure that all the city's parts: the democratic, the oligarchic, and the aristocratic, are represented in political institutions: the popular Assembly, the elected Council, and the Higher Council, and thus each social class receives its due expression. Still, a democratic skeptic can feel dissatisfied with Plato's proposal to grant the right to rule to the best, either individuals or laws, even on the basis of tacit consent of the governed. The skeptic may believe that every adult is capable of exercising the power of self-direction, and should be given the opportunity to do so. He will be prepared to pay the costs of eventual mistakes and to endure an occasional civil unrest or even a limited war rather than be directed by anyone who may claim superior wisdom. Why then should Plato's best constitution be preferable to democracy? In order to fully explain the Platonic political vision, the meaning of "the best" should be further clarified.

In the short dialogue Alcibiades I, little studied today and thought by some scholars as not genuine, though held in great esteem by the Platonists of antiquity, Socrates speaks with Alcibiades. The subject of their conversation is politics. Frequently referred to by Thucydides in the History of the Peloponnesian War, Alcibiades, the future leader of Athens, highly intelligent and ambitious, largely responsible for the Athenian invasion of Sicily, is at the time of conversation barely twenty years old. The young, handsome, and well-born Alcibiades of the dialogue is about to begin his political career and to address the Assembly for the first time. He plans to advise the Athenians on the subject of peace and war, or some other important affair. His ambitions are indeed extraordinary. He does not want just to display his worth before the people of Athens and become their leader, but to rule over Europe and Asia as well. His dreams resemble that of the future Alexander the Great. His claim to rule is that he is the best. However, upon Socrates' scrutiny, it becomes apparent that young Alcibiades knows neither what is just, nor what is advantageous, nor what is good, nor what is noble, beyond what he has learned from the crowd. His world-view is based on unexamined opinions. He appears to be the worst type of ignorant person who pretends that he knows something but does not. Such ignorance in politics is the cause of mistakes and evils. What is implied in the dialogue is that noble birth, beautiful looks, and even intelligence and power, without knowledge, do not give the title to rule. Ignorance, the condition of Alcibiades, is also the condition of the great majority of the people. Nevertheless, Socrates

promises to guide Alcibiades, so that he becomes excellent and renowned among the Greeks . In the course of further conversation, it turns out that one who is truly the best does not only have knowledge of political things, rather than an opinion about them, but also knows one's own self and is a beautiful soul. He or she is perfect in virtue. The riches of the world can be entrusted only to those who "take trouble over" themselves, who look "toward what is divine and bright", and who following the supreme soul, God, the finest mirror of their own image , strive to be as beautiful and wealthy in their souls as possible. The best government can be founded only on beautiful and well-ordered souls.

In a few dialogues, such as *Phaedo*, the *Republic*, *Phaedrus*, *Timaeus*, and the *Laws*, Plato introduces his doctrine of the immortality of the soul. His ultimate answer to the question "Who am I?" is not an "egoistic animal" or an "independent variable," as the twentieth century behavioral researcher blatantly might say, but an "immortal soul, corrupted by vice and purified by virtue, of whom the body is only an instrument". Expert political knowledge for him should include not only knowledge of things out there, but also knowledge of oneself. This is because whoever is ignorant of him will also be ignorant of others and of political things, and, therefore, will never be an expert politician. Those who are ignorant will go wrong, moving from one misery to another. For them history will be a tough teacher, but as long they do not recognize themselves and practice virtue, they will learn nothing. Plato's good society is impossible without transcendence, without a link to the perfect being who is God, the true measure of all things. It is also impossible without an ongoing philosophical reflection on which we truly are. Therefore, democracy would not be a good form of government for him unless, as it is proposed in the *Laws*, the element of freedom is mixed with the element of wisdom, which includes ultimate knowledge of the self. Unmixed and unchecked democracy, marked by the general permissiveness that spurs vices, makes people impious, and lets them forget about their true self, is only be the second worst in the rank of flawed regimes after tyranny headed by a vicious individual. This does not mean that Plato would support a theocratic government based on shallow religiosity and religious hypocrisy. There is no evidence for this. Freedom of speech, forming opinions and expressing them, which may be denied in theocracy, is a true value for Plato, along with wisdom. It is the basic requirement for philosophy. In shallow religiosity, like in atheism, there is ignorance and no knowledge of the self either. In Book II of the *Republic*, Plato criticizes the popular religious beliefs of the Athenians, who under the influence of Homer and Hesiod attribute vices to the gods and heroes He tries to show that God is the perfect being, the purest and brightest, always the same, immortal and true, to whom we should look in order to know ourselves and become pure and virtuous. God, and not human beings, is the measure of political order.

However, the *Republic* Book VIII begins when Plato has already arrived to his conclusion for the best form of government. He believes, as he talks to Glaucon about it, that the best King is one who is the best of philosophers and the best at war. Plato was more of a political philosopher and all his other theories were in some ways helping his theories on politics. Hence, we can assume that they were derived to support his political theories. For instance, his theory of Ideal Forms and his theory about psyche or soul also establish his political theory. He also believes that "political science" is the most important form of education. An aristocracy changes mildly into a timocracy or government of honor. This form of government is one in which the ruler is more involved in warfare, hence, a government of honor comes to being. The ruler is honored by public and this makes it similar to an aristocracy but the state is involved more into warfare. Plato, also, explains how timocracy comes to being in the first place. According to Plato, there are particular periods in which people should have babies and when babies are born otherwise it leads to deterioration and inequality. Metals are mixed when they shouldn't; hence, bronze and iron combine to fight for money, while silver and gold come together and fight to bring back aristocracy. This brings chaos and inequality which causes a state involved in warfare. Similarly, timocracy degrades into an

oligarchy. Oligarchy is a government of few and the rich are the few that rule the majority of the poor. Oligarchy just naturally evolves from timocracy because a nation indulged in war will accumulate a lot of wealth and it will lose its respect for excellence. The few rich people will begin to rule and suppress the poor. The rich will be scared of arming the poor majority, fearing they will turn on them and the state will be a weak one. Extreme poverty will bring crime rate and illiteracy to their peaks. However, the following stages are the basic tenants of the Plato's Theory of Government.

### ***Timocracy***

The word timocracy was there in the mind of Socrates with the picture of Sparta. In that kind of a setup, societies were ruled by military classes and so honour and ambitions were considered to be the highest virtues. Subsequently he imagines how his ideal state would degenerate into a timocracy. He explains that such a political change could result from disagreement among the ruling class. For instance, he says suppose one of the rulers at a marriage festival breaks the convention and brings together men and women who are not appropriate for each other and for producing children. Now the children of such a marriage will be deprived of their natural aptitude for ruling. He leaves the possibility open that many of them may be appointed as rulers. With this, according to Socrates, the decline of the state would automatically begin. This is how timocracy would make a place for itself. In such a state the rulers will not be pure in the sense that their souls will have not only gold and silver but also bronze and iron. They will be ambitious and would like to own money and private property and may also prefer to have private life. This will result in a lot of competition amongst them and consequently there will be no place for intelligence and wisdom. These virtues will be replaced by the virtue of courage, and subsequently auxiliaries will take over the rulers. As a result the internal balance of the ideal state will be immensely disturbed, and so justice of the state would be affected. The individual corresponding to such a state would be a timocratic man. He will be brave and ambitious with the passion for physical exercise and hunting. He will be more inclined towards military achievements as compared to other intellectual pursuits. Since his soul will not be a balanced or 'just' soul, his character will be dominated by the spirit or the emotion and not by the reason. This man according to Plato is 'ambitious, energetic, athletic, but a prey to inner uncertainty.'

### ***Oligarchy***

Socrates stated the characteristic feature of an oligarchy by distinguishing between wealthy and poor. Logically, all political power is concentrated in the hands of the rich. Here too, as in timocracy, people will take for more and more wealth until wealth becomes the criteria of honour in the sense of being the highly valued thing. One can see how the ideal state will go through the transition from timocracy to oligarchy. Socrates points out certain faults of the society, and says that the rulers will be chosen on the basis of their wealth alone without any surely of their consistency as rulers. Further, he says that there will be division in the society amounting to rich and poor classes, and there will always a rift between the two that would destroy not only the unity but also the peace of the state. The most disastrous aspect of such a society will be that most of its citizens will have nothing to do, and the poor will turn into beggars and criminals. As far as the oligarchic man is concerned, Socrates develops him from a timocratic man who supposedly tosses in a war. He says when he returns home he will be exiled and his rights and properties would be taken back. The son of such a man will grow up in a lot of insecurity. He will need to earn his own living. Surely, he will not have any values for honor and courage which his father had. His aim will be to collect as much money as possible over and above anything else. Therefore, he will lead a hardworking and ascetic life and will not succumb to his desires and impulses for otherwise he

will lose all his wealth. To some extent he will be respectable person but this respect will not be a result of his moral conviction. Thus timocracy is the form of government.

## **Democracy**

While explaining democracy, Socrates mainly refers to the city state of Athens where there prevailing democracy. Socrates flinches by giving an account of the changeover of the slate from oligarchy to democracy. He says that since there will be a tot of wealth in me oligarchic state, the rich men will have a tendency to lend money on higher rates of interest. They would make such an arrangement that that their debtors spend all the money as fast as possible and again turn to them for money. The entire mechanism will make the debtors go bankrupt and eventually they will revolt against their rich subjugators till they are defeated. As a result of this upheaval, everyone will get an equal right. This is how democracy will establish itself in the state. Once this happens, everybody will be free to behave the way he wants. There will be no compulsion to enter the public life nor will anybody be forced to obey the law of the land. The politician in the democracy need not have to be qualified or trained. At the most he will be a good friend of the citizens. Now the question arises regarding the characteristics of a democratic man.

One has seen how the man in oligarchy is ruled by the idea of money and wealth but he continues to be in place, i.e. to say he has control over his desires and other instincts. This man therefore is not expected to impart proper education to his son. Since the child will not know how to value other things, he will be easily influenced by any and every person who comes in his way. He will not have any sense of discrimination and won't be able to distinguish between the good and the bad. As a result he may mix the good pleasures or desires with the bad and so on. In other words he will live on his own terms. There will be no restrictions for anything in his life, and there will be no order either in his life. Plato describes the democratic man as 'versatile but lacking in principle,' his desires being both 'necessary and unnecessary'. When there is the extreme form of polity, democracy emerges.

## **Tyranny**

So far, we have seen the transition of the ideal state into timocracy, oligarchy, and democracy. These transitions are all in the line of degeneration which is subject to the dominant feature of every society. What is most demanding in democracy is the desire for freedom, and, according to Socrates; this is the cause of the failure of democracy. He explains that a natural consequence of this sense of freedom is that children do not fear their parents neither do they have any respect for them. The same is true of students too. Now, the leaders of the democracy are appointed from the rebellion class who fought against their oligarchic masters. Some of them therefore are likely to have a criminal background. Their main job is to somehow retain their popularity, and they would go to any extent to please the people. In the process, they would even tend to rob the remaining few wealthy citizens, and in order to impress people they would distribute their (wealthy people) wealth to the masses. Of course, the majority it is held back by them for future use. Such matters would be reported in the popular assembly. This would give the democratic leaders an opportunity to call them reactionaries, and they would try their best to convince the masses against them. This would result in an outbreak of civil war and the masses will take up to the most popular among the democratic leaders for support. This man will then become very powerful and he will uproot the remaining wealthy citizens. But there is another aspect of this historical development too. The so called popular leader will need to protect him because his opponents will always conspire against him. He will need a security cover all the lime and so would ask for bodyguards and even a private army. For maintaining his army he will impose heavy taxes on the citizens but at the same time, to retain his power he will spend lavishly for the benefit of the citizens. He will soon run out of

money and will start troubling his people who gave him the power to rule. This will bring in tyranny. He will become a tyrant. And his state would be the worst possible state because his core group will not have any intelligent person to advise him. There will be unhappiness all around,

Following, compatible to this state there will be the authoritarian man. Socrates progresses such an individual from the democratic man by imagining how his son would possibly behave. As we have seen in the description of the democratic man that this person indulges in all his desires, the good as well as the bad, equally. Now supposing such a man, says Socrates, falls into bad company, his life will be controlled not by the variety of desires that controlled his father but by lust. He will spend his entire life pursuing and satisfying his lust and in the process will tend to become more and more violent. Every individual, including his parents, will be used by this man as a means to satisfy his desires. He will not have any friends and his life will be the unhappy one. In Plato's words the tyrannical character has its 'essential similarity to the criminal type'. It seems that while giving an illustration of the four unjust states, Plato basically intends to offer a criticism of the states that actually existed at ancient times. What comes out very prominently in his descriptions is the fact that all the states are tilted in one direction, thus making them unbalanced. None of these states has an enlightened ruler as portrayed in the ideal state. For example, soldiers rule the timocracy; the rulers of oligarchy have money and wealth dominating their minds; democracy is ruled by clever and popular leader; and the ruler in the tyranny rules by force and violence. Accordingly, we have four types of unjust men too, the worst of them being the tyrannical man. He is the most unjust one as he lives a disturbed life. Socrates then proceeds to put forward some arguments in order to explain Glaucon, Polemarchus and Thrasymachus that why a just man lives a better life than an unjust one.

Socrates argues that the pleasures of the just man alone are to be acknowledged as the 'real' pleasures as it involves [the pleasures of knowledge. All other pleasures are illusory, according to Socrates. They are subject to the demands of our various physical conditions. The pleasures of knowledge by contrast are genuine and positive and have nothing to do with our physical demands. Thus, he shows that the pleasures of the just man are the real pleasures and therefore he is happiest of all men. He next attempts to show his disputers where the unjust man goes wrong. He argues that this man is starved or rather he has starved himself of that part which is considered as truly human, namely his reason. He has given a lot of importance to what is taken to be most inhuman, i.e. his lust. As a result he has inflicted a lot of injustice on himself which can never make a man happy. He insists that only the reason can guide one to lead a good and happy life. He also proposes that if a man's reasoning capacity is not strong enough then he should be open to be guided by the reasoning and intelligence of others. In this way Socrates is finally able to defend himself and answer the main issue of the Republic. Mentioning to the autocratic society he points out that all the citizens of such a state are enslaved except for the ruler, i.e. the tyrant himself. He applies this structure of the dictatorship state to analyze the tyrant himself, and explains that the better aspects of this tyrant are enslaved in a similar way by his worst aspects. In other words, his reason, emotions, and good desires are subject to his master passion, i.e. his lust. Such a man can never be happy, declares Socrates. On the other hand, the just man of the ideal state is the one who always acts as guided by his reason and wisdom. He is therefore much in control of himself, and displays right kind of emotions while selecting what course of action to follow. Thus, the just man is much happier as compared to the unjust man.

Further, he refers to the three parts of the soul and holds that correspondingly there are three types of men: the first one is controlled by his reasons and therefore seeks knowledge; the second type is dominated by the emotional or the spirited element and so he would seek honour and success; the third person is controlled by his desires and will always be looking for gains and satisfaction. Socrates categorizes the first man as exemplifying the just man, the second one to be

the timocratic-man, and the last one to be a combination of the oligarchic, democratic, and tyrannical man. Now, if asked who is the happiest of them all, each would answer for himself. This would entail three categories of happiness or pleasures: firstly, the pleasures of knowledge followed by the pleasures of success, and lastly the pleasures of satisfaction. The obvious question now is which of these pleasures is better than the others? As per Socrates assessment, it is expected of the just man 'to have an experience of all the three levels of pleasures, so he would favour the pleasures of knowledge. Since the other two do not have the experience of all the three levels, so they are not qualified to pass a judgment on the issue. Consequently, it is but obvious that the happiness of the just man is the best kind of happiness as it is complete in every sense.

### **1.11: Concept of Plato's idealism**

Plato is the father of idealism so far as western idealism is concerned. Idealism has to do essentially with ideas and the importance of ideals and values. Both these senses of idealism find an expression in Plato's philosophy. But before we embark into a discussion of his idealism, we must understand his theory of knowledge because it serves as a foundation for his theory of ideas. Plato's epistemology starts on a negative note whereby he first refutes what he considers to be the false theories of knowledge. The first such theory that he attacks is the sophistic view that knowledge is perception. Basically, he rejects their claim that what appears to be true to an individual is actually true for that person. This was also the position of Socrates as we have seen earlier. Plato maintains that perception gives us contradictory impressions, and it is not possible to judge which of the impressions are true. So the question of a choice among the various perceptions to account for a true impression which could constitute knowledge seems redundant here. Moreover, he also points out that if all perceptions are taken as true then there is no difference between a child's impression and that of his teacher or parents. His main objection against this kind of a theory, like Socrates, is that it spoils the objectivity of truth thereby making the distinction between truth and falsehood meaningless. Thus, he claims that no knowledge can be formed on the basis of perception.

Plato explains that a perception is just like an isolated dot which alone cannot combine with other sensations to produce knowledge. These combining and comparing operations, he says, are performed only by the mind.

Next, Plato attacks the second false theory which asserts that knowledge is opinion. According to him, neither a right opinion nor a wrong opinion can be called knowledge. He says that although right opinion is belief, it does not form knowledge because, like his master, he believes that the knowledge can only be produced by reason.

Having refuted the above theories, he adopts Socrates doctrine which says that all knowledge is through concepts for the simple reason that a concept is fixed and cannot be changed according to the changing impressions of an individual. In other words, he endorses Socrates view that knowledge should be founded on reason since reason alone can provide us objective truth. He in fact goes a step ahead of his master to study the nature of reality through concepts. This results in his most acclaimed theory of ideas.

One needs to understand Plato's theory of ideas as the theory of the objectivity of concepts. This has been nicely brought out by W.T. State. The essence of the theory of ideas, according to State, is that the concept is not just an idea in the mind. It also has a reality which is independent of the mind. He expresses that Plato arrived at this doctrine by realizing that truth consists in one to one correspondence between one's idea and the fact of its existence. That is to say, thoughts

inside our minds are reflections or images of things outside our minds. And this is what truth is. Now both Socrates and Plato, as we have seen, accept that the knowledge is the knowledge of concepts. From this, it follows logically that if by a concept one means true knowledge then the truth is due to or in virtue of its correspondence with something in the objective reality. There is an attempt to show in the course of this unit how starting from Cephalus to Thrasymachus, Socrates analyzes various instances of justice to arrive at the concept of justice and in the final analysis he identifies it with the concept of good. In this way he has tried to explain the objectivity of these moral concepts. He has thus tried to impress upon us that though there may be many just acts and as many instances of the good but ideally justice is only one and so is good. Ideas thus signify the objectivity of these concepts. It is therefore relevant here to mention the characteristics of 'ideas' as understood by Plato. To begin with, he holds that ideas mean substances. Philosophically, a substance is something which is in itself and caused by itself. Thus, it has a reality of its own and does not require anything other than itself for its determination. That is, it is self-determined. Ideas are substances in this technical sense. According to Plato, they are absolute and ultimate realities. He states that ideas depend on nothing but all things depend on them. In this sense, they are also the first principles of the universe. Further, since ideas represent concepts and all concepts are general therefore ideas are universals. They are not to be interpreted as particular things. Successively, it follows that ideas are not things at all. Rather they are thoughts. But thoughts here do not mean subjective thoughts in the mind of an individual or for that matter in the mind of God. By thought, Plato only means those that have a reality of their own and hence are objective in nature.

Since ideas are not liable to change they are eternal and imperishable. Being so, they form the essences of all things and have a perfection of their own. Thus every idea is perfection personified. Plato's theory of ideas with all its features and characteristics makes way for his dialectics. In a world of ideas there has to be some way to know the relations between these ideas, and also to connect and disconnect these ideas. This gives rise to a science of ideas namely dialectics. Plato contributed to dialectics to a great extent, which later became a very important part of Kant's philosophy. It needs to be mentioned here that after all the exhaustive talk about ideas Plato maintains that there is only one idea that is supreme and that is the idea of the good. He says that it serves as the ground for all other ideas. He connects all ideas with the supreme idea of good, as we have seen while discussing about his ideal state or in locating the virtues of the state and the individual. Even his arguments for a philosopher king are linked with the supreme idea of the good. This explains the ideological character of his philosophy. Good is the answer to everything, all acts in the universe.

Plato's idealism is reflected in his account of the tripartite division of the soul. The highest part of the soul, he says, is the rational part which apprehends the ideas. It is therefore the immortal part. The irrational part of the soul is mortal and all sensuous appetites belong here. The immortality of the soul is explained through his doctrines of recollection and transmigration, and this is associated with his idealism. Likewise, his views on individual ethics are touched by his idealism whereby he claims that morality has an intrinsic value and not an extrinsic one. He insists that virtue should be the end of right actions and the latter must proceed from a rational understanding of true values. He succeeds in proving to his people that the end of goodness consists in good itself by which he means happiness.

### **1.12: Relevance of Plato**

Plato may easily be rated as one of the most outstanding philosophers of the world. This is not particularly because what he preached, but largely because of the fact that many important tenets emerge from his philosophy and find a place in contemporary discourse. The various sub-divisions

of western thought clearly show Plato's ancestry. With good occupying the place of the highest end in every area, Plato's philosophy seems to have a soteriological side to it. In this sense, it is quite similar to Indian thought. So far as his contribution to western thought is concerned, what appears to be most striking is his rationalism not only in epistemology but also in ethics. He claims that it is possible to have a rational knowledge of the universe. He sets forth the basic principle of rationalism namely that reason and not sense-perception is the source of knowledge. This does not mean that he completely discards experience because he admits that experiences are instrumental in generating a-priori ideas in us. We also find a mix of all the theories pertaining to the status of the world in Plato's philosophy. It displays realism, as Plato takes examples and analogies from the real world; it asserts idealism when he tries to portray the world to be essentially mental or an ideal world: one also gets a sense of phenomenalism when he claims that the world of sense-perceptions is an appearance of the real world, i.e. the ideal world; further it reflects dualism by maintaining that mind and matter are the two principles of the world; moreover, there is a lucid explanation of the immanence and the transcendence. Plato's writings are fundamentally ethical because he tries to emphasize that the ultimate end lies in knowing the good and acting according to it. His theories also have an influence on the subsequent political theories of the world. We thus observe that Plato's philosophy is central not only to the world of philosophy, but also has a socio-political implication.

However, Plato's greatest achievement may be seen firstly in that he, in opposing the sophists, offered to decadent Athens, which had lost faith in her old religion, traditions, and customs, a means by which civilization and the city's health could be restored: the recovery of order in both the polis and the soul.

The best, rational and righteous political order leads to the harmonious unity of a society and allows all the city's parts to pursue happiness but not at the expense of others. The characteristics of a good political society, of which most people can say "it is mine", are described in the Republic by four virtues: justice, wisdom, moderation, and courage. Justice is the equity or fairness that grants each social group its due and ensures that each "does one's own work" The three other virtues describe qualities of different social groups. Wisdom, which can be understood as the knowledge of the whole, including both knowledge of the self and political prudence, is the quality of the leadership. Courage is not merely military courage but primarily civic courage: the ability to preserve the right, law-inspired belief, and stand in defense of such values as friendship and freedom on which a good society is founded. It is the primary quality of the guardians. Finally, moderation, a sense of the limits that bring peace and happiness to all, is the quality of all social classes. It expresses the mutual consent of both the governed and the rulers as to who should rule. The four virtues of the good society describe also the soul of a well-ordered individual. Its rational part, whose quality is wisdom, nurtured by fine words and learning, should together with the emotional or spirited part, cultivated by music and rhythm, rule over the volitional or appetitive part. Under the leadership of the intellect, the soul must free itself from greed, lust, and other degrading vices, and direct itself to the divine. The liberation of the soul from vice is for Plato the ultimate task of humans on earth. Nobody can be wicked and happy. Only a spiritually liberated individual, whose soul is beautiful and well ordered, can experience true happiness. Only a country ordered according to the principles of virtue can claim to have the best system of government.

Plato's critique of democracy may be considered by modern readers as not applicable to liberal democracy today. Liberal democracies are not only founded on considerations of freedom and equality, but also include other elements, such as the rule of law, multiparty systems, periodic elections, and a professional civil service. Organized along the principle of separation of powers, today's Western democracy resembles more a revised version of mixed government, with a degree of moderation and competence, rather than the highly unstable and unchecked Athenian democracy of the fourth and fifth century B.C.E., in which all governmental policies were directly

determined by the often changing moods of the people. However, what still seems to be relevant in Plato's political philosophy is that he reminds us of the moral and spiritual dimension of political life. He believes that virtue is the lifeblood of any good society. Moved by extreme ambitions, the Athenians, like the mythological Atlantians described in the dialogue *Critias*, became infected by "wicked coveting and the pride of power". Like the drunken Alcibiades from the *Symposium*, who would swap "bronze for gold" and thus prove that he did not understand the Socratic teaching, they chose the "semblance of beauty," the shining appearance of power and material wealth, rather than the "thing itself," the being of perfection. "To the seen eye they now began to seem foul, for they were losing the fairest bloom from their precious treasure, but to such who could not see the truly happy life, they would appear fair and blessed". They were losing their virtuous souls, their virtue by which they could prove themselves to be worthy of preservation as a great nation. Racked by the selfish passions of greed and envy, they forfeited their conception of the right order. Their benevolence, the desire to do well, ceased. "Man and city are alike," Plato claims. Humans without souls are hollow. Cities without virtue are rotten. To those who cannot see clearly they may look glorious but what appears bright is only exterior. To see clearly what is visible, the political world out there, Plato argues, one has first to perceive what is invisible but intelligible, the soul. One has to know oneself. Humans are immortal souls, he claims, and not just independent variables. They are often egoistic, but the divine element in them makes them more than mere animals. Friendship, freedom, justice, wisdom, courage, and moderation are the key values that define a good society based on virtue, which must be guarded against vice, war, and factionalism. To enjoy true happiness, humans must remain virtuous and remember God, the perfect being. Plato's achievement as a political philosopher may be seen in that he believed that there could be a body of knowledge whose attainment would make it possible to heal political problems, such as factionalism and the corruption of morals, which can bring a city to a decline. The doctrine of the harmony of interests, fairness as the basis of the best political order, the mixed constitution, the rule of law, the distinction between good and deviated forms of government, practical wisdom as the quality of good leadership, and the importance of virtue and transcendence for politics are the political ideas that can rightly be associated with Plato.

### 1.13: Let's summaries

- Born in Greek and not a barbarian, freedom not a slave, man not a woman, but above all that Plato was born in the age of Socrates. Plato was born in 427 BC and died in 347 BC. Since the time of his birth and throughout is youth, the Peloponnesian war (between city states of Athens and Sparta) was in full progress which eventually culminated in the defeat of Athens. The defeat was attributed to the democratic form of government which accentuated the death of Socrates for whom Plato had deep-rooted affection and respect.
- From this simple idea we may try to magnify Plato in Western political thought. Plato an aristocrat by both birth and temperament was born in democratic Athens, at turmoil when Athens and Sparta were engaged in the deadly Peloponnesian war (430-400) which sustained for about 28 years and resulted in the fall of Athens
- The word Metaphysics literally means what is beyond (meta) the physical. In general terms, it is an investigation into the real nature of things by going beyond what is only apparently or conditionally given to us.
- The *Republic* is by far one of the most popular and finest dialogues of Plato. Pure philosophy or metaphysics occupies a central place in the dialogue because Plato attempts to answer practical questions by constantly involving metaphysical.
- Socrates is asked if justice is good in itself, because the common view assume that injustice pays if one can get away with it. To answer this question, Socrates presents a picture of his ideal state that is also an ideal political community.
- The views on justice as presented and defended by Cephalus and his son Polemarchus projects 'justice' as a matter of conventional morality.

- Polemarchus's definition of justice claims that justice consists in benefiting one's friend and doing harm to one's enemies.
- The earliest period of the Greek system is represented in the pre-Socratic phase in the history of Greek philosophy represents a religious man who believed in the immortality of the soul, life after death, and the doctrine of reminiscence.
- Socrates was a great teacher. His teachings are mainly ethical pertaining to man and his duties, but even that is based on his theory of knowledge.
- There have been four major influences on Plato's philosophical temper. They are Pythagoras, Parmenides, Heraclitus, and Socrates.
- This implies that in the name of 'right' we may actually end up benefiting our enemies and harming the good man. So, this View is also not acceptable. However under the influence of Socrates Polemarchus makes a further change in his definition. He finally holds that justice is to benefit those friends who are in fact good and to harm those who are in fact bad people.
- Plato like Socrates wants his listeners to believe that to harm anyone in any sense is not good. He proceeds to argue in a dialogue form. His arguments are based on two assumptions:
  - That a just man can never harm anyone.
  - Whenever we harm anyone we make that individual even worse.
- Plato like Socrates tries to analyze and examine their views but fails to arrive at any conclusion regarding the concept of justice. He therefore uses another approach to understand this concept. This is based on his assumption that it is always easier to study things on a larger scale and then apply them to analyze the relevant particular cases. With this assumption, he makes an attempt to first study justice within the context of state and subsequently applies it to understand the same with regard to the individuals.
- Plato like states that the state thus founded by Socrates is the ideal and perfect state because it has the qualities of wisdom, courage, justice, and discipline. These qualities are also termed as the four cardinal virtues. To use Socrates words, 'if we have founded it properly, our state is presumably perfect'. Such a state will have 'the qualities of wisdom, courage, self-discipline and justice'.
- Plato like Socrates was having established the ultimate virtue of the state in terms of justice he makes an attempt to transfer the same findings to the individual to discover the virtues of the latter.
- Plato like Socrates envisages the entire exercise taken up by Socrates to demonstrate the three parts of the soul was precisely to search for the virtues in the individuals. For this purpose, he follows the same pattern of arguments that he used to locate virtues in the state.
- Plato like Socrates admits regarding the existing states that even they do not come close to the picture of the ideal state that he has drawn and recommends transformation which he feels can be brought about by one single change. What then is this change? Calling it the 'biggest wave' that would set people rolling into laughter, he proposes that change would consist in entrusting all political power to philosophers.
- Plato stated that the objects of ordinary of life which exemplify these forms are mere 'images'. He claims if we restrict ourselves only to the images we can never have the knowledge of the 'real'.
- Plato like Socrates described four kinds of unjust states and corresponding to these, four kinds of unjust men. He starts by imagining the decline of his ideal state, which can be understood either as royalty or aristocracy, and a simultaneous decay of the just man. The four kinds of unjust states are: timocracy, oligarchy, democracy, and tyranny.

- So far as the father of western idealism is concern, Plato is called the father of idealism, western idealism in particular. Idealism has to do essentially with ideas and the importance of ideals and values. Plato may easily be rated as one of the most outstanding philosophers of the world. This is not particularly because what he preached, but largely because of the fact that many important tenets emerge from his philosophy and find a place in contemporary discourse.
- Plato may easily be rated as one of the most outstanding philosophers of the world. This is not particularly because what he preached, but largely because of the fact that many important tenets emerge from his philosophy and find a place in contemporary discourse. The various sub-divisions of western thought clearly show Plato's ancestry
- In Plato's ideal state, category of craftsmen comprise of all those citizens who are not involved in governing the state, like doctors, farmers, artists, and poet. The four qualities are wisdom, courage, self-discipline and justice. According to Socrates, justice is related to the work for which one is best suited. According to Socrates, the reflective element in the soul is reason. The three elements of a soul are reason, emotion, and desire.
- A man can be considered wise as per Plato's calculation if he has wisdom in the reasoning part of his mind.
- All the political powers should be given to philosophers, according to Plato.
- According to Plato, a philosopher is one who Loves wisdom of any kind without any distinction. The highest form of knowledge is knowledge of good.
- Socrates uses the simile of sun tries to draw some parallels between the faculty of sight and the faculty of knowledge. The first theory of knowledge that Plato rejects is the sophist view that knowledge is perception .Plato attacks the second theory which asserts that knowledge is opinion.
- Coordination between the reason and spirit is maintained through a combination of intellectual and Socrates is the mouthpiece of most of Plato's diatogues. The earliest period of Greek philosophy is called Ionic period. The four major influences of Plato were: Pythagoras, Parmenides, Heraclitus. and Socrates. The idea of ideal state emerges in Plato's Republic. Polemarchus, the son of Cephalus, is the first one to offer a view of justice.
- The two assumptions are: That a just man can never harm anyone. Whenever we harm anyone we make that individual even worse. Two principles underlying the foundation of Plato's Utopian state are: Mutual needs different aptitudes of physical training.

#### 1.14: Some of the key concepts

- **Causality:** Causality is the relation between an event (the cause) and a second event (the effect), where the second event is understood as a consequence of *the* first,
- **Spatiotemporal:** It means having both spatial and temporal qualities
- **Ontology:** Ontology is the philosophical study of the nature of being, becoming, existence, or reality, as well as the basic categories of being and their relations.
- **Epistemology:** Epistemology is the branch of philosophy concerned with the nature and scope of knowledge.
- **Materialism:** The theory of materialism holds that all things are composed of material, and that all emergent phenomena (including consciousness) are the result of material properties and interactions.
- **Idealism:** Idealism is the group of philosophies which assert that reality, or reality as we can know it, is fundamentally mental, mentally constructed, or otherwise immaterial.
- **Doctrine:** Doctrine is a codification of beliefs or a body of teachings or instructions, taught principles or positions, as the body of teachings in a branch of knowledge or belief system.
- **Dualism:** Dualism denotes a state of two parts.
- **Hypothesis:** A hypothesis is a proposed explanation for a phenomenon. For a hypothesis to be a scientific hypothesis, the scientific method requires that one can test it.

### 1.15: Possible questions

1. Enlighten the formation of ideal state starting from primitive society to a class society.
2. With reference the three parts of the soul, discuss the various virtues in the individual. In the process link each virtue with the specific part of the soul.
3. What is the significance of the allegory of the cave?
4. How does Plato prove to his contenders that only a just man can lead a happy life?
5. How is 'justice' interpreted in the *Republic*?
6. What is conventional morality? Whose views exemplify this type of morality?'
7. Why does Socrates reject the views of Cephalus and Polemarchus on justice?
8. Explain how the various stages of economic structure are formed by Socrates.
9. How does Socrates ensure that one class would not interfere with the other classes? Explain the above by referring to his Myth of the Metals.
10. In what ways does Plato find similarities between a state and an individual?
11. Why does Plato or Socrates propose to study justice first in the state and then in the individual?
12. Why do people form a society according to Socrates?
13. What are the various qualities or virtues Socrates expects to find in his perfect state?
14. In what way does Socrates defend his stand on justice as confining oneself to one's own job and not interfering with others?
15. Explain the significance of the division of the soul into three parts.
16. Why did Plato advocate that rulers should not own any properties? What type of society do you think he had in mind while proposing this?
17. How is a philosopher different from others? Examine with reference to the distinction between knowledge and opinion.

### 1.16: Further readings

- Annas, J. (1999). *Platonic Ethics, Old and New*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bloom, A. (ed. and trans.) (1968). *The Republic of Plato*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bobonich, C. (2002). *Plato's Utopia Recast*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brickhouse, T. and N. Smith. (1994). *Plato's Socrates*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burnyeat, M. (1985). "Sphinx without a Secret," *New York Review of Books* 32, #9 (May 30, 1985).
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1992). "Utopia and Fantasy: The Practicability of Plato's Ideally Just City,"
- in *Psychoanalysis, Mind, and Art*. J. Hopkins and A. Savile, (eds.) Oxford: Oxford
- Gould, J. (1972). *The Development of Plato's Ethics*. 1955; rpt. New York: Russell and Russell.
- Guthrie, W.K.C.(1962-81). *A History of Greek Philosophy*. 6 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Vols. 4-5)
- Kerferd, G. B. (1947). "The Doctrine of Thrasymachus in Plato's Republic," *Durham University Journal* 19
- Lee, Desmond. Introduction by Melissa Lane. 2007. *Plato - The Republic*. Penguin books. Re-issued with new introduction.
- Audi, Robert. 1995-99. *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*- TI edition, Cambridge University Press.

- Durant, Will. 1954. *The Story of Philosophy*. New York. The Pocket Library. Field, GC. 1949. *The Philosophy of Plato*. New York, Oxford University Press. Grube, G M. A. 1935. *Plato's Twought*. London.
- Hamilton, Edith. 1948. *The Greek Way to Western Civilization*. New York.
- Masih, Y. 1993. *A Critical Hisiory of Western Philosophy*. Delhi: Molilal Bauarasidass.
- Patterson, G H. 2004. *Plato's The Republic Notes*. New Delhi-Ludhiana: Kalyani Publishers.
- Russel, Betrand. 1945. *A Hisiory of Western Philosophy*. New York. Stace, W.T. 1941. *A Critical Hisiory of Greek Philosophy*. London: Macuiillan and
  - Co.
- Thilly, Frank. 1993. *A History of Philosophy*. New Delhi: SBW Publishers.

## **UNIT-1 (Part 2)**

### **ARISTOTLE**

#### 2.0 Objectives

#### 2.1: Introduction

#### 2.2: The Famous works of Aristotle

#### 2.3: The Political Theory of Aristotle

#### 2.4: The Theory of Citizenship of Aristotle

#### 2.5: The views of Aristotle's realism

#### 2.6: Aristotle's Works

#### 2.6.1: Study on Classification of Sciences

#### 2.6.2: Study on Logic

#### 2.6.3: Study on Physics

#### 2.6.4: Study on the Cause and Its Nature

#### 2.6.5: Study on Chance and Impulsiveness

#### 2.6.6: Study on Metaphysics

#### 2.6.7: Study on the Rejection of Plato's Theory of Ideas

#### 2.6.8: Study on Substance

#### 2.6.9: Study on the Theory of Causation

#### 2.6.10: Study on the Four Causes in the Science of Nature

#### 2.6.11: Study on the Position of God

#### 2.7: Similarities and Differences between Plato and Aristotle

#### 2.8: Critical Estimate of Aristotle's Philosophy

#### 2.9: Summary

#### 2.10: Possible Questions

#### 2.11: Further reading

## 2.0: Objectives

The chapter is based on the following objectives. After going through the chapter one can be able to:

- The role of Aristotle in the Greek Political thought
- Deliberate the political philosophies of Aristotle
- Elucidate Aristotle's ideas interrelated to realism
- Explain the contribution of Aristotle to the Western Political Thought

## 2.1: Introduction

Aristotle was a Greek philosopher and is habitually mentioned to as the “first true scientist.” He was born in the Greek colony of Stagira in 384 and died on 322 BC. His father, Nicomachus, was physician to the King of Macedonia. Early exposure to his father’s habits of scientific observation is thought to be a significant reason for his drifting from Plato’s idealism. In 367 BC, Aristotle was sent to Plato’s Academy in Athens where he spent the next 20 years, until Plato’s death. Plato and Aristotle appear to have had great admiration for one another. Plato nicknamed Aristotle “the mind,” but did think of him as something of a dandy, paying more attention to clothes “than was becoming for a sincere lover of wisdom”. At Plato’s death in 347 BC, Aristotle left for Asia Minor under invitation from the philosopher King Hermeias, whose niece, Pythias, he married and with whom he had a daughter, also named Pythias . Persian military pressure in 345 BC interrupted this fruitful time of biological study and he moved to the Isle of Lesbos, later hearing that his friend and patron Hermeias had been executed. Aristotle so valued friendship, which accounts for a fifth of the Nicomachean Ethics that he wrote a eulogistic hymn to Hermeias which he sung after dinner every evening. In 343 BC biological studies in Lesbos were again interrupted when King Philip of Macedonia’s wished that Aristotle tutors his son, Alexander (Denise et al., 2005, p. 22). Although only teaching Alexander for four years, Aristotle stayed in Macedonia for eight. His wife died tragically during this time (Hughes, 2001, p. 3), and Aristotle later lived with Herpyllis, with whom he had a son, Nicomachus (Blackburn, 1996, p. 24). Aristotle, now 49 (335 BC), moved back to Athens and founded the Lyceum, which would last for eight centuries, where he taught and researched for 11 years. While this decade was thought to be Aristotle’s most prolific, the height of his mental powers, his prowess apparently did not extend to the physical. In his early 50s he is described as balding, pot-bellied, thin-legged, still with a boyhood lisp, restless, preferring to deliver lectures while walking under the colonnade, earning his school the name “peripatetics”. Aristotle is supposed to have spent some time in Macedonian palace, thus establishing contacts with the Macedonian monarchy, which lasted throughout his life. Nicomachus died while Aristotle was still a child and Aristotle was subsequently brought up by Pyroxenes, a family relative. The latter's son was later on brought up by Aristotle himself. Since there is insufficient information on Aristotle's childhood, it is difficult to assess the major influences during the formative years of his life. Since his father was a physician and member of the Asclepiadean medical guild, his interest in biology and the empirical approach that he takes towards any enquiry are greatly owed to him. This claim is universally and consistently supported by scholars. Further, that the members of the guild used to carry on empirical research with the help of dissections and trained their sons accordingly. Therefore, it was natural for Aristotle to develop a strong interest in studying the phenomenon of living things. Moreover, his surroundings where he spent his childhood provided him with ample opportunity to study the environment, including plants, animals, and marine life. This polished his meddlesome concentration supplementary.

Aristotle's student, Alexander, by then known as Alexander the Great, died in 323 BC with anti-Macedonia sentiment sweeping over Athens. Aristotle's Macedonian association soon landed him on trial from impiety. Unwilling to let Athens sin against philosophy a second time, and unlike Socrates, he chose exile to the island of Euboea. A year later, now 63 (322 BC), after making arrangements for Herpyllis and Nicomachus and freeing his slaves, the gentle and unperturbed philosopher had died of a digestive illness. Aristotle is credited with one of the largest libraries in the Greek world and to have written over 400 works ranging from the "nature of reality, physics, knowledge, the mind, language, biology, physiology, astronomy, time, theology, literature, rhetoric, the nature of human happiness, and much else". Only a third of his work has survived, but it alone requires 1.5 million words to translate. "An account of Aristotle's intellectual afterlife would be little less than a history of European thought" (Barnes, 1982, p. 86). For our discussion regarding the renewal of a moral paradigm for outdoor education, the primary Aristotelian text of interest is the eponymous *Nicomachean Ethics*, of such renown, that it is simply referred to as *The Ethics*. Aristotle's ethical enterprise is not to provide a moral argument, but to make us good (II 1§1). His is a search for "the good" for humankind. Although Plato has suggested the search should endeavor to identify a universal Ideal Form of the Good, Aristotle finds this impractical: It is a puzzle to know what the weaver or carpenter will gain for his own craft from knowing this Good Itself, or how anyone will be better at medicine or generalship from having gazed on the Idea Itself. For what the doctor appears to consider is not even health, but human health, and presumably the health of this human being even more, since he treats one particular patient at a time. His works cover topics from politics, philosophy, metaphysics, logic, ethics, biology and more. Subsequently one cannot attribute him as the last important political philosopher in Greece. Greek philosophy also continued in the various schools of the Epicureans, Sceptics, Stoics, even in Plato's Academy, and Aristotle's Peripatetic school across several countries for many centuries in a retrospective. The three important and distinguished thinkers had contributed enormously to the philosophical activities that subjugated Athens during the fourth and fifth century of the western world. The Socratic tradition was carried forward by Plato, his most sincere follower. But Aristotle, the most brilliant student of Plato's academy, debated his master's ideologies and was successful in laying foundations for a new philosophical tradition. So far as Socrates and Plato are considered, they are truly Athenians, i.e. they were born and spent their entire lives in Athens. This was not the case with Aristotle. In order to have an insight into his life, five periods have been identified, each corresponding to the place where he lived. Besides, there is another way by which one can trace his life and works. This consists of analyzing and understanding the various stages of his intellectual growth. However, Aristotle is considered to be greatest metaphysical and philosophical trinity of all times; the two other philosophers being Socrates (470-399 BC) and Plato (427-347 BC). He may be regarded as the most important figure among the distinguished Greek philosophical tradition that was initiated by Thales in 600 BC.

When Aristotle completed the age of eighteen he was guided by Plato's Academy to comprehend and complete his studies. He stayed there for twenty years until the death of Plato. It seems what attracted him to the academy was the life of philosophy that was practiced therein. It provided him with all research endeavors that suited his level of intellect. He is said to have shared with Plato, some of the main tenets of Platonism both as his student and later as an associate in the school. He is in fact considered to be the 'most genuine student of Plato' by Diogenes Laertius. From the early writings of Aristotle, one can make out his general adherence to Platonism. This is reflected in his way of writing too. Like his master, he chose dialogue as a medium to conduct philosophical inquiry. Even the issues that he discussed in his early writings were Platonic in the sense that they concerned education, immortality of the soul, nature of philosophy, and so on. At the same time however he also deviated from the views of his teacher wherever he felt it

necessary. With Plato's death, Aristotle left the academy in 347 BC. After some years in 342 BC, he was invited by king Philip of Macedon to tutor his thirteen years old son Alexander. Although it is not clear as to what Aristotle taught the young Alexander who became famous as the conqueror of the world, most scholars agree that he introduced the latter to politics and probably wrote a couple of books to this effect. Aristotle continued his association with Alexander till the latter died, but their association was not a close one because both of them professed opposite objectives in life. Aristotle favored a contemplative life, whereas Alexander opted for an action-filled life with the sole motive of building an empire. Aristotle contended against the war as the final end of human life. This is evident in his remark, 'It is possible to perform noble acts without being ruler of land and sea'. But here it is important to mention, as reported by scholars, that both Alexander and his father harbored a larger interest beyond their policies of warfare and empire building, and it was the unification of the eastern world. Thus, from those of Aristotle's works which clearly reflect Platonism, one can identify a particular stage of his life during which he was an ardent follower of Plato.

After leaving the Academy, Aristotle was invited to go live in the court of his friend Hermeas, ruler of Atarneus and Assos in Mysia. Aristotle remained there for three years, during which time he married Pythias, the niece and adopted daughter of the king. Later in life Aristotle married Herpyllis, with who had a son, named Nicomachus after his father. When Hermeas' kingdom was taken over by Persians, Aristotle moved to Mytilene. King Amyntas invited Aristotle to tutor his thirteen-year old son, Alexander. Aristotle tutored Alexander for five years until King Amyntas died and Alexander came to power. In gratitude for Aristotle's services, Alexander provided Aristotle generously with means for the acquisition of books and for the pursuit of scientific inquiry. While the extent to which Aristotle's tutoring influenced Alexander's successes in conquering an empire is disputable, Alexander did try to organize much of his empire along the model of the Greek city-state.

In 335 BC Aristotle went back to Athens, where he found the Academy flourishing under Xenocrates. Aristotle founded his own school, the Lyceum, and ran it for twelve years. The school is often called the Peripatetic School, because Aristotle used to like walking around and discusses his ideas with his colleagues. Peripatetics are "people who walk around." Aristotle would have detailed discussions with a small group of advanced students in the mornings, and larger lectures in the evenings. During his time at the Lyceum, Aristotle wrote extensively on a wide range of subjects: politics, metaphysics, ethics, logic and science.

Aristotle agreed with Plato that the cosmos is rationally designed and that philosophy can come to know absolute truths by studying universal forms. Their ideas diverged, however, in that Aristotle thought that the one finds the universal in particular things, while Plato believed the universal exists apart from particular things, and that material things are only a shadow of true reality, which exists in the realm of ideas and forms. The fundamental difference between the two philosophers is that Plato thought only pure mathematical reasoning was necessary, and therefore focused on metaphysics and mathematics. Aristotle, on the other hand, thought that in addition to this "first philosophy," it is also necessary to undertake detailed empirical investigations of nature, and thus to study what he called "second philosophy," which includes such subjects as physics, mechanics and biology. Aristotle's philosophy therefore involved both inductive and deductive reasoning, observing the workings of the world around him and then reasoning from the particular to a knowledge of essences and universal laws. In a sense, Aristotle was the first major proponent of the modern scientific method. The Lyceum was an unprecedented school of organized scientific inquiry. There was no comparable scientific enterprise for over 2,000 years after the founding of the Lyceum.

In 323 BC Alexander the Great died unexpectedly and the government of Athens was overthrown by anti-Macedonian forces. Having had close connections with the Macedonian royal family, Aristotle was associated with the Macedonians and was unpopular with the new ruling powers. The new government brought charges of impiety against Aristotle, but he fled to his country house in Chalcis in Euboea to escape prosecution. Aristotle commented that he fled so that "the Athenians might not have another opportunity of sinning against philosophy as they had already done in the person of Socrates." About a year later, Aristotle died after complaints of a stomach illness.

## **2.2: The Famous works of Aristotle**

The writings of Aristotle that we have today are based on this collection. In General, Aristotle wrote three types of works: dialogues or other works of a popular character, collections of scientific data and observations, and systematic treatises. His philosophy can be divided into four main areas: 1) Logic; 2) Theoretical Philosophy, including Metaphysics, Physics and Mathematics; 3) Practical Philosophy, such as Ethics and Politics; and 4) Poetical Philosophy, covering the study of poetry and the fine arts. Aristotle's writings were preserved by his student Theophrastus, his successor as leader of the Peripatetic School. Theophrastus' pupil Neleus and his heirs concealed the books in a vault to protect them from theft, but they were damaged by dampness, moths and worms. The books were found around 100 BC by Apellicon, who brought them to Rome. In Rome, scholars took interest in the works and prepared new editions of them. The Peripatetic school of philosophy groups Aristotle's writings on 'logic' under the title '*Organnn*', which means instrument because they considered logic to be the chief instrument for scientific investigation. However, Aristotle considered 'logic' to be the same as verbal reasoning. He believed that to gain knowledge of an object, people ask certain questions, and he classified words into substance, quantity, quality, relation, place, time, situation, condition, action and passion, arranged in the order in which the questions are asked. Obviously, 'substance' is considered most important including individual objects and the species to which these objects belong. In his works on philosophy, Aristotle first traces the history of philosophy. He believed that philosophy grew as a result of wonder and curiosity which were not fully satisfied by religious myths. At first there were only philosophers of nature such as Thales and Anaximenes who were succeeded by Pythagoreans with mathematical abstractions. Pure thought was partly a contribution of Eleatic philosophers such as Parmenides and Anaxagoras. However, the complete level of pure thought was reached in the works of Socrates. Socrates was able to express general concepts in the form of definitions. Aristotle was of the opinion that metaphysics dealt with the early principles of scientific knowledge and the final conditions of all existence. It was concerned with existence in its basic state. In contrast, mathematics dealt with existence in the form of lines, angles, etc. Aristotle moved to Stagira and stayed until Philip died and Alexander took over as the king, i.e. 340 BC to 336 BC. Thereafter, he once again returned to Athens and stayed there for some time. This second phase of his life which he spent in Athens turned out to be the most productive years of his life, as he wrote some major philosophical treatises during this period. In Athens he found that the Academy was run by Xenocrates and that Platonism was getting established as the dominant philosophy. So he founded his own school with some financial support from Alexander at a place called Lyceum. In 323 BC Alexander died suddenly amidst his triumphs. During that period, Athens was governed by a pro-Macedonian party. Subsequent to Alexander's death, this party was overthrown and there was a general reaction against everything that was Macedonian. Alexander's position in Greece was much like Napoleon in Europe a century ago. Entire Greece lived under a constant fear of invasion as long as Alexander lived. With his death, however, there was an overall outburst of feeling against Macedonia. Consequently, the party that came into power was also anti-Macedonian party.

However, Aristotle wrote an estimated 200 works, most in the form of notes and manuscript drafts touching on reasoning, rhetoric, politics, ethics, science and psychology. They consist of dialogues, records of scientific observations and systematic works. His student Theophrastus reportedly looked after Aristotle's writings and later passed them to his own student Neleus, who stored them in a vault to protect them from moisture until they were taken to Rome and used by scholars there. Of Aristotle's estimated 200 works, only 31 are still in circulation. Most date to Aristotle's time at the Lyceum. Aristotle viewed ethics as an attempt to find out the highest good or the final purpose or end. Most ends of life merely help us to achieve other ends, there is always some final goal or pursuit that we aspire for or desire, such an end is usually happiness, which must be based on human nature, and must originate from personal experience. Thus, happiness must be something practical and human, and should exist in the work and life which is unique to humans. It lies in the active life of a rational human being or in a perfect realization and outworking of the true soul and self, throughout a lifetime. According to Aristotle, the moral ideal in political administration is merely a different aspect of what is applicable to individual happiness. Men are social beings, and the ability to speak rationally results in social union. The state develops from the family through the village community, which is just a branch of the family. Although originally formed to satisfy natural wants, the state exists for moral ends and also to promote higher life. The state is a genuine moral organization that advances the development of humans.

**'Poetics':** Poetics is a scientific study of writing and poetry where Aristotle observes, analyzes and defines mostly tragedy and epic poetry. Compared to philosophy, which presents ideas, poetry is an imitative use of language, rhythm and harmony that represents objects and events in the world, Aristotle posited. His book explores the foundation of storymaking, including character development, plot and storyline.

**'Nicomachean Ethics' and 'Eudemian Ethics':** In Nichomachean Ethics, which is believed to have been named in tribute to Aristotle's son, Nicomachus, Aristotle prescribed a moral code of conduct for what he called "good living." He asserted that good living to some degree defied the more restrictive laws of logic, since the real world poses circumstances that can present a conflict of personal values. That said, it was up to the individual to reason cautiously while developing his or her own judgment. Eudemian Ethics is another of Aristotle's major treatises on the behavior and judgment that constitute "good living."

**On happiness:** In his treatises on ethics, Aristotle aimed to discover the best way to live life and give it meaning "the supreme good for man," in his words which he determined was the pursuit of happiness. Our happiness is not a state but an activity, and it's determined by our ability to live a life that enables us to use and develop our reason. While bad luck can affect happiness, a truly happy person, he believed, learns to cultivate habits and behaviors that help him to keep bad luck in perspective.

**The golden mean:** Aristotle also defined what he called the "golden mean." Living a moral life, Aristotle believed, was the ultimate goal. Doing so means approaching every ethical dilemma by finding a mean between living to excess and living deficiently, taking into account an individual's needs and circumstances.

**'Metaphysics':** In his book Metaphysics, Aristotle clarified the distinction between matter and form. To Aristotle, matter was the physical substance of things, while form was the unique nature of a thing that gave it its identity.

**'Politics':** In *Politics*, Aristotle examined human behavior in the context of society and government. Aristotle believed the purpose of government was make it possible for citizens to achieve virtue and happiness. Intended to help guide statesmen and rulers, *Politics* explores, among other themes, how and why cities come into being; the roles of citizens and politicians; wealth and the class system; the purpose of the political system; types of governments and democracies; and the roles of slavery and women in the household and society.

**'Rhetoric':** In *Rhetoric*, Aristotle observes and analyzes public speaking with scientific rigor in order to teach readers how to be more effective speakers. Aristotle believed rhetoric was essential in politics and law and helped defend truth and justice. Good rhetoric, Aristotle believed, could educate people and encourage them to consider both sides of a debate. Aristotle's work explored how to construct an argument and maximize its effect, as well as fallacious reasoning to avoid (like generalizing from a single example).

**'Prior Analytics':** In *Prior Analytics*, Aristotle explains the syllogism as "a discourse in which, certain things having been supposed, something different from the things supposed results of necessity because these things are so." Aristotle defined the main components of reasoning in terms of inclusive and exclusive relationships. These sorts of relationships were visually grafted in the future through the use of Venn diagrams.

**Other Works on Logic:** Besides *Prior Analytics*, Aristotle's other major writings on logic include *Categories*, *On Interpretation* and *Posterior Analytics*. In these works, Aristotle discusses his system for reasoning and for developing sound arguments.

**Works on Science:** Aristotle composed works on astronomy, including *On the Heavens*, and earth sciences, including *Meteorology*. By meteorology, Aristotle didn't simply mean the study of weather. His more expansive definition of meteorology included "all the affectations we may call common to air and water, and the kinds and parts of the earth and the affectations of its parts." In *Meteorology*, Aristotle identified the water cycle and discussed topics ranging from natural disasters to astrological events. Although many of his views on the Earth were controversial at the time, they were re-adopted and popularized during the late middle Ages.

**Works on Psychology:** on the *Soul*, Aristotle examines human psychology. Aristotle's writings about how people perceive the world continue to underlie many principles of modern psychology.

**Philosophy:** Aristotle's work on philosophy influenced ideas from late antiquity all the way through the Renaissance. One of the main focuses of Aristotle's philosophy was his systematic concept of logic. Aristotle's objective was to come up with a universal process of reasoning that would allow man to learn every conceivable thing about reality. The initial process involved describing objects based on their characteristics, states of being and actions. In his philosophical treatises, Aristotle also discussed how man might next obtain information about objects through deduction and inference. To Aristotle, a deduction was a reasonable argument in which "when certain things are laid down, something else follows out of necessity in virtue of their being so." His theory of deduction is the basis of what philosophers now call a syllogism, a logical argument where the conclusion is inferred from two or more other premises of a certain form.

**Aristotle and Biology:** Although Aristotle was not technically a scientist by today's definitions, science was among the subjects that he researched at length during his time at the Lyceum. Aristotle believed that knowledge could be obtained through interacting with physical objects. He concluded that objects were made up of a potential that circumstances then manipulated to

determine the object's outcome. He also recognized that human interpretation and personal associations played a role in our understanding of those objects. Aristotle's research in the sciences included a study of biology. He attempted, with some error, to classify animals into genera based on their similar characteristics. He further classified animals into species based on those that had red blood and those that did not. The animals with red blood were mostly vertebrates, while the "bloodless" animals were labeled cephalopods. Despite the relative inaccuracy of his hypothesis, Aristotle's classification was regarded as the standard system for hundreds of years. Marine biology was also an area of fascination for Aristotle. Through dissection, he closely examined the anatomy of marine creatures. In contrast to his biological classifications, his observations of marine life, as expressed in his books, are considerably more accurate.

**When and Where Was Aristotle Born?:** Aristotle was born circa 384 B.C. in Stagira, a small town on the northern coast of Greece that was once a seaport.

**Family, Early Life and Education:** Aristotle's father, Nicomachus, was court physician to the Macedonian king Amyntas II. Although Nicomachus died when Aristotle was just a young boy, Aristotle remained closely affiliated with and influenced by the Macedonian court for the rest of his life. Little is known about his mother, Phaestis; she is also believed to have died when Aristotle was young. After Aristotle's father died, Proxenus of Atarneus, who was married to Aristotle's older sister, Arimneste, became Aristotle's guardian until he came of age. When Aristotle turned 17, Proxenus sent him to Athens to pursue a higher education. At the time, Athens was considered the academic center of the universe. In Athens, Aristotle enrolled in Plato's Academy, Greek's premier learning institution, and proved an exemplary scholar. Aristotle maintained a relationship with Greek philosopher Plato, himself a student of Socrates, and his academy for two decades. Plato died in 347 B.C. Because Aristotle had disagreed with some of Plato's philosophical treatises, Aristotle did not inherit the position of director of the academy, as many imagined he would. After Plato died, Aristotle's friend Hermias, king of Atarneus and Assos in Mysia, invited Aristotle to court.

**Wife and Children:** During his three-year stay in Mysia, Aristotle met and married his first wife, Pythias, King Hermias' niece. Together, the couple had a daughter, Pythias, named after her mother. In 335 B.C., the same year that Aristotle opened the Lyceum, his wife Pythias died. Soon after, Aristotle embarked on a romance with a woman named Herpyllis, who hailed from his hometown of Stagira. According to some historians, Herpyllis may have been Aristotle's slave, granted to him by the Macedonia court. They presume that he eventually freed and married her. Regardless, it is known that Herpyllis bore Aristotle children, including one son named Nicomachus, after Aristotle's father.

**Teaching:** In 338 B.C., Aristotle went home to Macedonia to start tutoring King Phillip II's son, the then 13-year-old Alexander the Great. Phillip and Alexander both held Aristotle in high esteem and ensured that the Macedonia court generously compensated him for his work. In 335 B.C., after Alexander had succeeded his father as king and conquered Athens, Aristotle went back to the city. In Athens, Plato's Academy, now run by Xenocrates, was still the leading influence on Greek thought. With Alexander's permission, Aristotle started his own school in Athens, called the Lyceum. On and off, Aristotle spent most of the remainder of his life working as a teacher, researcher and writer at the Lyceum in Athens until the death of his former student Alexander the Great. Because Aristotle was known to walk around the school grounds while teaching, his students, forced to follow him, were nicknamed the "Peripatetics," meaning "people who travel about." Lyceum members researched subjects ranging from science and math to philosophy and politics, and nearly everything in between. Art was also a popular area of interest. Members of the

Lyceum wrote up their findings in manuscripts. In so doing, they built the school's massive collection of written materials, which by ancient accounts was credited as one of the first great libraries. When Alexander the Great died suddenly in 323 B.C., the pro-Macedonian government was overthrown, and in light of anti-Macedonia sentiment, Aristotle was charged with impiety for his association with his former student and the Macedonian court. To avoid being prosecuted and executed, he left Athens and fled to Chalcis on the island of Euboea, where he would remain until his death a year later.

**When and How Did Aristotle Die?:**In 322 B.C., just a year after he fled to Chalcis to escape prosecution under charges of impiety, Aristotle contracted a disease of the digestive organs and died.

**Legacy:** In the century following Aristotle's death, his works fell out of use, but they were revived during the first century. Over time, they came to lay the foundation of more than seven centuries of philosophy. Aristotle's influence on Western thought in the humanities and social sciences is largely considered unparalleled, with the exception of his teacher Plato's contributions, and Plato's teacher Socrates before him. The two-millennia-strong academic practice of interpreting and debating Aristotle's philosophical works continues to endure.

### **2.3: The Political Theory of Aristotle**

The political theory of Aristotle depicts with the human condition of living. He stated that men are social animals. Man's soul is of so divine a nature and excellency that man himself cannot comprehend it, being the infused breath of the Almighty, of an immortal nature, and not to be comprehended but by Him that gave it. For Moses, relating the history of man, tells us that "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul." Now, as for all other creatures, at His word they were made and had life, but the creature that God had set over His works was His peculiar workmanship, formed by Him out of the dust of the earth, and He condescended to breathe into his nostrils the breath of life, which seems to denote both care and, if we may so term it, labour, used about man more than about all other living creatures, he only partaking and participating of the blessed divine nature, bearing God's image in innocence and purity, whilst he stood firm; and when, by his fall, that lively image was defaced, yet such was the love of the Creator towards him that he found out a way to restore him, the only begotten son of the Eternal Father coming into the world to destroy the works of the devil, and to raise up man from that low condition to which sin and his fall had reduced him, to a state above that of the angels. It is the study of Political philosophy which envisages the body of knowledge that practitioners will use in pursuing their tasks. The most important role played by the politician is that of lawgiver, the one who frames the appropriate constitution comprising laws, customs and a system of moral education for the citizens. It is the responsibility of the politician to take measures to maintain the constitution and introduce reforms whenever the need arises and to prevent situations that may undermine the power of the political system. This is the field of legislative science, which according to Aristotle is more important than politics.

The political philosophy of Aristotle may trace back from his studentship of Plato's period, who was a prolific researcher, teacher and writer. Known in the Middle Ages as simply "the Philosopher," and called by Dante "the master of those who know," he composed as many as 200 treatises, of which we have only thirty-one. His was the first effort to classify the areas of knowledge into distinct disciplines, such as biology, ethics, and physics. Aristotle's works fall under several headings: dialogues, scientific treatises, and systematic works. The systematic works are typically categorized as Logical Works, which include Categories, On Interpretation, Prior

Analytics, Posterior Analytics, Topics, On Sophistical Refutations; Physical Works which include Physics, On the Heavens, On Generation and Corruption, Meteorology; Metaphysics; Psychological Works, which include On the Soul, On Memory, Reminiscence, Dreams and Prophecy; Works on Natural History which include History of Animals, On the Parts of Animals, On the Movement of Animals, On the Progression of Animals, and On the Generation of Animals; and Practical Works which include Nicomachean Ethics, Eudemian Ethics, Magna Moralia, Rhetoric, Politics, and Poetics.

Aristotle's political teaching is available to us in his practical works, primarily in his Nicomachean Ethics, Politics, and Rhetoric. These works are not straightforward scientific treatises, because we pursue practical sciences not simply for the sake of knowledge, as we do theoretical ones, but also for the sake of the benefits derived from them. Political science is the practical science par excellence. It is the architectonic science, Aristotle argues, concerned with the human good, or happiness, generally, and therefore the one that orders all other sciences, such as medicine or farming. Practical science is about human things, or human action, praxis, matters that are subject to change. Aristotle's practical works proceed through dialectical examinations of the opinions of different men or groups of men, and not as a metaphysical deduction from nature or human nature. The audience for the works is citizens and statesmen as well as philosophers. Nor does Aristotle forge a highly technical vocabulary that is remote from political life. In fact, all the terms of importance in the practical works belong to political life itself. Because human things are variable, we should not expect the same precision in the practical sphere as in the technical sciences or mathematics. The practical sphere concerns opinions about what is just, noble, good, advantageous or harmful, things that are inherently controversial and about which men passionately disagree.

Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics primarily concerns virtue, especially ethical or practical virtue, the virtues of character such as courage and moderation. His discussion remains clear and convincing to this day, and the virtues he clarifies continue to be characteristics to which we aspire. The ethical virtues are the core of happiness, he argues, (as opposed, say, to unlimited acquisition) and differentiate human action from animal behavior governed by pleasure. Each virtue is the disposition to follow measured judgment about the goods and passions that we seek and with which we deal. To be moderate, for example, is to enjoy pleasure in the right way and amount with the right people at the right time. Aristotle first discusses ten practical virtues, among them courage, which deals with fear; moderation, with pleasure; generosity, with wealth; magnificence, with great expenditures; great pride, with great honors; ambition, with lesser honors; and gentleness or proper anger, with anger. Each virtue is connected to two characteristic vices, an excessive and deficient way to deal with its good or passion. For example, cowardice or rashness is the vices that relate to courage, for example, or asceticism and licentiousness in relation to pleasure.

The peak of the ethical virtues is pride, for the chief honor with which it deals is political rule, and to have this virtue is to have the other virtues too. Aristotle treats the connection between virtue and politics even more fully and directly in the Ethics in his discussion of the several types of justice. Distributive justice, for example, is to give equal to equal and unequal to unequal's, as we might give the better violin to the better violinist rather than giving it by chance or lot. He also considers friendship and moral weakness in the Ethics, and modes of intellectual virtue that include not just practical reason, but theoretical reason too. Indeed, the most excellent or virtuous use of reason, or the happiest life for those few to whom it is available, is the philosophic life. How is Aristotle's ethical theory related to his politics? The connection lies in the fact that, for Aristotle, character and, thus, happiness, stem from habits and, therefore, to laws that promote

good habits. Also, politics must distribute rule or “offices” justly and, when possible, to those who possess good character and practical reason.

From the view of *The Politics*, as Aristotle understands things, the heart of political activity is the regime because it forms the people and resources of a particular place into a whole whose laws and actions serve an understanding of virtue and happiness. It is more significant than geography and resources or ethnic makeup, although such matters are significant. One can see the importance of the regime by reflecting on the vast difference between Germany rule by Nazi tyranny and Germany rule democratically. Regimes differ according to the principle of justice and central quality by which offices are distributed, and by their proclivity to serve the common good. Democracies attempt to distribute offices equally to those who are equally free, and the better ones serve a common good and not only the class good of the majority. But even the better democracies are inferior to regimes such as aristocracy and monarchy that attempt to distribute offices unequally to the practically virtuous, in this way serving a common good. Still, all democracies are superior to oligarchies, which distribute offices unequally to the unequally wealthy, and to tyrannies, that serve the tyrant’s pleasure. All political communities all cities and countries require wealth, secure freedom, and virtue, so good laws measure the rule even of the excellent.

It is because political science is a practical science, Aristotle considers varieties of regimes that are best in many types of circumstances, looking always for the type of regime that is least likely in any given circumstance to depart from the common good. Aristotle is neither an absolutist nor a relativist. He considers politics from the standpoint of one who founds a community, on the analogy of one who trains athletes or improves bodies. By understanding what is best or excellent simply, one can see what is best in the circumstances, seeking neither to “absolutely” or harmfully ignore limits neither on what one can achieve nor to act as if there were no natural standard for improvement. Aristotle does not and cannot separate practical understanding altogether from theoretical understanding, although practice occupies its own domain. To fully grasp Aristotle’s thought one must consider his criticism in the *Ethics* of Plato’s comprehension of the good; examine his understanding of the activity or “being at work” of things, including the soul and its excellence, virtue; and explore the view of form, matter, motion, causality, and being that guides his *Physics* and *Metaphysics*. The proper study of Aristotle may occupy a lifetime, as it did many great medieval thinkers. However, Aristotle stated that a politician is similar to a craftsman. Just like a craftsman produces an object making use of the four causes discussed earlier, namely formal, material, efficient and final causes, a Politician also works with the four causes. The state comprises several individual citizens, who form the material cause out of which the city-state is created. The constitution forms the formal cause. The city-state cannot exist without an efficient cause, that is, the ruler. In the absence of the ruler, the community, irrespective of its type will be in disorder. The constitution acts as this ruling element. So far as the communities are established with the aim of achieving some good this is where the final cause comes in. The community with the most authority and the one that contains the other communities has the most authority of all, aims for the highest good. This explains the existence of politics for good life or happiness. However, it is the state exists for life and better life.

#### **2.4: The Theory of Citizenship of Aristotle**

The Theory of Citizenship of Aristotle is the basic concept of his political philosophy. In this sphere, Aristotle disengages the politics with two important ideas which reflects as the state is a community and that it is the highest of all communities, 'which embraces all the rest, aims at good in greater degree than any other, and at the highest good' the first thesis came naturally to a Greek of the classical period: his polis was city state with a small area and population. Aristotle was the

first to define the state a community clearly as such, and thus he laid the foundation for the organic conception of the state, one of the two major types into which all political theories of the state may roughly be divided. Aristotle had a conservative standpoint for the concept of citizenship. Aristotle explained a state as a collective body of citizens. Citizenship was not to be determined by residence since the resident aliens and slaves also shared a common residence with citizens but were not citizens. He describes citizen as a person who has the power to take part in the deliberative or judicial administration of any state. Representative government was unfamiliar to Aristotle because the Greek city-state was governed directly by its citizens. A citizen also uses constitutional rights under the system of public law.

For him, a citizen was one who shared power in polis, and dissimilar to the concept of Plato, he did not distinguish between "an active ruling group and a politically passive community". Aristotle specified that the young and the old could not be citizens, for one was immature and the other infirm. He did not regard women as citizens, for they lacked the deliberative faculty and the leisure to understand the working of politics. A good citizen would have the intelligence and the ability to rule and be ruled Aristotle suggested a good citizen as someone who could live in harmony with the constitution and had sufficient leisure time to devote himself to the tasks and responsibilities of citizenship. A good citizen would possess virtue or moral goodness that would help in realizing a selfless and cooperative civic life. According to William Ebenstein, "Aristotle's idea of citizenship is that of the economically independent gentleman who has enough experience, education and leisure to devote him to active citizenship, for citizen must not lead the life of mechanics or tradesmen, for such life is hostile to virtue. Thus, he regarded citizenship as a bond forged by the intimacy of participation in public matters.

Further Aristotle stated that state is a natural community, an organism with all the attributes of a living being. Aristotle conceives the state as natural in two ways. First, he concisely delineates the evolution of social institutions from the family through the village to the city state; in the historical sense, the state is the natural and final stage in the growth of human relations. However, the state is also considered by Aristotle to be actual in a logical and philosophical sense: "The state is by nature clearly prior to the family and the individual, since the whole is of necessity prior to the part". Aristotle upholds that the state is not only a community but it is the highest community aiming at the highest good. The family is the first association, lowest in the chain of social development and lowest on the rung of values, because it is established by nature for the supply of men's every day wants. The village is the second type of association, genetically more complex than the family, and targeting at something more than, the supply of daily needs. The third and highest in terms of value and purpose: whereas family and village exist essentially for the preservation of life and comforts of companionship, the state exists for the sake of a good life and not for the sake of life only, and political society exists for the sake of principled actions, and not of mere companionship. It is well established that the state is the highest form of association, not only in terms of the social and institutional value, but in terms of man's own nature.

However, Aristotle gives his general theory of citizenship in *Politics* III. He distinguishes citizens from other inhabitants, such as resident aliens, slaves, even children, seniors and ordinary workers. According to him a citizen is a person possessing the right to participate in 'deliberative or judicial office'. Citizens were those who had the right to be part of juries, the assembly, the council and other bodies as was the case in Athens, where the citizens were directly involved in governance. However, full citizenship was not given to women, slaves, foreigners, etc. The city-state according to Aristotle comprised several such citizens. He considered the constitution as a tool for organizing the various offices of the city-state. The governing body is defined by the constitution in comprising either the people in a democratic set-up or a chosen handful in an oligarchy.

The great responsibilities is built in citizenship are not an obligation upon a natural state of human existence but are rather entirely in accordance with nature. Citizenship is nothing less than the fullest fulfillment of human potential in terms of the 'good life'. In this respect, as throughout Aristotle's Politics, the essence of citizenship lies in active participation. The citizen is not merely an inhabitant of the state, nor simply a member of a politically privileged class. Aristotle makes significant difference between the 'parts' of the state and its "necessary conditions". Only those who actively share or have the means and leisure to share in the government of the state are its components or integral part. All the others are just the necessary conditions who provide the material environment within which the active citizens freed from menial tasks, can function. It is demonstrated in theoretical studies that "Aristotle's idea of a citizen is broadly different from the modern conception because it is not representative but primary government that he has in view. His citizen is not content to have a say in the choosing of his rulers; every citizen is actually to rule in turn, and not merely in the sense of being a member of the executive, but in the sense, a more important one for Aristotle, of helping to make the laws of his state, for the executive is assigned the comparatively small function supplementing the laws when they are inadequate owing to their generality. It is owing to this lofty conception of a citizen's duties that he so closely narrows the citizen body." This is the reason that Aristotle excludes the mechanic class from citizenship.

At the outset, it is very clear that, Aristotle's conception of the citizen would not be effective today. He was unsuccessful to see the prospects of representative government. In present scenario, the minimum requirement for citizenship is the power of voting for the representatives of the people who do the actual ruling in egalitarianism. The benefit that is common to all in forming a city-state is the attainment of noble life. Aristotle also states that an individual can rule over another in many ways depending on his own nature and the nature of the subject. The master-slave relationship represents despotic rule wherein the slaves cannot function without a natural master to instruct or direct them. It is a form of rule which exists primarily for the master and is only incidental for the slaves who are born without the skill of self-governance. The other form of rule, paternal or marital, asserts that the male possesses more leadership qualities than the female. Similarly, children lack the ability to rationalize and cannot do without the supervision of adults. Aristotle firmly believed that paternal or marital rule was necessary for the sake of the women and children, a thought that was criticized by many modern thinkers. However, Aristotle was somewhat right in believing that the rule that benefitted both the ruler and the subject were just whereas the rule that was advantageous only to the ruler was unjust and inappropriate for the community consisting of free individuals. Going by this logic, the case of a single ruler is just if it is a kingship and unjust if it is a tyranny. Similarly, in case of a few rulers, aristocracy is just whereas oligarchy is certainly unjust. In case of several rulers, polity is correct while democracy was considered deviant by Aristotle. According to Aristotle, the city-state is not a business enterprise concerned with wealth maximization. It is not an association promoting equality and liberty either. The city-state, in fact, attempts to achieve good life. Therefore, aristocracy, he felt, was the best option wherein political rights could be assigned to those who could make good use of it in the interest of the community. His ideal constitution comprised fully virtuous citizens.

In the same way, Aristotle divides knowledge into *practical*, *theoretical* and *productive knowledge*. While theoretical knowledge is aimed at action, productive knowledge addresses daily needs. Practical knowledge deals with knowledge related to how to live and how to act. It is possible to lead a good life by making use of practical knowledge. Both ethics and politics are considered practical sciences and are concerned with human beings as moral agents. While ethics deals with how human beings act as individuals, politics deals with how human beings act in communities. However, Aristotle felt that both ethics and politics influence each other. According

to him, abstract knowledge of ethics and politics is useless because practical knowledge is useful only if we act on it. Both should be practiced to attain goodness or to become good. In his works Aristotle mentions that it is not for a young man to study politics because he lacks experience. Also, he rightly states that youngsters act according to emotions instead of reason. Without reason it is impossible to act on practical knowledge, therefore, young students are not equipped to study politics. Very few possessed the practical experiences of life and the mental discipline to gain from a study of politics, which is why a very low percentage of the population in Athens was given the benefits of citizenship or political participation.

Political and moral knowledge cannot possess the same level of precision or certainty as mathematics. For example, there cannot really be a fixed and accurate definition of 'justice'. However, many things in geometry or mathematics such as a point or an angle can be defined precisely. These definitions will not change either. This is probably why Aristotle refrains from listing set rules to be followed for making ethical and political decisions. Instead, he expects readers of his works to become people who know what is the correct thing to do or the right manner to act in a situation when faced with it. Ethics and politics are interlinked because of the ultimate purpose they serve. Human beings also have a purpose which they need to fulfill. This ultimate aim Aristotle feels is 'happiness'. However, happiness cannot be achieved without leading a life of virtue. A person who chooses to do a particular thing because he feels it is the right thing to do will lead a flourishing life. An individual can be happy and also possess a high degree of moral values only if he is placed in a political community that is well-constructed. A well-constructed political community will encourage and promote the right actions and ban the wrong ones and educate people about what is right and what is wrong. This is where the link between ethics and politics becomes clear. Aristotle saw the political community as a partnership of citizens who pursue a common good. It is the responsibility of the city-state to help its citizens attain good. Each individual will try to achieve his individual goal or purpose, that of happiness. In this way, all the individuals put together will achieve happiness or goodness.

Aristotle brings us face to face with the truth that we as individuals need to figure out how best to lead our lives together in a group. To figure this out, human beings, unlike animals, use the ability to reason and talk. Using this ability, they create laws that help practice justice and facilitate survival. People, in groups, all pursuing virtuous lives, together form a city. In the absence of this city and justice, human beings would be as good as animals. The most important element of a city is not the pursuit of security or wealth and riches but the pursuit of virtue and happiness. Aristotle states that "the politician and lawgiver is wholly occupied with the city-state, and the constitution is a certain way of organizing those who inhabit the city-state". His general theory of constitutions is set forth in *Politics III*. He begins with a definition of the citizen. Since the city-state is by nature a collective entity, a multitude of citizens. Citizens are distinguished from other inhabitants, such as resident aliens and slaves; and even children and seniors are not unqualified citizens. After further analysis he defines the citizen as a person who has the right to participate in deliberative or judicial office. In Athens, for example, citizens had the right to attend the assembly, the council, and other bodies, or to sit on juries. The Athenian system differed from a modern representative democracy in that the citizens were more directly involved in governing. Although full citizenship tended to be restricted in the Greek city-states (with women, slaves, foreigners, and some others excluded), the citizens were more deeply enfranchised than in modern representative democracies because they were more directly involved in governing. This is reflected in Aristotle's definition of the citizen (without qualification). Further, he defines the city-state (in the unqualified sense) as a multitude of such citizens which is adequate for a self-sufficient life.

However, the constitution defined by Aristotle is the governing body, which takes different forms: for example, in a democracy it is the people, and in an oligarchy it is a select few. Before attempting to distinguish and evaluate various constitutions Aristotle considers two questions. First, why does a city-state come into being? He recalls the thesis, defended in *Politics* that human beings are by nature political animals, who naturally want to live together.

## **2.5: The views of Aristotle's realism**

In comparable to idealism, realism is also one of the oldest philosophies in western culture and its origin began with the Greek philosopher Aristotle in ancient Greece. Being a longtime star student of Plato, he elaborated on the idealist view of reality being based on ideas and not matter. He thought that a proper study of matter could lead to better and more distinct ideas. After twenty years as a student and teacher at Plato's Academy, Aristotle opened his own school called the Lyceum wherein he developed his philosophical differences with Plato. Although he had his own views, the basis of Aristotelian realism is found within Plato's idealism. In these regards, Aristotle never broke free of his influence. Like idealism, since its beginning, realism has had many proponents and interpretations. Aristotelian realism was the foundation started in secular Greek culture. Religious realism came about through Thomas Aquinas, who like Augustine, was heavily influenced by ancient Greek culture and combined his ideas with Christianity. This is known as the classical period. Modern and contemporary realism consists of scientific, natural and rational realism. Some philosophers of this later period include Francis Bacon, John Locke, Alfred Whitehead and Bertrand Russell.

Throughout its long varied history, realism has had a common theme, which is called the principle or thesis of independence. This theme holds that reality, knowledge and value exist independently of the human mind. This means that realism rejects the idealist view that only ideas are real. Matter exists even though there is no mind to perceive them (recall the classic question about the tree falling in the woods). To the realist, matter is certainly an independent reality; however, the realist also considers ideas to be part of the thesis. Aristotelian realism is based on the principle that ideas (or forms) can exist without matter, but no matter can exist without form. Aristotle claimed that each piece of matter has universal and particular properties. For example, all people are different in their properties. We all have different shapes and sizes and no two are alike. We do all share something universal called "humanness." This universal quality is certainly real because it exists independently and regardless of any one person. Aristotle called this quality a universal form (idea or essence), which is a nonmaterial aspect of each single material object that relate to all other objects of that group.

Although form is nonmaterial, we realize it by examining existing material objects that are independent of us. Aristotle believed we should study and understand the reality of all things. He agreed with Plato on this position. They differed concerning the method of how to arrive at form. Aristotle believed one can get to form by studying material things and Plato believed it could be reached through reasoning, such as the dialectic. In his second principle, Aristotle thought that the forms of things, the universal properties of objects, remain constant and never change, but that particular components do change. Individual humans change through growth and then die, but humanness would remain because universal forms are constant. Aristotle and Plato agreed that form is constant and matter is always changing, but Aristotle believed that form was within particular matter and was even the motivating force of that matter. He thought that each object has a tiny "soul" or purpose in life. For instance, the purpose of a kitten is to become an adult cat. The purpose of a child would be to become an adolescent and finally an adult human.

Aristotle was not only a philosopher, but also a scientist. He believed there was a relationship between philosophy and science in which the study of one aids us in the study of the other. We can consider what physical properties make-up a cat (internal and external structure, color), however; these scientific questions naturally would lead us to asking deeper philosophical questions about a cat's origin, meaning and purpose. This process would lead us to discover its essence or form. He thought the most important questions we can ask about things relate to their purposes. Unlike all other animals, the human animal can think abstractly and Aristotle believed the use of this unique ability is humanity's purpose. When we don't use our intelligence, we go against our true purpose in life. In his third principle, Aristotle believed that design and order are present in the universe and thus, all things happen in an orderly fashion. As mentioned, the destiny of a kitten is to become a cat, a child to become a human adult. This process is unchangeable and constant like their universal forms. Thus, we can understand the universe by studying its purposes. However, Aristotle pointed out that humans have a free will to think. If we refuse to think or think poorly, then we go against our design and creation and suffer the consequences of wrong ideas, poor health and unhappiness. Aristotle believed that the person who follows a true purpose leads a rational life of moderation and avoiding extremes. He believed in two extremes: the extreme of too little and of too much. If one drinks alcohol too much, one will become an alcoholic and suffer from the disease. However, the moderate thinking person avoids such self-destruction. Aristotle called this moderate path of avoiding the extremes, the Golden Mean.

This fourth principle is illustrated by his idea of the soul as an entity to be kept in balance. He believed there are three aspects of the soul called vegetative, animate and rational. Vegetative represents doing too little or inactivity. Animate means the other extreme of too much as in anger and hostility. However, when one uses reason to keep the other two aspects in harmony, they are following the true path of design and purpose.

The ideal state exists when all three aspects, vegetative (brass), silver (animal) and gold (rational) are in balance and harmony. Aristotle believed that a good education helps achieve the Golden Mean and therefore, promotes the harmony and balance of soul and body. Aristotle believed that balance and order are central to the body and mind and also the universe. Concerning humans, he didn't view body and mind in opposition as Plato did; however, he viewed the body as the means by which data come to us through sense perception. Data from sense perception are organized by the reasoning mind. Universal principles are reached by mind from an examination of the particulars by sense perception and organizing the results into rational explanations. Thus, body and mind operate together in balance with their internal consistencies. Unlike Plato who believed only in ideas, Aristotle didn't separate matter from form or its universal being. This is his fifth principle. He saw them as two fundamental aspects of the same thing. All matter has form and is in some stage of actualization. Formless matter doesn't exist. He tried to unite the world of matter with the world of forms. An example of this is his view of actuality and potentiality. Actuality is that which is complete or perfect which would be form. Potentiality refers to the capability of being actualized or gaining perfection and form. It's the union of form and matter that gives concrete reality to things.

This union is further illustrated by Aristotle's conception of the Four Causes:

1. The Material Cause: the matter from which something is made
2. The Formal Cause: the design that shapes the material object
3. The Efficient Cause: the agent that produces the object

#### 4. The Final Cause: the direction toward which the object is tending

These causes can be attributed to building anything. One needs materials to build, a design or blueprint, the builder and finally the result.

The sixth principle is Aristotle's belief that matter is always in process and moving to some end. This is similar to the modern view of evolution and the idea of an open-ended universe. However, the difference between them is he saw this movement headed to a final end. The universe was open-ended to a certain point. He believed in an Ultimate Reality to be the power and creator that controlled the process of matter. This entity is the final end beyond all matter and form. In this regard, Aristotle's philosophy is as esoteric as Plato's. He saw this Ultimate Reality as a logical explanation for the order of the universe and as its principle organizer and operator. To search for the structure of independent reality, Aristotle worked on logical processes. He used the dialectic to synthesize opposing ideas about truth. He also tried to refine it. The logical method he developed was the syllogism, which is a method for testing the truth of statements. Consider the following example: All music is good, classical is a form of music, therefore, classical music is good.

The syllogism is composed of a major premise, minor premise and conclusion. Aristotle created it to help us think more accurately by ordering statements about reality in a logical and systematic form. This method is deductive which means it reaches truth from generalizations starting with the major premise. One problem with this method is that if either of the premises is false, the conclusion may be false. The chance of an unproven general premise is greater than starting with a specific fact. The syllogism runs contrary to his insistence that we can better understand form by studying specific material objects.

The final principle is his belief of the chief good, which is happiness. This depends on a virtuous and well-ordered soul. To achieve this, one has to develop habits of virtue that are shaped through the proper education. As mentioned, moderation through the Golden Mean is the key. This would result in assisting the state in producing good citizens with the proper social development. In *Politics*, Aristotle mentioned that a reciprocal relationship exists between the properly educated person and properly educated citizen. The Aristotelian influence has been very important to Europeans and Americans. Several approaches to thought include studying nature systematically, using logical processes, reaching general truths through the study of particulars, organizing things into hierarchies and emphasizing the rational aspects of human nature.

Religious realism began with Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) when he first encountered the work of Aristotle while studying in Naples, Italy. This began a lifelong passion of attempting to join Aristotelian philosophy with Christian concepts. Aquinas connected with the Aristotelian idea of human thinking being our highest good. He saw a parallel with the idea of Christian revelation and maintained that because we're children of God, our best thinking should agree with Christian tenants.

"Aristotle's ideas had a great impact on Christianity. In many respects, they have tended to secularize the church, as opposed to the monasticism engendered by the writings of Augustine. The ideas of Aristotle eventually were incorporated into Christianity and gave it a different philosophical base. Aquinas became the leading authority on Aristotle in the middle Ages. He claimed that since God is pure reason; the universe is reason. By the use of it, we can know the truth of all things. Aquinas believed that God created matter out of nothing and that he is the Final End who gives meaning and purpose to the universe. This Christian idea is similar to Aristotle's pagan view of an Ultimate Reality. In his work *Summa Theological*, he used the rational approach

suggested by Aristotle in dealing with religious questions. This monumental Christian work is considered by the Roman Catholic Church to be its leading philosophy."

Although Aquinas adopted reason in his work, he didn't subordinate revelation to it. He gave reason its proper place, but considered theology to be superior. Aquinas agreed with Aristotle that we arrive at universals by a study of particulars. He accepted the thesis of independence and "form" as the principle characteristic of all being. He disagreed with him about the origin of the soul. He held that the soul is not derived from humanity's biological roots; rather, soul is a creation, immortal from God. Concerning education, he believed that only God could be the true Teacher. The only one who can directly touch the souls of men? Humans can only teach indirectly through guidance using signs and symbols. However, teaching is one of the greatest ways to serve humankind and is part of God's work in this world. Aquinas agreed with Augustine that humans are born with original sin and life is a testing ground, but disagreed about the idea of only knowing truth through faith. He believed God to be pure reason and that when He created the world; He made it possible for us to acquire true knowledge using reason. Faith can be applied to things we yet don't understand and reason is used to understand religious truths. The Judeo-Christian belief of the immortal soul was central to the philosophy of Aquinas. He viewed the soul as having inner-knowledge that through reason would create perfection of a person. This was the major goal of education. The final step would be to reunite the soul with God.

Aquinas believed that human reality is not only spiritual, but also physical and natural. The path of the soul lies in the physical senses. This is an Aristotelian progression from a lower to a higher form. Aquinas views on education are consistent with his philosophical views. Knowledge is attained through the senses and can lead to God. One should study matter and then progress to form. And one should use reason to reach God in the material world.

Finally, he felt the main agencies of education are the family and church. The state or organized society is much less important. The family and church have the responsibility to teach moral and divine law. The state should enforce such law and respect the privacy of home and church. Modern realism developed out of the need to correct the failure of deductive reasoning.

Although classicists had developed the thesis that reality, knowledge and value can be discovered through studying particulars; the problem of working with a general major premise caused false conclusions. With the arrival of the scientific revolution, many philosophers applied themselves to the task of developing an adequate method of inductive reasoning. Francis Bacon introduced a new approach to reasoning called induction. He urged his fellow citizens to stop using false deductive reasoning that relied on faith in old beliefs and past generalizations, which may or may not have been valid. He illustrated this concern with his four "idols" listed below.

1. Idols of The Den: We believe things from our own limited experience
2. Idol of The Tribe: We tend to believe what others believe
3. Idol of The Marketplace: Language is used to prevent understanding
4. Idol of The Theatre: Religion and philosophy distorts our objective judgment

Induction is the opposite of deduction. To reach a conclusion, we start with a collection of particular data, not unproven generalizations. This data is examined and found to be true or false based on present scientific or other kinds of facts. This method would create valid knowledge. Bacon influenced John Locke (1632-1704). He attempted to continue his work by explaining how

we develop knowledge. He agreed with Bacon that people we're hindered by false beliefs from the past and that they needed to rid themselves of the "idols."

Locke believed that there are no innate ideas. At birth, the mind is a blank sheet of paper, a *tabula rasa*, on which ideas are imprinted. All ideas come from experience through sensation and reflection. Bacon had a significant influence on the twentieth century mostly American philosophy called pragmatism. It emphasizes the practical process (induction) to achieve the best possible result of a problem. Pragmatists were born from British, European and ancient Greek traditions. The character of the pragmatist is very American. They accept past traditional views, but also examine those views and apply them to present life. They also are open to create new ideas to the constantly changing world. These refreshing attitudes came about not through sealed minds of the Catholic Church, but through invention and progressive thinking in the scientific revolution and the Enlightenment.

Moreover, many pragmatists were inspired by Bacon's inductive thinking as a basic scientific method and extended his approach to other fields such as economics, politics, psychology, ethics and education. The following three Americans were major contributors. John Dewey (1859-1952) popularized and systematized pragmatism in education. He believed there were no absolutes or universal truths as in idealism and realism, but that life was about human experiences and consequences. William James (1842-1910) had similar views in psychology. He felt truth is not absolute, but tested as viable in the real world. It doesn't belong to any idea; however, it's discovered through acting on ideas and their consequences. Truth is inseparable from experience. Charles Peirce (1839-1914) maintained that ideas are part of human conduct and cannot be separated from it. He also believed that personal experience tests the validity of true ideas. Another progressive area that developed in modern realism was a psychological theory called behaviorism. This is a theory that regards objective behavior as the only subject for psychological study. It's related to the thesis of independence that resembles the behaviorist view that behavior is caused by environmental conditions. It differs from idealism in that it's based on realism and behavior in the material world. Its connection to classic realism is with the idea of the meticulous study of particulars. The realist does this to reach form and the behaviorist does it to reach conclusions about behavior. Behaviorism is also based on materialism.

Important behaviorists include Ivan Pavlov (1849-1936) and B.F. Skinner (1904-1990). Pavlov was an early behaviorist who is famous for his conditioned reflex behavior using dogs. Conditioning illustrates how realism and behaviorism is related. Harvard University's Skinner walked between the science and social science. He was a disciplined scientist dealing with facts, but also a psychologist who wrestled with human behavior. He often criticized philosophical observations of psychology. He claimed that philosophers were trying to reach conclusions about human understanding through a priori generalizations rather than through controlled scientific experiments. This was a deductive approach, not inductive. Skinner was known as both paradoxical and controversial, but no one questions the breakthroughs he made in psychology and education. Everything is in a state of evolution, both physically and spiritually. The only thing that is constant in the universe is change itself (even if the world ended in a supernova, a new beginning or change would emerge). This is expressed through the cycle of life, death and rebirth. Even these facts of existence aren't constant as seen with the scientific advancement of birth control and living longer.

Christians often accuse scientists of "playing god," but then again, the majority of them have no problem adopting the latest advancements in their lives. This includes leaders like Augustine and Aquinas who despised pagans, but incorporated Greek philosophical ingenuity into their church dogmas. Actually, this view of forms contradicts what I said in my previous paper. I mentioned

that the only absolute truths that exist are found within the objective universe or nature. I continue to alter my views on this (even math changes when new theories are introduced by physicists like Einstein). The only constant is change. Absolute truth doesn't exist. As said above, nature does have universal forms or laws, but as in science, it is always changing. Everything has a purpose, as Aristotle said, and that is to evolve through time. It is to develop into existing or future universal forms. Aristotle's views about matter were the next logical step to advance humanity beyond Plato's idealism. Although they were both searching for absolute forms, they had different methods of how to reach it. The world of ideas is very important, but we are not just thinking animals. It would be very limiting to not look beyond thoughts and consider your material surroundings for any meaning.

However, the practicality of the Golden Mean is everyone must have balance of the two harmful extremes in life to achieve true happiness and to fulfill their destinies. Albeit, this would seem obvious, many people today indulge in unhealthy extremes. This observation by Aristotle is a landmark for self-awareness and preservation. Finally, his syllogism was a great attempt at tackling logic, although one can see the limitation of its deductive reasoning. Assumptions and unproven subjective generalities are not foundations for future scientific progress.

Francis Bacon was a very big leap for reason. Why was there such slow progress from ancient Greece until the scientific revolution? The Christian religion with Aquinas assimilated realism like Augustine had with idealism. Human progress is the opposite of Christianity! God is all about stagnancy and conformism. Jesus said, "You can't enter the kingdom of heaven without becoming a little child." The second is dualistic thinking. Aristotle and Aquinas thought this way with matter and form and the material and spiritual sides of humankind, respectively. Now, there's nothing wrong with discovering particular properties of something in nature and forms, but when one makes general unproven assumptions like the existence of God, then that ends all reason. Reason is based on scientific facts as Bacon realized. One can't discover universal truths in nature without reason and science. Dualism uses the deductive method, rather than the inductive one.

Concerning pragmatism, this was another logical step for Bacon's ideas of induction and the four "idols." In the twentieth century, inductive reasoning based on scientific evidence brought about practical thinking. Plato's idea of seeking the best result was the goal of pragmatism. Dualistic thinking was unpopular among philosophers and scientists, at least secular ones. Pragmatists like Charles Peirce, William James and John Dewey brought together pragmatism and the real world for which the philosophy was meant. This was the combination of reason and real world philosophy. They all discovered that true knowledge and absolutes are derived from life or the human experience. Thus, this proved Aristotle's thesis of independence was correct.

Behaviorism refocused realism with the combination of behavioral psychology, science and philosophy. Behaviorists such as Pavlov and Skinner advanced our understanding of individual and social behavior. They both believed in one-way conditioning of human and animal behavior. Skinner saw no distinction in education and conditioning. He viewed the act of repeated positive reinforcement would encourage good behavior. Realism has greatly influenced American education in several ways. Aristotle's view of matter as forms gave us deductive reasoning which although it led to false ideas; it also resulted in Bacon's inductive reasoning. Induction was the basis for scientific facts, which led to the scientific revolution. From progressive science, induction was applied to many other fields such as psychology and economics. In the twentieth century, the spirit of science for examining particular matter to find facts gave us pragmatism, which with its emphasis on practicality and economy has laid the blueprint for American schools.

Realists emphasize basic factual data in school curriculum such as reading, writing and arithmetic. Technical knowledge takes prominence over more idealistic studies such as philosophy, literature and the arts. Since the Soviet launch of Sputnik in 1957, the race for the moon and the US second-place position in science caused resurgence in realism. This led many to criticize American education as "unfocused" and needed to return to the basics like math and science. This brought about the formation of the Council for Basic Education. This would emphasize realism, of course, and also idealist courses. This implies that truth is found within personal experience. Discipline would stem from parents and teachers and would reflect their role in society. Consequence, or limits to behavior are crucial to forming a well-behaved and morally productive child. I don't believe in the "open education" approach because character development comes from hard work, not unstructured discovery. This open approach needs balance, as realists have said, and has its proper place in society. Most importantly, a school needs to reflect the Constitutional amendment of separation of church and state. The opposite of religion is reason, more specifically, inductive reasoning. Human progress came about through proving particular matter as fact. And not by men like Aquinas who adopted pagan ingenuity while still parading around as a power-hungry man of God. Pagans should be pagans; Christians should act as Christians, not hypocrites. Alas, throughout history Christians have always "changed with the times" to keep their churches profitable. And the Pope and the word of God are supposed to be infallible.

## 2.6: Aristotle's Works

Aristotle was a prolific writer in Greek philosopher who had written nearly four hundred books. His works fall under the headings of dialogues and other works of a popular character; collections of facts and material from scientific treatment; and systematic works. Among his writings of a popular nature the only one which we possess of any consequence is the interesting tract On the Polity of the Athenians. The works on the second group include 200 titles, most in fragments, collected by Aristotle's school and used as research. Some may have been done at the time of Aristotle's successor Theophrastus. Included in this group are constitutions of 158 Greek states. The systematic treatises of the third group are marked by a plainness of style, with none of the golden flow of language which the ancients praised in Aristotle. This may be due to the fact that these works were not, in most cases, published by Aristotle himself or during his lifetime, but were edited after his death from unfinished manuscripts. Until Werner Jaeger it was assumed that Aristotle's writings presented a systematic account of his views. Jaeger argues for an early, middle and late period (genetic approach), where the early period follows Plato's theory of forms and soul, the middle rejects Plato, and the later period is more empirically oriented. Aristotle's systematic treatises may be grouped in several divisions such as

### **Logic**

Categories (10 classifications of terms)

On Interpretation (propositions, truth, modality)

Prior Analytics (syllogistic logic)

Posterior Analytics (scientific method and syllogism)

Topics (rules for effective arguments and debate)

On Sophistical Refutations (informal fallacies)

Physical works

Physics (explains change, motion, void, time)

On the Heavens (structure of heaven, earth, elements)

On Generation (through combining material constituents)

**Meteorology** (origin of comets, weather, disasters)

Psychological works

On the Soul (explains faculties, senses, mind, imagination)  
 On Memory, Reminiscence, Dreams, and Prophesying  
 Works on natural history  
 History of Animals (physical/mental qualities, habits)  
 On the parts of Animals  
 On the Movement of Animals  
 On the Progression of Animals  
 On the Generation of Animals  
 Minor treatises  
 Problems  
 Philosophical works  
 Metaphysics (substance, cause, form, potentiality)  
**Nicomachean Ethics** (soul, happiness, virtue, friendship)  
 Eudemian Ethics  
 Magna Moralia  
 Politics (best states, utopias, constitutions, revolutions)  
 Rhetoric (elements of forensic and political debate)  
 Poetics (tragedy, epic poetry)

Here a 'book' is intended to mean a chapter in a treatise. It is said that more than three quarters of his writings were found in a mutilated form. Particularly, it is claimed that his treatise on metaphysics was unfinished. One of the chapters of this treatise ended in the middle of a discussion and others were available in a wrong order. It was more or less same with his other writings. They lacked final revisions and for this reasons it had been very difficult and challenging for scholars to develop a chronological sequence of Aristotle's works, therefore, as reported in *A Companion to Aristotle*, edited by Georgios Anagnosto, scholars resorted to innovative methods in order to understand the chronological order of Aristotle's works. These methods included cross references within his works. According to this method, if there is a reference of one work in another, then the former would be assessed to have been written before the latter. The second method included references to historical events in Aristotle's works. Accordingly, any reference to historical events would give a clue that a particular work must have been written after the event. The next method is based on philosophical views, or pre suppositions. Thus, scholars tried to determine the chronology of his works by observing whether or not a particular position elaborated in one work was also presupposed in another work. This would give an idea as to which of the compositions was written earlier.

Further, Plato and Aristotle in terms of their writings, is found that Aristotle composed most of his works during his second phase of stay at Athens, i.e. when he was more than fifty years of age. In that sense, his writings are more mature and fully developed. This view is supported by Y. Masih in *A Critical History of Western Philosophy* (Greek, Medieval, and Modern) where he writes that Aristotle was quite different from Plato in his mental constitution and orientation. Looking at the vast variety of areas that he touched upon in his voluminous writings, he was aptly called an encyclopedic genius. His extensive understanding of logic and biology greatly impacted his thinking. In order to avoid inconvenience, his works have been categorized as early and late. This has been done keeping in mind Plato's influence on him. Accordingly, amongst his early works we have *Organon*, *Physics*, *De Anima*, *Eudemian*, *Ethics*, and *Metaphysics*. The later works comprise of *Nicomachean Ethics*, *Politics*, and the *Rhetorics*. In this unit we shall mainly deal with his logic, physics and metaphysics. Since he classifies them under the broad category of theoretic sciences, it is relevant first to give an account of how he classifies the sciences. This will be followed by a detailed discussion on his logic, physics and metaphysics.

However, Aristotle emphasizes on good reasoning combined with his belief in the scientific method forms the backdrop for most of his work. For example, in his work in ethics and politics, Aristotle identifies the highest good with intellectual virtue; that is, a moral person is one who cultivates certain virtues based on reasoning. And in his work on psychology and the soul, Aristotle distinguishes sense perception from reason, which unifies and interprets the sense perceptions and is the source of all knowledge.

### **2.6.1: Study on Classification of Sciences**

To understand the concept of classification in the early modern period, it is necessary to first understand the conceptual framework the early moderns inherited from their predecessors. The world prior to 1600 was still largely Aristotelian. Aristotle (384–322 B.C.E.) provided a classification scheme based on matching a basic kind of specie with a set of distinguishing characteristics in order to sort things in the world. Thus a human individual is a rational animal. That is, a human is of the kind "animal" but is distinguished from all other animals by rationality. This example reveals an underlying assumption of Aristotle's system: genuine classification provides definitions. When a thing is properly classified, it is defined. Definition, in turn, relies on the concept of essences. An essence is a property a thing must have to be what it is. Thus one might say that being rational is essential to being human; an individual thing is simply not a human if it lacks rationality.

In Aristotle is also found the first division between the arts and sciences. The distinction is modeled on the natural or artificial divide. *Scientia* concerns demonstrable and certain knowledge derived from nature. In nature, things develop according to natural internal principles of change (entelechies). Something is artificial if it changes because of an external source—like some clay becoming a sculpture because of a craftsman's work. Sculptures are artificial because they do not possess internal principles of change. They are what they are because someone or something else altered them. This distinction led Aristotle to characterize science as an enterprise whose goal is to account for the internal causes or explanatory principles we find in nature. Since this goal is reached by definition (asserting the essences of things), one discovers that appropriate classification is in fact the scientific enterprise—the process of acquiring knowledge where we find

*“I do not deny but nature, in the constant production of particular beings, makes them not always new and various, but very much alike and of kin one to another. But I think it nevertheless true, that the boundaries of the species whereby men sort them, are made by men; since the essences of the species, distinguished by different names, are, as has been proved, of man's making, and seldom adequate to the internal nature of the things they are taken from. So that we may truly say, such a manner of sorting things is the workmanship of men”.*

From the above it is clearer that he is said to have contributed to almost every branch of knowledge. He was thus a 'man of universal learning', as State puts it. Therefore, it is not considered proper by many scholars to call him a philosopher in the restricted sense of the term. With the kind of background he had, he was naturally inclined towards the field of physical science. But he intended to know about everything including the existing sciences of his time. Where science was not available he went ahead to lay the foundations of new sciences. He is credited with founding two sciences, namely logic and biology. With Plato and Aristotle being two prominent philosophical figures during that time, it was expected that one should either be a Platonist or an Aristotelian in spirit. However, this does not imply that Plato and Aristotle had contrasting viewpoints. According to State, Aristotle was the greatest of all Platonists. He carried

forward Plato's idealism by making it free from all of its shortcomings. State points out that Plato's idealism were crude and untenable, for he was the founder of idealism, the first proponent. Aristotle took it upon himself to correct Plato's idealism from its crudities, and supplemented it with an acceptable philosophy. Thus, the difference between them, as it appears, is mostly a superficial one, except that Aristotle believed in facts, whereas Plato had no regard for facts or for that matter the objects of senses.

Further, Aristotle also acknowledged the perfectionistic and philosophical presumptions of Plato, particularly his view that the world was an ideal one with eternal and unchangeable ideas that he called the forms. He further agreed with the view that these ideas were very much a part of the world and immanent in it, thus giving it a form and life. But being the son of a physician, he was fascinated by the sciences, which is reflected in his later approach towards philosophy. He believed that knowledge did not consist in merely being acquainted with the facts but also in investigating their reasons and causes. This is what makes up for the definition not only of philosophy but also of science. Both are concerned with the study of the ultimate or first cause of things. He named this course of investigation as 'first philosophy' which we now call metaphysics. Thus, from Aristotle's point of view, metaphysics is the science which studies the being (Aristotle considered the being to be the first principle or the first cause). All the other sciences dealing with other parts of the being were partial sciences and therefore he called them second philosophies.

He broadly divided the sciences into three main categories:

- (i) Theoretical sciences dealing with mathematics, physics and metaphysics.
- (ii) Practical sciences concerning ethics and politics.
- (iii) Creative sciences that studied mechanical and artistic productions.

His area of interest was physics, metaphysics, and practical sciences to which he added logic.

Recounting the hypothetical sciences, he first talks about physics. According to him, the subject matter of physics comprises of the class of natural and physical things, and they all possess the internal principle of motion and rest which explains why these things either move or remain stationary in a particular place. Their movement can be gazed in terms of their growth and decrease in size, and also in terms of qualities which they either generate or pass away. Therefore, the natural and physical things include plants and animals as well as their parts. According to Aristotle, the subject matter of physics can never be purely formal because it essentially concerns the nature which is always dynamic. The principles of physics are thus framed on the basis of the change in the physical things, through induction. The subject matter of mathematics, Aristotle maintains, comprises of numbers, lines, points, surfaces, and volumes. Although these properties are treated as physical properties in various branches of physics, they are treated differently by the mathematicians. This is because, although it is unimaginable to conceive these properties in the absence of matter and motion, mathematicians conceive them in abstraction. In fact, the possibility of arithmetic and mathematics, it is said, depends on its ability to give an abstract treatment to 'quantity' which is one of the physical properties of belongings.

Lastly, Aristotle talks about the forms that not only exist apart from matter and motion but are also known independently of them. This constitutes the subject matter of the first philosophy or metaphysics. It is for this reason metaphysics is accepted as dealing largely with the issue of the being. Firstly, it enquires into the ultimate principles of knowledge, this also includes an examination into the ultimate causes of existences and change. Secondly, it investigates the principles which determine the interconnections between various aspects of the universe. Thus, Aristotle differentiates between physics, mathematics, and metaphysics, the three theoretic

sciences on the basis of a general differentiation of their respective subject matters and form. In this context, it is further brought up by Richard Mckeon in his *Introduction to Aristotle* that all the above three mentioned theoretic sciences, irrespective of their subject matter, emphasize on the necessary rather than what is contingent. In other words 'it is by virtue of this characteristic in their subject matter that their propositions are necessary and not merely probable'.<sup>1</sup> He explains that this necessity may be either simple or absolute or it may be even be hypothetical. The propositions of metaphysics which are treated as universal, and deal with the essence or definition of a thing exemplify simple and absolute necessity. On the other hand, the propositions of mathematics and physics involve a tot of hypothetical reasoning which ultimately leads to necessity. He writes: 'Necessity in metaphysics must be sought in essence, in mathematics, in the postulates, in physics in the matter; in all three the problem of discovering the necessary is the problem of definition and causes'. As far as the practical sciences are concerned Mckeon says that they are differentiated from the theoretic sciences by their purposes or ends. Where on one hand the end of theoretic sciences is knowledge, the end of practical sciences on the other hand not only consists in knowledge but also acting or behaving on the basis of that knowledge. It is the dissimilarity of the purposes of these two sciences that makes the subject matter and method of one distinct from that of the other. It is further clarified by Mckeon that since the subject matter of practical sciences are contingent things as compared to necessary connections that we find in theoretic science, the inquirer is not concerned with the precision which is needed in the theoretic sciences, particularly in mathematics and physics. Since its subject matter is not one 'nature' or one 'substance', but the way a man grows, reproduces, perceives, or thinks his definition will therefore be different and would be based on the functions of his nature. On the other hand, his virtues, the social and political institutions that he adopts in his life, the objects of his appreciation, etc. depend on his customs and practices that are prompted by his actions which he has performed and control or guidance he has experienced in life.

Further, the various theoretical sciences where there are sharp distinctions, the case with ethics and politics, which are the practical sciences, is different. Mckeon claims that ethics is but subdivision of politics, and we study human conduct in both. In ethics, this study is done from the point of view of personal morality along with acknowledging the fact that an individual's actions are also influenced by political institutions. Likewise, in politics, human conduct is studied with reference to his associations and institutions. Along with this it is also admitted that the character of an institution is established by the traits of the people who compose them. There is, however, the need for a natural foundation in both the sciences, to assess the ends of actions and associations. In ethics, it is found in the habit of a man and in politics it consists in habits subject to man's needs and is related with his good living.

Approaching to the productive sciences, these are demarcated in terms of their products. Mckeon claims that nature has minimal role to play here because it cannot impose any lines to separate the arts and kind of artificial things. Thus, the three categories of the sciences discussed herewith are differentiated from each other on the basis of their subject matter, the ends they pursue and the principles they follows. Yet Mckeon says that each one of them is relevant to the other in terms of subject matter and the principles they empty. Aristotle is credited with arranging and organising the three sciences with absolute perfection and clarification. The subtlety with which he has segregated the subject matter, principle, and purposes of the three sciences is extremely significant. It provides us with an immediate effect, a sharp distinction between artistic, moral, and theoretic considerations. At the same lime, he also allows a way by which a single object or an action can be a subject of enquiry of either of these sciences. And finally, it also makes way for the possibility to reduce the various sciences to theory, practice, or even art

Further, with the understanding of the classification of the three categories of sciences, we shall proceed to take a look at Aristotle's physics and metaphysics. Both these sciences as we have seen are part of theoretic science. But before we do that, we must stop briefly to look at Aristotle's logic, for his logic is considered to be an essential pre-requisite in understanding his physics and metaphysics. This is because the issue of proof or cause marks its beginning in his logic. Thus When a thing is properly classified, it is defined. Definition, in turn, relies on the concept of essences. An essence is a property a thing must have to be what it is. Thus one might say that being rational is essential to being human; an individual thing is simply not a human if it lacks rationality.

### 2.6.2: Study on Logic

Aristotle's writings on logic are grouped in six treatises. These are collectively given one name - *Organon*. The six works on logic are *Categories*, *On Interpretation*, *Prior Analytics*, *Posterior Analytics*, *Topics*, and *Sophistical Refutation*. Hence, it is significant to deliberate upon each of these six works individually.

To begin with his first work *Categories*, it is said that the issue discussed therein is about the relation between uncombined terms. These relations are derived from the basic things that exist in world, and the interrelations between them. According to Aristotle, every uncombined term communicate to something in the ten most universal kinds of categories. These categories are: substance, quality, quantity, relative, place, time, position, having, doing, and being. They represent the senses of being per se. In other words, with these categories Aristotle wants to communicate that there are as many senses of being as there are categories. However, he maintains that what exist primarily are the primary substances. He separates these primary substances from their accidental categories, and further tries to show how the category of substance itself is divided into primary and secondary substances. For example, when we say 'Socrates is a man', Socrates here represent the primary substance and man represent the secondary substance. In other words, this means that secondary substances are said of the primary substances, or they can be predicated of the primary substances either as names or definitions. So secondary substances do not have and independent existence apart from the primary substances to which (hey belong. The primary substance, on the other hand, does not need anything else for their existence. Hence, from an ontological point of view they are basic.

Coming now to *On Interpretation*, it offers explanation of statements or assertions that are considered to be meaningful expressions. Prior to Aristotle, Plato claimed that a simple statement is composed of only a name and a verb. For example, 'Radha sings'. Further, it was said that they also include general categorical statements symbolized by the letters A, E, I and O:

- A represents 'all men are mortal'.
- E represents 'no men are mortal'.
- I conveys 'some men are mortal'
- O conveys 'some men are not mortal'.

Further, he tries to show the logical relation between these propositions by proposing a square of opposition. We all must remember that these logical relations are relations of opposition that holds between the four above mentioned categorical propositions. These are:

- Contrary relations between A & E
- Sub-contrary relation between I & O
- Contradictory relation between A & O and E & I

- Subalternation relation between A & I and E & O

Moreover, in this work, Aristotle also discusses a theory of true conditions for all statements whether they affirm anything or deny anything.

*Prior Analytics* introduces one to logic as a formal discipline. This work attempts to offer a complete system, at least virtually, of logical inference which is also known by the term 'syllogistic'. In this work, Aristotle has used the categorical propositions that he introduces in *On Interpretation*. He develops a syllogism with the help of three categorical propositions. Two of these are the premises and the third one is the conclusion. This work thus shows which of the two categorical propositions should yield the conclusion. It gives an exposition of the valid forms of syllogisms' in terms of their figures and moods. Thus, the prior analytics show that inferences, proofs, or syllogisms' must necessarily consist of combinations of three terms. The syllogisms' also reflect deductive reasoning because a particular conclusion is derived from universal premises. Induction is the opposite process where a conclusion is derived from a number of particular premises.

As far as the *Posterior Analytics* is concerned, it shows an attempt to extend the syllogism of prior analytics to the sciences and scientific explanations. As we know, scientific knowledge is always aimed to discover the 'why' rather than knowing 'that'. Hence, it consists of a deductively ordered body of knowledge. This means that the premises of scientific syllogism must be necessary, that is they must represent established truth. As a result, conclusions are made to depend on the premises but not vice-versa. Each premise is known independently of the conclusion. These, therefore, serve as axioms from which conclusions are derived through proper demonstration.

Thus, from *Posterior Analytics*, one derives the idea that a demonstration, which consists of scientific proofs, involves reasoning. This is because all scientific demonstrations are based on true and necessary propositions that serve as their starting points. So the idea of the first cause or the first principle which Aristotle tries to investigate in physics and metaphysics has its roots in his logic.

*The Topics* deals with dialectical reasoning. The premises of such reasoning are not the scientific premises, but accepted opinions of people.

Finally, *Sophistical Refutation* is concerned with thirteen fallacies. Such arguments arise from opinions that are accepted generally but are not so. They also seem to have their roots in the opinions that are usually accepted or at least appear to be accepted generally.

If we run through the subject matter of each of these works then one thing becomes evident that out of the six works that compose *Organon*, his *Prior Analytics* and *On Interpretation* together contains the fundamental elements of scientific or deductive logic.

One may raise a question here that why did Aristotle explain or talk about logic, at all? If we took at his classification of sciences into theoretical, practical, and productive science (as discussed earlier), we will observe that logic does not find a place in any one of them.

This actually came up as a problem during his time. In an attempt to find a solution to this problem, Alexander of Aphrodisias, a great Aristotelian scholar, held that logic was an instrument of science, particularly the theoretical one". Since then the science of logic has been interpreted as an important instrument for the acquisition of genuine knowledge. Though Aristotle himself was

not satisfied to treat it as *Organon*, he nevertheless acknowledged and conveyed the fact that rather than a part of some special science, it should be prior to the study of the special sciences. He suggests that one should not even attempt to undertake the study of the first philosophy or the science of the essence of things, unless one is familiar with the analytics. (He uses the term analytic to refer both to the *Prior Analytic* and *Posterior Analytic*). It is important, for the clarification of the students that in the classification of logic, Aristotle's logic is considered as traditional logic. The mathematical logic of twentieth century emerging from Gottlob Frege's works comprises modern logic; and the logic of recent years namely, the logic of necessity and possibility, is modal logic.

Continuing further with Aristotle's logic we will observe that in *Prior Analytics*, he deals with syllogisms. Syllogisms are arguments having one or more premises and a conclusion. Aristotle uses natural language to form the syllogisms. The statements that he uses for premises and conclusions are assertion or statements which are either true or false. Further, these statements are not disjunctive or conditional statements. They are categorical statements with a subject and a predicate. The subject refers either to a particular or a universal, but the predicate refer only to universals. These universals cover a wide range including man, animal, substance, horse, well, line, number, wisdom, and so on.

According to Aristotle, the natural way of connecting the subject and predicate of a categorical statement is by a copula which is a verb in the English grammar. This is written as S is P, where S is the subject and P represents the predicate. In the *Prior Analytics*, Aristotle forgoes the natural mode by favouring the three artificial idioms:

- (i) P belongs to S
- (ii) P is predicated of S
- (iii) P is said of S

The categorical statements are of four types. They are distinguished from one another in terms of their quantity, quality, and modality. In terms of quality, a categorical statement is either affirmative or negative; quantity wise, it may be universal or particular; and from the point of view of modality, it is either necessary or possible. Based on the above distinctions, the four types of assertoric categorical statements are:

- (i) Universal affirmative (P belongs to every S), i.e. all S is P
- (ii) Universal negative (P belongs to no S), i.e. no S is P
- (iii) Particular affirmative (P belongs to some S), i.e. some S is P
- (iv) Particular negative (P does not belong to some S), i.e. some S is not P.

These are represented by customary four vowels a, e, i, and o.

It is evident from the above description of the categorical propositions that singular propositions and indeterminate statements are not included among the categorical statements.

Next, he discusses the relations between the four categorical statements. He has deliberated on these relations in *On Interpretation*. Summarizing these relations, Aristotle is quoted in Devid Keyt's article 'Deductive Logic' thus: 'I call an affirmation and a negation contradictory opposites when what one signifies universally the other signifies not universally, for example, every man is white and not every man is white or no man is white and some man is white. But I call the universal affirmation and the universal negation contrary opposites. For example, everyman is just and no man is just. So these cannot be true together, but their opposites may both be true with respect to the same things for example, not every man is white and some men are white'.

It follows from the above, that A and O propositions and E and I propositions have opposite truth-values, and so they have 'contradictory relations' between them. Similarly, the corresponding A and E statements are 'contrary opposites' that is to say they cannot be true together though they can both be false. Their contradictories can however be true together. In other words, I and O propositions can be true together. For instance, some diamonds are precious stones (I) and some diamonds are not precious stones (O) can both be true together. Thus, the corresponding I and O propositions, according to Aristotle, have the sub-contrary relation of opposition amongst them. This implies that they cannot both be false, although they can be true together.

Thus, one can derive the following logical facts from the above discussed relations of oppositions. These are:

1. That statement A is contradictory of the corresponding O statement.
2. That statement E is contradictory of the corresponding I statement.
3. That A and E statements are contraries.
4. That I and O statements are sub-contraries.

These relations of 'oppositions' are represented with help of the square of opposition as shown in the figure given below:

Apart from these opposite relations, there is another type of opposition that holds between two universal propositions and their corresponding particular propositions. This is the relation between A & I and E & O. It is known as subaltern relation.

Eight types of immediate inferences are drawn from these relations who are as follows:

- (i) Given A as true, E is false, I is true, and O is false.
- (ii) Given E as true, A is false, I is false, and O is true.
- (iii) Given I as true, E is false, while A & O are undetermined.
- (iv) Given O as true, A is false, while E and I are undetermined.
- (v) Given A as false, O is true, while E and I are undetermined.
- (vi) Given E as false, I is true, while A and O are undetermined.
- (vii) Given I as false, A is false, E is true, and O is true.
- (viii) Given O as false, A is true, E is false, and I is true.

We may mention in this context that the process of inference involves deducing the conclusion from one premise through the mediation of another premise. Immediate inferences are those in which conclusions follows directly from one premise without the mediation of the second premise. The eight inferences following from the square of opposition are immediate in this sense.

Another important feature of deductive logic is the concept of figure and mood in the syllogisms. David Kept quotes Aristotle defining syllogisms as 'an argument in which:

- (i) Certain things having been supposed.
- (ii) Something different from the things supposed.
- (iii) Results of necessity.
- (iv) Because these things are so.'

The first phrase refers to the premises of syllogisms. The word 'things' clearly indicate more than one premise. The second phrase refers to the conclusion of the syllogisms.

The third phrase emphasizes the fact that there is a relation and necessity between the premises and the conclusion. The last phrase shows that no element external to the argument is needed to fulfill the necessary relation between the premises and the conclusion in a given argument.

One can draw some obvious and inherent implications from the above definition of a syllogism. Firstly, that Aristotle rules out the possibility of immediate inferences from the scope of a syllogism. Secondly, the relation of 'necessity' between the premises and the conclusion presents the possibility of a logical fallacy. Thirdly, it shows that only valid arguments can be called as syllogisms.

Thus, we can say that a valid argument is an extension of a syllogism. But Aristotelian logic puts its central attention only on one type of syllogism, i.e. the one consisting of three categorical statements sharing three terms and each term occurring twice throughout the argument. In fact, he restricts the application of the term 'syllogistic' only to refer to arguments that exemplify the above stated structure. Such arguments alone constitute what he calls a 'basic syllogism'. In order to further examine the syllogistic arguments, Aristotle introduces the concepts of 'figure' and 'mood'. The arrangement of the three terms used in the argument determines its figure; whereas the quality and quantity of the propositions that are employed in the syllogism determines its mood. Aristotle coins specific names for the three terms that are used in the argument. The term that is commonly shared by both the premises is the 'middle term', and the other two terms which he calls 'extremes' (in *Prior Analytics*) are the 'major' and the 'minor' terms. Basically, the 'predicate' of the first premise is the major term, and the subject of the second premise is the minor term. The major and minor terms of a syllogism are determined corresponding to the subject and predicate of the conclusion. The figure and mood together make the 'form' of an argument.

All the books on formal logic, present us with four different types of figure. But it is important to mention here that Aristotle gave recognition to only three of them. The fourth figure was not considered by him. These figures are as follows:

Now let us consider an example of syllogism:

- All criminal actions are wicked deed
- All prosecutions for murder are criminal action.
- Therefore, all prosecutions for murder are wicked deed.

The subject of the conclusion is the phrase 'prosecutions for murder' and the predicate is 'wicked deeds'. Thus, the former is the 'minor' term and the latter is the 'major' term of the syllogism. Now both the premises share 'criminal action'. This makes it the 'middle' term. The mood of the syllogism is AAA because all the (three statements are universal affirmative. And with regards to the position of the middle term, its figure is first figure. Therefore the form of the syllogism is AAA-1.

Aristotle recognizes 192 forms of syllogistic arguments. Out of these, only fifteen forms are valid. The students are expected to be familiar with these forms. So Aristotle's analysis of the logical form occupies a very significant place in the *Prior Analytics*. Its conceptual basis is imbedded in his distinction between the form and matter. Although, the word 'matter' is not directly used in *Prior Analytics*, Keyt tries to show that the concept of 'matter' is used in a close sense to signify premises, when Aristotle writes in *Physics* that 'the hypotheses (are matter) of the

conclusion'. However, [he way he uses the concept of figure in *Prior Analytics*, comes very close to what he means by form, but it does not fully characterize the form of an argument.'<sup>1</sup>

After conversing about the important feature of deductive logic, Aristotle proceeds to distinguish between 'perfect' and 'imperfect' syllogism. According to him, as quoted by David Keyt, a syllogism is perfect, 'if it stands in need of nothing else besides the things taken in order for the necessity to be evident; I call it imperfect if it still needs either one or several additional things which are necessary because of the terms assumed, but yet were not taken by means of premises.' Keyt points out that for Aristotle the imperfect syllogisms are the 'potential syllogisms' which need to be unveiled. The perfect syllogisms on other hand are 'transparently valid'.

Keyt explains that in order to make perfect an imperfect syllogism, its conclusion needs to be deduced from its premises, through a series of valid steps. This implies that the premises and conclusion should be the initial and final stages of a deduction. Four types of perfect syllogism's are enumerated by Aristotle, in the first figure, namely, Barbara, Celarent, Daril and Ferio. According to Aristotle, there are fifteen valid forms of arguments. In order to show that the other forms are invalid, he uses the method of counter examples. Counter examples are arguments forms with true premises and a false conclusion, and hence are essentially invalid. Besides deducibility, he also gives importance to the soundness and completeness of all arguments types, i.e. syllogistic arguments, categorical arguments, and arguments in general. The categorical syllogism, as commented by W.T.- Stace, is the fundamental type of reasoning, and all forms of deduction are ultimately reduced to it. Thus, Aristotelian logic offers all that is basic and essential to its study. Starting from judgment or statements or proportions, and moving on to, syllogism's and fallacies, valid and invalid syllogisms', and even definitions, h is a complete package of the facts of reason. To use State's words, 'whoever knows common logic and the text books, knows the logic of Aristotle'."

In *Posterior Analytics*, he mainly talks about the theory of demonstration in scientific knowledge. It serves as the source not only of several distinctions and the technical terms that he uses, but also as the source used by later logicians to develop their theories on scientific method. In *Posterior Analytics*, he makes an attempt to formulate the problem of scientific proof which, he says, is at the center of two processes. These are instruction and inquiry.

He claims that all instructions involve argument and therefore proceed from pre-existent knowledge. To quote his words: 'All instructions given or received by way of argument proceeds from pre-existent knowledge.' All arguments, deductive, inductive, and even the scientific proofs, according to him, are essentially concerned with the principles of sciences and inferences from the principles. He therefore makes an attempt to prove that each science has first principles that are proper to it and an infinite regress of these premises is not possible. As a result he holds that predication must terminate in both upward and downward direction. That is to say in the upward direction it must end in generality and in the downward direction it must end in particularity. In between there must be a finite number of steps between the most universal and the most particular.

As far as inquiry is concerned, he holds that it is into facts and causes. From this point of view scientific proof must be concerned with the relation between definition and proof. He also tries to show how the causes constitute the middle term in scientific demonstration.

Aristotle believes that science depends on demonstrations. It involves an analysis not only of the structure of knowledge but also of the connections of things. In fact, for him, demonstration is nothing but 'scientific. 'Syllogism'. He claims that we possess science only in virtue of possessing scientific syllogism. Scientific syllogism, according to him, is a process of

demonstration of scientific knowledge; and he claims that scientific knowledge is possible when we know the cause.

The summary of Aristotle's theory of demonstration, as stated by Robin Smith in 'Aristotle's Theory of Demonstration' is as follows:

1. Science or demonstrative science is knowledge that consists in possessing a demonstration.
2. A demonstration is a syllogism with immediate (indemonstrable) premises.
3. Possessing a demonstration requires finding premises to be more intelligible than its conclusion.
4. Every truth either is itself an immediate proposition or is deducible from immediate proposition.
5. Knowledge of immediate proposition is possible through some means other than demonstration. (Aristotle owes an explanation for this).

Aristotle maintains, as is evident, that not all knowledge is demonstrative. With regard to the knowledge of the immediate premises, he particularly claims that their knowledge is independent of demonstration. He argues that since we must know the prior premises from which the demonstration is drawn and since the regress must end in immediate truths, those truths must be indemonstrable. But here he also adds that the same things cannot be both prior and posterior to one another. So he makes it very clear that demonstration must be based on premises prior to and better known than the conclusion. In other words, Aristotle does not entertain the idea of 'circular demonstration'.

Moving ahead, he says that demonstrative knowledge is only present when we have a demonstration. Therefore, he interprets demonstration as a kind of inference from necessary premises. But in order to find out the characteristics of these requisite premises he makes an attempt to analyze different kinds of attributes. These are 'true in every instance of its subject', 'essential' attribute, and 'commensurate and universal' attribute. The first type of attributes is truly predicate of all instances and at all times. For example, he explains that if animal is truly predicable of every man then if it be true to say 'this is a man', it will also be true to say 'this is an animal'. As far as 'essential attributes' are concerned, he considers four different possibilities. Firstly, according to him 'essential attributes' are those that belong to their subject as elements in its essential nature just as line belongs to a triangle or a point belongs to a line. Secondly, while they belong to certain subjects, the latter are contained in the attribute's own defining formula. For instance, straight and curved both belong to the line and so on. Thirdly, that which is not predicated of a subject other than itself. Here he adds that things predicated of a subject are accidental or coincidental. And lastly, that which is consequentially connected with anything is also an essential attribute, and that which is not so connected, Aristotle calls it 'coincidental'. For instance, he takes the statement 'while he was walking it lightened'. Here, says Aristotle, the lightning was not due to his walking. It was a mere coincident. Now, coming to the third type of attribute, he says that 'commensurately universal' attributes are those which belong to every instance of its subject and that too essentially and as such. From this he derives that all commensurate universals are necessarily inherent in their subjects. For example, he expresses that a point and straight belong to line essentially because they belong to the latter as such.

What Aristotle tries to convey is that an attribute belongs commensurately and universally to a subject if it could be shown to belong to any random instance of that subject. Moreover, he maintains that the subject should also be the first thing to which it could be shown to belong.

He contends that the errors that we make are largely because of the fact that our conclusion is not primarily and commensurately universal in the sense stated above. He enumerates certain

situations that contribute to our committing such errors: when the subject is an individual or individuals with no universals; when the subject's belong to different species, and there is a higher universal but it has no name; and when the subject which the demonstrator takes as a whole is only a part of a larger whole. In the last case, the demonstration would be restricted only to individual instances within the part. It will not be true of the subject primarily, commensurately and universally.

Thus, Aristotle shows that demonstrative knowledge must have basic truths as their starting point. He argues that the object of scientific knowledge cannot be other than it is. He asserts that the attributes that attach essentially to their subjects attach necessarily to them. Thus, he derives that premises of the demonstrative syllogism must exhibit essential connections. In other words, he wants to communicate that all attributes must inhere essentially in the subject, or else they become accidental attributes which, according to him, are not necessary to their subjects.

He maintains that the fact that demonstration proceeds from necessary premises is further authenticated when we often reject a professed demonstration on the ground that one of its premise is not a necessary truth. He cautions that basic truths of a demonstration are not constituted of popularly accepted truths. For example, the sophist declaration that to know is the same as to possess knowledge is only an assumption and does not constitute a basic truth.

Further in this context, he tries to assert that where demonstration is possible, if one fails to give an account of the cause then one cannot have scientific knowledge. He sums up by saying that '...demonstrative knowledge must be knowledge of a necessary nexus, and therefore must clearly be obtained through a necessary middle term; otherwise its possessor will know neither the cause nor the fact that his conclusion is a necessary connation. Either he will mistake the non-necessary for the necessary and believe the necessity of the conclusion without knowing it, or else he will be ignorant whether he actually infers the mere fact through middle terms or the reasoned fact and from immediate premises.'

It ensues from the above that in demonstration one cannot pass from one genus to another. Aristotle says, for example, that we cannot prove geometrical truths by arithmetic. According to him every demonstration has three elements in it. The first is what is proved that is the conclusion. This is an attribute which must essentially inhere in a genus. The second is the axioms which make up for the premises of the demonstration; and the third element is the subject-genus whose attributes that is the essential properties are revealed by the demonstration. Aristotle admits that the axioms or the premises of the demonstration may be identical in two or more sciences. But he states that if the genera are different as in the case of geometry and arithmetic then we cannot apply arithmetical demonstration to the properties of magnitudes unless the magnitudes are given in numbers. What he tries to imply is that all the sciences have their own genera. Therefore, if the demonstration is to pass from one sphere to another, then The genus must be either absolutely or to some extent [the same. If it is not so then Aristotle holds that no transition from one genus to the other is possible. This is because he reasons that the extreme and the middle terms must be derived from the same genus or else they will be just 'accidents'.

Thus, we observe (hat Aristotle tries to interpret the indemonstrable premises in terms of 'universal'. He claims (hat scientific knowledge concerns the universal and that science is nothing but knowledge of the universal themselves. He also adds that if the premises from which the syllogism proceeds are commensurately universal then the conclusions of such demonstrations must also be eternal. Thus, he tries to assert what can be considered as the most debatable point between him and Plato, He rejects Plato's claim that the universals have an independent existence.

Aristotle's view of science, as is shown by Robin Smith, is a visit back to Plato's claim on science. Plato maintained that the objects of science have a necessary existence and so they are different from perceptible objects. These necessary existences constitute the causes of things. This further leads him to account for innateness of the knowledge of the universal. Aristotle, on the other hand, maintains that what exists necessarily, that is the universals, are very much significant. They do not have a separate or independent status from the world and the perceptible objects. Consequently, he denies Plato's view on having an innate knowledge of them. Thus, according to Aristotle, the universals exist as perceptible things.

Smith further explains Aristotle's universals as existing in our intellects. He says that the universals have causal powers by virtue of which they find a place in other individuals. He explains that when we perceive particular objects of the same class, then the universal presents in them cause the same universals to exist in our minds too. It is like the human form present in the parent, causing the human form in the child. In other words, he tries to convey that the intellect is capable of taking the form of the universal without its matter. Since knowing the universal is as good as knowing its essence or definition, it is equivalent to say that we know the universal by its 'through-itself predicates.' This fits into Aristotle's theory of demonstration being based on immediate premises. Thus, the universals are the immediate premises preceded by the intellect. We may correlate these 'universals' or what he calls the 'immediate premises', with the category of 'substance' which is the all-important category for him. And in this way, we can see, how he relates science with the ultimate principle of reality, i.e. the substance, or the universal or the being. This in a way also shows why an insight into Aristotle's logic is preliminary to the study of his physics and metaphysics.

In *Metaphysics*, the aim of *Physics* is defined as a natural science that “confines itself to one class of beings, i.e. to that sort of substance which has the principle of its movement and rest present in itself” (E, 2, 1025b18-21). Consequently, beings lacking this characteristic do not fall within *Physics*' area of study, so things which cause movement without being moved themselves “are no longer inside the province of natural science, for they cause motion not by possessing motion or a source of motion in themselves, but being themselves incapable of motion” (Phys. II,7, 198a27-29). What is required is to distinguish between the different types of possible studies, depending on the type of substance each kind of study deals with: “Hence there are three branches of study, one of things which are incapable of motion, the second of things in motion, but indestructible, the third of destructible things” (Ib., 198a30-31). Thus, there are three different *pragmata*. The first one is *proté philosophía* which deals with the timeless and motionless and studies the first *ousíai* and the unmoved movers, the non-material realities and the supreme of these (God). The second *pragma* is Astronomy. It deals with the imperishable but mobile and studies the indestructible bodies subject to movement. The third *pragmateîai* is *Physics*. Dealing with what is perishable and mobile, it studies mobile destructible substances. These three characteristic *pragmateîai*, which are nothing but the three divisions of the theoretical sciences, require a retrospective analysis in order to justify how they are established from Aristotle's general division of the sciences. In the following, what I do is a slight restructuring of the above-mentioned classification, however, given the nature of this paper, I will not record all of the relevant philosophical implications involved in this matter. The division of theoretical sciences in these three precise domains, which corresponds exactly to the three types of substances that are hierarchically ordered, becomes clear in *Met. E*, 1 just after Aristotle defines the general division of sciences. However, before their unambiguous definition in *E*, these divisions, distinctions, and classifications were previously prefigured.

### 2.6.3: Study on Physics

Aristotle held that the universe was divided into two parts, the terrestrial region and the celestial region. In the realm of Earth, all bodies were made out of combinations of four substances, earth, fire, air, and water, whereas in the region of the universe beyond the Moon the heavenly bodies such as the Sun, the stars, and the planets were made of a fifth substance, called quintessence. Here the elements are denoted by italics. Thus, earth is a pure element, whereas Earth is a planet made mostly of earth but also containing some of the other elements; air is a pure element, whereas the air we breathe is mostly air, but with some other elements mixed in. Heavy material bodies like rocks and iron consisted mostly of earth with small parts of the other elements. Less dense objects were thought to contain a larger admixture of the other elements along with earth. For instance, humans consisted of a complex mixture of all the elements: earth, which gave material strength and weight; fire, which provided warmth; water, which accounted for blood and other bodily fluids; and air, which filled the lungs and provided the breath of life. Of course, some people were more earthly, fiery, airy, or watery than others. The Sun, planets, and stars were made of quintessence, a pure, perfect substance, quite unlike the elements found on Earth. The Moon, marking the boundary between the sublunary earthly region and the superlunary heavenly region, was mostly quintessence, but because of its proximity to Earth it was contaminated with a small admixture of earthly elements, which accounted for the visible imperfections on its surface. The fundamental assumption in Aristotelian physics was that the natural state of sublunary matter is rest. Earth, air, and water must seek their natural place at rest in the center of Earth unless stopped by an impenetrable surface like the ground or a table. The natural place of rest of the element fire is somewhere above us (but well below the Moon). The air we see around us is a mixture of the elements air and fire (after all, air, at least in Greece, has warmth), so its behavior is complicated by the competition between the tendency for fire to rise and air to fall. Except in very complicated situations such as when air and fire were mixed together, motion was not a natural state of affairs.

As we have stated earlier that the theoretic sciences, as per Aristotle's classification, are aimed at studying the first principles. Therefore, in his *Physics* he makes an attempt to treat the principles behind the natural bodies and of natural motion. He tries to do this by analyzing the concepts implied in motion, for instance change of continuity, infinity, place, and time. In the process, he tries to set forth the various kinds and causes of motion, and finally relates all of them by (reducing the causes of motion to an unmoved mover. Next, in *On the Heavens*, another treatise on physics, he talks about the total motions of the bodies and attempts to differentiate these movements from those of the elements out of which heavenly bodies are made. Aristotle's model provided a simple, compelling explanation for falling rocks, rising flames, and the circulation of the air. However, it was less successful in explaining "violent motion" such as when an object is hurled from a catapult. To see why this would be a problem for the Aristotelian worldview, imagine the following experiment: Find a cat, and putt it from a siege machine. You would observe that the cat continues to travel through the air (before landing safely on its feet) even after it was no longer being pushed by the arm of the machine. If the natural state of motion of the cat is rest on Earth, why didn't the cat drop to the ground immediately on leaving the pult? Here, Aristotelian physics had to say that this kind of motion is different because it is "violent," and had to invent some mechanism to keep the cat in the air during violent motion. All of the mechanisms fall under the technical description "hand waving." One of the most popular explanations was that the air in front of the cat became disturbed by the movement of the cat and swirled behind the cat and pushed it along. Thus, in Aristotelian dynamics, there was a distinction between "natural" downward motion (for example, a rock falling to the ground when dropped) and unnatural violent motion not directed toward the center of Earth (such as that resulting from a catapult). In contrast to earthly motions, in the superlunary regions of the heavens the natural state of motion was circular, because circles were considered to be the perfect geometric figure. Thus the planets would travel

forever in circular orbits without the intervention of any force or impetus, because, well, it's the natural thing for planets to do.

Although there was some degree of experience and observation in the physics of Aristotle, at its heart was a philosophical approach to science where the laws of nature are constructed to conform to a particular philosophical outlook. This basis for the investigation of nature led to some strange statements by Aristotle - for instance, that women have fewer teeth than men. Aristotle was not a very accurate observer, he couldn't count, or he had odd taste in women. Essentially, it is often fashionable to make such critics of Aristotle as a residual of the long fight between the new view and the classical Greek view. And there are a number of areas where it is easy to ridicule; however, in general the classical Greek scholars and in particular Aristotle were quite good in their work and their descriptions of the world. Their contribution to science was major. Although Aristotle had been the first and last word on dynamics for two millennia, after the work of Galileo, Descartes, and others it had become clear to the leading natural philosophers that a new system was needed. Although in the intellectual vanguard of physicists the feeling was that the physics of Aristotle was dead, in the curriculum of many universities in the mid-seventeenth century Aristotelian physics was not yet buried. Now we think of universities as the petri dishes of society where all sorts of new ideas and philosophies are grown (and, thankfully, most are discarded). But in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the universities were reactionary institutions dominated by Aristotelians, and they were not about to relinquish their authority without a struggle. Aristotle conceives physics as the philosophy of nature. Consequently, its subject matter involves a study of the changes that takes place in the nature. These changes include the inorganic as well as the biological and psychological changes. The inorganic changes are the ones that we study in astronomy, meteorology, chemistry, and physics, to name some of the sciences. It is held that Aristotle's contribution to physics has survived in a very narrow sense (a collection of merely four treatises). We briefly present here the main issues that he has discussed in these treatises.

In his *On Generation and Corruption*, he talks of the causes of changes. These include change in substance whereby he discusses generation and corruption, change in quality or allegation, and change in size. i.e. growth and diminution. Finally, his *Meteorology* is an exposition of how the natural elements their mixtures and compounds cause rains, winds, dew, storms, lightning, earthquakes, thunder, rainbows, and other natural processes.

Further out of these four treatises on physics, Aristotle considers the first two as the proper physical treatises because he exclusively deals with the principles of natural changes and motion in them. But one may ask: what does Aristotle mean by the principle of motion? Aristotle explains that principles of motion do not imply any scientific proposition. He interprets the principles as representing the irreducible terms of the process of motion or change, which may help in forming the propositions of science. According to him, any change or motion is marked by an initial and a terminating point. These may be the place, quality, or quantity at which a process begins or ends. Moreover, there must be a subject too that undergoes the change or motion. Thus, there are three basic principles of the entire process of change namely, privation, form, and matter. He claims nature to be the cause of all motion and distinguishes it from art on the one hand and chance and spontaneity on the other.

Thus, physics as conceived by Aristotle is chiefly concerned with nature and motion. It is distinguished from mathematics in the sense that the latter is an abstraction from matter and motion. Its difference from metaphysics lies in the fact that metaphysics essentially deals with being as such and is also concerned with the existence and essence of forms. It follows that the significance of the word 'nature' is very crucial in understanding Aristotle's physics. Here nature

has to do with growth. As Russell points out, when one says that the nature of an acorn is to grow into an oak, one seems to be using the word in the Aristotelian sense.<sup>14</sup> Thus the word 'nature' has a Ideological implication in Aristotle's writings. He further claims that the 'nature' of a thing is its end. A thing exists precisely to achieve this end. It is in this context that he says that certain things exist by nature and others from causes. He specifies that those things that exist by nature have an internal principle of movement. For instance, animals, plants and simple bodies exist by nature as they all show an internal principle of movement which not only includes their locomotion, but also accounts for their qualitative change or change of size. Thus, nature is the source or cause of their being in the state of rest or of motion. And this is what constitutes their internal principle. The entire phenomenon is expressed in book II of *Physics*. He writes: 'Of things that exist, some exist by nature, some from other causes. By nature the animals and their parts exist, and plants and simple bodies.... All the things mentioned present a feature in which they differ from things which are not constituted by nature. Each of them has within itself a principle of motion and of stationaries ... which seems to indicate that nature is a source or cause of being moved and of being at rest in that to which it belongs primarily. It seems to follow from the above statement that 'nature is a source or cause of being moved or of being at rest in that to which it belongs primarily in virtue of itself and not in virtue of a concomitant attribute'."<sup>1</sup>

He further explains that the phrase 'according to nature' applies to all such things and also to their attributes. For instance the property of fire to carry upwards is according to its own nature or by its own nature. It is in this sense that Aristotle asserts that nature exists. In other words, he wants to convey that it is a self-evident principle and does not require any proof. According to Aristotle, this is one sense of 'nature'. It implies the 'immediate material substratum of things which have in them a principle of change or motion.' Besides, Aristotle gives a second interpretation of nature when he says that 'nature is the shape or form which is specified in the definition of the thing.'\* He explains that the word nature is applied to mean what is according to nature and what is natural in the same way we apply the word 'art' to mean what is artistic or what should be called a work of art. But he clarifies that what is only potentially present and has not attained a form according to its definition cannot be called its nature. This applies both in the case of art as well as natural compounds. He says there is nothing artistic about what is only potentially a bed. Similarly, he expresses that 'what is only flesh or bone has not yet its own nature, and does not exist by nature until it receives the form specified in the definition. Aristotle thus tries to convey that shape or form is 'nature' as long as it has a source of movement in itself to reach the end which it is expected to attain.

According to Aristotle, it thus follows that the nature is in form rather than in matter. This is because he maintains that a thing is more properly said to be what it is when it attains fulfillment and not when it exists potentially. Aristotle further states that nature of a thing is also exhibited in the process of its growth by which its nature is attained. In this sense, he says that nature is not like doctoring because the latter does not lead to any art but to health. So growth is not from what it grows but to which it tends to lead.

It appears then that nature has two senses, namely the 'form' and 'matter'. Aristotle says in the process of nature it is the form which impels and matter which retards and creates obstruction. In his *Physics*, he only introduces these two categories as a preliminary to his metaphysics with which he deals later on. Hence, we will not discuss these principles here. We shall take them on in our next section on metaphysics. At the most, he examines the question: Out of the two principles with which the physicist is concerned? Or whether he is concerned with a combination of the two? Referring to his predecessors, he feels that physics must deal with 'matter'. But after a little reflection it occurs to him that if art imitates nature and if it belongs to the same discipline to know form and matter up to a certain point then, it falls within the scope of physics to know the nature in

both these senses. Moreover, matter being a relative term, Aristotle again holds that the physicist would know the form only up to a certain point. With these preliminary thoughts, Aristotle sets to examine the causes in terms of their numbers and nature.

However, in the *Metaphysics*, Aristotle argues that if there is a distinction between potentiality and actuality at all, there must be a distinction between two kinds of potentiality. The man with sight, but with his eyes closed, differs from the blind man, although neither is seeing. The first man has the capacity to see, which the second man lacks. There are then potentialities as well as actualities in the world. But when the first man opens his eyes, has he lost the capacity to see? Obviously not; while he is seeing, his capacity to see is no longer merely a potentiality, but is a potentiality which has been put to work. The potentiality to see exists sometimes as active or at-work, and sometimes as inactive or latent. But this example seems to get us no closer to understanding motion, since seeing is just one of those activities which is not a motion. Let us consider, then, a man's capacity to walk across the room. When he is sitting or standing or lying still, his capacity to walk is latent, like the sight of the man with his eyes closed; that capacity nevertheless has real being, distinguishing the man in question from a man who is crippled to the extent of having lost all potentiality to walk. When the man is walking across the room, his capacity to walk has been put to work. But while he is walking, what has happened to his capacity to be at the other side of the room, which was also latent before he began to walk? It too is a potentiality which has been put to work by the act of walking. Once he has reached the other side of the room, his potentiality to be there has been actualized in Ross' sense of the term, but while he is walking, his potentiality to be on the other side of the room is not merely latent, and is not yet canceled by, an actuality in the weak sense, the so-called actuality of being on that other side of the room; while he is walking his potentiality to be on the other side of the room is actual just as a potentiality. The actuality of the potentiality to be on the other side of the room, as just that potentiality, is neither more nor less than the walking across the room.

A comparable analysis will apply to any motion whatever. The growth of the puppy is not the actualization of its potentiality to be a dog, but the actuality of that potentiality as a potentiality. The falling of the pencil is the actuality of its potentiality to be on the floor, in actuality as just that: as a potentiality to be on the floor. In each case the motion is just the potentiality qua actual and the actuality qua potential. And the sense we thus give to the word *entelechieis* is not at odds with its other uses: a motion is like an animal in that it remains completely and exactly what it is through time.

#### **2.6.4: Study on the Cause and Its Nature**

Aristotle differentiates four types of cause, or explanation. First, he says, there is that of which and out of which a thing is made, such as the bronze of a statue. This is called the material cause. Second, there is the form or pattern of a thing, which may be expressed in its definition; Aristotle's example is the proportion of the length of two strings in a lyre, which is the formal cause of one note's being the octave of another. The third type of cause is the origin of a change or state of rest in something; this is often called the "efficient cause." Aristotle gives as examples a person reaching a decision, a father begetting a child, a sculptor carving a statue, and a doctor healing a patient. The fourth and last type of cause is the end or goal of a thing that for the sake of which a thing is done. This is known as the "final cause." Although Aristotle gives mathematical examples of formal causes, the forms whose causation interests him most are the substantial forms of living beings. In these cases substantial form is the structure or organization of the being as a whole, as well as of its various parts; it is this structure that explains the being's life cycle and characteristic activities. In these cases, in fact, formal and final causes coincide, the mature

realization of natural form being the end to which the activities of the organism tend. The growth and development of the various parts of a living being, such as the root of a tree or the heart of a sheep, can be understood only as the actualization of a certain structure for the purpose of performing a certain biological function.

For Aristotle, “being” is whatever is anything whatever. Whenever Aristotle explains the meaning of being, he does so by explaining the sense of the Greek verb to be. Being contains whatever items can be the subjects of true propositions containing the word is, whether or not the is is followed by a predicate. Thus, both Socrates is and Socrates is wise say something about being. Every being in any category other than substance is a property or a modification of substance. For this reason, Aristotle says that the study of substance is the way to understand the nature of being. The books of the *Metaphysics* in which he undertakes this investigation, VII through IX, are among the most difficult of his writings. Aristotle gives two superficially conflicting accounts of the subject matter of first philosophy. According to one account, it is the discipline “which theorizes about being qua being, and the things which belong to being taken in itself”; unlike the special sciences, it deals with the most general features of beings, insofar as they are beings. On the other account, first philosophy deals with a particular kind of being, namely, divine, independent, and immutable substance; for this reason he sometimes calls the discipline “theology.”

It is important to note that these accounts are not simply two different descriptions of “being qua being.” There is, indeed, no such thing as being qua being; there are only different ways of studying being. When one studies human physiology, for example, one study humans qua animal that is to say, one studies the structures and functions that humans have in common with animals. But of course there is no such entity as a “human qua animal.” Similarly, to study something as a being is to study it in virtue of what it has in common with all other things. To study the universe as being is to study it as a single overarching system, embracing all the causes of things coming into being and remaining in existence. Aristotle says that man by nature thinks that he has no knowledge of a thing until he has grasped the 'why' of the thing. Therefore, he expresses that since the object of our inquiry is to know about the physical change, i.e. how things come into being and pass away, we must also know their principles that is their causes. He enumerates four different types of causes in this context. First, 'that out of which a thing comes to be and persists, is called "cause". This is the material cause. Aristotle seems to imply that material cause of a thing is the matter out of which it is composed. It indicates the raw material which is made into something, for example, the born of the statue and the silver of the bowl. The second type of cause according to Aristotle is 'the form or the archetype that is the statement of the essence, and its genera...' By this cause, Aristotle seems to mean the formal cause. For example, he talks about the octave, the relation of 2:1. Numbers, and also the parts in a definition while explaining the formal cause. We know that the essence of a thing is captured in its definition or concept. Thus, the formal cause is the concept of a thing in the sense that it accounts for the shape and design of the thing. If we remember in the first unit, both Plato and Socrates identified a concept with an idea. Aristotle revisits both of his predecessors in explaining the formal cause.

He defines the third cause as 'the primary source of the change or coming to rest'. For example, according to him the father is the cause of the child, and a mangiving advice is also the cause. That is to say what causes change of what has changed fall under this category of the cause. Thus the third type of cause connotes the moving cause or the efficient cause that is instrumental in bringing about a change in a body. It can be a change of any sort and not particularly restricted to change of place. For example, in the case of the bronze statue it is not the bronze that makes the statute; it is the sculptor who changes the bronze into a statue. The final cause, according to Aristotle, is the cause 'in the sense of end or that for the sake of which a thing is done'<sup>23</sup>. For

instance, he mentions good health as the cause of people going out for walks. The final cause is therefore the end towards which a thing is directed. In other words, by the final cause Aristotle means the purpose towards which a thing is directed. It includes all the intermediate steps that serve as means to arrive at an end.

Thus, Aristotle shows the various ways in which the term 'cause' is used. Moving ahead, he makes an important observation in the context of the cause. He points out that since there are several senses of the cause it follows logically that there must be several causes for the same thing. For example, he says in the case of the bronze statue, the art of the sculptor and the bronze are the causes of the statue; one is the material cause and the other is the efficient cause. He further says that there are some things that cause each other reciprocally. For example, hard work causes fitness and vice-versa. But here again Aristotle shows that one is the end while the other is the origin of the change. Yet another situation explains, that the same thing is the cause of contrary results. Aristotle explains that the presence of a thing may bring about one result, and its absence may lead to an altogether contrary result. He says, for instance, that wreck of a ship is ascribed to the absence of its captain and its safety is ascribed to his presence". Next, Aristotle elaborates on the various modes of causation. He expresses that within the same kind one cause may be prior to the other.' For example, both the doctor and the expert are the cause of good health. Another mode of causation, according to him, is the 'incidental and its genera'. For instance, he says that both *polyclitus* and the 'sculptor' are the cause of the statue. This is because he reasons that being *polyclitus* and sculptor are conjoined incidentally. Further he asserts that all causes are proper as well as incidental, and may be interpreted as potential and actual. Having assessed the variety of modes of the causes, Aristotle declares that in all they are six in number. He writes: 'cause means either what is particular or a genus, or an incidental attribute or a genus of that, and these either as a complex or each by itself; and all six either as actual or potential.'<sup>15</sup> He holds that the causes that are actually in operation and exist cease to do so once the effect is produced. He also suggests that while investigating a cause it is important and necessary to seek what is most precise. Thus, he says that man builds because he is a builder, and a builder builds because in virtue of his art of building. Thus, the last cause in this case, according to Aristotle, is prior. He concludes the issue by stating that particular effects should be assigned to particular causes, generic effects to generic causes, and so on. On the whole, what Aristotle wants to convey is that nature belongs to the class of causes which operate for the sake of something. Therefore, he next touches on the tractors of chance and necessity and tries to show how these factors also contribute to form a cause.

Nevertheless, it is so important to note that Aristotle restricts the principle of causal synonymy in different and subtle ways. Most significantly, an important domain of cases where a property of an object is actualized is exempted from the requirements of this principle. The actualization of a property can be the continuation of a previous causal process to the extent that Aristotle claims it is a second actuality, following upon a previously acquired first actuality. In these cases the emergence of the second actuality does not necessarily require an additional external efficient cause. The operation of this first actuality, through which it reinforces and completes itself, can be the mere extension of the operation of the original efficient cause, or the entity which has acquired this first actuality can be already causally responsible for its own activities, including the ones which bring it to a level of higher actuality. It is important to note that these claims are far from trivial: they rest on further claims that the very definitions of these first actualities inseparably include references to these activities.

### **2.6.5: Study on Chance and Impulsiveness**

In Physics, Aristotle deals with the technical concepts of 'luck' and 'chance'. In the opening paragraph of this, he states that the ensuing discussion, in the next couple of chapters, is intended

to do three things: (a) determine what luck and chance are, (b) resolve how, if at all, these two fit into the scheme of the four causes and (c) specify how luck and chance are related to each other. As is well known, in Phys. II. 5 Aristotle addresses (a) and (b). He presents an analysis of luck and chance, and he then argues that although these are not causal forces in their own right, there is none the less a sense in which some things do happen by luck or chance (197a32-35).<sup>2</sup> Finally, in Phys. II. 6 he goes on to clarify how these two concepts are connected to each other. In Phys. II. 5-6 Aristotle makes a number of comments on the relation between luck and chance. First, he states that 'luck' is to be used only for events which are due to the causal agency of persons, i.e. subjects who are capable of 'thought' and 'choice' Aristotle recognizes chance and impulsiveness among causes. This is because he opines that many things are said to come to exist due to mere chance and spontaneity. For this reason, he feels, it is of concern to know in what ways chance and spontaneity occupy a place in the understanding of cause and whether they are real or not. Such a thought is provoked by a general opinion of people who try to locate a cause even in what happens by chance. Citing the observations of some people he says that some people maintain that nothing happens by chance, and whatever one ascribes to be a chance or spontaneity must have a cause. However, Aristotle maintains that there are also cases that do not happen by chance and spontaneity. But people, in spite of ascribing them a cause, speak of them as happening by chance. He therefore expresses his surprise as to why physicists failed to take a note of the concept of chance. As far as Aristotle himself is concerned, he admits that most of the parts of animals came to be by chance. At the same time, he also talks of others who believe that chance is a cause but they also admit that human intelligence cannot scrutinize it. Therefore, he insists on an enquiry into 'chance' and 'spontaneity'.

Aristotle instigates by saying that there are some things that come to exist and then pass away in the same manner. These are things to which one cannot apply chance or the effects of chance. They happen out of necessity. Next, he says that there are some events that are for the sake of something, while others are not. The former according to him are subject to deliberate intentions. These are things outside the realm of the necessary and the normal. Such things, when they pass incidentally, are said to be by 'chance' or to be 'spontaneous', according to Aristotle. The following example from Mckeon's Introduction to Aristotle may be cited here to clarify the position further. The example cites a man who is engaged in collecting subscriptions for a feast. He would have gone to such and such place for the purpose of getting money if he had known. He actually went there for another purpose, and it was only incidentally that he got his money by going there; and this was not due to the fact that he went there as a rule or necessity, nor is the end (getting money) a cause present in himself. It belongs to the class of things that are intentional and the result of intelligent deliberations".

In the same way Aristotle explains that when the above conditions are satisfied one may say that the man went there by chance. Had he gone there, says Aristotle, with the purpose of collecting funds and as a part of his normal and routine visit then he could not have been said to have gone there by chance. Aristotle conveys that chance is an incidental cause in the sphere of those actions which are for the sake of something and involve a purpose. Thus, he claims that intelligent reflection and chance fall in the same sphere because 'purpose implies intelligent reflection'. Elaborating further, he says the causes of what passes as chance are indefinite. Therefore, 'chance' belongs to the class of indefinite cause. For the same reason, he explains that chance is beyond the comprehension of man, thus prompting the notion that nothing occurs by chance. According to Aristotle, a chance is an incidental cause, 'but strictly it is not the cause-without qualification-of anything'. For instance, he says that a house builder is the cause of a house with qualification but a flute-player is so only incidentally. He concludes by communicating that chance is indefinite because its causes are indefinite and so a chance is also contrary to a 'rule'. Aristotle attempts to connect chance with moral actions. He says that chance and what entails

from chance are applicable to moral agents. This is so because the moral agents are capable of good or evil fortune. So he assigns chance to the sphere of moral actions.

Impending to extemporaneity, Aristotle claims that it is to be found in the lower animals as well as in the inanimate objects. He describes spontaneity thus: 'events which (1) belong to the general class of things that may come to pass for the sake of something, (2) do not come to pass for the sake of what actually results, and (3) have an external cause may be described by the phrase "from spontaneity'. He further expresses that these spontaneous event may be said to be 'from chance' if they are also the objects of deliberate intentions. He declares them to be the mode of causation as they, in some way, also constitute the source of change. Because he maintains that some natural or some intelligent agent is always the cause of things. The summary of the above explanation can be stated thus: 'spontaneity and chance are causes of effects which, though they might result from intelligence or nature, have in fact been caused by something incidentally'. Now since nothing which is incidental is prior to what is per se, it is clear that no incidental cause can be prior to a cause per se. Spontaneity and chance, therefore are posterior to intelligence and nature. Hence, however true it may be that heavens are due to spontaneity, it will still be true that intelligence and nature will be prior causes of all this and many things in it besides.'

Aristotle expresses that the physicist must know the four causes essentially in order to assign the 'why' in the way befitting the science, i.e. in terms of the matter, the form, the mover, and 'that for the sake of which'. He thus implies that the 'why' is answered by referring to the matter, to the form, and to primary moving cause. As far as 'necessity' is concerned, he explains the necessary in nature in terms of matter and the changes in it. He says that the physicist must take into account both the causes and particularly the end. This is because, according to him, the end is the cause of the matter. We shall discuss more on this in the following section on *Metaphysics*. For the time being we should focus on what Aristotle says about the end. For him, the end is nothing but 'that for the sake of which'.

Now, apart from nature, form, matter, causes that we have discussed above we all know that physics also deals with the notions of motion, space, and time. Therefore, Aristotle considers it equally important to dwell upon these basic concepts of physics too. To start with, he interprets motion as the movement or passage of matter into form. He talks of four such types of movements. These have been aptly brought out by Stace in his book, *A Critical History of Greek Philosophy*. He says that the first type of motion is one that affects the substance of a thing, its origination and decease. Second is the movement which brings about qualitative change. The third type of motion results in the change of quantity whereby there is an increase and decrease and finally there is locomotion that implies change of place. Out of these Aristotle considers the last one to be the most basic and important.

As far as space is concerned, Aristotle does not seem to agree with the definition of space as the void. For him empty space is an impossible notion. This is reflected in his rejection of Plato's and Parmenides's claim that elements are composed of geometrical figures. In a similar manner, he also repudiates the mechanical hypothesis that quality is based on quantity that is on the composition and decomposition of its elements. He asserts on contrary that quality has an independent existence. Further, Aristotle is also not comfortable with the view that space is a physical thing. He objects that on this view there would be two bodies occupying the same place at the same time that is the body itself and the space it occupies. Thus, he conceives space to be a limit. He defines it as the limit of the surrounding body towards what is surrounded. In some sense it indicates that in his view space is not infinite.

Coming to the notion of time, he defines it as the measure of motion in regard to what is earlier and later. So time is dependent on motion for its existence. Time is understood with respect to all the changes in the universe. Had there been no change, we would not have any idea of time. Since time involves a measuring or counting of motion, Aristotle argues that its existence also depends upon a counting mind. Thus, he tries to convey that had [there been no minds there could be no time either. According to Aristotle, there are two essential elements in time, namely change and consciousness. Aristotle also answers Zeno's proposal regarding the infinite divisibility of space and time. He opines that space and time are potentially divisible in the above stated sense. But actually they are not so divided because we do not experience them as infinitely divided. Having commented on the notions of physics, he takes on the scale of being. This composes the main subject of physics for him. Calling it also as the scale of values, he asserts that the higher in the scale has more worth in it as the principle of form. Moreover, by way of the scale of being, Aristotle also proposes a theory of development along with a theory of evolution. Hence we shall now study about the scale of being and see how it also harbors in it the aforementioned theories.

The bottom line of the scale of being is well expressed by his statement that the lower develops into the higher. He declares that the process is not time-bound. It is, he insists, a logical process. Consequently, the development that he talks about is to be seen as a logical development. Aristotle explains that the lower always contains the higher, potentially, and the higher contains the lower, actually. So what is implicitly present in the lower gets explicitly reflected in the higher. In other words, that which is latent in the lower form becomes more and more realized in the higher form. According to Aristotle, there appears to be no difference between the higher and the lower except that the former is a more evolved state. In terms of form and matter the higher is the form whereas the lower is the matter, or we can also assume from this that that the latter serves as the foundation of the former. Thus, Aristotle attempts to show how the entire universe is one continuous chain. It is not a time bound process but an eternal process in which the one ultimate reality is eternally exhibited in every sphere of development.

There is another side of the scale of being which Aristotle tries to explain with the help of the distinction between the organic and the inorganic. He says that nature is the first to provide us with this distinction. The inorganic matter is located at the bottom of the scale, and its end lies external to it. Therefore, the essential function of the inorganic matter is to move in space in the direction of its external end. In the present time we call such a movement as gravitation. On the other hand, he claims that the form of a thing involves its organization. That is to say that the higher in the scale is more organized than the lower. From this he derives that if the end of the inorganic matter is external to it, the end of the organic matter has its end internal to it. In other words, Aristotle wants to assert that every organic matter has an inward self-developing principle. It is very crucial to mention here that by organic matter the philosopher means an organism. This will become clear as we proceed further. Now, he points out that the activity of the organic matter consists in spatial movement. Likewise, he holds that the activity of the organic matter comprises of its internal growth. By internal growth, Aristotle means inward organization which is definite and constitutes the principle of the form. Aristotle calls this inward organization to be the life or the soul of the organism. Human soul is also a likewise organization of the body. So from organism, Aristotle arrives at the idea of the living soul. He interprets the living soul as having lower and higher grades of being. The higher grade concerns a higher realization of the principle of form. He expresses that the self-realization is also expressed in the form of self-preservation. This means preservation of the individual, and occasions two very important functions namely nutrition and propagation.

Accordingly, Aristotle classifies in the lowest grade those organisms whose functions are to nourish them, grow, and propagate their kind. He places the animals next to the plants in the scale of being. Since the higher contains the lower, as we have stated earlier, the animals share with the plants the functions of nutrition and propagation. But at the same time, the higher exhibits a further realization that is peculiar to its form. The characteristic that places the animals above the plants is the possession of sensation. Thus sense-perception is the special function of the animals. They therefore possess both the nutritive and the sensitive souls. Along with the sensations, the animals also possess the power of locomotion. This is because sensations come in the form of pleasure and pain. This generates the impulse to avoid the pain and seek the pleasure which is achieved only by the power of locomotion. Plants do not possess the power to move, subject to the sensations of pleasure and pain. After the animals it is the position of man in the scale of being. Man as a higher organism has in him all the principles of lower organisms. He nourishes himself, grows, propagates his kind, moves around, and is gifted with sense-perception. But what is his special function that raises him above the plants and animals? According to Aristotle, it is his reason that advances man beyond the animals. Thus, the soul of man is not only nutritive and sensitive but also rational. Moving ahead, he classifies human consciousness into lower and higher grades as he did in the case of the soul. By grades, he means the different stages of consciousness and not the various 'parts' of soul as Plato had interpreted. These stages are the different aspects of the activity of the same being and represent different stages of its development. Aristotle interprets them as 'faculties'. The lowest faculty, according to him, is the sense-perception. Above this is the common sense. Next in the upward direction is the faculty of imagination, the power of forming mental images that everyone possesses. The next faculty is memory by which past sense-perceptions are copied. Beyond the memory is the faculty of recollection by which memory-images are deliberately evoked. Finally, from recollection there is a passage to the faculty of reason. Even in the reason he locates two grades, a lower and a higher. The former is passive and the latter is active. When the reason is passive, mind is like a wax and when the reason becomes active, the mind begins to think. The sum total of all these faculties constitutes the soul, as per Aristotle. He asserts that the soul has no existence without matter in the same way in which form is inseparable from matter. Thus, he denies Plato's doctrine that the soul reincarnates itself in new bodies. He holds that since the soul is the form of the body, it is not separable from it. Thus, the connection between them is essentially organic and not just mechanical. Soul for him is the end or the function of the body. In this way, Aristotle tries to connect the study of soul as a part of his physics. He relates the soul to the organic body just as actuality is related to potentiality. It, therefore, acts as the 'substance' of the organic body. It corresponds to the definition of the essence of the organic body the way he explains that the essence of an axe is to facilitate the act of cutting.

However, it seems that Aristotle's description of chance outcomes parallels his account of what an outcome of luck is. A chance outcome is an event with very specific traits. It is an event which involves the action of a non-rational agent. Furthermore, it is of a kind to promote a certain end. For instance, the horse's coming to a certain location the per se cause of the animal's being saved. This type of event, however, does not come to be for the sake of its effect. To return to the Phys. 197b15-16 example, Aristotle explicitly states that the horse did not come to the particular location for the purpose of being saved; it came for a different reason which the text does not specify. Hence, it follows that a chance outcome\* comes to be incidentally; it is the incidental result of a causal chain aimed at an end other than the one actually realized.

## **2.6.6: Study on Metaphysics**

At the outset, it is important to mention that the term 'metaphysics' was invented by Andronicus, one of the early editors of Aristotle's works, to serve a title for a group of treatises which he placed

after the physics. It is in this sense that we use the term metaphysics now. As far as Aristotle is concerned he used the phrase 'first philosophy' to describe the subject matter of metaphysics, which concerns the first, highest, or most of general principles of the universe. In other words, metaphysics deal with the discovery of ultimate principle<sup>1</sup>; or the ultimate cause of the world. It is the science of the highest order, according to Aristotle, since it deals with the general principles. All other sciences, he says, are lower than metaphysics in a logical sequence because they deal with one or other aspect of the being. In Metaphysics A.1, Aristotle says that "all men suppose what is called wisdom to deal with the first causes and the principles of things" and it is these causes and principles that he proposes to study in this work. It is his customary practice to begin an inquiry by reviewing the opinions previously held by others, and that is what he does here, as Book A continues with a history of the thought of his predecessors about causes and principles.

These causes and principles are clearly the subject matter of what he calls 'first philosophy'. But this does not mean the branch of philosophy that should be studied first. Rather, it concerns issues that are in some sense the most fundamental or at the highest level of generality. Aristotle distinguished between things that are "better known to us" and things that are "better known in themselves," and maintained that we should begin our study of a given topic with things better known to us and arrive ultimately at an understanding of things better known in themselves. The principles studied by 'first philosophy' may seem very general and abstract, but they are, according to Aristotle, better known in themselves, however remote they may seem from the world of ordinary experience. Still, since they are to be studied only by one who has already studied nature, they are quite appropriately described as coming "after the Physics." Aristotle's description 'the study of being qua being' is frequently and easily misunderstood, for it seems to suggest that there is a single (albeit special) subject matter—being qua being—that is under investigation. But Aristotle's description does not involve two things—(1) a study and (2) a subject matter (being qua being)—for he did not think that there is any such subject matter as 'being qua being'. Rather, his description involves three things: (1) a study, (2) a subject matter (being), and (3) a manner in which the subject matter is studied. Aristotle's Greek word that has been Latinized as 'qua' means roughly 'in so far as' or 'under the aspect'. A study of x qua y, then, is a study of x that concerns itself solely with the y aspect of x. So Aristotle's study does not concern some recondite subject matter known as 'being qua being'. Rather it is a study of being, or better, of beings—of things that can be said to be—that studies them in a particular way: as beings, in so far as they are beings. Of course, first philosophy is not the only field of inquiry to study beings. Natural science and mathematics also study beings, but in different ways, under different aspects. The natural scientist studies them as things that are subject to the laws of nature, as things that move and undergo change. That is, the natural scientist studies things qua movable (i.e., in so far as they are subject to change). The mathematician studies things qua countable and measurable. The metaphysician, on the other hand, studies them in a more general and abstract way—qua beings. So first philosophy studies the causes and principles of beings qua beings. Aristotle adds that for this reason it studies the causes and principles of substances. We will explain this connection in Section 3 below.

In Book E, Aristotle adds another description to the study of the causes and principles of beings qua beings. Whereas natural science studies objects that are material and subject to change, and mathematics studies objects that although not subject to change are nevertheless not separate from (i.e., independent of) matter, there is still room for a science that studies things (if indeed there are any) that are eternal, not subject to change, and independent of matter. Such a science, he says, is theology, and this is the "first" and "highest" science. Aristotle's identification of theology, so conceived, with the study of being qua being has proved challenging to his interpreters. Finally, we may note that in Book B, Aristotle delineates his subject matter in a different way, by listing the problems or perplexities (aporiai) he hopes to deal with. Characteristic of these perplexities, he

says, is that they tie our thinking up in knots. They include the following, among others: Are sensible substances the only ones that exist, or are there others besides them? Is it kinds or individuals that are the elements and principles of things? And if it is kinds, which ones: the most generic or the most specific? Is there a cause apart from matter? Is there anything apart from material compounds? Are the principles limited, either in number or in kind? Are the principles of perishable things themselves perishable? Are the principles universal or particular, and do they exist potentially or actually? Are mathematical objects (numbers, lines, figures, points) substances? If they are, are they separate from or do they always belong to sensible things? And (“the hardest and most perplexing of all,” Aristotle says) are unity and being the substance of things, or are they attributes of some other subject? In the remainder of Book B, Aristotle presents arguments on both sides of each of these issues, and in subsequent books he takes up many of them again. But it is not always clear precisely how he resolves them, and it is possible that Aristotle did not think that the *Metaphysics* contains definitive solutions to all of these perplexities.

However, in order to understand the problems and project of Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, it is best to begin with one of his earlier works, the *Categories*. Although placed by long tradition among his logical works, due to its analysis of the terms that make up the propositions out of which deductive inferences are constructed, the *Categories* begins with a strikingly general and exhaustive account of the things there are beings. According to this account, beings can be divided into ten distinct categories. They include substance, quality, quantity, and relation, among others. Of these categories of beings, it is the first, substance to which Aristotle gives a privileged position. Substances are unique in being independent things; the items in the other categories all depend somehow on substances. That is, qualities are the qualities of substances; quantities are the amounts and sizes that substances come in; relations are the way substances stand to one another. These various non-substances all owe their existence to substances each of them, as Aristotle puts it, exists only ‘in’ a subject. That is, each non-substance “is in something, not as a part, and cannot exist separately from what it is in” Indeed, it becomes clear that substances are the subjects that these ontologically dependent non-substances are ‘in’.

Every member of a non-substance category thus stands in this inherence to some substance or other—color is always found in bodies, knowledge in the soul. Neither whiteness nor a piece of grammatical knowledge, for example, is capable of existing on its own. Each requires for its existence that there be some substance in which it inheres. In addition to this fundamental inherence relation across categories, Aristotle also points out another fundamental relation that obtains between items within a single category. He describes this as the relation of “being said of a subject,” and his examples make clear that it is the relation of a more general to a less general thing within a single category. Thus, man is ‘said of’ a particular man, and animal is ‘said of’ man, and therefore, as Aristotle points out, animal is ‘said of’ the particular man also. The ‘said of’ relation, that is to say, is transitive. So the genus is ‘said of’ the species and both genus and species are ‘said of’ the particular. The same holds in non-substance categories. In the category of quality, for example, the genus (color) is ‘said of’ the species and both genus and species are ‘said of’ the particular white. There has been considerable scholarly dispute about these particulars in no substance categories. For more detail, see the supplementary document:

However, Aristotle was the first philosopher to formalize the subject of *Metaphysics*. As Aristotle explains, *Metaphysics* is the study of the One Substance (and its Properties) which exists and causes all things, and is therefore the necessary foundation for all human knowledge. Aristotle (and Leibniz) was correct to realize that One Substance must have Properties that cause matter's interconnected activity and Motion. Though Aristotle did not know what existed, he explained the scientific method such that we could determine these ourselves. Thus Aristotle's ideas are very

important, for within them are the clues to the solution of this most profound of all problems, 'what exists', and thus what it means to be 'human'. Ancient Greek Philosophy, of which Aristotle was the high point, marked a fundamental turning point in the evolution of humanity and our ideas about our existence in the universe. Over the past 2,500 years Aristotle's philosophy has directly contributed to the evolution of our current science reason based society. Thus it is unfortunate that many people imagine our post-modern society to now be so 'enlightened' that Aristotle (and other Ancient Greek Philosophers) have become irrelevant. In fact the opposite is true. As Bertrand Russell observed it was the Ancient Greek Philosophers who first discovered and discussed the fundamental Principles of Philosophy, Physics and Metaphysics, and most significantly, little has been added to their knowledge since. As Einstein wrote; somebody who only reads newspapers and at best books of contemporary authors looks to me like an extremely near-sighted person who scorns eyeglasses. He is completely dependent on the prejudices and fashions of his times, since he never gets to see or hear anything else. And what a person thinks on his own without being stimulated by the thoughts and experiences of other people is even in the best case rather paltry and monotonous. There are only a few enlightened people with a lucid mind and style and with good taste within a century. What has been preserved of their work belongs among the most precious possessions of mankind. We owe it to a few writers of antiquity (Plato, Aristotle, etc.) that the people in the Middle Ages could slowly extricate themselves from the superstitions and ignorance that had darkened life for more than half a millennium. Nothing is more needed to overcome the modernist's snobbishness.

### **2.6.7: Study on the Rejection of Plato's Theory of Ideas**

Aristotle has stated that, "Wisdom will never die with Plato", and on another occasion he said, Plato is dear, but truth is dearer. As mentioned above, while Academy was dedicated to speculative and political philosophy, Lyceum took biology and natural sciences seriously. But metaphysics or first philosophy occupies a central role in his scheme of things as well. According to him, mathematical and physical sciences treat of the quantity, quality, and relations of things. On the other hand, the first philosophy deals with the category of substance and also studies the causes of things. It enquires into the nature of being without considering the conditions imposed by space and time. The absolute and necessary being, as understood by Aristotle, is the eternal essence of things as opposed to the relative, contingent, and accidental. In this regard he agrees with Plato to a great deal. Aristotle's major criticism of Plato's philosophy targeted the latter's idea of universal essences. For Plato they are universal and objective realities and they exist independent of objects. They are eternal and imperishable and the objects in the world are fundamentally unreal and are mere copies of these eternal essences. Aristotle agrees with Plato on many counts. But he opposes the latter's transcendentalism, which maintains that the essences are apart from the things. According to Aristotle, essences or forms are immanent to things.

As Russell says, Aristotle considered them as common nouns and not as objective realities and things. Any name capable of universal application to the members of a class represents a universal. Opposing Plato's theory, which posits them as abstract original forms to which objects "participate", Aristotle initiates the third man argument. This argument aims at criticizing Plato's theory of ideas, which according to Aristotle states that, "a man is a man because he resembles or participates in the idea of man in the world of essences." Aristotle states that, if a man is a man because he resembles the ideal man, there must be a still more ideal man to whom both ordinary men and the ideal man are similar. Aristotle intends to demonstrate that the notion of imitation or copying used in the theory of forms runs into logical difficulties. In order to explain the similarity between a man and the form of man, one needs to construe a third form of man and this always requires another form and hence the theory of ideas leads to ad infinitum. Aristotle further

asks whether the ideal man is an ideal animal. If he is, there must be as many ideal animals as there are species of animals. Again, how do the perfect and the eternal world be held responsible for the imperfect and perishable world of material objects? Plato's transcendentalism conceived Ideas as real beings existing apart from the individuals, which express them. Aristotle finds this position objectionable. He asks, if the general Idea is the substance of the particulars or the essence of the things, how can it exist apart from that of which it is the substance and the essence? He affirms that the general cannot exist outside of and alongside of the particular. According to him ideas considered as such and apart from the things, are not real beings or substances. Opposing Plato he maintains that the phenomenal world is not unreal and argues that both form and matter coexist in the world of objects. Their coexistence is responsible for the existence of the world we live. Since he considers this world as real he finds it worthwhile in pursuing knowledge about it. This makes natural scientific investigations meaningful and important. He maintains that genuine scientific knowledge is not a mere acquaintance with facts as knowledge consists in knowing the reasons and causes of things and it should explain why they cannot be other than what they are. The theory of form-matter coexistence answers these fundamental questions. Aristotle asserts that ideas do not and cannot exist apart from things. On the other hand, they are inherent or immanent in things. The idea is the form of the thing, and cannot be separated from it except by abstraction. It is the essence of the particular and with it constitutes an indivisible whole. For example, Aristotle would hold that there is manhood because there are actual men in this world. There is parenthood, because there are parents. Russell elucidates Aristotle's argument of immanence with an interesting Aristotle's concept of matter is unique. According to him matter is coexistent with form and different forms design matter differently in the process of evolution of objects. It is something that changes and Aristotle believed that each concrete instance of matter has an inner purpose. It is destined to become something. But Aristotle also maintains that matter has no reality apart from the form, as matter without the Idea is also an abstraction like Idea apart from particular object. We shall take a concrete example of a pen in order to understand the concept of matter and matter-form relationship. Let us consider the form and matter of a ball pen. The form of the ball point pen is constituted by the properties of the pen, it has a ballpoint, it has ink in it, it can be used to write and can be held by the hand. Matter on the other hand is the material stuff to which these properties are attached to, the material by which the pen is made up of etc. The form of the pen, he affirms, is inherent in the material stuff. The former does not have an existence apart from and independent of the latter or many such pens. But in a unique manner, the form is independent, as it does not depend on any particular pen in this world. At the same time, Aristotle is not prepared to separate the form completely from the actual pens in the world. Aristotle's philosophical perspective advocates avoiding the extremes and adopting a middle path. His metaphysical theory thus adopts a position, which avoids the extremes of Platonism and Atomism. He rejects Plato's view, which considers essences alone as real and the material world as illusion. As a consequence of his idealism, Plato also affirmed that all change is an illusion. The Atomists, on the other hand, advocated a unique form of materialism, which holds that everything is made up of atoms. According to them, the ultimate reality is constitutive of atoms and they try to explain the nature of reality and world in quantitative terms. They hold that atoms have no natural properties and all qualities and nature of objects result from a combination of atoms. Atoms themselves have no natural qualities. To this Aristotle responds by arguing that, if qualities and properties are not actually there but are only illusions, then the sensible world cannot be trusted. Aristotle holds that everything that exists has a definite nature and hence is potential to become something. Aristotle explains matter in terms of substantial material elements: earth, water, fire, air and ether. These five basic elements have qualities and each is distinguished from the other in terms of their unique quality and hence things have definite nature. Hence the Atomists' doctrine is unacceptable for him. Aristotle says that these qualities can transfer through matter.

One important aspect of Aristotle's metaphysics is his conception that all change is evolution. He maintains that all change is evolution. Form and matter, according to him, eternally coexist as they cannot be separated from one another. The form of an object changes when it evolves into another thing. For example, seed into tree. Here matter remains more or less the same and different forms design the matter differently. In this process of evolution, the seed becomes a tree; it realizes its purpose. Aristotle here provides a teleological explanation of the universe in terms of the matter-form relationship. Though the forms are eternal and non-perishable and here Aristotle subscribes to the Platonic view—he maintains that they are nevertheless not transcendent. It is often stated that Aristotle has brought forms from heaven to earth. According to him, they are not apart from things but in them. They are not transcendent, but immanent. On the other hand, matter too is equally real and eternal. It is not non-being, but dynamic and is in the process of change. Matter realizes the form or idea of the thing in the process of evolution. Aristotle explains the problem of change in the world with this dualism of form and matter and their constant coexistence. Here Aristotle significantly deviates from Plato's position, which held that all change is illusion. According to Plato the material world is a copy and hence no knowledge is possible about it. We can form only opinions about it. Aristotle on the other hand considers the material world as real and explains it in terms of the above described form-matter coexistence. His conception of change becomes relevant in this context. His theory of change is different from most of his predecessors. Unlike Plato and Parmenides, he never treated change as unreal and an illusion. But he does not agree with Heraclitus and others who find nothing but blind change as real. Aristotle adopts a middle path and affirms that all change is not illusion. Change is not blind, but purposeful and meaningful. Every entity in nature is actually something and has the potential to become something else. For example, the seed is actually a seed but it has the potential to become a tree. According to Aristotle, in the seed state, the form of seed fashions or shapes in order to make it an actual seed. But as the seed progresses to the tree, it gets shaped and designed by different other forms. Finally the seed actualizes its potentials and becomes a tree. Aristotle thus considers both change and permanence are real. In change it is the form that changes while the matter remains the same. Change occurs when the arrangement of the matter changes. Even though the form of an object can change, it is form, not matter that provides the order and permanence in the world. The matter of all things is ultimately the same. Underlying this conception of change is his idea that all change is purposeful, because, according to him all change is evolution. He further explains this theory with a teleological explanation. He contends that the essential form of a thing determines what an object is and it guides the changes and development of that thing. Hence changes are not blind or illusory, but are intelligible. During evolution an organism realizes its purpose. Hence, there is no concept of complete change. Only some aspects of the form of a thing changes and as long as a thing remains in existence, its essential form remains the same. An apple seed will evolve into an apple tree and not to anything else. The form of the matter changes in those ways that are necessary for it to become an apple tree. Again, while Plato rejected the world as illusion, for Aristotle it is real. The world is not just an imitation or a shadow, but a reality and hence it is possible to have knowledge about it. Consequently, Aristotle believes that studying the processes of the natural world is not worthless. This approach to the physical world and knowledge about it had encouraged the growth of natural sciences. We can see that the systematic study of natural sciences began with Aristotle's systematic approach to the knowledge about the natural world. It was he who initiated the classification of the living universe as species and genera, which even today lies at the foundation of elementary scientific enquiries.

Further, Aristotle points out that Plato has failed to explain the relation of ideas to things. He only says, as we have seen in the *Republic*, that things or particulars are copies of ideas which are universal. Aristotle views such explanations as mere utterances of poetic metaphors. He says that these do not give a real account of the relation between ideas and things. He writes: 'And to say that they are patterns and the other things share in them is to use empty words and poetical

metaphors....And anything can either be, or become, like another without being copied from it, so that whether Socrates exists or not a man like Socrates might come to be; and this might be so even if Socrates were eternal. And there will be several patterns of the same thing ... again the Forms are patterns not only of sensible things, but of Forms themselves also...therefore the same thing will be pattern and copy.' Aristotle points out that Plato's theory of ideas fail to explain motion or movements of things. He says that the ideas themselves being immutable and motionless, cannot explain a world of motion as a copy of these ideas. Thus the picture of world portrayed by Plato's theory of ideas is at best, a static world. But in reality, the world is a world of change, motion, and becoming. Aristotle points out that if one deduces white object from a mere idea of whiteness, it cannot explain why these objects arise, decay, and cease to exist. That is to say the theory of ideas does not explain the movement in things in terms of their growth and decay.

Further, Aristotle contests Plato's claim that ideas are non-sensuous. He points out that for Plato there is no difference between the horse and the idea of the horse; or between man and the idea of a man. Aristotle finds the expressions 'in itself or 'in-general' to be nonsensical and meaningless. He charges Plato for employing these expressions with every object only to make them appear as something different. Aristotle criticizes him by bringing out that the ideas are nothing but hypostatized things of the sense. For him Plato's ideas are like 'anthropomorphic gods of the popular religion'. Aristotle also uses his ingenious 'third man' argument to attack Plato's theory of ideas. He says that Plato uses ideas to explain what is common to a number of objects. The Ideas are thus derived from these common elements. But apart from this, he says that there is a common element between an individual object and the idea of that object. This further produces another idea, which he calls the 'third man'. Likewise, this process goes ad infinitum, which makes the theory of ideas redundant.

Finally, the most important and serious objection that Aristotle levels against Plato's ideas is the latter's assumption that ideas are the essences of things, and the claim that these essences exist outside the things themselves. Aristotle argues that essences must inhere in the things and not outside of them. So, whereas Plato places his ideas as universals in a mysterious world, Aristotle holds that universals must exist in the particular only. He explains that the universal horse is not something different from the individual horses. Plato on the other hand tries to give an impression that besides the individual horses, there is also a horse-in-general. Aristotle finds this a highly contradictory position. He brings out that Plato's theory of ideas first tries to portray that the universals are real and particulars are unreal; and then end up degrading the universals into the particulars through 'participation.' On the basis of this objection, Aristotle derives the fundamental principle of his philosophy. He claims not only that the universal is the absolute reality, but also that the universal exists in the particular. Now, the primary concern of every metaphysician is to examine what is reality or what is substance? So Aristotle tries to assess which among the two, the universal or the particular, fits into definition of substance. As we have seen, in his *On Categories*, Aristotle tries to convey that a substance is that which has an independent existence of its own, that is never a predicate, but to which all predicates are applied.

First, he takes the universals and declares that it alone cannot constitute a substance because a universal is a predicate common to all the members of a particular class. For instance 'humanness' is a predicate common to all man. As per the above definition, substance itself cannot be a predicate. Therefore, universals which are common predicates cannot replace the 'substance'. Consequently, we cannot ascribe 'humanness' as the status of a substance. But then one can ask: what about the particular? Even in this regard, Aristotle maintains that since a particular is not isolated and absolute, i.e. it does not have an existence of its own. And therefore, it cannot be called a substance. For instance, he says that 'humanness' cannot exist apart from man and man

also has no existence if taken away from 'humanness'. So the individual man cannot fit into the category of substance. It appears therefore that neither the universal nor the particular alone can constitute a substance. Hence, substance must be a combination of the two, i.e. a substance must be, according to Aristotle, the universal in the particular. This way of defining a substance, makes the substance not only real and existent, but also absolute. In other words, the universal and the particular are not conceivable apart from one another. This is what he has tried to highlight in his criticisms against Plato's theory of ideas. It is therefore significant to study Aristotle's views on substance in more detail. As mentioned above, Aristotle adopts a teleological approach and attempts to explain everything, including human reality with the assumption that the nature of reality, including the human world, can be explained teleologically; as the actualization of a purpose. According to him, the purpose of human life is eudemonia. Before we explain what this constitutes, let us examine his conception of human reality. Aristotle conceived ethics as a very important science and according to him it deals with actual human behavior. Unlike Plato, he affirmed that the empirical world and life in it are valuable. But unlike the materialists, he adopts a teleological conception of human life and hence conceived that there is a higher purpose to life, which needs to be realized in our present life in this world. Russell comments that, Aristotle's metaphysics, roughly speaking, may be described as Plato diluted by common sense. He is difficult because Plato and common sense do not mix easily. The first point that Aristotle debates in Plato's theory of ideas is the fact that his ideas do not explain the existence of things. Just by merely having an idea of whiteness, Aristotle claims, and one cannot derive the existence of white objects. Thus, the explanation of the world or reality which is the main issue or problem of philosophy has not been successfully done by Plato's theory of ideas.

### **2.6.8: Study on Substance**

Aristotle's physics, and further it would be evident from his theory of causation, that Aristotle has primarily been focused on the issue of first principles and the first causes. Many of the concepts analyzed by philosophers have their origin in ordinary or at least extra-philosophical language. Perception, knowledge, causation, and mind would be examples of this. But the concept of substance is essentially a philosophical term of art. Its uses in ordinary language tend to derive, often in a rather distorted way, from the philosophical senses. (Such expressions as 'a person of substance' or 'a substantial reason' would be cases of this. 'Illegal substances' is nearer to one of the philosophical uses, but not the main one.) There is an ordinary concept in play when philosophers discuss 'substance', and this, as we shall see, is the concept of object, or thing when this is contrasted with properties or events. But such 'individual substances' are never termed 'substances' outside philosophy.

There could be said to be two rather different ways of characterizing the philosophical concept of substance. The first is the more generic. The philosophical term 'substance' corresponds to the Greek thought, which means 'being', transmitted via the Latin *substantialis*, which means 'something that stands under or grounds things'. According to the generic sense, therefore, the substances in a given philosophical system are those things which, according to that system, are the foundational or fundamental entities of reality. Thus, for an atomist, atoms are the substances, for they are the basic things from which everything is constructed. In David Hume's system, impressions and ideas are the substances, for the same reason. In a slightly different way, Forms are Plato's substances, for everything derives its existence from Forms. In this sense of 'substance' any realist philosophical system acknowledges the existence of substances. Probably the only theories which do not would be those forms of logical positivism or pragmatism which treat ontology as a matter of convention. According to such theories, there are no real facts about what is ontologically basic, and so nothing is objectively substance.

The second use of the concept is more specific. According to this, substances are a particular kind of basic entity, and some philosophical theories acknowledge them and others do not. On this use, Hume's impressions and ideas are not substances, even though they are the building blocks of—what constitutes 'being' for his world. According to this usage, it is a live issue whether the fundamental entities are substances or something else, such as events, or properties located at space-times. This conception of substance derives from the intuitive notion of individual thing or object, which contrast mainly with properties and events. The issue is how we are to understand the notion of an object, and whether, in the light of the correct understanding, it remains a basic notion, or one that must be characterized in more fundamental terms. Whether, for example, an object can be thought of as nothing more than a bundle of properties, or a series of events.

It may then be asked: what are these principles and causes of? Aristotle answers that the principles and causes are essentially of substances. He writes: 'The subject of our inquiry is substance; for the principles and the causes we are seeking are those of substances. For if the universe is of the nature of a whole, substance is its first part; and if it coheres merely by virtue of serial succession, on this view also substance is first, and is succeeded by quality, and then by quantity'<sup>30</sup>. Thus, he claims that substance is the first principle or the first cause. In support of his position, he further states that there is no other category except the category of substance that can exist on its own. He refers both to his predecessors and 'present day' philosophers to show how they too gave primacy to the category of substance. As far as the early philosophers are concerned, he explains that they testified the primacy of substance because it was only of substance that they were seeking the principles, elements, and causes. By 'present day' philosophers, he mainly means Plato, Xenocrates and Speusippus and claims that they ranked 'universal' as substances. These philosophers talked about the genera. According to Aristotle, genera are universal which were described as principal and substances by them. The old thinkers, he adds, ranked the particular things as substances like fire, earth, and so on.

Further, Aristotle divides substance into three kinds, sensible substances, substances that can be known by their elements, and immovable substances. He elaborates that the sensible substances are those that are divisible into eternal and perishable kinds. It is the latter that is recognized by all men and includes plants, animals, etc. The substances in the second category are those that can be grasped by their numbers. For instance, we say of these substances whether they are one or many. The immovable substances are those that, according to some thinkers, are capable of existing apart. Others divide it into two kinds, and there are still others who identify the forms and objects of mathematics with it. The first two, he says, belong to physics as they imply movement: the third type of substance belongs to some other science, according to him. Regarding the sensible substance, he maintains that they are changeable, and it is the 'matter which is the subject of change'. He enumerates four kinds of changes. These are with respect to quality, quantity, place and thickness. The change with respect to quality is alteration. With respect to quantity, it is 'increase and diminution'. The change of place is motion; and lastly, the change in respect of 'thickness' implies 'generation and destruction'.

Aristotle contends that all these changes necessarily indicate that the change is always from the given states to its contrary. Since matter undergoes the changes so discussed, it must be capable of both the states, i.e. the given state and its contrary state. So what Aristotle tries to assert is that all things that change have matter. But at the same time, he holds that matter is different for different things. For example, eternal things that are not gettable but movable do not have matter for generation but have matter for motion. Thus, Aristotle concludes that the causes and principles are three fold. Two of these constitute the pair of contraries, of these one is definition and form and the other is privation, and the third one, according to him, is the matter.

It, therefore, follows that change implies not only form and privation, but also matter. He asserts that neither matter nor form comes into being. This is because, he explains, that everything that undergoes a change is something, and is changed by something into something. That which brings about the change is the immediate mover, according to Aristotle, the one which undergoes the change is the matter, and that into which it is changed is the form. He also adds that whatever comes into being comes from a substance of the same kind and 'shares its name. He talks of four different ways by which things come into being: these are by art, by nature, by luck, and by spontaneity. Of these, he says that art is the principle of movements in something and not in the thing moved. But nature, on the contrary is a principle of movement in the thing itself. Luck and spontaneity, according to Aristotle, is privation of these two.

Thus, there are three kinds of substances as claimed by Aristotle: the matter, which is a 'this' in appearance; the nature, which is the 'this' towards which the movement takes place; and lastly, the particular substance which is composed of these two. The specific response is that in some cases the 'this' constituting the form, does not exist apart from the composite substance. For instance, the form of house does not exist apart from the art of building. However, he claims that if ever there is a possibility of form existing independent of the composite substance, it is in the case of natural objects. It is in this sense that he supposes that there is some validity in Plato's claim, when the latter expresses that there are as many forms (ideas) as there are natural objects. However, he alters his position as soon as he analyses the causes. Aristotle holds, with regard to the causes, that the existence of moving causes precedes the effects. So, health is the cause and it exists simultaneously with the effect that is the health of a man. It is on this ground that Aristotle attempts to show that there is no necessity for the existence of ideas or form. He explains that, speaking naturally, a man is begotten by a man. This means that a human being is created by another human being. Similarly, in the context of arts, he says that medical art is the formal cause of health.

Further, Aristotle holds that things are composed of elements that are numerically different but are same in kind. These elements are causes. Apart from these, Aristotle says that everything also has something external which constitute its moving cause. In this way Aristotle tries to show that while 'principle' and 'element' are different, both are causes. Moreover, he holds that something which is responsible for producing motion or rest is both a principle and a substance. Consequently, he asserts that analogically there are three elements and four causes and principles. Besides, he also maintains that things also have proximate and ultimate moving causes. The proximate moving causes, he claims, is different for different things. For example, the proximate moving causes for health, disease, and body is the medical art; for bricks, it is the art of building; and in case of natural things, like man, it is the man; and in the products of thought, it is the form or its contrary. These make up for three causes. But Aristotle claims that there are, in a sense, four causes because 'there is that which as first of all things moves all things'. These constitute the ultimate moving causes. Thus, Aristotle shows that all things have the same causes, because if there are no substances, then there are no modifications and movements either. Aristotle goes ahead further in this context and contends that actuality and potency are also principles common to all things, but they apply differently in different cases. The division into potency and actuality stands in a definite relation to the previous division into matter, form, and privation. He explains that in some cases the same thing exists at one time actually and at another potentially. He gives the example of wine or flesh or man to support his position. He expresses that the form exists actually, if it can exist on its own, and so does the complex, which is formed out of the form and matter, as well as the privation like disease or darkness. Matter, says Aristotle, has a potential existence because it becomes qualified either by the form or by the privation.

Subsequently, there also is another way, in which the above stated distinction is applicable. For this, Aristotle refers to cases where the maker of cause and that of effect is not the same. Besides, he also talks of cases where the form is not the same, but different. For instance, he takes the causes of man to be firstly the elements in man (comprising of fire and earth as matter, and the peculiar form); secondly, something else outside, namely the father; and lastly, the sun and its course, which are neither matter nor form nor privation of man, but are the moving causes.

Consuming said all these; Aristotle also asserts that the principles of all things are only analogous, and not identical. He expresses that they are analogous in the sense that:

1. Matter, form, privation, and the moving causes are common to all things.
2. The causes of substances may be said to be the causes of all things because when substances are removed, all things are removed
3. Which is first in terms of complete reality is the cause of all things.

But in the other sense, Aristotle insists that there are different kinds of first causes as the matters of different things are different. Thus, Aristotle clarifies how many principles of sensible things there are, and in what sense they are same and in what ways they are different. Aristotle's focus is on movement. In this context, he talks about the third type of substance which is the unmovable substance (the other two being the physical substance). He says that since movement must be eternal, there must be an eternal mover. He explains that we conceive the substances to be the first of existing things, similarly, one needs to assume that movement must have always existed. This is because we cannot think of movement as having come into being or ceasing to be. Movement is continuous and so is time. Time, like movement also must have always existed, otherwise there could not have been a before and an after. Thus, time is also continuous. And as far as movement is concerned, he particularly speaks about the circular movement that is continuous.

However, he insists that the essence of the eternal mover is its actuality and not potency because the former is prior to the latter. If something has the capacity to move all things or act on them, but fails to do so then there will be no movement at all. This is because 'that which has potency, need not exercise it'. He argues that even if we suppose that there are eternal substances, like those who believe in the forms, they do not serve any purpose unless they have in them some principle which could cause a change. Moreover, if there are substances other than the forms unless they act, they will not cause any movement. And even if they act, it would be out of potency and that would not be enough to bring about an eternal movement because what is potential, according to Aristotle, 'may possibly not be'. So, Aristotle emphasizes that if it is a principle, its essence ought to be actuality and not potency, and it must be without matter, if the principle had to be eternal.

For the above statement one may observe that movement and change are very central to Aristotle's philosophy. But when he talks in terms of the universal as a whole, he speaks about uniform change that is brought about by one principle, which acts continuously even though there may be variations in the actions. He expresses that if the principle acts in the same way, a constant cycle is produced; but if it acts in different ways, the result is generation and destruction. The first is therefore the cause of perpetual regular motion, and the cause of variety is something else. Aristotle holds that when both these work together we have the cause of perpetual variety. It follows from above discussion that there is an eternal mover. One may raise a question here that how does the eternal mover originate the movement. Aristotle contends that the eternal mover originates motion by being the primary object of desire. He spells out that it is a fact and not a mere theory that there is something which is always moved with an unceasing circular motion.

Hence, there must be something which moves it. Now, Aristotle holds that which is moved and moves is intermediate.

However, the eternal mover, according to Aristotle, is thus the 'thinking' because desire is consequent upon opinion and thinking is the starting-point of opinion. There is something which moves without being moved. It is eternal, it is actuality and it is the substance. He says, only the object of desire and the object of thought move in this way, i.e. they move without being moved.

Thus, Aristotle interprets the eternal mover or the first mover as a substance which is eternal and unmovable and separate from sensible things. It is without parts and is indivisible. It is also impassive and unalterable because all other changes are posterior to it. Besides the prime mover or the first mover, Aristotle admits of a large number of unmoved movers. Now, Aristotle wants to claim that object of such a thought must be the divine object itself. He says that the thought and the object of thought are never different when the object is immaterial. He explains that in theoretical sciences, the definition or the act of thinking is the object of thought. In other words, there is no difference between the act of thinking and the object being thought of, and also there is no room for any matter here. Thus, the divine thought and its object become the same. In other words, the thinking is one with its object. He adds that the object of divine thought is not composite either. If it were so, the thought itself would change while passing from part to part of the whole. He says that there ought to be as many unmoved movers as there are simple motions that are involved in the movement of the planets.

Thus, Aristotle derives that thought that does not have matter is indivisible, as human thought. He claims this to hold true, throughout eternity, for the thought that has only itself as its object. Now, last but not the least, he ponders upon the issue, that how the good is present in the universe both as the order of the parts, or their ruler. In other words, he wants to know the two ways in which the nature of the universe contains the good and the highest good, as something separate and by itself, or as the order of the parts. Aristotle attempts to locate the answer by using the anatomy of the army. He says the goodness of the army is found both in its order and in its leader, and more in the latter. Because the leader does not depend on the order, but the order depends on him. He expresses that all the things are ordered together. The world is not such that one thing has nothing to do with another. In fact they are all connected. Because all that are connected together have one end. He expresses that all things must come together to be dissolved into their elements. Moreover, there are functions also in which all share for the good and the whole. In this regard, Aristotle finds the views of other philosophers not too satisfactory. He concludes, 'the rule of many is not good, one ruler let there be.'

For the above it is clear that Substances are most fundamental because their existence prior to the existence of accidents and knowledge of substances is prior to that of accidents. The existence of substances is prior to that of accidents because no accident can exist unless a substance exists for it to be in. However, it is possible for a substance to exist without that accident. For example, it is possible for a desk to exist before it is painted white. Knowledge of substances is prior to that of accidents because we do not know what accidents are unless we know what substances are. We can know what substances are without knowing what accidents are. For example, we do not know what white is unless we have seen a white thing and we cannot explain whiteness without talking about white things.

One should believe substance theory for several reasons. First, it allows us to keep our common-sense understanding of the world. We can continue to believe that balls break windows, balls are things, and our standard divisions of the world are accurate. Second, it allows us to integrate a scientific understanding of the world with a common sense understanding of it. Scientists speak of how sound waves reach our ears. If we understand that sound waves are things just as puddles are

things, then we are extrapolating from what we know in order to understand what we do not know. Finally, substance theory makes nonsense of reason and science when it is rejected. If we do not believe in substances, then we are claiming that rocks, trees and computers don't exist. What really exist are atoms arranged in some way. Doing this is not only against common sense, but it also fails to properly explain the things we most clearly know. If we cannot do that, then no argument for particles will ever do anything but beg the question. Any argument that undercuts itself it against reason, therefore, we should all believe substance theory.

However there are several senses in which a thing may be said to be. In one sense it refers to what a thing is, in another sense to its quantity or quality 'or has some such predicate asserted of it'. This does not mean that the term being is homonymous. In *Metaphysics*, however, Aristotle is concerned mainly with the concept Substance, or the 'what' which indicates the substance of the thing. Substance is that category of being in virtue of which all other qualifications of being depend. So, for example, describing Socrates as tall says something about Socrates, namely that he is tall. But tallness as a category cannot stand on its own; it must be attached to something, in this case Socrates. Other categories, such as quantity, quality, relation, place, time, position, state, action and affection are not self-subsistent or capable of standing or existing apart from the category of substance which underlies all other categories. Substance enjoys a sort of logical autonomy, whereas all other kinds of beings are predicated of and dependent on substance. "Clearly then" says Aristotle, "it is in virtue of this category that each of the others is. Therefore that which is primarily and is simply must be substance".

### **2.6.9: Study on the Theory of Causation**

The theory of 'causation' is discussed as a theory involving cause and event as two distinct events, one following the other in the sequence of time and priority, and related to each other through a causal relation. In the *Posterior Analytics*, Aristotle places the following crucial condition on proper knowledge: we think we have knowledge of a thing only when we have grasped its cause. That proper knowledge is knowledge of the cause is repeated in the *Physics*: we think we do not have knowledge of a thing until we have grasped its why, that is to say, its cause. Since Aristotle obviously conceives of a causal investigation as the search for an answer to the question "why?", and a why-question is a request for an explanation, it can be useful to think of a cause as a certain type of explanation. In *Physics* II 3 and *Metaphysics* V 2, Aristotle offers his general account of the four causes. This account is general in the sense that it applies to everything that requires an explanation, including artistic production and human action. Here Aristotle recognizes four types of things that can be given in answer to a why- question

1. The material cause: "that out of which", e.g., the bronze of a statue.
2. The formal cause: "the form", "the account of what-it-is-to-be", e.g., the shape of a statue.
3. The efficient cause: "the primary source of the change or rest", e.g., the artisan, the art of bronze-casting the statue, the man who gives advice, the father of the child.
4. The final cause: "the end, that for the sake of which a thing is done", e.g., health is the end of walking, losing weight, purging, drugs, and surgical tools.

All the four (types of) causes may enter in the explanation of something. Consider the production of an artifact like a bronze statue. The bronze enters in the explanation of the production of the statue as the material cause. Note that the bronze is not only the material out of which the statue is made; it is also the subject of change, that is, the thing that undergoes the change and results in a statue. The bronze is melted and poured in order to acquire a new shape, the shape of the statue. This shape enters in the explanation of the production of the statue as the formal cause. However,

an adequate explanation of the production of a statue requires also a reference to the efficient cause or the principle that produces the statue. For Aristotle, this principle is the art of bronze-casting the statue. This is mildly surprising and requires a few words of elaboration. There is no doubt that the art of bronze-casting resides in an individual artisan who is responsible for the production of the statue. But, according to Aristotle, all the artisan does in the production of the statue is the manifestation of specific knowledge. This knowledge, not the artisan who has mastered it, is the salient explanatory factor that one should pick as the most accurate specification of the efficient cause. By picking the art, not the artisan, Aristotle is not just trying to provide an explanation of the production of the statue that is not dependent upon the desires, beliefs and intentions of the individual artisan; he is trying to offer an entirely different type of explanation; an explanation that does not make a reference, implicit or explicit, to these desires, beliefs and intentions. More directly, the art of bronze-casting the statue enters in the explanation as the efficient cause because it helps us to understand what it takes to produce the statue; that is to say, what steps are required to produce the statue. But can an explanation of this type be given without a reference to the final outcome of the production, the statue? The answer is emphatically “no”. A model is made for producing the statue. A mold is prepared for producing the statue. The bronze is melted and poured for producing the statue. Both the prior and the subsequent stage are for the sake of a certain end, the production of the statue. Clearly, the statue enters in the explanation of each step of the artistic production as the final cause or that for the sake of which everything in the production process is done.

In thinking about the four causes, we have come to understand that Aristotle offers a teleological explanation of the production of a bronze statue; that is to say, an explanation that makes a reference to the tools or end of the process. Moreover, a teleological explanation of the type sketched above does not crucially depend upon the application of psychological concepts such as desires, beliefs and intentions. This is important because artistic production provides Aristotle with a teleological model for the study of natural processes, whose explanation does not involve beliefs, desires, intentions or anything of this sort. Some have contended that Aristotle explains natural process on the basis of an inappropriately psychological teleological model; that is to say, a teleological model that involves a purposive agent who is somehow sensitive to the end. This objection can be met if the artistic model is understood in non-psychological terms. In other words, Aristotle does not psychologize nature because his study of the natural world is based on a teleological model that is consciously free from psychological factors.

The final clarification is drawn by insisting on the art of bronze-casting as the most accurate efficient cause of the production of the statue, Aristotle does not mean to preclude an appeal to the beliefs and desires of the individual artisan. On the contrary, there are cases where the individual realization of the art obviously enters in the explanation of the bronze statue. For example, one may be interested in a particular bronze statue because that statue is the great achievement of an artisan who has not only mastered the art but has also applied it with a distinctive style. In this case it is perfectly appropriate to make reference to the beliefs and desires of the artisan. Aristotle seems to make room for this case when he says that we should look “for general causes of general things and for particular causes of particular things”. Note, however, that the idiosyncrasies that may be important in studying a particular bronze statue as the great achievement of an individual artisan may be extraneous to a more central case. To understand why let us focus on the study of nature. When the student of nature is concerned with the explanation of a natural phenomenon like the formation of sharp teeth in the front and broad molars in the back of the mouth, the student of nature is concerned with what is typical about that phenomenon. In other words, the student of nature is expected to provide an explanation of why certain animals typically have a certain dental arrangement. We shall return to this example in due course. For the time being, it is important to emphasize this important feature of Aristotle's explanatory project; a feature that we must keep in

mind in trying to understand his theory of causality. This theory has in fact been developed primarily (but not exclusively) for the study of nature.

### **2.6.10: Study on the Four Causes in the Science of Nature**

In the *Physics*, Aristotle builds on his general account of the four causes by developing explanatory principles that are specific to the study of nature. Here Aristotle insists that all four causes are involved in the explanation of natural phenomena, and that the job of “the student of nature is to bring the why-question back to them all in the way appropriate to the science of nature” . The best way to understand this methodological recommendation is the following: the science of nature is concerned with natural bodies insofar as they are subject to change, and the job of the student of nature is to provide the explanation of their natural change. The factors that are involved in the explanation of natural change turn out to be matter, form, that which produces the change, and the end of this change. Note that Aristotle does not say that all four explanatory factors are involved in the explanation of each and every instance of natural change. Rather, he says that an adequate explanation of natural change may involve a reference to all of them. Aristotle goes on by adding a specification on his doctrine of the four causes: the form and the end often coincide, and they are formally the same as that which produces the change. This is one of the several times where Aristotle offers the slogan “it takes a man to generate a man” (for example, *Phys.* 194 b 13; *Metaph.* This slogan is designed to point at the fundamental fact that the generation of a man can be understood only in the light of the end of the process; that is to say, the fully developed man. What a fully developed man is specified in terms of the form of a man, and this form is realized in its full development at the end of the generation. But this does not explain why it takes a man to generate a man. Note, however, that a fully developed man is not only the end of generation; it is also what initiates the entire process. For Aristotle, the ultimate moving principle responsible for the generation of a man is a fully developed living creature of the same kind; that is, a man who is formally the same as the end of generation.

Thus the student of nature is often left with three types of causes: the formal-final cause, the efficient cause, and the material cause. However, the view that there are in nature causes besides material and efficient causes was controversial in antiquity. According to Aristotle, most of his predecessors recognized only the material and the efficient cause. This explains why Aristotle cannot be content with saying that formal and final causes often coincide, but he also has to defend his thesis against an opponent who denies that final causality is a genuine mode of causality.

The final Causes Defended Aristotle uses causation in its wider conception including both causes and reasons. The difference between (he two is nicely taken up by W.T. Stace when he tries to analyze this issue. Stace maintains that the cause of a thing is not to be interpreted as the reason for the explanation of the thing; so cause does not explain anything. It is just a mechanism by which a reason explains its consequences. For instance, Stace says that there may be many causes of death, but that does not explain why there should be death at all in the world. Thus, the cause and reason are different, and Aristotle while analyzing 'causation' keeps an account of both these elements. It is evident that by including 'reason' in the conception of cause, Aristotle makes an attempt to connect wisdom with cause. In The process he tries to differentiate between knowledge and understanding on the one hand, and experience on the other. He says that an individual's wisdom depends on his knowledge and understanding rather than on experience. This is because the former knows the cause and the latter does not. He writes: 'for men of experience know that the (thing is so, but do not know why, while the others know the 'why' and the cause.'<sup>31</sup> He explains that the master workers in each craft are more honorable because they know the causes of the things that are done. In this sense they are "wiser<sup>1</sup> too as compared to the manual workers. The latter simply act without knowing what they do. Thus, according to Aristotle, the master-workers

of craft are wiser since they have a theory on the basis of which they act. They know the cause of what they are doing. In other words they have true knowledge of their work and are in a better position to teach their art than the man of experience.

Moreover, he states that we cannot regard any of the senses to be 'wisdom' although they provide us with the most authoritative knowledge of particulars. This is because, he claims, our senses do not tell us the 'why' of things. Senses only say that fire is hot; not 'why' it is so. By so connecting wisdom with cause, Aristotle, in a way, tries to show further how the theoretic sciences are superior to productive sciences. This is well expressed when he writes: '.....all men suppose what is called wisdom to deal with the first causes and principles of things; so that, .... the man of experience is thought to be wiser than the possessors of any sense-experience whatever, the artist wiser than the men of experience, the master-workers than the mechanic, and the theoretical kinds of knowledge to be more of the nature of wisdom than the productive. Clearly then wisdom is knowledge about certain principles and causes'.

Aristotle thus proclaims that change is not blind or meaningless, but is purposeful and hence is teleological. All change is evolution. The whole process is explained by analyzing the relationship between form and matter, the two ultimate realities in his metaphysical scheme. As far as conceiving the general Idea as the essence of the particular, he agrees with Plato. But he opposes Plato's transcendentalism and affirms that Ideas do not exist apart from things. Instead, idea is inherent or immanent in the thing by being its form and hence cannot be separated from it except by abstraction. To understand Aristotle's idea of evolution we may have to know how he explains the relationship between form and matter and how he accounts for motion or movement in his scheme. Reality is constituted of all the three: form, matter and movement. As mentioned above, forms are immanent in things, which are constitutive of matter and matter has no reality apart from the form. Movement also cannot exist by itself and presupposes a substratum. In other words, form, matter and movement have no real or substantial existence independent of each other. Reality consists of all these taken as a whole and these constitutive elements of reality can only be separated in thought. The problem of change is a perennial philosophical problem in many civilizations. It is also related to the question of the nature of reality. For example, in Indian philosophy many systems like Buddhism, Nyaya, Samkhya and Vedanta have different conceptions about the nature and reality of change. In the Greek tradition itself this has been a major issue of debate, in which Heraclitus and Parmenides have taken opposite stands; the former proposing ceaseless change while the latter conceiving change as illusory. Plato followed Parmenides and rejected the reality of change. Aristotle brings all these problems into a single framework and presents a comprehensive conception of reality. He adopts a middle path, which seeks to avoid the extremes. Aristotle's philosophy introduces a teleological conception in the very outset and explains the nature of reality accordingly. This view holds that behind everything that happens in the world a purpose is unraveled. There is a higher purpose, which is being realized. Hence in order to understand anything one needs to understand this purpose. For this we have to analyze the form—matter relationship in the light of two other concepts of potentiality and actuality. The distinction between the two concepts of potentiality and actuality helps us understand the nature of reality and the form matter relationship in a better manner. It also helps understanding the nature of change. Aristotle holds that bare matter is potentiality of form. According to him, different forms shape the matter differently in change. At every stage of evolution, the thing in question will have more form than before. In other words, it is then more actual, a more advanced stage of existence. Aristotle's theory of causation explains the process of becoming things undergo with the explanation of change in various stages. For example when a seed evolves into a tree, it necessarily happens through several stages; seed- sapling-tree- fruit. But underlying these different stages, there must be something that undergoes changes; something that persists in the change. Here Aristotle's theory of causation explains how matter remains

changeless and persists during change. It exhibits different qualities—as a result of being shaped or designed by different forms—on different occasions or stages of evolution. During change, an object changes its form. But form itself does not change and become anything different than what it is. In this sense, forms are also changeless. Here he agrees with Plato who considers forms as essences.

However, in Aristotle's theory of causation, presented in his metaphysics, and the way he has analyzed causation in the context of nature, it would appear that he includes both mechanism and teleology to explain the cause. But even speaking from the point of view of mechanism, it is much wider in its scope than most of the scientific conceptions of causation. It is therefore necessary to compare Aristotle's views of causation with that of scientific causation. This comparison is elaborated by W.T. Stace in his *Critical History of Greek Philosophy*." Stace uses Mill's conception of cause to express the scientific position. Quoting Mill, he defines a cause as 'the invariable and unconditional antecedent of a phenomenon.' As is obvious, this definition straightaway rules out the possibility of final cause, because it only takes of the cause as an antecedent but not as an end. It does not consider the formal cause either, because the formal cause which should have been the 'concept' of cause is not included in this definition of cause. Thus, we are left with the material and the efficient causes. These correspond to the scientific notions of 'matter' and 'energy' respectively. Stace shows that the 'efficient cause' finds a place in the scientific definition, only in the sense of mechanical energy. Aristotle on the contrary uses it in the sense of an 'ideal force', operating from the end and not from the beginning. It needs to be mentioned here that Stace's comparison of the Aristotelian and the scientific views of causation is not intended to assess the two positions to find out a better and tenable one. He says the science restricts itself only to the mechanical aspect of cause and leaves the formal and final side of the phenomena to philosophy. This is mainly because science takes the existence of things for granted whereas philosophy makes an attempt to explain why the things exist in the first place, in order to explain the rationality of their existence.

Further, the question comes is what kinds of causes and principles constitute that particular knowledge, which we call wisdom? In an attempt to answer this question, Aristotle analyses the possible characteristics out of which we develop the notion of a 'wise man'. He says, first, we suppose a wise man to be one who knows everything, as far as possible, though he does not have knowledge of each of them in detail. Secondly, he holds that a wise man is one who has the ability to learn things that are difficult and not easy for man to know. Next, he says, a wise man is one who is more exact and more capable of teaching the causes, in every branch of knowledge. The formal cause is the idea or plan in the mind of the carpenter, according to which he makes the chair. It is the blue print or the plan, which he has in the mind. The material cause is the wood of which the chair is made; the efficient cause is the arms, hands, and tools, as motive forces used by the carpenter. It is through these efficient causes he makes the chair. The final cause is the final product, the chair, which is the purpose that sets these forces in action and effected the transition from potentiality to actuality. In other words, it is that for the sake of which it is made. Aristotle conceives that these four principles operate, not only in the objects we human make (like chairs and other artifacts) but also in nature; the only difference is that, in the case of nature the artist and his product are not separate. As far as the sciences are concerned, he maintains that (the science which is desirable on its own account and for the sake of knowing comes closer to the nature of wisdom than the sciences which are desirable on account of their results. Thus, he asserts that the superior science itself adopts the nature of wisdom. He concludes by expressing that 'wise man must not be ordered, but must order, and he must not obey another, but the less wise must obey him. From the above stated various notions of the wise and the wisdom, Aristotle derives that one who has knowledge of (the universal, knows that he has knowledge of everything because he knows, in a sense, all the instances that fall under the universal. Such a man is the wise man, in

Aristotle's perception, by virtue of the fact that he knows the universals that are not only farthest from the sense, but are also hardest for men to know. Among the sciences, he says, that those which deal with fewer principles are more exact than those which involve additional principles. Accordingly, he declares that the sciences which deal mostly with the first principles are the most exact of the sciences. However, he gives a higher degree to that science which investigates the causes. Such a science is 'instructive'. Similarly, he places the wise man on a higher plane because he knows about the causes of each thing. In the context of science, he holds that most authoritative among the science is the one, 'which knows to what end each things must be done.....and this end is the good in the whole of nature.' Aristotle concludes that it is the same science that investigates the first principles and the end, 'for the good, i.e., the end, is one of the causes.' Clearly, such a science cannot be the productive science because it is sought for its own sake, and not for any other advantage. It is a 'Tree science', because it atone exists for its own sake. But one may justly point out that such a science is beyond human power, because in many ways, human nature limited. Therefore, Aristotle calls it the most divine science dealing with divine objects, namely god because:

- God is thought to be the cause of all things and to be a first principle.
- Only god can have a conception of such a science.

He claims that all other sciences may be necessary, but are not better than this science. He therefore declares that the acquisition of such a science ends in our knowledge of the first cause, or the most original cause. Here the form or plan and the end or purpose coincides. He argues that the purpose of the organism is the realization of its form, which is the idea of motion. Hence in the ultimate sense, there are only two causes: form and matter. In the process of evolution matter evolves into what it is potential of. For example, the seed into the tree, the wood into chair. The potentiality represents its purpose and hence it can also be equated with a directing force inherent in matter. We may say that the directing force inherent in the seed makes it a tree and it cannot become anything else. Potentiality of a thing is determined by form, which is actuality. Hence it is fixed and not accidental. Here Aristotle opposes the mechanistic-atomistic view advocated by Democritus and many others. He argues that change is not blind or purposeless; instead it is teleological. Nature is dynamic and teleological and not mechanical. As we have seen above, the concept of God helps Aristotle to explain the inherent teleology in the universe. This idea of God enables Aristotle establishing the unity of the universe and accounting for the beginning of motion. Motion in turn, enables the actualization of the potential. Matter has an inherent tendency to move towards its potentials, as in the case of the seed, which has the tendency to move towards the tree. In other words, we may say that matter has a desire for the form. The Aristotelian ontology is thus constitutive of God, matter and form. Since matter and form are eternal and they eternally coexist, motion is also eternal. This eternal motion in turn presupposes an eternal unmoved mover, who is God, the ultimate cause of motion which is unmoved. Motion has its beginning there in God who is the eternal unmoved first mover. He is the fundamental ground of all vital forces in nature and is the pure form without matter. He is the highest motivating force of the universe. All beings crave for the realization of their potentialities because of this ultimate motivator. It is God who gives the universe a higher purpose which causes motion. He is the highest Good, who comprises all actuality and who is pure intelligence. He is the unifying principle of the universe and every possibility realizes in Him. He is the principle of all order and unity.

Further, in the process of building his theory of causation further, he reverts to the four causes that he discussed in his explanation of the nature. The purpose is mainly to convey, that prior to him, his predecessors have also employed the four causes in their respective analysis of the reality. Aristotle therefore wants to assess those view points, and he also intends to communicate to the readers, how his theory has grown out of a critical examination of the views of

his predecessors, on the issue of the first cause of the world. To begin with, the earliest thinkers, namely the Ionics, he says, used material cause to explain the universe. Everything was explained with reference to matter in all its variations. For example, Thales described water to be the material cause of the universe. Anaximenes located the same in air. Similarly, Heraclitus talked about fire; Empedocles, the four elements; and so on. But as the thinking of philosophers became more and more matured and advanced, the need for a second cause was felt in order to explain, the motion or becoming of things. As a result, the idea of an efficient cause surfaced in the explanation of things. Although the Eleatics denied such a cause because they denied motion as such, Parmenides allowed it vaguely in terms of the hot and the cold. Empedocles supported the idea of efficient cause by talking about harmony and discord, love and hate, and so on as the moving forces. Similarly, Anaxagoras also used *nous* as a moving force. As far as the formal causes are concerned, these were acknowledged by the Pythagoreans. They believed numbers to represent forms. But they brought the forms or the formal cause to the level of material cause by declaring that things are made from numbers. After the Pythagoreans, the importance of a formal cause was emphasized by Plato in the form his ideas. As far as the final causes are concerned, Aristotle gives credit to Anaxagoras for introducing them into philosophy. He says that Anaxagoras assumes a world-forming mind in order to explain the design and purpose of the universe. But as his system developed, he used the concept of *nous* to explain the motion in the universe. Thus, the final cause was reduced to the efficient cause. But since Plato acknowledged matter in the creation of things, he also admitted of a material cause. This means that Plato's system had both the formal and the material causes. It, however, lacked any principle of motion. So, there is no evidence of an efficient cause in Plato's philosophy. But then Plato connected everything with the supreme good, be it justice, knowledge, or education. Therefore, Aristotle feels that one finds the idea of the final cause pertaining to the 'end' in Plato's philosophy. Aristotle's own analysis of the above view is that his predecessors did recognize all the four causes in some form or the other. But there was a dominance of the material and efficient causes over the formal and final causes.

Aristotle tries to show that the formal cause and the final cause are the same. As we have seen before, the formal cause represents or indicates the essence, concept, and idea of a thing. If we took at the final cause, we will observe that it indicates the end. In other words, the final cause is the realization of the idea of the thing in its actuality. This amounts to saying that what a thing aims at is actually its form. Therefore, logically the final cause or end of anything is its form. In this sense Aristotle identifies formal cause with the final cause. Having discussed at length his theory of causation, the next step that Aristotle takes in his metaphysics is the reduction of the causes of 'nature'<sup>1</sup> to the two principles of matter and form. The material cause is interpreted as the matter; and the efficient cause, formal cause, and final cause are all bottled up in the single conception of form. Aristotle proceeds step by step, to explain the entire process.

However, with the weakening of the efficient, formal, and final causes to the category or the principle of form is explained by Stace with the help of some example which Aristotle takes from nature. He expresses that the final cause or end of an acorn is oak. So, one may deduce the oak to be the cause of the acorn's growth. This growth, in other words, shows a movement that begins with the acorn and drives towards the appropriate end, namely the oak. Aristotle says that this kind of movement is possible in case of humans also. The only difference is that in nature, the movement is unconscious or instinctive, whereas in case of human production, i.e. when a thing is produced by human efforts, the movement towards the end is a conscious movement. For example, if we take the case of the sculptor producing a statue, we find that it is he who moves the brass or the bronze. But there is another factor that moves the sculptor and forces him to act upon, and it is the idea of the completed statue in his mind. So, idea of the end is the ultimate and actual

cause of the movement when humans produce a work. The idea of the end is actually present in their minds. This is what motivates them to move towards the end. But where nature is concerned, it is obvious that there is no mind that is conscious of the end. Nevertheless, there is a movement towards the end. This end then causes the movement. So, basically, it is the 'form' into which, the causes, other than the material causes, are reduced or moderated. The material cause is modified into the 'matter'. Hume attacks certain theories of causality. His discussion on causality can be divided into two parts, namely 1) negative account of causation which he points out the contradictions that are involved in some theories of causation, especially that of John Locke, and 2) positive account of causation which contains his own theory of causation. Hume raises the question, 'do we have any impression of necessary connection' between events? If anyone tries to give an affirmative answer to this question, the following will be the only possible basis. It is also important to quote Locke. We need to understand Locke's position concerning the concept of cause in order to understand the criticism of Hume. Locke tries to explain the empirical basis for our concept of causing, which we call our 'idea of power' as follows: "Power also is another of those simple ideas which we receive from sensation and reflection. For observing in ourselves that we do and can think and that we can at pleasure move several parts of our bodies which were at rest; the effect, also, that natural bodies are able to produce in one another occurring every moment to our senses, we both these ways get the idea of power's. Hume denies that causal laws are logically necessary. The logical necessity of causal laws consists in the following: 'an Event occurs' can support 'a G event will occur' because it is logically impossible that an F event should fail to be followed by a G event. However, it is not clear as to why Hume rejects this sort of view.

### **2.6.11: Study on the Position of God**

According to Aristotle, the absolute form, which has no trace of any matter at all, is God, and comes at the top of the scale. He ascribes the characteristics of God on the basis of the features of the form. As we have seen throughout our discussions on form and matter, form is 'actuality', therefore Aristotle considers God to be absolutely actual. He further explains, as we go higher up the scale the things by virtue of possessing more form tend to become more real. Consequently, at the highest level, God alone is real, devoid of any matter. We have seen that Aristotle posits the formal, final, and efficient causes in the form. Thus, he claims that God has them all in his being. He expresses, as formal cause, God is the idea; he is the reason. As the final cause, God is the absolute end. All beings are ultimately driven towards him. This is to mean that all beings or everything in the universe is driven towards perfection as a final end which is nothing but God.

As an efficient cause, Aristotle maintains that God is the ultimate cause of all motion and becoming. In this sense, God is also the first mover, but he himself is unmoved. And this is again a necessity, Aristotle maintains, of God being the ultimate end and the ultimate form. Aristotle explains that there is no end beyond the absolute end. And this is what makes God the unmoved mover, because after God there is no higher form towards which God can be moved. It also implies, as per Aristotle's logic, that the real and the ultimate causes are also unmoved. Here one must realize that in Aristotle's philosophy God is not a mechanical cause. This is because every mechanical cause has a cause of its own and this goes ad infinitum. Aristotle's God, on the other hand, is the ideological cause that works from the end, but from a logical point of view it comes before the beginning of all. Hence, it is the first mover.

Further in the context of Aristotle's God, Stace brings out that God can be conceived as thought. But what is the subject of God's thought? Since he is absolute form, there is no matter in the conception of God, therefore, God in the final analysis is the form of form. His matter is the form itself. And this is how Aristotle arrives at the celebrated definition of God as, 'thought of thought.' In other words, God is at once the subject and object of his thought. It is in this sense

Stace maintains that God is also self-consciousness. God cannot think anything other than thought. Stace also points out that Aristotle, by way of using such expressions, slides into the use of figurative language. And the use of this kind of language tends to convey the idea of a personality in his conception of God. Now, Stace expresses that 'personality' implies both an individual consciousness and an existent consciousness. Therefore, the question at hand is whether we can take God as an individual and whether he can be called existent. Stace explains that when Aristotle claims God to be an absolute form, the form here also implies the universal. Now, what is universal must have the particular in it too. The form, as universal, has no particular in it. Therefore, it cannot be an individual. \* Thus, God cannot be an individual. Further, as we have discussed earlier, Aristotle insists that form has no existence apart from matter. God as a pure form is without matter, and so he cannot be called existent, although he is absolutely real. Thus, Stace tries to show that Aristotle's God is neither existent nor individual. This naturally disqualifies him as a person. But a problem surfaces here that if God is not a person, then Aristotle's language is merely figurative. Stace solves this problem by holding that if there is any inconsistency, it is only in the language but not in Aristotle's thought.

## 2.7: Similarities and Differences between Plato and Aristotle

In the introduction where we talked about Aristotle's life and his works, we mentioned that Aristotle spent a considerable part of his life in the Academy. Thus, he had been under the spell of Plato and remained influenced by him up to the end. But Aristotle was also a genius in his own capacity, so he endeavored to take on Plato's theory of ideas and tried to give further elaboration of the same. His criticism of his master's theory of ideas tends to give us the impression that the latter was not very friendly with Plato's philosophy. But this is only at a superficial level. Behind the scene there is much deeper resemblance between the two. Let us now look at these resemblances.

To begin with, both Plato and Aristotle accept idealism. This means both these philosophers give supremacy to the spirit and ideas over matter. In other words, thought are given priority over things. This assertion is evident in Plato when he claims that the idea of the good is the ultimate and the real idea because it drives the other ideas towards itself. In the same line, Aristotle maintains that *Actus Purus* or the prime mover causes everything to move towards the end, i.e. itself, without being moved itself. The *Actus Purus* is thus acts as the ultimate form of all forms and ultimate idea of all the ideas, (since form and idea have the same connotation). If we remember Plato, we shall realize that he too emphasized that the world of becoming constantly participates in the world of ideas. Now, since all ideas are thoughts, Aristotle derives that all things while striving to 'become' are potentially thought of. This is the basic tenet of idealism which is shared by both Plato and Aristotle. Next, in their respective explanation of the world, both Plato and Aristotle reject mechanism and accept teleology. By considering good to be the supreme end or purpose of the world, Plato maintains that whatever has been created by God in this world has been done in order to achieve the goodness of the God. Even in the context of the philosopher king, we have seen that Plato has argued that they have the knowledge and understanding of the good; hence only philosophers ought to be the rulers. Similarly, Aristotle also maintains that there is a holistic tendency in every being to move towards its final end, i.e. towards the prime mover or the *Actus Purus*. Even ethically, both Plato and Aristotle claim that the ethical end is the sole end of the universe. Both reject pleasures as good and accept happiness to be the end of moral life.

### Differences

Apart from the above stated similarities between Plato and Aristotle, one finds certain differences between them too. These differences are associated with regard to their background and orientation regarding the world. Aristotle being a logician and having a scientific background gives importance to facts. This aspect of the world is ignored by Plato, who, as we have seen, uses a language full of poetic expressions, myths, and allegories to explain the various concepts of the

world. Aristotle, as we have discussed, uses natural language in logic, and in his explanation of the world his language is precise. Rather than myths, he employs technical and scientific terms like change, motion, cause, actual, potential, and so on. Another important respect in which these philosophers differ is Aristotle's failure to discuss mathematics, which has been given importance by Plato. If we compare both these philosophers, it appears that Plato's views are static whereas there is more activity and dynamism in Aristotle's position as he talks of change, motion, and transition. Plato's indulgence with myths and metaphors results in the concept of a 'personal God' as is shown by Y Masih. His ideas thus influenced the Christian theology; Aristotle's concept of the 'prime mover' has to do with nature rather than prayers and worships.

## **2.8: Critical Estimate of Aristotle's Philosophy**

It has been maintained by many that Aristotle's philosophy is an improvement upon Plato's idealism. Being the founder of idealism, Plato's idealism exhibited many defects and crudities. For instance, he gave a transcendental status to the ideas. For him ideas as universal existed in a separate world altogether. He considered the ideas alone to be real, thus creating confusion between reality and existence. Aristotle, on the other hand, took it upon himself to clear his master's theory of its shortcomings. Whatever he could retain in Plato's theory of ideas, he did and developed his philosophy by a critical analysis of the rest. Like Plato, he too held that the idea, form, the universal, or the thought was the ultimate reality, and the world was founded on them. But Plato gave a mental status to the universals, and claimed that they had independent existence divorced from the sensible world. Thus, he conjoined thought with the thing. Aristotle was not comfortable with this situation because it represented a degradation of the universals into a mere particular. He, on the contrary, believed that the universals, as real entities, have relevance only if they could be a part of this world. He analyzed them as formative principles of particular things. His philosophy, in this sense, is perceived to be more advanced than Plato's philosophy. In fact, as far as Greek idealism is concerned, many consider Aristotle's idealism to be more perfect and complete.

Aristotle is also given credit for producing the only philosophy of evolution that world has witnessed. Hegel is also said to have contributed in this area, but this was by following Aristotle's theory. Although the theory of evolution is considered to be Aristotle's original contribution, many of the elements of this theory were derived from his predecessors. The problem of becoming in the works of earlier philosophers laid the ground work for Aristotle's theory of evolution. We have briefly stated about this problem in the beginning of this unit. The predecessors including Heraclitus and others could not provide a concrete solution to this problem, since they failed to analyze the meaning of 'becoming'. For them becoming was not a development but only a change, that was endless and without any purpose. Aristotle dwelled upon this issue, rather deeply, and tried to show what 'becoming' means. His physics and metaphysics are largely revolves around the explanation of the 'becoming'. In the process, we have already seen how he rationally deciphered the world process which is the result of development towards rational end.

Moreover, when Aristotle claims the form to be absolute, he also implies that the form constitutes a rational principle, but this is not explained properly by him. A rational principle has the element of necessity in it. But Aristotle does not succeed in showing the form to be a necessity. He shows it as an end that attracts everything towards it. But why is the form an 'end' is not explained properly by Aristotle. Moreover, the movement from matter to form, which consists of endless number of particular forms as one goes higher in the scale, is also said to be left unexplained by Aristotle. Consequently, he is criticized for not explaining the 'change'. He only states that as one moves from formless matter to matter less form, the lower form passes into the higher form or changes into the higher form. But the necessity behind such a change is not explained by him. Thus, the rationality behind the change remains unexplained by Aristotle.

## 2.9: Summary

- Aristotle conceives physics as the philosophy of nature. Consequently, its subject matter involves a study of the changes that takes place in the nature.
- Theoretic sciences, as per Aristotle's classification, are aimed at studying the first principles. Therefore, in his *Physics* he makes an attempt to treat the principles behind the natural bodies and of natural motion. Aristotle considered logic to be the chief instrument for scientific investigation; according to him logic and verbal reasoning were similar.
- Aristotle classified words into substance, quantity, quality, relation, place, time, situation, condition, action and passions; questions asked by human beings to gain knowledge were asked using words belonging to these classes, arranged in the order in which the questions were asked.
- According to Aristotle, the nature is in form rather than in matter. This is because he maintains that a thing is more properly said to be what it is when it attains fulfillment and not when it exists potentially.
- Aristotle says that man by nature thinks that he has no knowledge of a thing until he has grasped the 'why' of the thing.
- Aristotle recognizes chance and spontaneity among causes. This is because he opines that many things are said to come to exist due to mere chance and spontaneity.
- Aristotle holds that chance is an incidental cause in the sphere of those actions which are for the sake of something and involve a purpose. Thus, he claims that intelligent reflection and chance fall in the same sphere because 'purpose implies intelligent reflection'<sup>7</sup>.
- Aristotle does not seem to agree with the definition of space as the void. For him empty space is an impossible notion.
- Aristotle used the phrase 'first philosophy' to describe the subject matter of metaphysics, which concerns the first, highest, or most of general principles of the universe.
- The most important and serious objection that Aristotle's levels against Plato's ideas is the latter's assumption that ideas are the essences of things, and the claim that these essences exist outside the things themselves.
- Theoretical sciences dealing with mathematics, physics and metaphysics.
- Practical sciences concerning ethics and politics.
- Creative sciences that studied mechanical and artistic productions.
- Aristotle's writings on logic are grouped in six treatises. These are collectively given one name - *The Organon*. The six works on logic are *Categories*, *On Interpretation*, *Prior Analytics*, *Posterior Analytics*, *Topics*, and *Sophistical Refutation*.
- In *Categories* the issue discussed is about the relation between uncombined terms.
- *On Interpretation* offers explanation of statements or assertions that are considered to be meaningful expressions.
- *Prior Analytics* introduces one to logic as a formal discipline.
- *Posterior Analytics* shows an attempt to extend the syllogism of prior analytics to the sciences and scientific explanations.
- *The Topics* deals with dialectical reasoning.
- *Sophistical Refutation* is concerned with thirteen fallacies.
- Aristotle believed that philosophy grew as a result of wonder and curiosity which were not fully satisfied by religious myths.
- Aristotle believed that everything in nature existed to fulfill a purpose or an end.
- Aristotle divides knowledge into practical, theoretical and productive knowledge. While theoretical knowledge is aimed at action, productive knowledge addresses daily needs. Practical knowledge deals with knowledge related to how to live.
- Both ethics and politics are considered practical sciences and are concerned with human beings as moral agents.

- Aristotle believed that youngsters act according to emotions instead of reason, and without reason it is impossible to act on practical knowledge; therefore, young students are not equipped to study politics.
- Aristotle is the last amongst what is considered to be greatest philosophical trio of all times; the two other philosophers being Socrates (470-399 BC) and Plato (427-347 BC).
- In *A Critical History of Greek Philosophy*, Stace reports that Aristotle is said to have written nearly four hundred books (by book, he meant chapter).
- For the sake of convenience, his works have been categorized as early and late. This has been done keeping in mind Plato's influence on him. Accordingly, amongst his early works we have *Organon*, *The Physics*, *De Anima*, *Eudemian*, *Ethics*, and *Metaphysics*. The later works comprise of *Nicomachean Ethics*, *Politics*, and the *Rhetorics*.
- Aristotle intended to know about everything including the existing sciences of his time. Where science was not available he went ahead to lay the foundations of new sciences. He is credited with founding two sciences, namely logic and biology.
- He broadly divided the sciences into three main categories:

### 2.10: Possible Questions

1. 'Nature belongs to the class of causes which act for the sake of something'. Explain,
2. How does Aristotle explain chance and spontaneity?
3. Aristotle says that there are four different ways by which things come into being. In this context how he differentiate art from nature?
4. How does Aristotle justify his belief that it is not necessary for ideas to exist?
5. On what grounds Aristotle reject Plato's theory of ideas?
6. Why does Aristotle say that a politician is similar to a craftsman?
7. How did Aristotle define 'citizens'?
8. Write a note on the various types of rules described by Aristotle.
9. How did Aristotle justify despotic rule?
10. Briefly state the subject matter of each of Aristotle's writings.
11. Although Aristotle is primarily regarded as a metaphysician, why is his logic considered preliminary to the study of his physics and metaphysics?
12. Define a syllogism. What are the various constituents of syllogism?
13. Name the four types of categorical statements with examples. How do you differentiate them?
14. How does Aristotle differentiate between theoretical sciences, practical science and the productive sciences?
15. How is a syllogism defined by David Keyt? What implications can one draw from this definition?
16. How does Aristotle interpret physics? Is it similar to scientific interpretation of Physics?
17. Why does Aristotle consider it relevant to discuss the cause in the context of his physics?
18. State the four types of causes with proper examples.
19. Mention the various modes of causation.
20. Aristotle divides the substance into three kinds. What are these?
21. What are the three-fold causes and principle?
22. What is the third man argument of Aristotle?
23. State the difference between form and matter.
24. Briefly state Aristotle's theory of demonstration as given in *Posterior Analytics*.
25. How does Aristotle connect the immediate or the indemonstrable premises with the universals?
26. How does Aristotle interpret motion?
27. How does Aristotle's approach differ from (hat of Plato's)?
28. Attempt a critical assessment of Aristotle's ideas.
29. Explain the idea of unmoved mover.

## 2.11: Further reading

1. Coleman, Janet. 2000. *A History of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Black well.
2. Copleston, Frederick, *A History of Philosophy, vol.1: Greece and Rome*, New York, Image Books, 1993.
2. Durant, Will, *A Story of Philosophy: The Lives and Opinions of the Greater Philosophers of the Western World*, Pocket Books, 1991.
3. Rogers, Arthur Keyon, *A Student's History of Philosophy*, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1935.
4. Russell, Bertrand: *History of Western Philosophy*, London, Routledge Classics, 2004.
5. Thilly, Frank: *A History of Philosophy*, New Delhi, SBE Publishers, 1983.
6. Zeller, Eduard, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, London, Longmans, green and Co., 1881.
7. Audi, Robert. 1995-99. *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy - II edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
7. Balme, D.M. Aristotle. 2002. *HistoriaAnimalium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

## UNIT-2 (P-3)

### MACHIAVELLI, HOBBS

- 3.0: Objectives
- 3.1: Introduction
- 3.2: Machiavelli Early Life and works
- 3.3: Machiavelli and Medieval period
- 3.4: Machiavelli's Methods: The Child of Renaissance and reformation
- 3.5: Views on the Separation of Politics from Ethics and Religion
- 3.6: Views on state and preservation
- 3.7: Types of Government
- 3.8: Views on the Doctrine of Aggrandizement
- 3.9: Views on Modernism
- 4.0: Early Life and education
- 4.1: View on the State of Nature
- 4.2: Views on the Natural Rights
- 4.3: Views on Laws of Nature
- 4.4: Summary
- 4.5: Possible Questions
- 4.6: Further reading

### 3.0: Objectives

After going through this unit, you will be able

- Elucidate Machiavelli's ideas related to politics, ethics, religion, government and modernism
- Deliberate Hobbes' ideas related to nature, natural rights and the covenant and the sovereign

### 3.1: Introduction

The father of modern political theory, Niccolo Machiavelli, was born at Florence on May 3, 1469. He was the real visionary of the frequent troubles of the French invasion of 1493. He was a philosopher, author and Italian politician whose ideas serve as the foundation of modern political science. He was a Renaissance man in every sense of the term, as the term implies someone who is a polymath. Niccolo Machiavelli was a diplomat, a political philosopher, a musician, a poet and a playwright, but the most important role that he played was that of a civil servant of the Florentine Republic. He was employed in a great variety of missions, including one to the Emperor Maximilian, and four to France. His father was a wealthy and influential lawyer, and so Machiavelli received an extensive formal education and got his first job as a secretary for the city, drafting government documents. His dispatches during these journeys, and his treatises on the Affairs of France and Germany, are full of far-reaching insight. On the restoration of the Medici, Machiavelli was involved in the downfall of his patron, Gonfaloniere Soderini. Arrested on a charge of conspiracy in 1513, and put to the torture, he disclaimed all knowledge of the alleged conspiracy. Although pardoned, he was obliged to retire from public life and devoted himself to literature.

It was not until 1519 that he was commissioned by Leo X to draw up his report on a reform of the state of Florence. In 1521-25 he was employed in diplomatic services and as historiographer. After the defeat of the French at Pavia (1525), Italy was helpless before the advancing forces of the Emperor Charles V and Machiavelli strove to avert from Florence the invading army on its way to Rome. In May 1527 the Florentines again drove out the Medici and proclaimed the republic but Machiavelli, bitterly disappointed that he was to be allowed no part in the movement for liberty, and already in declining health, died on June 22. Through misrepresentation and misunderstanding his writings were spoken of as almost diabolical, his most violent assailants being the clergy. The first great edition of his works was not issued until 1782. From that period his fame as the founder of political science has steadily increased. With accomplishment of Machiavelli, along with Leonardo da Vinci, is often cited as a prime example of the Renaissance Man. Machiavelli found renown mainly on the basis of his short political treatise called *The Prince*. Machiavelli's *Prince* lays down realistic political discourse. However, both *The Prince* and the *Republican Discourses* that dealt with more serious issues were not published until after Machiavelli's death. Irrespective of his personal beliefs still considered as controversial in some aspects, Machiavelli is read widely and is considered to have astute intelligence. Machiavellianism represented the cold-blooded politics and treachery that was used to obtain and retain political power.

Machiavelli was preoccupied by a fundamental problem in politics is it possible to be a good politician and a good person at the same time? And he has the courage to face the tragic possibility that, given how the world really is, the answer is no. He doesn't just think that political advancement comes more easily to the unscrupulous. He gets us to contemplate a darker possibility: that doing rightly and well what a political leader should and fulfilling the proper duties of political leadership is at odds with being a good person. Machiavelli wrote his most famous work, *The Prince*, about how to get and keep power and what makes individuals effective leaders. He proposed that the overwhelming responsibility of a good prince is to defend the state from external and internal threats to stable governance. This means he must know how to fight,

but more importantly, he must know about reputation and the management of those around him. People should neither think he is soft and easy to disobey, nor should they find him so cruel that he disgusts his society. He should seem unapproachably strict but reasonable. When he turned to the question of whether it was better for a prince to be loved or feared, Machiavelli wrote that while it would theoretically be wonderful for a leader to be both loved and obeyed, he should always err on the side of inspiring terror, for this is what ultimately keeps people in check.

Thomas Hobbes was an English philosopher whose political theories became the foundation of modern political thought. Hobbes gave us a theory based on how social and political order could be maintained in the world. His theories are aimed at establishing peace in the society. He believed in delegating political authority to a powerful sovereign. He believed that in the absence of a sovereign, the state of nature will prevail. This could very well lead to a civil war. Hobbes has often been accused of having taken a 'selfish' view of human nature. In this unit, you will learn about the state of nature and the concepts related to it. The unit also describes the concept of natural rights, where you will learn at length about the relationship between the state of nature and natural rights. The unit also will deal with the concept of the law of nature.

### **3.2: Machiavelli Early Life and works**

Machiavelli was born in Florence, Italy, had authored the well-known book, *The Prince*. From the 13th century onward, Machiavelli's family was wealthy and prominent, holding on occasion Florence's most important offices. His father, Bernardo, a doctor of laws, was nevertheless among the family's poorest members. Barred from public office in Florence as an insolvent debtor, Bernardo lived frugally, administering his small landed property near the city and supplementing his meagre income from it with earnings from the restricted and almost clandestine exercise of his profession. He worked as the Secretary to the Second Chancery, the Government of Florence. During this job, he got the opportunity to gain first-hand knowledge of national and international politics. It was while working as an envoy for several years that he went to Paris, Rome and to the court of Ceasar Borgia. Machiavelli's long experience gave him enough expertise of statecraft. In this capacity, he was at the center of the political life of Florence. He completely rejects the feudal conception of a complex hierarchy of relatively autonomous entities. And for it, he substitutes an all-powerful central authority, which is supreme over all institutions within the region over which he has any jurisdiction at all. Machiavelli was the first exponent of power-politics. His concern was not only the internal life of the city, but, since its very existence depended on maintaining a balance in the ever-shifting relationships between the city states of Italy and the great powers beyond the Alps. He also contributed greatly in the direction of foreign affairs. In 1512, the republic came to an end and with it ended Machiavelli's political career. Machiavelli's most radical and distinctive insight was his rejection of Christian virtue as a guide for leaders. Machiavelli's Christian contemporaries had suggested princes should be merciful, peaceful, generous, and tolerant. They thought that being a good politician, in short, was the same as being a good Christian? But Machiavelli argued differently with energy. He asked his readers to dwell on the incompatibility between Christian ethics and good governance via the case of Girolamo Savonarola. Savonarola was a fervent, idealistic Christian who had wanted to build the city of God on earth in Florence. He had preached against the excesses and tyranny of the Medici government, and had even managed for a few years to lead Florence as a peaceful, democratic, and (relatively) honest state. However, Savonarola's success could not last, for – in Machiavelli's view – it was based on the weakness that always attends being 'good' in the Christian sense. It was not long before his regime became a threat to the corrupt Pope Alexander, whose henchmen schemed, captured and tortured him hung and burned him in the center of Florence. This, in Machiavelli's eyes, is what inevitably happens to the nice guys in politics. Eventually they will be faced with a problem which cannot be solved by generosity, kindness or decency. It is because they will be up

against rivals or enemies who do not play by those rules. The unscrupulous will always have a major advantage. It will be impossible to win decently. Yet it is necessary to win in order to keep a society safe.

In this regard, Bernardo kept a library in which Niccolò must have read, but little is known of Niccolò's education and early life in Florence, at that time a thriving centre of philosophy and a brilliant showcase of the arts. He attended lectures by Marcello Virgilio Adriani, who chaired the Studio Fiorentino. He learned Latin well and probably knew some Greek, and he seems to have acquired the typical humanist education that was expected of officials of the Florentine Chancery. In a letter to a friend in 1498, Machiavelli writes of listening to the sermons of Girolamo Savonarola (1452–98), a Dominican friar who moved to Florence in 1482 and in the 1490s attracted a party of popular supporters with his thinly veiled accusations against the government, the clergy, and the pope. Although Savonarola, who effectively ruled Florence for several years after 1494, was featured in *The Prince* (1513) as an example of an “unarmed prophet” who must fail, Machiavelli was impressed with his learning and rhetorical skill. On May 24, 1498, Savonarola was hanged as a heretic and his body burned in the public square. Several days later, emerging from obscurity at the age of 29, Machiavelli became head of the second chancery a post that placed him in charge of the republic's foreign affairs in subject territories. How so young a man could be entrusted with so high an office remains a mystery, particularly because Machiavelli apparently never served an apprenticeship in the chancery. He held the post until 1512, having gained the confidence of Piero Soderini (1452–1522), the gonfalonier (chief magistrate) for life in Florence from 1502.

During his tenure at the second chancery, Machiavelli persuaded Soderini to reduce the city's reliance on mercenary forces by establishing a militia (1505), which Machiavelli subsequently organized. He also undertook diplomatic and military missions to the court of France; to Cesare Borgia (1475/76–1507), the son of Pope Alexander VI (reigned 1492–1503); to Pope Julius II (reigned 1503–13), Alexander's successor; to the court of Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I (reigned 1493–1519); and to Pisa (1509 and 1511). In 1503, one year after his missions to Cesare Borgia, Machiavelli wrote a short work, *Del modo di trattare i sudditi della Val di Chiana ribellati* (On the Way to Deal with the Rebel Subjects of the Valdichiana). Anticipating his later *Discourses on Livy*, a commentary on the ancient Roman historian, in this work he contrasts the errors of Florence with the wisdom of the Romans and declares that in dealing with rebellious peoples one must either benefit them or eliminate them. Machiavelli also was a witness to the bloody vengeance taken by Cesare on his mutinous captains at the town of Sinigaglia (December 31, 1502), of which he wrote a famous account. In much of his early writings, Machiavelli argues that “one should not offend a prince and later put faith in him.”

During the period of 1503 Machiavelli was sent to Rome for the duration of the conclave that elected Pope Julius II, an enemy of the Borgias, whose election Cesare had unwisely aided. Machiavelli watched Cesare's decline and, in a poem (First Decennale), celebrated his imprisonment, a burden that “he deserved as a rebel against Christ.” Altogether, Machiavelli embarked on more than 40 diplomatic missions during his 14 years at the chancery. In 1512 the Florentine republic was overthrown and the gonfalonier deposed by a Spanish army that Julius II had enlisted into his Holy League. The Medici family returned to rule Florence, and Machiavelli, suspected of conspiracy, was imprisoned, tortured, and sent into exile in 1513 to his father's small property in San Casciano, just south of Florence. There he wrote his two major works, *The Prince* and *Discourses on Livy*, both of which were published after his death. He dedicated *The Prince* to Lorenzo di Piero de' Medici (1492–1519), ruler of Florence from 1513 and grandson of Lorenzo de' Medici (1449–92). When, on Lorenzo's death, Cardinal Giulio de' Medici (1478–1534) came to govern Florence, Machiavelli was presented to the cardinal by Lorenzo Strozzi (1488–1538),

scion of one of Florence's wealthiest families, to whom he dedicated the dialogue *The Art of War* (1521; *Dell'arte della guerra*).

Looking towards employment of the famous philosopher, Machiavelli for the first time employed in 1520 by the cardinal to resolve a case of bankruptcy in Lucca, where he took the occasion to write a sketch of its government and to compose his *The Life of Castruccio Castracani of Lucca* (1520; *La vita di Castruccio Castracani da Lucca*). Later that year the cardinal agreed to have Machiavelli elected official historian of the republic, a post to which he was appointed in November 1520 with a salary of 57 gold florins a year, later increased to 100. In the meantime, he was commissioned by the Medici pope Leo X (reigned 1513–21) to write a discourse on the organization of the government of Florence. Machiavelli criticized both the Medici regime and the succeeding republic he had served and boldly advised the pope to restore the republic, replacing the unstable mixture of republic and principality then prevailing. Shortly thereafter, in May 1521, he was sent for two weeks to the Franciscan chapter at Carpi, where he improved his ability to "reason about silence." Machiavelli faced a dilemma about how to tell the truth about the rise of the Medici in Florence without offending his Medici patron.

After the death of Pope Leo X in 1521, Cardinal Giulio, Florence's sole master, was inclined to reform the city's government and sought out the advice of Machiavelli, who replied with the proposal he had made to Leo X. In 1523, following the death of Pope Adrian VI, the cardinal became Pope Clement VII, and Machiavelli worked with renewed enthusiasm on an official history of Florence. In June 1525 he presented his *Florentine Histories* (*Istorie Fiorentine*) to the pope, receiving in return a gift of 120 ducats. In April 1526 Machiavelli was made chancellor of the *Procuratori delle Mura* to superintend Florence's fortifications. At this time the pope had formed a Holy League at Cognac against Holy Roman Emperor Charles V (reigned 1519–56), and Machiavelli went with the army to join his friend Francesco Guicciardini (1482–1540), the pope's lieutenant, with whom he remained until the sack of Rome by the emperor's forces brought the war to an end in May 1527. Now that Florence had cast off the Medici, Machiavelli hoped to be restored to his old post at the chancery. But the few favours that the Medici had doled out to him caused the supporters of the free republic to look upon him with suspicion. Denied the post, he fell ill and died within a month.

### **His Writings**

In office Machiavelli wrote a number of short political discourses and poems on Florentine history. It was while he was out of office and in exile, however, that the "Florentine Secretary," as Machiavelli came to be called, wrote the works of political philosophy for which he is remembered. In his most noted letter (December 10, 1513), he described one of his days in the morning walking in the woods, in the afternoon drinking and gambling with friends at the inn, and in the evening reading and reflecting in his study, where, he says, "I feed on the food that alone is mine and that I was born for." In the same letter, Machiavelli remarks that he has just composed a little work on princes a "whimsy" and thus lightly introduces arguably the most famous book on politics ever written, the work that was to give the name Machiavellian to the teaching of worldly success through scheming deceit.

About the same time that Machiavelli wrote *The Prince* (1513), he was also writing a very different book, *Discourses on Livy* (or, more precisely, *Discourses on the First Ten Books of Titus Livy*). Both books were first published only after Machiavelli's death, the *Discourses on Livy* in 1531 and *The Prince* in 1532. They are distinguished from his other works by the fact that in the dedicatory letter to each he says that it contains everything he knows. The dedication of the *Discourses on Livy* presents the work to two of Machiavelli's friends, who he says are not princes

but deserve to be, and criticizes the sort of begging letter he appears to have written in dedicating *The Prince*. The two works differ also in substance and manner. Whereas *The Prince* is mostly concerned with princes—particularly new princes—and is short, easy to read, and, according to many, dangerously wicked, the *Discourses on Livy* is a “reasoning” that is long, difficult, and full of advice on how to preserve republics. Every thoughtful treatment of Machiavelli has had to come to terms with the differences between his two most important works.

## 1. The Prince

The first and most persistent view of Machiavelli is that of a teacher of evil. The German-born American philosopher Leo Strauss (1899–1973) begins his interpretation from this point. *The Prince* is in the tradition of the “Mirror for Princes” i.e., books of advice that enabled princes to see themselves as though reflected in a mirror which began with the *Cyropaedia* by the Greek historian Xenophon (431–350 BC) and continued into the Middle Ages. Prior to Machiavelli, works in this genre advised princes to adopt the best prince as their model, but Machiavelli’s version recommends that a prince go to the “effectual truth” of things and forgo the standard of “what should be done” lest he bring about his ruin. To maintain himself a prince must learn how not to be good and use or not use this knowledge “according to necessity.” An observer would see such a prince as guided by necessity, and from this standpoint Machiavelli can be interpreted as the founder of modern political science, a discipline based on the actual state of the world as opposed to how the world might be in utopias such as the Republic of Plato (428/27–348/47 BC) or the City of God of Saint Augustine (354–430). This second, amoral interpretation can be found in works by the German historian Friedrich Meinecke (1862–1954) and the German philosopher Ernst Cassirer (1874–1945). The amoral interpretation fastens on Machiavelli’s frequent resort to “necessity” in order to excuse actions that might otherwise be condemned as immoral. But Machiavelli also advises the use of prudence in particular circumstances, and, though he sometimes offers rules or remedies for princes to adopt, he does not seek to establish exact or universal laws of politics in the manner of modern political science. Machiavelli offers *The Prince* as an advice-book to Lorenzo de’ Medici, who ruled Florence from 1514 until 1519. In placing his political science in a book of advice, Machiavelli indicated his participation in the tradition of political reflection known as the mirror of princes. Many of the great Christian students of politics had done the same: Augustine in book 5 chapter 19 of his *De civitate dei*, Giles of Rome in his *De regimine principum*, and Thomas Aquinas in his *De regno ad regem Cypri*. As is true of Giles’s contribution—the most widely circulated item in the mirror of princes literature—Machiavelli’s private advice book took on a life of its own. That result seems to be something that Machiavelli had anticipated.

The twenty-six chapters of the work fall into three natural divisions. The first eleven chapters discuss principalities and princes; chapters 12–14 discuss the prince’s relationship to the military; and chapters 15–26 discuss the virtues proper to a prince, and the way that those virtues may assist those who read Machiavelli’s work. The theme of the opening chapters of *The Prince* is the types of principalities and the modes of their acquisition. In contrast to major classical works of political science such as Aristotle’s *Politics*, Machiavelli emphasizes how principalities are acquired—a sort of knowledge more useful to an ambitious prince than to the mere custodian of old orders. Machiavelli sets aside what he calls the hereditary principality—a principality devoted to the preservation of inheritance—in chapter 2, as the first and least interesting kind of principality. It is the principalities that are acquired that are of most interest to him. He treats principalities that are acquired by addition, and principalities that have previously lived under their own laws. He treats new principalities that are acquired by others’ arms and fortune, and principalities acquired by one’s own arms and virtue. The subsequent chapters discuss acquisition through crime, through alliance with the people, in relation to military force, and in relation to God.

Machiavelli's emphasis on how regimes are acquired involves a shift in perspective from what was common in the political analysis of Aristotle. According to Aristotle, political regimes were to be classified on two bases: the number of those ruling (one, few, many), and whether rule was for the sake of the common good or for the private good of the rulers. That classification emphasized what political regimes aimed at on the one hand, and each regime's basis in justice and human partisanship (the rule of many, a few, or one) on the other. Machiavelli's shift at the beginning of *The Prince* puts the emphasis on how regimes are acquired, rather than their aim. That shift presages a larger shift away from the common good and justice, which were the themes of classical philosophy. By considering principalities from the standpoint of acquisition, Machiavelli brings up another theme that marks his shift away from classical and Christian thought—the theme of necessity. The hereditary prince is of little interest to Machiavelli. Thanks to the love his people have for him, he has “less cause and less necessity to offend.” The new prince cannot enjoy that security, so his situation causes greater difficulty and along with its greater difficulty, a greater chance for distinction and glory. As Machiavelli examines the different types of new principality, he suggests that the most self-reliant princes have the greatest success. Though being new princes presents them with the “necessity to offend” not a dilemma about whether to offend, but a need to do so—the new princes exemplify what can be done by relying on what Machiavelli calls one's own arms. The new princes who relied upon their own arms had nothing from fortune “but the opportunity.” Machiavelli's examples of such princes include Theseus, Cyrus, Romulus, and Moses. Machiavelli suggests the possibility of a new sort of virtue: not obedience to the commandments of God, but seizing opportunities from fortune.

Machiavelli's new understanding of virtue emerges most clearly in chapter 15 of *The Prince*. In that chapter he addresses himself not only to princes but to all men. Past writers on republics and principalities, he says, have taught men what they should do rather than showing them how men act in fact. To pursue virtue in the traditional moral sense, Machiavelli says, leads a man to ruin “among so many who are not good.” In Aristotle's analysis of virtue in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, each virtue is a mean between two vices. The virtue of courage, for example, strikes a proper balance in matters of fear. Erring by excess is the voice of rashness, erring by defect the vice of cowardice. Machiavelli instead presents several pairs of qualities for which men are commonly praised or blamed, without indicating which are praiseworthy and which blameworthy. He suggests that virtue consists in the proper use of the qualities he mentions, while managing the praise and blame that goes with them.

In the subsequent four chapters (16–19) he examines several of these pairs of qualities in order to clarify what he means. Liberality and parsimony seem to be strongly opposed: liberality is praiseworthy and parsimony blameworthy. In Machiavelli's new analysis, liberality taken to its end would deprive a prince of all his goods—leaving him nothing with which to be generous. He should instead manage his affairs such that he gains the material benefits of parsimony along with the reputation of liberality. Although Machiavelli is, in one sense, authorizing princes to use qualities good and bad, he is not simply approving vice in the sense understood by the tradition. Aristotle taught that the virtues and vices were habits of action acquired by successive choices made over time. A repeated choice of what is bad would lead to the formation of a habitual vice. Machiavelli is far from allowing princes to give in to their desires particularly not for the property or women of their subjects. Rather, a prudent prince must study what is necessary for the success of his rule. He must, as Machiavelli writes in chapter 15, “learn to be able not to be good, and to use this and not use it according to necessity.” The new prince thus rises above or falls below virtue in the classical sense. He must choose what is necessary according to the time in order to stave off the malign effects of fortune. The ability to do this successfully is the heart of Machiavelli's new understanding of virtue.

In Machiavelli's view the traditional virtues undermine themselves. Just as liberality could lead to the loss of all one's goods, so mercy could allow cruel situations to fester, whereas an apparently cruel act might bring about the security necessary for men to flourish. Rather than advising his readers to follow the example of the saints or of God, Machiavelli invokes the examples of beasts—the fox and the lion—to describe the combination of shrewdness and power necessary to rule a principality well. The prince must avoid stirring up either hatred or contempt among those over whom he rules. He should be master of his actions and of how they appear, and he must be mindful of the qualities that others wish to see in those who rule them. Machiavelli shows an ambitious prince how to situate himself with respect to the two humors that dominate political life—that of the great who wish to rule, and that of the people who do not wish to be ruled. Machiavelli's science presents political life as the product of these competing humors. Armed with that science, no prince would do as the princes of Italy do in Machiavelli's own day, and bemoan their malignity of fortune. The political world manifests the competing influence of fortune and human virtue, and if men do not array their virtue against the tendencies of fortune, they will fall. The belief in providence may succor men when they are afflicted, but it cannot provide any realistic underpinning for human politics.

Machiavelli divides principalities into those that are acquired and those that are inherited. In general, he argues that the more difficult it is to acquire control over a state, the easier it is to hold on to it. The reason for this is that the fear of a new prince is stronger than the love for a hereditary prince; hence, the new prince, who relies on “a dread of punishment that never forsakes you,” will succeed, but a prince who expects his subjects to keep their promises of support will be disappointed. The prince will find that “each wants to die for him when death is at a distance,” but, when the prince needs his subjects, they generally decline to serve as promised. Thus, every prince, whether new or old, must look upon himself as a new prince and learn to rely on “one's own arms,” both literally in raising one's own army and metaphorically in not relying on the goodwill of others. The new prince relies on his own virtue, but, if virtue is to enable him to acquire a state, it must have a new meaning distinct from the New Testament virtue of seeking peace. Machiavelli's notion of virtue requires the prince to be concerned foremost with the art of war and to seek not merely security but also glory, for glory is included in necessity. *Virtù* for Machiavelli is virtue not for its own sake but rather for the sake of the reputation it enables princes to acquire. Liberality, for example, does not aid a prince, because the recipients may not be grateful, and lavish displays necessitate taxing of the prince's subjects, who will despise him for it. Thus, a prince should not be concerned if he is held to be stingy, as this vice enables him to rule. Similarly, a prince should not care about being held cruel as long as the cruelty is “well used.” Machiavelli sometimes uses virtue in the traditional sense too, as in a famous passage on Agathocles (361–289 BC), the self-styled king of Sicily, whom Machiavelli describes as a “most excellent captain” but one who came to power by criminal means. Of Agathocles, Machiavelli writes that “one cannot call it virtue to kill one's citizens, betray one's friends, to be without faith, without mercy and without religion.” Yet in the very next sentence he speaks of “the virtue of Agathocles,” which did all these things. Virtue, according to Machiavelli, aims to reduce the power of fortune over human affairs because fortune keeps men from relying on them. At first Machiavelli admits that fortune rules half of men's lives, but then, in an infamous metaphor, he compares fortune to a woman who lets herself be won more by the impetuous and the young, “who command her with more audacity,” than by those who proceed cautiously. Machiavelli cannot simply dismiss or replace the traditional notion of moral virtue, which gets its strength from the religious beliefs of ordinary people. His own virtue of mastery coexists with traditional moral virtue yet also makes use of it. A prince who possesses the virtue of mastery can command fortune and manage people to a degree never before thought possible.

In the last chapter of *The Prince*, Machiavelli writes a passionate “exhortation to seize Italy and to free her from the barbarians” apparently France and Spain, which had been overrunning the disunited peninsula. He calls for a redeemer, mentioning the miracles that occurred as Moses led the Israelites to the Promised Land, and closes with a quotation from a patriotic poem by Petrarch (1304–74). The final chapter has led many to a third interpretation of Machiavelli as a patriot rather than as a disinterested scientist.

## 2. The Discourses on Livy

Like *The Prince*, the *Discourses on Livy* admit of various interpretations. One view, elaborated separately in works by the political theorists J.G.A. Pocock and Quentin Skinner in the 1970s, stresses the work’s republicanism and locates Machiavelli in a republican tradition that starts with Aristotle (384–322 BC) and continues through the organization of the medieval city-states, the renewal of classical political philosophy in Renaissance humanism, and the establishment of the contemporary American republic. This interpretation focuses on Machiavelli’s various pro-republican remarks, such as his statement that the multitude is wiser and more constant than a prince and his emphasis in the *Discourses on Livy* on the republican virtue of self-sacrifice as a way of combating corruption. Yet Machiavelli’s republicanism does not rest on the usual republican premise that power is safer in the hands of many than it is in the hands of one. To the contrary, he asserts that, to found or reform a republic, it is necessary to “be alone.” Any ordering must depend on a single mind; thus, Romulus “deserves excuse” for killing Remus, his brother and partner in the founding of Rome, because it was for the common good. This statement is as close as Machiavelli ever came to saying “the end justifies the means,” a phrase closely associated with interpretations of *The Prince*.

Republics need the kind of leaders that Machiavelli describes in *The Prince*. These “princes in a republic” cannot govern in accordance with justice, because those who get what they deserve from them do not feel any obligation. Nor do those who are left alone feel grateful. Thus, a prince in a republic will have no “partisan friends” unless he learns “to kill the sons of Brutus,” using violence to make examples of enemies of the republic and, not incidentally, of himself. To reform a corrupt state presupposes a good man, but to become a prince presupposes a bad man. Good men, Machiavelli claims, will almost never get power, and bad men will almost never use power for a good end. Yet, since republics become corrupt when the people lose the fear that compels them to obey, the people must be led back to their original virtue by sensational executions reminding them of punishment and reviving their fear. The apparent solution to the problem is to let bad men gain glory through actions that have a good outcome, if not a good motive.

In the *Discourses on Livy*, Machiavelli favours the deeds of the ancients above their philosophy; he reproaches his contemporaries for consulting ancient jurists for political wisdom rather than looking to the actual history of Rome. He argues that the factional tumults of the Roman republic, which were condemned by many ancient writers, actually made Rome free and great. Moreover, although Machiavelli was a product of the Renaissance and is often portrayed as its leading exponent (e.g., by 19th-century Swiss historian Jacob Burckhardt he also criticized it, particularly for the humanism it derived from Plato, Aristotle, and the Roman orator Cicero (106–43 BC). He called for “new modes and orders” and compared himself to the explorers of unknown lands in his time. His emphasis on the effectual truth led him to seek the hidden springs of politics in fraud and conspiracy, examples of which he discussed with apparent relish. It is notable that, in both *The Prince* and the *Discourses on Livy*, the longest chapters are on conspiracy. He *Discourses* treats the public deliberations concerning Rome’s rise from an internal (book 1) and external perspective

(book 2), before turning to a discussion of the private maneuverings that contributed to Rome's rise (book 3).

Moreover, what distinguishes Machiavelli's treatment of Rome's internal rise is his defense of party government. By contrast, Aristotle thought that faction begat strife, which in turn led to the continual destruction, or cycling, of regimes. Machiavelli suggests instead "that the disunion of the plebs and the Roman Senate made that republic free and powerful" (book 1, chapter 4, title). Within this framework, Machiavelli suggests that the traditional cycle of regimes could, in fact, be overcome. Rather than weakening a city, the conflict of humors provides a source of energy that can be directed outward, toward the conquest of other regimes. Before discussing Rome's external deeds in book 2, Machiavelli treats the two humors, that of the people and that of the great, from which political life arises. Rather than seeking to establish a good regime based on orientation toward the common good, Machiavelli shows how management of the different humors could lead to a more secure and better outcome.

Modern republics are significantly different from their ancient forebears, however. The modern "education," as Machiavelli calls it, depends on a different religion. Christianity directs the human virtues toward the eternal life of heaven rather than, as the Roman religion did, toward the acquisition of worldly glory. As Machiavelli considers the expansion of Rome in book 2, he also points to the differences between the Roman and the Christian religions. The Romans sought worldly glory, and were able to attain it through their continual expansion. That same expansion made possible a venting of the domestic humors that typically plagued political life. The republicanism that Machiavelli presents in the Discourses assumes, contrary to the hopes of the classical philosophers that cities are not self-sufficient, and must turn outward to achieve their own common good. The new science of virtue that Machiavelli presents in *The Prince* is still necessary, then, in order to make the hopes of Machiavelli's Discourses a reality.

Throughout his two chief works, Machiavelli sees politics as defined by the difference between the ancients and the moderns: the ancients are strong, the moderns weak. The moderns are weak because they have been formed by Christianity, and, in three places in the Discourses on Livy, Machiavelli boldly and impudently criticizes the Roman Catholic Church and Christianity itself. For Machiavelli the church is the cause of Italy's disunity; the clergy is dishonest and leads people to believe "that it is evil to say evil of evil"; and Christianity glorifies suffering and makes the world effeminate. But Machiavelli leaves it unclear whether he prefers atheism, paganism, or a reformed Christianity, writing later, in a letter dated April 16, 1527 (only two months before his death): "I love my fatherland more than my soul."

### **3. The Florentine Histories**

Machiavelli's longest work commissioned by Pope Leo X in 1520, presented to Pope Clement VII in 1525, and first published in 1532 is a history of Florence from its origin to the death of Lorenzo di Piero de' Medici in 1492. Adopting the approach of humanist historians before him, Machiavelli used the plural "histories," dividing his account into "books" with non-historical introductions and invented speeches presented as if they were actual reports. His history, moreover, takes place in a non-historical context a contest between virtue and fortune. The theme of the Florentine Histories is the city's remarkable party division, which, unlike the divisions in ancient Rome, kept the city weak and corrupt. Like the Discourses on Livy, the Florentine Histories contains (less bold) criticism of the church and popes and revealing portraits of leading characters, especially of the Medici (the book is organized around the return of Cosimo de' Medici [1389–1464] to Florence in 1434 after his exile). It also features an exaggeratedly "Machiavellian" oration by a plebeian leader, apparently Michele di Lando, who was head of the 1378 Revolt of

the Ciompi (“wool carders”), a rebellion of Florence’s lower classes that resulted in the formation of the city’s most democratic (albeit short-lived) government. Although not a modern historian, Machiavelli, with his emphasis on “diverse effects,” exhibits some of the modern historian’s devotion to facts.

#### **4. The Art of War and other writings**

The Art of War (1521), one of only a few works of Machiavelli to be published during his lifetime, is a dialogue set in the Orti Oricellari, a garden in Florence where humanists gathered to discuss philosophy and politics. The principal speaker is Fabrizio Colonna, a professional condottiere and Machiavelli’s authority on the art of war. He urges, contrary to the literary humanists, that the ancients be imitated in “strong and harsh things, not delicate and soft” i.e., in war. Fabrizio, though a mercenary himself, inveighs against the use of mercenaries in modern times and presents the Roman army as his model of military excellence. The dialogue was later praised by the Prussian war theorist Carl von Clausewitz (1780–1831) and has achieved a prominent place in the history of writings on war.

However, Among Machiavelli’s lesser writings, two deserve mention: The Life of Castruccio Castracani of Lucca (1520) and The Mandrake. The former is a sketch of Castruccio Castracani (1281–1328), the Ghibelline ruler of Lucca (a city near Florence), who is presented as the greatest man of postclassical times. It concludes with a list of witty remarks attributed to Castruccio but actually taken from ancient philosophers, providing a rare glimpse of Machiavelli’s view of them. The Mandrake, the best known of Machiavelli’s three plays, was probably composed in 1518. In it a foolish old jurist, Messer Nicia, allows himself to be cuckolded by a young man, Callimaco, in order to produce a son he cannot beget himself. His wife, Lucrezia, is persuaded to comply despite her virtue by a crooked priest, and the conspiracy is facilitated by a procurer. Since at the end of the play everyone gets what he wants, the lesson is that immoral actions such as adultery can bring happiness out of evil can come good.

However, Machiavelli’s thought is even more radical than it appears, because it suggests a new understanding of fundamental matters beyond those restricted to politics, issues such as nature, fortune, and history, as well as issues of morality and rule. Machiavelli’s work implies a transformation of the classical and Christian praise of virtue. He also suggests that the accidents men attribute to fortune can be rationally controlled, if men can control the most vexing part of nature human nature. When human nature is resolved into its constituent parts, the princely and the popular humors, a new picture of political life emerges. The common good sought by classical political philosophy cannot be achieved through moral education. Necessity imposes upon human affairs a different set of requirements that does not respect the traditional virtues. By seeking the higher things, especially in the form of Christian renunciation and humility, men have instead allowed the human things to sink into disrepair. A new science of the political parties suggests that the indirect management of human affairs, through party government and a self-sufficient understanding of virtue, may bring human beings greater glory than Christianity offered.

#### **3.3: Machiavelli and Medieval period**

Unlike political theory after Machiavelli, in ancient Greek and Roman thought politics cannot be separated from goodness and “the final end” of man – that is, the natural destiny of man as the sort of creature that he is. In good Renaissance humanist fashion (and mindful of the prevailing intellectual spirit of his times, we should also say) Machiavelli claimed to be basing his political theory on ancient authors, in particular by making explicit what they (he says) continually implied

but never openly said. In reality, however, he was creatively reinterpreting those authors to suit his own life situations and expectations. Interestingly, Machiavelli judged that such princes as Julius II and Cesare Borgia would have had much more success had they accommodated their principles to the spirit of the times rather than trying to shape the times in accord with their principles. Thus, it seems that in terms of how he used ancient sources, accommodation of principles to the exigencies of the times was something Machiavelli himself practiced.

This “accommodations” raises the interesting question, recognized by nearly all scholars today, of the deep interpenetration of the Medieval and Renaissance mindsets. Following Petrarch, the acknowledged father of Renaissance humanism, we often think of discrete “periods” of history whose boundaries are characterized by discontinuities – “the Ancient world” of pristine humanism gives way to the “Middle Ages” of cultural stagnation, which in turn eventually gives way to “the Renaissance,” the dramatic rebirth of the Ancient in “Modern times.” This sense of historical particularization and unique sociocultural rootedness of truth claims and indeed of all human activities, is a chief characteristic of the intellectual movement we call “the Renaissance,” and we usually take its neat categorizations for granted.

But consider that one of the chief humanist criticisms of scholasticism was that by breaking up authoritative ancient texts into bundles of decontextualized statements (*sententiae*) which were to be dialectically analyzed, scholastic intellectuals did not properly interpret the ancient texts but instead creatively reinterpreted them through the lens of contemporary concerns. Ancient authors were made to speak to issues which had not been in their sight, but their opinions, when arranged logically as supports or defeaters for contemporary problems (*quaestiones*), were considered authoritative. The humanists, by contrast, preferred to read the whole of an ancient text in as much of its historical and cultural context as could be understood, so that the original author’s own meaning could be understood. This is the much-celebrated (by us) appeal to *ad fontes* (“to the sources”). Sweep away the commentaries and traditions and speculative analyses and applications of the intervening ages, return to the pure point, and take the contextual meaning found there as the only legitimate meaning.

However, paradoxically, this difference between humanism and scholasticism implies that by using classical authorities to actually subvert classical teachings, Machiavelli, usually thought of as a “Renaissance or “early Modern” political theorist was acting more in the Medieval than the Renaissance (or Modern) mode of approaching texts. In effect, he used Medievalism to subvert Medievalism, and used an ethic of creative fidelity to the past to introduce something completely discontinuous with the past. Or so it seems to me. Machiavelli had a keen observation and a sensitive disposition. The political and intellectual tendencies of the medieval age greatly influenced him. He exhibited these influences through his political philosophy. At the dawn of the 16th century, the Council or Movement was stopped by the monarchical reaction. This movement propagated and supported democratic beliefs and a government that was based on an established set of principles of governance, both in the church and the state. The Pope re-established his supreme position over Church Councils. On the secular front, absolute monarchies reasserted themselves in all the important states and deterred the feudal assemblies and feudal aristocracy for the time being. However, this monarchic re-consolidation did not have much influence in Italy at the time. No ruler of the Italian states, namely, Venice, Naples, Milan, Florence and Papal State, could affect a consolidation of the whole Italian empire. The Italian politics during this period was influenced by constant intriguing by ambitious potentates, local as well as foreign. In this way, political turmoil became common in Italy, and so did internecine wars. The political leaders of Italy seemed to be more inclined to achieve their motives rather than care for public interests. Statecraft and the law of public morality became the main source of defense. Machiavelli was not able to keep himself aloof from the political situation in Italy, which had become alarmingly

complicated and depressing. His main wish was to secure independence for Italy and restore prosperity to its cities. It was Machiavelli's firm belief that the basis of contemporary politics was selfish political seizure and violence and not good Christian ethics.

## **Looking towards the Spirit of Renaissance**

In addition to feeling deeply pained about the chaotic politics of Italy, the growing spirit of the Renaissance in Italy and the wave of unrestrained intellectual freedom from the hold of scholastic dogmas and ancient beliefs strongly influenced Machiavelli. This comprised of a pre-Christian attitude towards religion and morality. During the middle Ages, the functions of the church and the state were closely linked, and the church dominated the state and influenced its political philosophy to a great extent. With the advent of the Renaissance, men began to challenge the clerics' points of view, and to formulate political theories of a secular bent. Machiavelli became the chief exponent of this new thinking.

## **Spirituality salvation and School of Thought**

Machiavelli's period was the transition stage between the middle and the modern ages. Spirituality, salvation and God dominated the dogmatic Christian theology, and the idea of social morality being governed by free thoughts was incomprehensible to most. The Renaissance influenced man, and sharpened his dignity and individualism. There was less focus on God and religion that were the chief entities and subjects of study earlier. The Renaissance guided the era of the rationalists who viewed God, man and nature from the standpoint of reason and not faith. After incidents of geographical discoveries, international conflicts propelled the development of nationalism and nation-state which stood in opposition to medieval universalism of church and state. Self-assertion, individualism and disregard of conventional morality were promoted by these new conditions. Machiavelli genuinely represented his times. A strong reflection of his representation was seen in his mental processes, in the core of his research, in his aims and ideals, in his realistic viewpoint, in his hedonistic morality, in his empiricism and in his nationalism. Machiavelli, like the medieval scholars and thinkers, his imagination was influenced by the great Greek philosopher, Aristotle. He criticized the rigid version of the Christian scriptures, the church's version of these scriptures, the rampant corruption in the church and the way the church and the state wrestled for power and dominion with each other. According to Machiavelli, human problems were deeply linked to the basics of human nature. Human nature was essentially the same everywhere every time, and Machiavelli manifested this phenomenon by understanding the present with the help of the past.

However, in the *Policraticus*, by John, Bishop of Salisbury, and *The Prince*, by Niccol Machiavelli, show distinguishable differences in thinking between the middle Ages and the period of Renaissance. The two books were written in different eras, and they both talk about the true meaning of prince as a ruler and how he should conduct himself in order to maintain his power. The most significant differences between the two writers result from their differing views regarding religion, political power, and political goals.

### **3.4: Machiavelli's Methods: The Child of Renaissance and reformation**

The Renaissance was considered as the beginning of the modern history by majority of European historians. Renaissance was contributed to by scientists, scholars, philosophers, architects, artists, and rulers. The Renaissance in Italy was the most notable in Europe in the 15th century. Machiavelli was one of the leaders of that time. He made one saying that has been influential to the present human age; He said that if you want to make an individual obey a particular aspect in life, you will be forced to supply a particular level of power that will make him prefer the aspect other than any other that is in existence. In this case, safety and security will be maintained in any state.

Machiavelli was a Florentine political theorist and also a statesman. Though considered a controversial figure in political history, he has been identified as exclusive in his influence during the renaissance especially due to his manual in 1532, the prince. His work addressed political and historical topics which faced great criticism from many writers. His work in the prince aimed the Medici who was ruling Italy. In the prince, he gives the ruler, who was a monarch, advice on how to retain his position in power. He argued that political life may at times be excused for performing acts of violence and deception that is not right in private life, because alone moral or religious rules are not adequate to govern. Due to this argument, Machiavelli was to great extent misunderstood by many critic writers for his view on relationship between ethics and politics, and was regarded as an opportunistic politician in manipulating other people. His advice in the prince was said to have minimal practical influence. However, there are several write that valued his work and claim to be greatly inspired by Machiavelli in their political life. They argue that while Machiavelli's advice to the leaders contradicts with Christian morals, it was just pragmatic advice to those who want to succeed in politics. These writers find his advice effective in governance and not an alternative value system. Thus they do not find Machiavelli's idea conflicting with moral values.

Although his work was forbidden from publication and even reading, printings and translations were still found in the following centuries. His enormous influence was evident when many writers responded positively to his work. It may be that the only way to stop an evil man from killing millions is to kill him. Utilitarian moralities can cope with these problems, but only by avoiding absolute moral proscriptions.

Larry Koz states that Machiavelli is considered a highly influential character in European History especially during Renaissance. In the article, the Larry Koz states that Machiavelli work affects him especially in his political beliefs. The he says that Machiavelli influenced him when he ceased to work in the government. This is when Machiavelli started writing about politics where he included his beliefs and doctrines in his work. With this, he published the prince, in 1513. In his work, he talked of authoritative rule as the best form of leadership. This followed with an argument that "ends justifying the means". Machiavelli's beliefs as cited in his "the prince" on government though seen unethical by critics of his work, influenced the political beliefs of this writer. Machiavelli wrote; "There are three ways of holding on to them [acquired states]: the first is to destroy them; the second, to go and live there in person; the third, to allow them to live under their own laws, exacting tribute from them and creating a government there within the state composed of a few people who will keep it friendly towards you, though this is seen as morally wrong by critics of his work, this writer finds these steps as important in political life. In addition the writer thinks the steps if followed wound form a successful government (Brill Academic, 68). The writer goes to the extent of recommending Machiavelli's points to any nation for they could create a possibility for allies among rival nations and strive towards a more peaceful world. The writer confirms that Machiavelli's work influenced many during renaissance, and that his influence has survived the test of time and he affirms that he is one of those people affected by the work to date. He confesses his beliefs in Machiavelli work about political theories, and political practices. He agrees that Machiavelli's argument on authoritative rule is an effective way of governance, and on "ends justifying means". He further advices those against Machiavelli's works to look at them in order to learn from them. He also approves Machiavelli work by regarding him to as an intelligent and an influential man during renaissance.

However, Niccolo Machiavelli is one of the political leaders of the early renaissance period. He was born in 1469. He did a number of treaties that made him famous during that time and even today. In many historical books as regards the past time, he is well quoted and treated as one of the pragmatic leaders who have happened to be in this world. He was a politician as well as a

philosopher. It is due to this work of philosophy that he was able to write various books and documentations that he used to pass his message to the people he ruled. It was during the period of renaissance that many philosophers were active. Machiavelli left a legacy that made many to wonder whether it could really happen. Machiavelli had a view of the kind of rulers who existed in Italy. He realized that they were egoistic and wicked. He made one decision that had a great effect after he had died. It is due to proper use of power that will enable an individual to manage a given group of people. Machiavelli had every reason to learn and teach people the rules of political power. The political activity that exists is specifically due to the kind of power that is being practiced by the leader of that place. People need to be handled by use of power. It is only a good use of power that an individual leader is able to maintain safety and peace of any human setting.

Machiavelli considered the use of force as the only and applicable theory to be able to administer a good leadership system. For a well ordered political system, one has to embrace the use of coercion among the people. Effective laws and arms are crucial in the formation and the maintenance of any political system. It is through a political power that any political activity is defined. Machiavelli has a distinctive difference between law and force. It is only through a perfect arm and excellent law that an individual can manage a given political authority. The arms are for the administration of force while laws are for guidance in this administration. Legality is only obtained from the use of force. This is actually the reason why Machiavelli decided to use coercion in most of the leadership that he had during his time. He said that it is very rare to find good laws without the presence of good and functional arms. He therefore decided to concentrate in establishing strong and effective arms force that will see to it that good laws are made and implemented. It is only through coercion that a human being is made to do a particular activity or obey a given directive. Machiavelli therefore considered the use of force to establish everything that he desired for in his life and governance. Machiavelli addresses the issue of fear among human beings. He said that it is fear that makes people to behave and act in unusual ways. If you subject an individual to fear and intimidation, he will be made to adhere to the force that results to the stimuli of fear in him. In this case, Machiavelli considers that people can be made to come to terms of certain principles by simply subjecting them to a state of fear.

Within the existing period of time and the political thought, most of the work of Machiavelli could not be grasped by many people. This made many people to hate most of what he did. Moreover, he happened to have used a lot of force that people could not withstand. Within the abrupt time of the collapse of the Italian city states, he came into existence. It was abrupt and forced people to act according to how he wanted. He had a formative movement that no one could withstand at any time. Within a short period of time, he again announced a break in what he had announced to be done. In his work of discourses of Livy, there are a number of controversies in what Machiavelli wrote. The work itself has some introductions that are in two paragraphs. The first exemplifies the dangers of finding new systems and methodologies, and the intention that an individual declares before. Here he decides to take a path that has never been taken by anybody in the entire state. The second paragraph is basically a dismissal of the antiquarianism that existed during the time of renaissance. The reason for dismissal is faked and not true at all. This activity becomes one of Machiavelli's undoing in his government. He regards this renaissance period as poor and with the only main purpose of protecting the sovereignty of the country with the prospect of making history. In every piece of writing, it is normally important for the writer to follow particular steps that will guide him in a good production. In the book, there is nevertheless a method that can be used to interrogate these kinds of reasoning in nature. This is to be able to see and note the changes that different areas have.

Most of the works that Machiavelli did are found in other people's pieces of works. There are several social theories that have been seen to explain the concepts that Machiavelli was trying to

apply to life. The book therefore is not a true account and reflection of the political groupings that existed among the people together with the various forms. People could therefore not pay much attention to what was said in it. It is quite ironical to find an individual like Machiavelli, who is a crucial republican, get to advice an autocrat on how to manage power and security among the people of the land. He was a strong republican but yet wrote a number of books that contained advices of an autocrat on how to get and maintain power. There were foreign threats that Machiavelli was foreseeing. That is why he decided to embrace a shrewd leadership. He saw it as the only way to protect the power and wealth that was in the state to avoid the foreign threats as France and Spain. This was also for the reasons of personal interests. Moreover, there was no positive influence that could make people to come to like the works of Machiavelli, especially the book titled the prince. It was neither interesting nor startling to the eyes of the people. This was mainly because of the fact that during that time, there was a widespread handbook of behavior that met the needs of the monarchical states.

Many ideas in the prince are of shock to many people. This is because of the sentence he gave as regards to his perspectives of life and leadership. He suggested that a prince should not be failing in virtues. He should be loyal to the state and the people as long as he is following the interests of the state. This is also a perspective that any leader should take any political alliance or power. For instance, he says that a priest should not evade the punishment of murder if he deserves according to the law. He is the first individual to act according to the rules and regulations of the existing laws and norms of the society. According to Machiavelli, there are two aspects that every leader and leadership strategy has to adhere to. These are the power and the influence of luck. He said that these are the main aspects of life that act to determine the destiny of every individual in the society. Power arises from the force applied upon the lives of the people and the style of cunning that superimposes. According to Machiavelli, there is no role that God plays in each part of politics. This is one of the reasons why there is a failure in the works of Machiavelli which raised controversies after his death.

Moreover, he does not eschew it openly. He speaks of love as an organ that should be exercised for the betterment of the society. This is crucial to the fact that he does not recognize ethics yet they are the major sources and tranquilizers of love. This is a big controversy of Machiavelli. This further shows that there is no room for Christian ethics to take place yet he stresses the need for love among the people. There is also the issue of murder. In this case, he says that murder should be condoned when it is necessary. People could not understand nor act according to this order. The prince is totally political in nature. The nature in which the book is set is a clear indication of the program of the Italian princes. The classification of the principalities, the methods of winning and their maintenance is a clear indication that it is a program of the Italian princes. He does a number of deeds simply to prove the more-than-ethics scenario in the human conduct.

There are a number of aspects that Machiavelli considers to be the causes of the failures portrayed in the prince. The resultant reactions from the people, and especially the high class made him to consider the book a failure. He expected the book to be praised and highly reputed by the people of the high class. This would result to a huge gain when it came to selling the book. Moreover, it would have made what he said get to the big places and people of the country. However, the people confiscated the book. The people called the Medicis had no important thing in the book. They could not realize what had actually been written in the book. They therefore could not give any credit to Machiavelli. There was no political favor that got to Machiavelli either. He therefore considers this book one of the failures in his intentions of carrying out the message that he had for the people of his nation. Moreover, the book took a lot of time before it was printed. This actually happened when he had died. This however had a lot of impact on the Italian people as they took another long period before they got their independence. The book had a number of reactions from

other people even those not of Italy. Many people say that many political leaders as president bush used Machiavelli's ideas in their governance. For instance, during his attack of Iraq. Moreover, many ruthless rulers as Hitler had to use the book to justify many of the misdeeds that they did to the people of their lands. This also made many people and leaders to take advantage of Machiavelli's thesis. They carried out many unethical deeds in their countries. Machiavelli's works has become subjects of concern among many people of many countries in the world. This was actually not the intention of Machiavelli himself. It has actually brought up many and varied ethical questions that were inexistent before his writings. Many political and business ventures are utilizing the ides of the book to carry out their weird intentions in the societies. These people are rationalizing many of the actions that they are doing with the prospect that the end will justify the beginning. This is actually wrong having in mind what actually justifies the beginning.

From the above, varied reactions that followed Machiavelli's work during the renaissance period, may be interpreted indifferent way. They ranged from those which sounded positive to those that were actually negative in nature. However, most of the works that Machiavelli did have been of practical use in many governance and leadership skills in the world. Machiavelli was not concerned with medieval problems and had no use for medieval postulates, Christian principles of justice and morality and deductive methods of study employed by medieval thinkers. Medieval appeal to authority and scriptures and a priori reasoning did not suit him. He got his inspiration from Aristotle. Like Aristotle, he preferred to generalize from particulars. He followed the empirical method of observation that was reinforced by historical method. He conducted a deep study and analysis of contemporary politics, came upon conclusions and made his conclusions more effective with the support of historical evidence. Ancient Roman history offered him the most convenient parallels and political truths. He relied on history because he believed that one, who desires to foresee what is going to take place, should consider what has already taken place. Machiavelli provides modern examples in *The Prince* and cites several examples from ancient history in *The Discourses*.

Machiavelli specifically believed in the historical method, because he preferred practical rather than speculative politics. As a realist in politics, he did not care much for the philosophy of politics. Machiavelli's works set forth a theory of the government and actual working of its machinery rather than the state and the abstract principles of constitution. Machiavelli took at things from the viewpoint of a ruler rather than from that of the ruled. For Machiavelli, a deed which may be immoral for an individual would be moral for a ruler, if it is in the interest of the state. It was his belief that public morality and private morality were different, based on circumstances. In his writings, Machiavelli rejected the doctrine of natural law. His view was that a man's virtue is a collective measure of his power, fame and intellect. Hence, for 'virtue' it is inappropriate to impose any restraints by general principles which natural law implies. He revolted against medievalism and the doctrine of natural law by refusing to accept the coexistence of the clerics and the secularists. As to the spiritual ancestry of Machiavelli the great Greek philosopher Aristotle held his imagination. Machiavelli quietly put aside the Church's scriptures. He believed that human nature, and therefore, human problems were the same at all times and places, and so the best way of enlightening the present, according to him, was possible with the help of the past. Thus, Machiavelli's methods, like that of Aristotle, were historical. But, it was more so in appearance than in substance and reality. He was more concerned with the actual working of the governmental machinery than the abstract principles of constitution. A realist in politics his writings expound a theory of the art of government rather than a theory of State. The actual source of his speculation to the interest he felt in the men and conditions of his own time. He, therefore, adopted a form and method of political philosophy which ignored completely the scholastic and juristic ideals, He adopted the ancient Greek-Roman philosophy because the Romans had established a well-organized empire which the Greeks could not which led him to

perceive the true relation between history and politics and it is from history that he drew his conclusions as the political truths. His conclusion was reached empirically based on common sense and shrewd political foresight. According to Sabine "He used history exactly as he used his own observation to illustrate or support a conclusion that he had reached without reference to two histories." He was a political realist, and like Aristotle he amassed historical facts to others, but his political writings belong less to political theory than to the class of diplomatic literature. It was Dunning who called his study as "the study of the art of government rather than a theory of the State". Thus, the substance of his thought covers a much narrower field than Aristotle. But, in this narrow field to his treatment of the problems exhibit, in the words of Sabine, "going into points of weakness and strength in a political situation, the clearest and coolest judgment of the resources and temperament of an opponent, the most objective estimate of the consequences of a policy, the soundest common sense in forecasting the logic of events, and the outcome of a course of action". Machiavelli is generally seen as being critical of Christianity as it existed in his time, specifically its effect upon politics, and also everyday life. In his opinion, Christianity, along with teleological Aristotelianism that the church had come to accept, allowed practical decisions to be guided too much by imaginary ideals and encouraged people to lazily leave events up to providence or, as he would put it, chance, luck or fortune. While Christianity sees modesty as a virtue and pride as sinful, Machiavelli took a more classical position, seeing ambition, spiritedness, and the pursuit of glory as good and natural things, and part of the virtue and prudence that good princes should have. Therefore, while it was traditional to say that leaders should have virtues, especially prudence, Machiavelli's use of the words virtue and *pudenda* was unusual for his time, implying a spirited and immodest ambition. Famously, Machiavelli argued that virtue and prudence can help a man control more of his future, in the place of allowing fortune to do so.

### **Machiavelli's views of Human Nature**

Machiavelli states that actions can not to be judged by individual ethics and morality. He prescribes double standard of conduct for statesmen and the private citizens. This exaggerated notion of what a ruler and a state can do is perhaps because of Machiavelli's understanding of the problem that confronted a ruler amid the corruption of 16th Century Italy. So he said a sheer political genius a successful ruler must to create a military power to overcome the disorderly cities and principalities and, therefore, the force behind the law must be the only power that holds society together; moral obligations must in the end be derived from law anti-government. Machiavelli was similar to John Calvin and Thomas Hobbes, as he did not subscribe to the school of thought that believes in the essential goodness of human beings and human nature. He held that man was an uncomfortable blend of bravery, folly and weakness, who was easy to hoodwink and lord over. It is not difficult to understand why some thinkers choose to give so less credit to human nature. Men are not generally rational and their emotions often dictate their actions. His belief that men were wicked and essentially selfish was similar to that of Hobbes. Human conduct is governed by motives such as selfishness and egoism. Men are 'ungrateful, fickle, deceitful, cowardly and avaricious'. Being good is more of a necessity than a choice. Men have no general inclination towards goodness and are more easily corrupted than reformed. They are good by necessity and are compelled to form societies in order to live in security provided by the laws of society. The element of fear dominates life more than love. Fear should therefore be personified by a prince. A prince who is feared knows his true position among his subjects. He should be able to create fear in their minds, without the presence of hatred or contempt.

'Love of wealth and ambition and enemy are powerful motives of human action.  
Men always commit the error of not knowing when to limit their hopes. Man is

acquisitive and wants to add to what he already enjoys. He wants secularly. He also desires liberty that is independence of others and feels that the best way of ensuring liberty for him is by establishing dominion over others. Men are constantly ambitious and discontented with their ... This leads to strife between men and societies. Machiavelli does not give a 'systematic exposition of human psychology as was done by Hobbes who drew largely on Machiavelli for his conception of human nature.'

The state being the highest form of human association has supreme claim over men's obligations. This theory of Machiavelli gives supreme importance to the law given in society. The ruler, in order to prove this claim, must at the same time enlance every opportunity to develop his reputation. He must keep people busy with great enterprises, must surrounded all his actions with open participation in the affairs of neighboring states. Besides, he must also. Pose as the patron of art, commerce and agriculture and should refrain from imposing burdensome taxation. To Machiavelli, the justice of state was in the interest of the sovereignly and the safety of state was the supreme law. In the concept of the ruler, he or she is the head as well as the authority of the state. It is for his or her moral obligation that one must ultimately besustained by law and the ruler, as the creator of the state, is not only outside the law, but if thelaw enacts morals, lie is outside morality as well. There is no standard to judge his acts except the success of his political expedience for enlarging and perpetuating the power of his state. Itwill be the ruin of the state if the ruler's public action were to be weighed dowel by individualethics, especially those which relate to internal and external security. Therefore, public and private standards were difficult. It was airways wrong for an individual to commit crime even to the, but sometimes good and necessary for the ruler to do so in the interest of the state. Similarly, it is wrong for a private individual to kill, but not for the state to execute someoneby way of punishment. The state hangs a muleteer because public safety demands it, Public conduct, in fact, is neither inherently good nor bad. It is good if its results are good. A citizenacts for himself and as the greatest participant of the state and is also responsible for his action, whereas the state acts for all, and therefore, same principles of conduct could not be applied to both. The state has no ethics.

However, Machiavelli's concept of human nature has, inevitably, contoured his theory of the state, the ends of the state and his views regarding the methods of achieving those ends. It leads to divorce between Ethics and Politics. His concept goes against the Aristotelian view of the essential sociability of man and leads to the conclusion that the stale is not a natural organism, but a contrivance against the evil nature of man. I( must be pointed out that his concept of human nature is empiric. It is not based on any scientific or rational analysis. There are similarities between Machiavelli's theory of human nature and John Calvin's doctrine of Original Sin. Machiavelli does not subscribe to the idea of man's moral evolution. According to him, man's moral and ethical conduct is not mutable. In a similar vein as Hobbes, Machiavelli did not present human nature in a very positive light. His political ideas are based on his analysis of human nature. Further, Machiavelli. Political thought centered around one problem, i.e., the end of the stale. Political power of the stale was only a means in the service of a higher end. i.e, securing of good life, leading a good health etc. Machiavelli's thought is based on the concept that power is an end in itself. Machiavelli, therefore, addresses himself to the discovery of means to 'acquire, retain and expand power'. Machiavelli was the first thinker to use the word 'state' in its modern connotation.

### ***The role of Prince***

The Prince is developed and explained by Machiavelli with twenty-six chapters by dividing each chapter into three divisions. The first division comprises of a general introduction that resides upon the different types of absolute governance. The second division criticizes the prevailing system of mercenary troops and furthers the cause of the establishment of a national army. The third division of the book is the most essential part as it carries the substance of Machiavelli's philosophy. This part offers ways to a prince to learn statecraft and the rules of state governance. Machiavelli is specifically addressing the 'new prince', i.e., one who was a usurper of power or a leader of men who had seized a state with force or craft. *The Prince* is based upon two important premises that have been chiefly derived from Aristotle. The most essential of these premises is that affiliation to the state is the highest form of the social human condition, and that the state should be directed towards the promotion of human welfare. Machiavelli maintains that all individuals who constitute a state should merge themselves in the state so that an individual is able to attain his best self. Therefore, it is essential that state welfare should take precedence over individual or group welfare. Another premise is that individual and public actions are governed by material forces. Thus, when it comes to governing a state, the ruler or the prince must pursue self-interests. There is essentially no need to consider the ethical dimension of these interests. Machiavelli ends up identifying the state with the ruler.

For Machiavelli, similar to ancient Greeks, virtue lay in functional excellence. These characteristics (cunning, deceit, and ruthlessness, energy, boldness, shrewdness and unflinching will) were virtuous for a prince who was adept in yielding success and power. In *The Prince*, a handbook on government, Machiavelli lays down certain guiding principles for the ruler. The ruler must not only be strong, but must exhibit his strength when necessity arises. 'A Prince must not mind incurring the charge of cruelty for the purposes of keeping his subjects united and faithful'. He ought to try to be both feared and loved. He must, however, see to it that neither cruelty nor fear is used for its own sake. A ruler must keep a watchful eye on the dissidents and the disaffected. He must not be weighed down by conventional moral standards. 'It is necessary for a Prince who wishes to maintain himself to learn how not to be good'. A prince must always retain the initiative and power of decision with himself and in everything.

One of the most effective means whereby a prince maintains himself in power is by clearly using the sentiments of the people, particularly the religious sentiments. Men are generally tradition bound. A prince, while introducing reforms, must keep the people's love of tradition in mind. He must keep up appearances of old institutions while changing them.

Chapter XVIII of *The Prince* expresses Machiavelli's notion of the qualities that were to be inherent in a successful prince. 'Virtue' in the 16th century did not have the moral import, which is attached to it nowadays; it only meant 'qualities' of a man. In theory, integrity may be preferred and valued over deceit and connivance, but in the practical world, craftiness and ingenuity prove to be more helpful. Law and force are two essentials that the state can depend upon for its success. A prince should be both rational and brutal, the latter in turn representing a judicious combination of the lion and the fox. A ruler needs the qualities of a lion in organizing and undertaking military expeditions and stirring men to action. He needs fox-like qualities in diplomatic and administrative affairs. By fox-like qualities, he can create and maintain a lion-like image of him. A prince who is prudent is not required to keep his words and promises when they conflict with his own interests and 'when the reasons which make him bind him no longer exist'. Hypocrisy is a positive quality for a prince, and he must be as clever as a fox. He should have the dexterity to hide his real motives and inclinations from his subjects. To Machiavelli, it was reason deter to preserve the state of monarchy. For a prince, all his neighbors are potentially his enemies, and so, he should always be cautious. A clever prince will attack his enemy without being prepared. He will consolidate and be aware of the internal unity of his state, not by surrendering his powers to the people but by

establishing thorough despotism. Since the human conduct is fundamentally associated with economic motives, a prince should be focused on all that is required to keep his subjects from experiencing economic problems. A prince might execute a conspirator, but he should never confiscate his property. Confiscation would be considered more of a serious issue by the affected family rather than execution.

A prince must avoid being condemned or hated. He will be condemned if he builds a reputation of being variable, inconsistent, effeminate, cowardly or irresolute. He should show in his actions grandeur, courage, gravity and determination. A prince should be a good dissembler and should seem to be merciful, faithful, human, religious and upright. Machiavelli advises the prince to use subtlety to deal with the affairs of the public. He believed that dishonesty is the best of polity. It is a fact that Machiavelli considered him a physician of the state. The ethics of his patient's public actions were not his concern. He was only concerned with offering ways in which the state could be maintained at all costs, but he did not consider why it was necessary. Thus, Machiavelli believed that a prince should not be emotionally disturbed, but he should be prepared and have the capability of using other people's emotions. A prince must be a cool and calculating opportunist. He should have the ability of opposing evil with evil. If the interest of the state demands, he should be prepared to commit any sin without hesitation. His purpose should not be deterred by any other trace of emotion except love for his state, for which he should be prepared to sacrifice his soul too. As far as state is concerned, a prince need not feel burdened by any childish consideration of justice or injustice, good or bad, right or wrong, mercy or cruelty and honor or dishonor.

### **3.5: Views on the Separation of Politics from Ethics and Religion**

The principal claim of this view is that one should believe in the difference between ethical rules and political exigencies, and that one should take political measures on the basis of reality and by keeping in mind the interests and benefits. Anchored to this approach is also called political realism, is the consideration of ethics in politics ending in failure in this sphere. It is because the pivot of ethics is truth and right while the motive of politics is interests and benefits. Ethics demands that we tell the truth even though it is against us, not to do injustice, not to take people as our instruments, to be advocates of justice all the time, not to lie, to abstain from deception, not to conceal the truths, etc. This is while politics necessitates the abandonment of some principles of ethics. Basically any step in politics begins with hostility against ethics and trampling upon moralities. Any political activity is impossible without 'the dirty hands'. Politics is nothing but an arena for the obtainment, expansion and preservation of power, which cannot be realized without sacrificing the principles of ethics. After every political step, the abundance of crushed moral virtues is conspicuous. Therefore, one must choose ethics or politics, purity or defilement while discarding the other since combining the two is absurd. As a result, "All the interests of man who wants his soul to remain pure through piety lie in not doing anything."

According to a political realist adhering to ethics in the political sphere is not only unbeneficial but also means total loss since he knows that in this world, "In spite of the moral tales who are for children, virtue remains unrewarding. The real sovereign is power... and moral temptations are signs of weakness of designs." Apparently, the first thinker who dwelt on this issue and elucidated it was Thucydides, a Greek political thinker and historian. He precisely sketched out this viewpoint two thousand and four hundred years ago and decided to delineate the exact boundary between ethics and politics and to separate these two realms from one another. In the belief that politics is tied to interests while ethics is to truth, he narrates the dialogue between the representatives of Athens, which was then in a position of strength, and the representatives of the

city of Melos, a former ally of Athens that was in a position of weakness. The dialogue strikingly shows the essence of this view.

After the city of Melos fell under siege, the representatives of Athens went there to conduct a dialogue and talked with the elders of the city. An excerpt of the dialogue is as follows:

“What we want is to make it clear to you that we have come here for the expansion of our empire and is conducting this dialogue so as to maintain the safety of your city. To prevail over you is not difficult for us, but at the same time, we want your safety since this affair is beneficial to both of us.” The representatives of Melos replied, “How could it be just as good for us to be the slaves as for you to be the masters?” Representatives of Athens: “You, by giving in, would save yourselves from disaster; we by not destroying you, would be able to profit from you. Representatives of Melos: “Hence, according to the people of your city, just behaviour lies in not differentiating between the cities that have nothing to do with you (neutral) and those that are either your puppets or have revolted against you, and you have gained control over them?. Representatives of Athens: “From the viewpoint of right and wrong, our people do not make any difference between them and they believe that the cities are still independent as they are strong, and the reason why we do not attack them is that we are afraid of them. So, by conquering you we shall increase not only the size but the security of our empire as well. We have mastery over the seas and you are a small and weak island. As such, it is only natural that you should surrender to us.” Therefore, since the people of Athens are more powerful than the people of the island of Melos, the power itself gives them the right to occupy the island and make its inhabitants their slaves. The view of the separation of ethics from politics is more explicitly associated with Machiavelli, the Italian thinker. He not only insists on this dichotomy but also recommends, in his concise and famous thesis named, *The Prince*, to the ruler or prince to trample upon every ethical consideration so as to fortify his power.

Machiavelli is sometimes called the father of political science arguing that political life as a symbol of different kinds of moral calculus, one in which everybody must be responsible for the result even of good actions. He broke away from the tradition upheld by Plato, Aristotle and medieval thinkers which looked at the state in terms of its ethical purpose of making men happy and good. Machiavelli did not pay much attention to ethics in his political theory about the state. The state is manifested as an entity that has its own interests. State-power was an end in itself and not a means to a higher moral end of promoting special welfare. Machiavelli justified the actions of the state by focusing on its interests. According to him, laws were to be created by the state and individual ethics did not apply to the actions of the state. Machiavelli prescribed double standards of conduct for the ruler and for individual citizens. As such he is above both. The state will be ruined if the prince allows his individual morals to interfere in public affairs upon which the external and internal security of the state depends. There was a difference in the public and private standards of conduct. In the case of an individual, it was always wrong to lie. However, it was often important and favourable for a ruler to do so in the interest of the state. The state is a non-ethical entity. Machiavelli's belief was the same as that of Thrasymachus, who stated that the sovereign would do well in establishing justice in the state. After all, the safety of the state held supreme importance. However, these double standards were based on the theory that it is the duty of the ruler to form the law as well as determine the moral obligations of the subjects. The law must sustain these moral obligations in the best way possible.

On the grounds of humanitarian ground, Machiavelli's belief that the state was the highest form of human association, and that man was primarily obligated to the state. His belief also stated that the state should be considered more important than any ethical considerations. Public interests held the highest degree of potential than any other motive for political action. The standards of

action for the public were not the same as private standards. It was not right for a subject of the state to kill another, but the state is justified in killing an individual in the form of punishment for his crime. A murderer is hanged by the state to ensure public safety as public interests should be protected first and foremost over private interests, and are more important than the private interests of the criminal. Private interests of ethics are not related in any way to public conduct and neither to that of the criminal. This scheme of thought suggests that Machiavelli did not give much importance to ethics, or for that matter, for religion in his system of political philosophy. This was the main factor which differentiated him from the medieval writers. Though Aristotle was one of the early scholars to distinguish ethics from politics, still he had not separated the two concepts, whereas Machiavelli completely separated the two entities. He valued moral virtues, but these found no resonance in his political philosophy. Machiavelli agrees that qualities like liberalism, mercy, fidelity, courage, chastity and sincerity make a good man and adds, 'I know that everyone will confess that it would be most praiseworthy for a prince to possess all the above mentioned qualities which are held to be good.' Again, 'one cannot call it a virtue to murder one's fellow citizens, to betray one's friends, to be without faith, without mercy, without religion here the word virtue is used by Machiavelli in the conventional sense. Morality was not denied but was treated as secondary to politics, and hence, Machiavelli 'was not immoral but unmoral in his politics'. To Machiavelli, there is no absolute good or evil. That which serves the interest of the individuals and of the community and which brings security is good. Machiavelli, like the Jesuits, has the same definition for means as those that justify the end. Machiavelli may be called the 'founder of utilitarian ethics'. On the grounds of interests and private interests, we may be related with the private enterprises. Private interests of ethics are not related to public action. Public conduct cannot be called inherently good and neither can it be termed as bad. It is good if its results are good. It is possible for a good citizen to be a bad man in the form of one who values nationalism and patriotism. A citizen acts only for his own self, whereas the state acts for everyone and hence the same principles of conduct are not applicable to both. The state is neither moral nor immoral but has no moral. It is not a moral entity like the individual and, therefore; individual ethics do not apply to it. Thus in the view of morality Machiavelli has introduced two different types of morality, one for the ruler and another for the private citizen.

### **3.6: Views on state and preservation**

Machiavelli was a practical politician who was greatly disturbed by the conditions of his native state. He never claimed to be political philosopher. His 'Prince' contains the tips given to the fictional prince. The 'Prince' as mainly a handbook on the art of ruling and maintaining oneself in power in his advice; he is mainly concerned with the actual state of his time without bothering about its origin, nature, functions etc. Allen says "The Prince was written of a Prince, for a Prince and for no one else"? However in subsequent period, his ideas were concretized to develop a systematic whole. The following are the various ideas of Machiavelli on state that can be said to have formed into a systematic political theory.

1. For Machiavelli, state has its origin in the calculating self-interest on the part of individuals. For, human beings are selfish, egoistic and ambitious, but weak and fickle.
2. The state for Machiavelli is an artificial creation.
3. Machiavelli identifies three kinds of state, viz., monarchy, aristocracy and republic. He neglected aristocracy, hailed republic as best but favored monarchy in Italy which was plagued by many problems.
4. State exists only on account of interplay of material interests. Likewise, he makes the Church subservient to the state.

5. Machiavelli supports the constitution of state by citizens with spirit of probity, law abidingness, and trustworthiness in the performance of public duties.
6. Machiavelli puts faith in the reality of power politics. For him, there remains an inherent tendency in states to expand and continue. To quote him, "All free governments have two principal ends—one of which is to preserve their liberties and the other to enlarge their dominions".
7. Machiavelli is in favour of maintaining a national army without which a state cannot survive for longer period, so he advocates military training for citizens between the age of 17 and 40.

Machiavelli is considered that the state is the highest association of the people and there finds their whole hearted surrender and participation. The state exists to check self-interest and promote general wellbeing. It is the prosperity of the people and popularwealth and developmental assert which enhances the development of the state. Machiavelli states that the doctrine that the state should have supremacy over the church in all ecclesiastical matters. Machiavelli did not believe in a supernatural end. Men value material prosperity, power and fame, etc., disbelieving in a supernatural end. Machiavelli has no use for the divine law. Machiavelli not only separated morality from politics, but also relegated religion to a very subordinate position in his political system, and it is because of this that we think that the modern study of politics begins with Machiavelli. For centuries, politics and religion had been intertwined. Politics was, in fact, the handmaid of religion. Some of the best medieval thinkers subordinated the state to the church. As a political realist, Machiavelli realized that passive Christian virtues, like gentleness and meekness, had little bearing on the sordid Italian politics of the day where success followed only the pagan virtues of courage, audacity, cunning and duplicity. Italy had no place for Christianity for, as represented by papacy, it was deliberately impeding the realization of Italian unity. Once again, Machiavelli was notirreligious, but non-religious. He was more attracted to the propagandist utility than tothe doctrinal virtue of Christianity. Machiavelli knew the public utility of the binding force of religion without which the state could not exist. He looked upon devotion to religion as a useful weapon in the hands of statesman to be skillfully used in furtherance of the ends of the state. He took a pagan rather than the medieval ecclesiastical view of religion. To Machiavelli, the church was a department of the state and not independent of it. The church had a place within the state but not above or beside it. Properly used, it could reinforce a citizen's sense of duty to the state. Machiavelli must be reckoned as the last of the great line of medieval secularists who urged the subordination of the church to the state. A good deal of criticism attaches to Machiavelli for his cynical disregard of morality and religion. Machiavellianism has become a byword for unscrupulousness. Machiavelli wrote *The Prince* and *The Discourses* primarily from the point of view of the preservation of the state, every other consideration being secondary. The growing success of men like Caesar Borgia and the active contact of Machiavelli with him reacted strongly on the mind of the philosopher in favour of the 'strong man", capable of other's emulation. In *The Prince*, Machiavelli tries to idealize Borgia. On the other hand, Machiavelli had been very unfavorably impressed by the collapse in Florence of Savanorla's regime which was based on the shaky principle of moral excellence, unsuited as it was to the Italy of his day. Morality and religion had very little touch with the actual Italian politics in the days of Machiavelli, who in this respect was a mere creature of his time. Machiavelli, when he discarded morality and religion from his political philosophy, acted like a realistic painter, for he had more of the Aristotelian than the Platonist about him. The onrushing wave of Pagan Renaissances had greatly weakened the hold of Christianity and Christian morality on the minds of the people. It appeared then that Christianity had ceased to function and that new standards of conduct based on self-interest were necessary, and therefore, justifiable. It was not surprising then that morality or religion has no place in Machiavelli's political theory. Ethics and religion were social forces, working within the state, not above it. However, behind Machiavelli's belief and his cynicism of his political opinion were national patriotism and a desire for the unification of Italy and her preservation from internal

disorder and foreign invaders. He frankly asserted that duty towards one's own country overrides all other duties and scruples.

## **Classification of Government**

Niccolò Machiavelli, more famous for *The Prince*, describes the “various kinds of states” in a fashion similar, but in some important ways different, from Plato. Plato's description (at left) is really a thought experiment of how his ideal state, the Aristocracy of philosophers, would decay. His description is generational, that unworthy children fail to perpetuate the virtues of their parents. Thus, the Timarchy is produced by children who value themselves just for their honor and ability to use force, the Oligarchy is produced by children who decide to use their force to become wealthy, the Democracy is produced by children who think they have a right to that wealth just by being citizens, and the Tyranny is produced by children whose total lack of discipline and restraint produces a chaos that is only ended by one of their number seizing personal power. True to his generation, the tyrant uses his power to take whatever he wants. Plato's description is often psychologically true of many specific events and persons in history.

Machiavelli's description is also generational, but it also introduces another principle, and it results in a kind of conclusion foreign to Plato's thinking. The principle that Machiavelli introduces is simply that of a classification by the distribution to power, i.e. power is exercised by one, by a few, or by the many. This is a useful device, and is used here in the theory of Liberties in *Three Dimensions*. Thus, power exercised by one is a Monarchy, by a few, an Aristocracy, and by the many, a Democracy. However, Machiavelli allows that there are good and bad versions of each of these, reserves these terms for the good forms, and introduces “Tyranny,” “Oligarchy,” and “Anarchy” for the bad versions of rule by one, the few, and the many, respectively. These terms are conveniently schematic and descriptive and ignore a utopian possibility like Plato's government of philosophers.

Machiavelli imposes his generational thought experiment, beginning with a “state of nature” origin for Monarchy of a sort that we still find later in Thomas Hobbes. The good monarch, however, is succeeded by corrupt rulers who begin to use their power for their own gain, becoming tyrants. The tyrant is then overthrown, and the rebels decide to retain power among them collectively, producing an Aristocracy. The aristocrats are succeeded by a generation that again begins to use its power to oppress the people, producing the Oligarchy, and so they end up getting overthrown like the tyrant. Now political power passes to the people, making for Democracy. Unlike Plato, Machiavelli, does not view democracy per se as worse than the other “good” forms of government. Indeed, Machiavelli includes a chapter in the *Discourses* (Book II Chapter LVIII) on how “The Multitude is Wiser and More Constant than a Prince.” The propensity of Democracy to decay into Anarchy, which Machiavelli describes in much the same terms as Plato, is therefore no more a failing of Democracy than the similar propensities were of Monarchy and Aristocracy. The only difference might be in the next step: Plato sees a tyrant benefiting from the Anarchy produced by Democracy, while Machiavelli brings his thought experiment full circle by having Anarchy, which mimics the “state of nature,” followed once again by Monarchy. As a matter of historical fact, we have no difficulty finding chaotic conditions that led to both tyrants (Hitler) and virtuous monarchs (Diocletian). Machiavelli's thought experiment, like Plato's, would seem to be entirely pessimistic. Plato's only hope would be his government of philosophers where precautions are taken to prevent the principle of hereditary succession from beginning. Machiavelli also sees hereditary succession as a source of evil; but, as a realist and a historian, he does not imagine that it can be long prevented, especially when people are inherently bad. His solution for the corruption of the “good” governments must therefore come from a different direction. His inspiration turns out to be a historical one, the Roman Republic, which,

although followed by the Empire, nevertheless endured for several centuries and accomplished great things. The strength of the Republic, according to Machiavelli, depended on its combination of the devices of the “good” forms of government: I say, therefore, that all these kinds of government are harmful in consequence of the short life of the three good ones and the viciousness of the three bad ones. Having noted these failings, prudent lawgivers rejected each of these forms individually and chose instead to combine them into one that would be firmer and more stable than any, since each form would serve as a check upon the others in a state having monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy at one and the same time. The Roman Republic thus had monarchical authority in the Consuls, aristocratic authority in the Senate, and popular authority in the Tribunes. In Machiavelli’s phrase, “...since each form would serve as a check upon the others,” we see the introduction of the idea of checks and balances as means to prevent the corruption and oppression of government. If people cannot be good, then we must have a government where the interests and power of some work to secure the conscientiousness and honesty of others. This idea is later expanded by 17th and 18th century thinkers, until we have the great system of the Executive, Legislative, and Judiciary, and the States and the Federal Governments, designed as checks upon each other in the United States Constitution. That this system has now failed to actually protect freedom and virtue is a consequence of historical circumstances, failure in the original design, and changing, fallacious, unsympathetic ideology. Nevertheless, it is clear that the principle is sound and is able to secure responsible government for extended periods. The fallacy in Plato is exposed: the problem is not who is in power, since none is wise.

Over time, of course, what we see is that the ingenuity of those in power never ceases to undermine the limitations of their power, and the cupidity of some citizens never tires in the hope of extracting the substance of their less politically powerful fellows. Our challenge, then, is simply to perfect the design and prepare the ground so that, when the next Franklin, Washington, and Jefferson come along, it may be put to the test — hopefully to even more enduring results. As it happens, Machiavelli was not the first to admire Roman government as succeeding through the sort of “mixed” constitution that had originally been described by Aristotle. Such a view of Rome began at least with the Greek historian Polybius (c.200-120 BC), who saw the Roman Republic in one of its more successful periods (as a hostage from the Achaean League), before civil wars began to unhinge its institutions. For a thinker of his capability, Machiavelli classified the forms of government in a rather disorganized way. He accepted the way Aristotle classified the government a monarchy, aristocracy and constitutional democracy, with tyranny, oligarchy and democracy being their perversions respectively. He also endorsed the ideas of Polybius and Cicero who called for a mixed type of constitution with proper checks and balances is the best and the most suitable constitution for a state. But his definition of the balance was economic or social but not political. Machiavelli held his belief in economic determinism, and he connected wealth with political power. An economic interest existed behind this struggle for political liberty. Machiavelli was inclined to be a republican more than a monarchist. According to him, a republican form of governance was the most suitable for a political community, where there was a general economic equality. A republic is capable of maintaining its traditions and reconcile to new changes in a better way than a sentimental prince. In order to ensure more streamlined and universal material prosperity, a republican system of government is preferred, as a republic government can provide equal opportunities to all the subjects. A republican system has a higher level of endurance and is more liberal than most monarchies. In a group, people exhibit more prudence and judgment qualities and are able to choose officers of a better type, than a prince who is influenced by the court.

### **3.7: Types of Government**

Niccolo Machiavelli wrote political works during the Renaissance. In *The Prince*, Machiavelli advised his audience that in a system of Rule by Man it was "better to be feared than loved." An absolute ruler may be accepted because the people believe or accept the idea that God gave him or her right to rule. This belief is known as divine right, which often has been associated with a monarchy, a form of government in which the power of the king or queen is hereditary. A similar idea legitimized the Chinese emperor, whose rule was threatened if his subjects perceived that he had lost the "mandate of heaven." Rule by man can also take the shape of an oligarchy, or rule by a few elites whose right to rule is based on possession of wealth, social status, military position or achievement. A little more broadly based rule is by aristocracy (literally, "rule of the highest"), but if the type of government is "rule by man", their decisions are still arbitrary and absolute the rules shape the government's legitimacy, or the degree to which the people accept the authority of the government. Thus Machiavelli introduced the rule of the government by the following ways.

### **Rule by Man**

Countries whose citizens are governed by the absolute decisions of the ruler have not necessarily been unhappy. A government whose king or queen rules justly and wisely may enjoy a great deal of legitimacy as long as the ruler's authority is accepted. Sometimes people may accept their leader because they are afraid of the consequences if they don't. In the words of Machiavelli, "it is better to be feared than loved." as long as the feared ruler is seen as bringing about prosperity or protecting the lives of his subjects, it is entirely possible that his people will be happy.

### **Rule by Law**

Rule by law exists in any political system in which those with power cannot make up all their own rules, but must follow an established code of law. In ancient times a byzantine emperor established Justinian's code, a set of laws named after him that lived on long after he died. We still follow parts of that code today. The romans were also known for codifying laws, as was napoleon, emperor of France, many centuries later.

### **Rule by the Law-giver and law**

Machiavelli assigns an important position to law-giver and law in his scheme of things. Force, fraud and fear are no solid foundations for the society and the state, and their use by the ruler needs to be reinforced by some force which has a greater appeal to man and which is law. Law is indispensable for the society and the state. It moulds the national character of the people. It inculcates moral and civic virtues in individuals. These virtues are good for all states, but are indispensable for republics.

'In view of the selfish nature of man, law is the most effective means of holding the society and the state together because it compels the egoistic individual to honour his moral obligations. For this reason a wise law-giver is of supreme importance. He is the architect not only of the state but of society as well, with all its moral, religious and economic institutions.'

### **Rule by Aristocracy**

An aristocracy, specifically a landed aristocracy, could often lead to unnecessary feuds and chaos, and would oppose the formation of a state. Machiavelli neither endorsed a republic nor a monarchy. He had no preconceived preference for majority or minority rule. His prime concern

was an efficient state. To achieve this motive, he suggested the need for an extra-legal sovereign. He knew that a state needed to have different kinds of governments at different points of time. Machiavelli was of the opinion that in the Italy of his day, an elective monarchy would be more suitable than a republican form of state. The most important requirement of Italy then, was deliverance from the foreigners (German, French and Spanish) and a wise and strong elective prince suited this requirement better than a republic. Machiavelli held his belief in the cyclical character of the forms of government.

### **Rule by the Prince**

In *The Prince*, Machiavelli makes a strong plea for monarchical absolutism whereas in *The Discourses*, he pleads for democracy or popular share in government. The fact is that he admired both monarchical despotism and popular government as suiting different conditions and situations. Despotism was more suited than democracy in his founding of a new state by revolution or in the reforming of a corrupt state. But once the state has been founded, it can become stable only if there is popular support to it arising from popular participation in the government. A monarchical state becomes stable only if the ruler rules in accordance with law and respects the property and other rights of the people. Thus, despotism is good when the need is to find a new state by force or cleanse a corrupt one by revolution, while democracy is good in settled states.

Machiavelli's administration for despotism and democracy were not consistent and can only be explained on the basis that he had 'one theory for revolutions and another for government'. Despotism is suitable for revolutionary times and popular government is suited to peaceful, well-settled states.

### **Rule by A realist in politics**

Machiavelli, with his sensitive mind and clear insight, saw clearly the direction of political evolution in Europe towards an absolute monarchy, supreme within the state and independent of control by any external universal authority. He realized that medieval institutions had become defective and that nationalism was becoming a vital force. He saw clearly the moral and political corruption all around him. He wrote on the basis of the realities of his own day. Machiavelli mainly studied practical and not speculative politics. Being a realist in politics, he did not care much for political philosophy. He concentrated on the preservation and strengthening of the state, and he was not bothered about the excellence of its constitution. He writes about almost nothing except about practical politics, statecraft and the art of war. He divorces them almost wholly from religious, social and ethical considerations. He writes about the means by which the state could become strong, about politics by which they could expand their territories and power and about factors which cause political decay and destruction. He judges state and ruler, not by the ethics of their public action, but by the degree of success or failure attending these actions.

The political realism of Machiavelli is apparent from his classic. *The Prince* is not an academic treatise or a book on political science or political philosophy as such. It is one on practical politics. It is a treatise on the art of government suggesting the means that might enable a ruler to achieve political success and stabilize power for him. As a realist in politics, Machiavelli recommends to the ruler those virtues which bring success such as cunning, deceit and ruthlessness. Like a practical realist, he points out that 'Men always commit the error of not knowing where to limit their hopes'. The political realism of Machiavelli is apparent from the fact that the means, which he suggests for the preservation and strength of monarchical states, are not the same as those for republican state. Machiavelli writes as a realist painter, mirroring the conditions and trends of his own day when there was almost a constant struggle for power between Italian rulers. His realism is well brought out by his doctrine of aggrandizement, which he

advocates both in *The Prince* and *The Discourses*. Machiavelli insists that everything can be justified by interests of the state. The safety of the state was supreme law. By his political realism, Machiavelli brought political theory in line with political practice. Thus Machiavelli stated the norms of the government in the following manner.

1. Nothing is more difficult than establishing a government,; for he who introduces it makes enemies of all who prospered under the old regime and finds but lukewarm defenders from those who stand to benefit from the new one.
2. Those who gain power from strictly nefarious means gain dominion but not glory
3. The strength of a principality is measured on whether it can survive on its own in times of trouble
4. Ecclesiastical principalities are the easiest to protect thank to the great power of the church due to the efforts of Alexander VI. No one will attack the power of the church and it does not matter what kind of ruler is in place, for nothing can destroy the religious ties of the people.
5. There is greater security in being feared than loved, but be careful not to be hated.
6. It is best for a new ruler to arm his people. This shows a sense of trust in the people and puts the responsibility of protecting the new regime on the people.
7. To promote goodwill among the people, a good prince should always support new businesses, promising artisans, and the like. He should also celebrate at festivals with his people in honor of days and events that they hold special. Both rewards and punishments should be quick and creative.

### **3.8: Views on the Doctrine of Aggrandizement**

In *The Prince* and *The Discourses*, Machiavelli insisted on the necessity of expanding the realms of the state. Both monarchies and republics exhibit an overwhelming inclination to expand. His theory of extending the dominion of a state did not mean 'the blending of two or more social or political organisms, but as consisting in the subjection of a number of states to the rule of a single prince or commonwealth'. According to Machiavelli, a state must either grow or eliminate and it was easier to extend the dominion in one's own country, because common language will only help the subjects of the conquered state to assimilate with the subjects of the prince's land. Machiavelli held his belief on the Roman state and its policy of expansion in the form of tin idea. The use of force was essential for political aggrandizement and for the perpetuation of state. However, force should have a judicious combination of statecraft. The doctrine of aggrandizement is a highlight of Machiavelli's political philosophies, and emphasizes the hints of moral apathy that most of his theories can be said to contain. It must be realized that so rational a thinker as Montesquieu supports Machiavelli when he writes, 'The right of natural defense sometimes involves the necessity to attack, if one nation notices that a longer lasting peace would put another one in the position to destroy her.'

Both *The Prince* and *The Discourses* are expressions of Machiavelli's theories pertaining to the perpetuation of the state. When a prince wants to perpetuate monarchy.he must try to uphold the traditions and customs of the people, because these are dearer to his subjects than even liberty and life. When the use of force and fear has been made for the establishment of the government, a prince should have a well-trained army of his own subjects. He should draw on the spoils of war more than on the regular public treasury. He must be enterprising and promise his subjects that he

will build a grand empire. The imposition of heavy taxes is strictly prohibited. It is also important for the prince to be a patron of art and literature. For Machiavelli, an ideal prince is an enlightened despot who is without morals. In a republic, it is very important for the constitution to be flexible. The law of the land should change in keeping with other changing aspects of the republic. Machiavelli justified occasional dictatorship and party strife in a republic.

### **3.9: Views on Modernism**

Modern thought is based on the inapplicability of medieval concepts to modern society, transformed by the Renaissance and the Reformation. Due to the Universalism of the Papacy and the Empire, there was no concept of territorial sovereignty in the Middle Ages. Sovereignty is the authority of a state to govern itself. The first need of the modern period now that the papacy and the Empire had been discredited was to evolve a concept of sovereignty which could withstand the tendencies of feudalism to divide the state into smaller units and the weak pretensions of papacy and empire. This was done by Machiavelli and after him by Bodin, Grotius and others. Machiavelli is responsible to a great extent for the way we perceive state in the modern times. Machiavelli rejects the notion of universal authority. For him, the 'state is the nation'. He has freed the state from the medieval bondage of religion. Machiavelli was hardly a political theorist. His writings are directed more towards how to govern a state rather than offering a philosophy of the state. Machiavelli is often termed as the father of modern political theory. There are several modern theorists whose theories are based upon Machiavelli's theories. He had used the term 'state' in a different context as compared to the context in which it is used now. Its use now is something that has a defined territory, population, government and sovereignty of its own. Bodin and Grotius' theory of legal sovereignty was built on Machiavelli's concept of a sovereign and territorial secular state. This was formulated properly by John Austin and Thomas Hobbes, who borrowed the concept of human nature from Machiavelli. Hobbes believed that man is a brute with a huge ego and his actions are motivated by fear. Machiavelli can rightly be placed among the first modern, totalitarian thinkers.

Machiavelli reinforced the precedence of material interests over spiritual ones. He deified the state and supported the theory that individuals should be completely absorbed by the state. Machiavelli's ideas were similar to the ideas of Hegel, who established a parallel between the state and the God on earth. Machiavelli's theory of aggrandizement resembles the modern theory of power-politics on which thinkers like Nietzsche, Treitschke, Bernhardi and others have written a lot. The problems of Machiavelli's prince are of everlasting interest because they are the problems of efficient government. Even the ethics of Machiavelli are not out of debate in the modern world which relies on material forces rather than moral ones. Machiavelli is the father of realpolitik. He refuses to idealize anything. He writes about men and affairs as they are and not as they should be.

Modern thought is based on the inapplicability of medieval concepts to modern society, transformed by the Renaissance and the Reformation. Due to the Universalism of the Papacy and the Empire, there was no concept of territorial sovereignty in the Middle Ages. Sovereignty is the authority of a state to govern itself. The first need of the modern period now that the papacy and the Empire had been discredited was to evolve a concept of sovereignty which could withstand the tendencies of feudalism to divide the state into smaller units and the weak pretensions of papacy and empire. This was done by Machiavelli and after him by Bodin, Grotius and others. Machiavelli is responsible to a great extent for the way we perceive state in the modern times. Machiavelli rejects the notion of universal authority. For him, the 'state is the nation'. He has freed the state from the medieval bondage of religion. It has been said that Machiavelli's theories are aimed at preserving states, rather than being mere theories that only theorize. So, his theories have a specific purpose, i.e., the preservation of states and state power. Machiavelli was a political

realist rather than a political philosopher. His thoughts are related to the conditions and needs of the Italy of his day. Machiavelli was not interested in political philosophy or political ideals as such. Italy, of his day, was torn among petty states, almost constantly at war with each other and with constantly changing frontiers. Machiavelli called upon to suggest ways and means of preserving the state from internal revolutions and foreign attacks which were the order of the day.

Machiavelli employed an empirical approach to most issues. He combined political theory and political practice in his approach. Pragmatism was inherent in all his political philosophies. This realism of Machiavelli is well illustrated by the doctrine of aggrandizement. Aggrandizement was the order of the day in Machiavelli's Italy. Absorption of other states or by other states was the order of the day. This doctrine of aggrandizement must have carried weight later on with government and with princes like Frederick the Great and Henry VIII of England, etc. Jesuits in the century stood for Machiavellianism in the realms of Ethics and Politics.

The influence of Machiavelli on modern political science and practice has been tremendous. Princes like Frederick the Great were essentially Machiavellian though Frederick had the boldness to repudiate Machiavellianism in his *Refutation Prince de Machiavelli*. Machiavelli contributed in one of the many ways by bringing political theory on the same plane as political practice. It must be noted that in the Middle Ages, the two were, on the whole, out of harmony with each other. Machiavelli can rightly be termed as a political scientist who gave more importance to the ends, and not the means. At the same time, his theories were inherently non-idealistic. Neither in *The Prince*, nor in *The Discourses*, does Machiavelli expound his views about the state as such and its various attributes. He does not directly deal with concepts such as sovereignty, separation of powers, etc. He is interested in political maxims rather than political ideals. Often, he takes his principles or maxims for granted instead of giving a systematic exposition of them. He was a pragmatist, and the theory of the state as such did not interest him. Sabine characterizes the political thought of Machiavelli as narrowly local and narrowly dated. There is a certain measure of truth in this observation, which, however, is too categorical to be completely correct. Machiavelli's thought is local because it reflects and was provoked by the conditions and needs of Italy of his day. Machiavelli wrote as an impassioned Italian patriot, practically ignoring the world outside Italy. His thought was local also in the sense that it was not in consonance with contemporary European thought outside Italy. It was, however, not narrowly local in the sense that it reflected only conditions and needs of Italy. The conditions in other European countries, particularly Germany, were not very different from those obtaining in Italy. The same observation may be made regarding Machiavelli's thought being 'narrowly' dated.

## 4. THOMAS HOBBS

### 4.0: Early Life and education

Thomas Hobbes, one of the greatest political thinkers in the history of political thought, was born on 5 April 1588 near Malmesbury in Wiltshire, England. He was born in a poor family and was the son of a clergyman. His uncle had brought him up. He was a talented student. His intelligence can be assessed by the fact that while he was still in school, he could master a number of languages, which included Greek, Latin, French, English and Italian. He began to translate many original works into Greek, Latin and English. He translated Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War* into English in 1629. He also translated Euripides' *Medea* from Greek to Latin. He studied at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and went on to work as a tutor to the son of the Earl

of Devonshire. At Oxford University, Hobbes learned logic and physics, but gradually, he began to dislike the education imparted at Oxford. He termed scholasticism as a collection of absurdities. After his University education, he got an opportunity of recruitment in the family of William Tord Cavendish which was an aristocratic family. In the beginning, he was a tutor but later he became a secretary. He spent the rest of his life in the employment of this family or its neighbors and cousins. He got an opportunity to tour various parts of Europe with the son of Lord Cavendish. This gave him a unique opportunity to meet various personalities that included renowned politicians and intellectuals. These, meetings expanded his intellectual horizon. The great personalities like Pierre Gassendi (1592-1655), Galileo Galilee (1564-1642) and Marin Mersenne (1588-1648) had a profound influence on him. It was Mersenne who induced Hobbes to write his critical observations on the *Meditations* of Descartes. Hobbes explains the connection between nature, man, and society through the law of inertia ("bodies at rest tend to stay at rest; bodies in motion tend to stay in motion"). Thus man's desire to do what he wants is checked only by an equal and opposite need for security. Society is but an artificial man invented by man, so to understand politics one should merely consider himself as part of nature.

The social and historical context of the period when he was born was very much significant; it was a tumultuous situation when England was witnessing a civil war. Hobbes started writing since late 1630s. In 1651, he published *Leviathan*, his masterpiece. It was published in the midst of constitutional upheavals of the civil war and the commonwealth. His aim throughout was to warn against the consequences of political conflict, the only cure for which, he thought was an absolute and undivided sovereignty. During the course of the English civil war in which he was identified with the royalist cause, he became tutor in mathematics to the young Charles, Prince of Wales. At that time, he was exiled in France in the late 1640s. He served the Cavendish family faithfully for more than four generations. However, in his old days he was not treated properly and in 1679, he died of paralysis having lived beyond the age of ninety. He was influenced by the new developments in the physical sciences and by the works of Francis Bacon, Kepler and Galileo. He regarded power as the end of knowledge and an instrument to harness the forces of nature. He pointed out that all individuals are equal, but differences arise due to their varying capacity for knowledge. He was a voracious reader, and read anything that he came across. He was conscious of being a self-taught philosopher. The intellectual career of Hobbes was very much significant because he disagreed so roundly and radically with the prevailing orthodoxy of his time. In the later days, he was inspired by the new scientific methods being applied in fields such as medicine and cosmology. He thus set out to rewrite political theory and to create a true science of man. The scientific approach dominated his thought and can be regarded as the foundation of his political theory.

Thomas Hobbes' contribution and interests range from history, geometry, and physics to gases, theology, ethics, and general philosophy to political science. Many of his theories, such as seeing man as a self-centered entity, still find resonance in the domain of philosophical anthropology. Hobbes can also be credited with integrating materialism with philosophy.

The diverse intellectual paths of the seventeenth century, which are generically called modern classical philosophy, began by rejecting authorities of the past—especially Aristotle and his peers. Descartes, who founded the rationalist tradition, and Sir Francis Bacon (1561–1626), who is considered the originator of modern empiricism (political theory regarding the British Empire), both sought new methods for achieving scientific knowledge and a clear conception of reality. Thomas Hobbes authored significant philosophical works, which he broadly divided into sections and even published at three different times of reality. These are *De Cive* (On the Citizen), a work that

was further developed and later published under the title *Leviathan; De Corpore* (On the Body); and *De Homine* (On Man). Hobbes' philosophy had a deep impact on the political thinkers of England and those outside it. Hobbes' *Leviathan* is often considered by many to be his masterpiece. The questions Hobbes posed to the world in the seventeenth century are still relevant today, and Hobbes still maintains a strong influence in the world of philosophy. He challenged the relationship between science and religion, and the natural limitations of political power.

Hobbes was fascinated by the problem of sense perception, and he extended Galileo's (1564–1642) mechanical physics into an explanation of human cognition (process of learning). He believed the origin of all thought is sensation, which consists of mental images produced by the pressure of motion of external objects. Thus Hobbes anticipated later thought by explaining differences between the external object and the internal image. These sense images are extended by the power of memory and imagination. Understanding and reason, which distinguish men from other animals, are a product of our ability to use speech.

In Hobbes's view the sovereign power of a commonwealth (England's power over its colonies) is absolute and not subject to the laws of its citizens. Obedience will remain as long as the sovereign (England) fulfills the social contract by protecting the rights of the individual. According to these laws Hobbes believed that rebellion is, by definition, unjust. However, should a revolution prove victorious, a new absolute sovereignty would rise up to take the place of the old one. Such a reading is cold comfort as life before society is characterized by Hobbes, in a famous quotation, as "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short." The equality of human desire is matched by an economy of natural satisfactions. Men are addicted to power because gaining power is the only guarantee of living well. Such men live in a state of constant war, driven by competition and desire for the same goods. The important result of this view is man's natural right to seek self-preservation (protection of one's self) by any means. In this state of nature there is no value above self-interest because the absence of common power results in the absence of law and justice. But there is a second law of nature that men may surrender their individual will to the state. This "social contract" binds the individual to treat others as he expects to be treated by them.

#### **4.1: View on the State of Nature**

Thomas Hobbes' accounts of the state of nature differ greatly with regards to individual security. Both present a stateless scenario but draw completely different conclusions, with inhabitants of Locke's state of nature having greater security than those in Hobbes'. One reason for these different conclusions lies in their opposing understanding of human nature, with, in the crudest sense, Hobbes seeing man as a creature of desire and Locke as one of reason. A second explanation for their conclusions is their understanding of the nature of rights. Locke saw certain rights as independent of government or the state, whereas Hobbes, in a sense, saw them as coming from the state. Finally, both give what they call laws of nature which ought to guide behavior in the state of nature, but Hobbes' laws are far less secure than Locke's, thus being another reason why inhabitants of Locke's scenario would enjoy greater security. The idea of state of nature is one of the fundamental aspects of Hobbes' political philosophy. The state of nature means a situation where men live or would have lived without the authority of civil law, state or political control. In the state of nature, there was no industry and no systematic production. Man was totally dependent on the nature for his survival. The behaviour of man was largely governed by his inner impulses. According to Hobbes, some sort of natural law existed. The man had not recognized rights, although he said that they had some natural rights. He draws out a very gloomy and sordid

state of nature. In the state of nature, human relationship was based on mutual suspicion and hostility. There was no law, no justice, no notion of right and wrong in the state of nature. The force and fraud were not the principle virtue of man. In his opinion, the life of man was solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. There was constant conflict among men. The main reasons behind this conflict were competition, diffidence and glory. Basically, men invaded for gain, safety and reputation. While competing, men desire to become master of and own other person's property, spouse, children and cattle. Fighting a battle for safety means that men want to defend themselves against opposing forces, whatever they might be. When men fight for glory, they want to continue their legacy and desire trifles such as a word, a smile, a different opinion, or any other sign of value, either directing their persons or by reflection in their kindred, their friends, their nation, their profession, or their name. The state of nature degenerated into a state of war, 'a war of every man against every man'. Thus, the state of nature was a condition when political authority failed. For Hobbes, it was the option of 'faith' or 'trust' and not the presence of an evil quality of man that cause human misery in the natural state.

The state of nature is a natural corollary of Hobbes<sup>1</sup> concept of human nature. When he was describing the state of nature, he was obviously not referring to an actual historical process of the development of human society. The conditions in which men lived were of their own making. His concept of the state of nature is thus based on man's basic psycho-physical character, his sensations, emotions, appetites and behaviour. He said that man is primarily a body governed by the law of motion. He pointed out that there are two kinds of motions in animals -vital motions and voluntary motions. He defines vital motion as the automatic movement of the physiological mechanism, which goes within our organism from birth to death without our knowledge. Examples of these kinds of motions are the circulation of blood, breathing, digestion and excretion. On the other hand, voluntary motion is first born in our mind and is caused by the impact of external stimuli on our sense organs. The two original motions or emotions are generated such as desire and aversion. From these motions, Hobbes says the emotions like hope, diffidence, glory, courage, anger and benevolence are formed. According to Hobbes, the desire and aversion, which are the two principal motions or emotions, are the two cause of conflict in the state of nature. Everybody in the state of nature was guided by their natural impulse of self-preservation to desire and possess the objects or goods that are conducive for their survival. As everybody was roughly equal in strength, and the goods or objects of desire were limited, it led to competition and conflict of interest. As a result, the state of nature became the ground of struggle for power among all.

The boundary of Hobbes' state of nature is typified as the "war of every man against every man". This one line sums up the severity of the scenario presented by Hobbes and informs why the life of man must be "nasty, brutish and short". This position of Hobbes is arrived at in a systematic way that perhaps makes him the father of political science. Such a scientific approach is none more evident than in his invocation of Galileo's theory of the conservation of motion: that whatever is in motion will remain so until halted by some other force. In terms of human agency Hobbes viewed motion as producing delight or displeasure within us. Obviously we will desire that pleasure or delight inducing motions rather than painful or even contemptible ones and so are in a fixed search for felicity and aversion to pain.

Furthermore, Hobbes saw men as roughly equal. Although one man may be physically stronger than another and one smarter than another, these differences do not produce any sort of natural hierarchy. For the stronger man may dominate the weaker, but the weaker may take up arms or join with others in confederacy thus negating the strong man's apparent advantage. In terms of intellectual equality Hobbes describes how any given man will often believe himself to be wiser than most others. Yet it cannot be logically possible for most men to be wiser than most others. In

fact Hobbes points out that if each man thinks himself wiser, then he must be contented with his share and there is no “greater sign of the equal distribution of anything, than that every man is contented with his share”.

Our search for felicity coupled with us being relatively equal in terms of capabilities sets us on a collision course. We want to fulfill our desires, but our neighbors want to fulfill theirs too. If we have the same tangible desire and that object is in scarcity then we will be on a path to confrontation. This confrontation puts our ultimate end or strongest desire in great jeopardy and if our opponent is successful and subordinates, kills or takes what we possess, the same misfortune may soon await him.

The problems associated with this search for felicity and aversion of the undesired does not end here though. For there is also the consideration of potential enemies. For man X may desire a set piece of land and take it peacefully, but his knowing that all else is equal could give him reason to suspect that man Y or Z may have a desire to take this land, even though they have made no such expression of the will. In such a case he may make a pre emotive strike to eliminate what are merely potential enemies. It even matters not the status of either Y or Z. Y may be a man of many possessions and prestige and so X has reason to suspect him of wanting to further these attributes. Z may be a man with nothing and so X knows he also has motive to take his land and so in the state of nature no man is safe, not the figurative prince nor pauper. Yet still this is not all, for the picture painted becomes even worse if we consider those who simply enjoy conquest or the suffering of others. With these people added to the equation even that content “with what they have must act like the worst kind of tyrant in order to try to secure themselves”. Acting for one’s security for Hobbes is really the only right we have in the state of nature. Self-preservation is the only right (or perhaps obligation is more apt) independent of government. For he saw the state as being prior to any kind of virtue which coupled with the picture painted informs why he thinks the state of nature to be a state of war.

Finally, Hobbes gives a list of laws of nature. These laws essentially come down to the fact that it is rational for us to seek peace in the state of nature, which would apparently conflict with the entire scenario he has so far presented. However the laws of nature are an expression of collective rationality were as our behaviour described in the state of nature is an example of individual rationality. While it may be rational to seek peace this is only possible if everyone else seeks peace and given the suspicious nature of man out with the state and the lack of mechanisms (a commonwealth) available to achieve this end, this expression of collective rationality simply cannot be made. The individuals in The state of nature, according to Hobbes, were essentially emotional creatures driven by their desires and physical appetites. 'Might is right' was the order of the day. Every man was enemy to every man. It was a state of total insecurity. Men were free to take what they could, and to rob whenever they could. There was no law to prevent or contain the 'law of the jungle'. Thus, the state of nature was a state of perfect anarchy. According to him, there can be no morality and consciousness of duty or obligation in the state of nature. All human emotions or passions, he maintained, spring from two basic kinds of motives -desires or aversions. Desires are potential motions or movements towards an object, whereas aversions are potential motions or movements away from an object. However, while human actions are primarily determined by emotions springing from these motives, human beings are also combinations of passions and reason. The role of reason is to offer guidance about how best to satisfy one's desires. Moreover, in his view of human nature, he emphasized to overriding emotions. The first of these is the fear of death, especially of violent death, which he considered to be a basic psychological and biological disposition inherent in the human condition.

## **4.2: Views on the Natural Rights**

For many centuries, natural law was recognized as a type of higher law that spelled out universal truths for the moral ordering of society based on a rational understanding of human nature. As a higher moral law, it gave citizens a standard for determining if the written laws and customs of their nation or any other nation were just or unjust, right or wrong, humane or inhumane. Today, natural law is not discussed very much, at least not explicitly. When mentioned at all, it is usually rejected as dangerous because it undermines existing laws or as intolerant because it is contrary to “multiculturalism,” which requires the non-judgmental acceptance of other cultures.

This negative view of natural law can be traced to Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), whose writings are largely devoted to showing the anarchy and civil wars caused by appeals to natural and divine laws above the will of the sovereign. Hobbes rejected traditional higher law doctrines and encouraged people to accept the established laws and customs of their nations, even if they seemed oppressive, for the sake of civil peace and security. His critique has been a leading cause of the demise of natural law and the acceptance of positive law as the only reliable guide for political authority. One may be equally surprised to learn, however, that many people today embrace a different (and seemingly contradictory) view of natural law, and this too is traceable to Thomas Hobbes. For example, when conscientious people are confronted with violations of human rights—as in religious theocracies that violate women’s rights or in countries that allow sweatshops to trample on worker’s rights—they feel compelled to protest the injustice of those practices and to change them for the better. The protesters usually deny that they are following natural law, but they obviously are asserting a belief in universal moral truths that are grounded in human nature—in this case, the natural equality of human beings that underlies human rights. This understanding of higher law originates with Hobbes because he was largely responsible for transforming classical natural law into modern natural rights, thereby beginning the “human rights revolution” in thinking on natural law. How is it possible for Hobbes and his followers to embrace seemingly contradictory views of natural law, rejecting one form as intolerant, self-righteous, and anarchical, while embracing another form as the universal ideal of social justice? Let us turn to Hobbes for an answer to this puzzle, and, in so doing, uncover the sources of our modern conceptions of law, rights, and justice.

The key to solving this puzzle is Hobbes’s famous statement about the desire for power in *Leviathan*: “So that in the first place, I put for a general inclination of all mankind, a perpetual and restless desire for power after power that ceased only in death.” What Hobbes means by this sweeping claim is that human nature consists of ceaseless motion without a natural end that constitutes happiness or felicity; hence, Hobbes says, “there is no *Finis Ultimus* (utmost aim) nor *Summum Bonum* (greatest good) as is spoken of in the books of the old moral philosophers. . . . Felicity is a continual progress of the desire, from one object to another.”[1] Hobbes’s denial of the greatest good is the crucial point of disagreement with “the old moral philosophers,” Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas, who expounded the classical natural law doctrine. According to the classical view, man is a rational and social animal who has a natural inclination to his proper end, happiness, which can be attained by the virtues or the perfections of mind and character. Classical natural law was therefore “teleological”: directed to the natural end of human beings and to the good life of virtue in a just political community. Hobbes rejects the teleological view of human nature as a false and dangerous illusion. Instead, he sees human nature as the restless striving for power after power that has no end and therefore no happiness or perfection. The rejection of end-directed motion underlies Hobbes’s revolution in thinking from classical natural law, and its perfectionist principle of virtue, to modern natural rights, and its minimalist principle of self-preservation. Hobbes begins by explicating his concept of the ‘right of nature’. This implies that all individuals share the common right to all objects that exist in the state of nature. Prior to the appearance of any form of political order, ‘every man has a right to everything; even to one another body’. This signifies that individuals have the right to all actions that guarantee their self-

preservation. The state of nature is explained by Hobbes as a 'condition of war of every one against every one; in which case everyone is governed by his own reason: and there is nothing he can make use of that may not be a help unto him, in preserving his life against his enemies'. In a nutshell, this implies that all human actions are justifiable in the state of nature and that all individuals are free to choose the way they act. Each individual is free to act or not act and this freedom does not place restrictions on others or on the individual right holder, in the form of duties or obligations.

It can be observed that Hobbes claimed that rights did not always bring benefits to the right holders. When individuals are free to exercise the liberty rights or rights that exist in the state of nature, then there is no obligation or a sense of duty of other individuals not to obstruct the right holder. Also, there is no provision for the protection of anyone's rights. Since everybody has the right to exercise their rights equally, so, a situation of competition should exist between all individuals for exercising their rights. But in this case, Hobbes says that 'there is little use and benefit' of having the right. In the absence of machinery that enables the protection of individuals who exercise their rights, the individual will feel powerless because of the competition. There is a sense in which the right of nature entitles an agent, under conditions of war, to seek not only profit, but also dominion over others. This natural right to unlimited propriety is permitted because, in the state of nature, anything may prove useful to deal with failure threats to the agent's life. With this supposition in mind, Hobbes argued that unlimited propriety includes a right to someone else's body, i.e., dominion over others is to be understood in terms of the proprietary sense of the right of nature. Hobbes makes this clear when he argues that an agent in the state of nature has a right of self-defense in relation to an invader who will use violence to obtain dominion over 'other men's wives, children, and cattle'.

Hobbes builds a conception of 'the right of nature out of his psychological theory by first assuming that all living creatures are physiologically constructed so as to be motivated by their appetites and aversions, and, with minor qualifications, he further assumes that the avoidance of death is the strongest possible motive. On the basis of this assumption, he then argues that, when frightened, a living creature cannot but react so as to protect itself. Indeed, since it is impossible for the creature to do otherwise, it has a right to protect itself. But this is clearly not a moral right since the exercise of it always presupposes a pre-civic context of blameless liberty. The two-fold sense of Hobbes' right of nature rests on an assumption which underlies all of his political theory, viz., that it is necessary for agents in the state of nature to promote their general self-interest to ensure their continued self-preservation. Acquiring goods and dominion over others are self-interested actions that enhance an agent's power to overcome future threats to its life. Hobbes tends to conflate the concept of self-defense and the concept of self-interest because he not only saw acts of self-defense as necessary for promoting the agent's general self-interest, but he also saw self-interested acts as necessary for maintaining the agent's ability to defend herself in the long run. This conflation is understandable given his belief that humans have a physiologically-based disposition to avoid death, pain, or injury, and, to ensure their future safety, they are also inclined to seek more and more power.

Hobbes equates the right of nature with the right of self-preservation. It should be noted that this 'right' stands in contrast to the 'law' that forbids individuals to take any destructive step in their lives or to eliminate the means of self-preservation. Hobbes' jurisprudence stands on these twin pillars of laws and rights. The rights and laws are to be employed together at two levels in his theory - the state of nature and the civil society. In the state of nature, the right of nature signifies that all individuals have the right to all things equally, whereas the law of nature demands that all individuals should lay aside this right if possible. This would result in a covenant under which all individuals are required to lay down their rights, and entitling them to the sovereign. It is a case of

absolute authority on two grounds. Firstly, since all individuals are entitled to these rights to all things equally, so, the authority is absolute. Secondly, it is unconditional because when the individuals give up their rights to be used by the sovereign, they also forgo the right to assess the actions of the sovereign. In other words, they have no right left to judge the sovereigns' actions.

In a nutshell, the right of nature is an aggregate right that comprises of all possible actions that someone, living in the state of nature, might consider to be conducive to self-preservation. It denotes unlimited liberty. It allows individuals unrestrained and complete freedom to choose the way they want to act. But there is an inherent contradiction in this because it is impossible for individuals to enjoy this uninterrupted state for long and this will make survival impossible. After all, if everyone has the same set of rights and a sanction to act according to their desires, the strong would rule over the weak. This would prevent the fruition of any form of human association completely. Hobbes draws conclusions about human nature, saying that in a state of nature, a war among individuals is inevitable. In order to avoid a state of war and to attain a '• peaceful state, it is important to meet certain conditions such as protecting the rights of all individuals. Thus, there is a need to replace the inherent and unhindered freedom of I the state of nature with the protected freedoms that exist when individuals agree to I give up some of their liberty rights and accept obligations towards others. The notion of natural necessity was employed by Hobbes to address his concern with the interplay between natural right and obligation. He argued that on the onehand, under hypothetical conditions where obligations do not exist, people would be miserable, and therefore, willing to enter into covenants whereby obligations are created; while on the other hand, the whole point of his asserting that an individual has a natural right to do what is necessary to preserve oneself was to restrict the applicability of the notion of obligation.

Hobbes used the expression 'right of nature,' or 'natural right,' in a variety of ways, but there are two general categories under which his different usages might be classified. His best known remarks occur at the beginning of chapter XIV of *Leviathan* where he defines liberty as 'the absence of external impediments'. He maintained that rights denote a liberty to do, or to forbear, and contrasts this with obligation, suggesting that he meant to speak of liberty in the sense of there being an absence of obligation. This category of natural right is concerned with morality. In other equally well-known remarks, he claimed that in the state of nature everyone has a right to everything. In this instance, the notion of a right of nature is rendered in terms of propriety, i.e., the absence of ownership. Thus, his right of nature is a liberty in a twofold sense - 'in the state of nature, to have all, and do all is lawful for all'. Although the right of nature, in either sense, is stated as an absolute, he draws the ironic conclusion that in the state of nature neither obligation nor propriety exists. The argument he employs to arrive at this skeptical conclusion regarding obligation and propriety trades on his two-fold concept of natural right. When the notion is explicated in terms of a freedom from obligation, he seemed to have been primarily concerned with the agent's self-preservation; hence, the right of nature is equivalent to the right of self-defence. When Hobbes claimed that the right of nature entitles the agent to take whatever steps she deems necessary to avoid death, pain or injury, he is mainly concerned with the agent's right of self-defence. Although he frequently refers to preserving the body in his discussion of the right of self-defence, he sometimes goes a tot further and makes assertions which suggest that by self-defence he mean to include much more than merely protecting the body. In *Leviathan*, for instance, he claimed that 'no man can transfer, or lay down his right to save himself from death, wounds, and imprisonment'.

### **4.3: Views on Laws of Nature**

Thomas Hobbes' in his famous book *Leviathan* discusses the man, commonwealth, and how the two interrelate with each other. In this article, I will discuss how Hobbes views liberty, and how

his views differ from that of Augustine of Hippo's view of free will. Next, I will discuss Hobbes' view of the law of nature. By analyzing Hobbes thoughts and ideas, one can gain a better understanding of humans and the societies in which they live. As Hobbes begins discussing liberty, he says that man should use liberty for the advancement of self in the world. We are given liberty so that we may prosper in the world and give meaning for the lives we live. Liberty, Hobbes defines, is "the absence of external impediments, which impediments may oft take away part of a man's power to do what he would" . Liberty is the absence of opposition against another man's will. In chapter twenty-one, opposition is the "external impediments of motion. Hobbes describes liberty as a type of freedom. This freedom must be of physical consistency. Since liberty must be of a physical nature, this means that one cannot technically speak freely, receive something that is free, or even have a free will. If these things are not condemned by the law, they are not defined as free because they were never enslaved in the first place. Hobbes states that liberty is consistent with fear and liberty is consistent with necessity. By being consistent with these two things, man creates a commonwealth which creates laws or covenants that dissolve any liberty in which man may have held in the first place. After a commonwealth is established, it is then up to the commonwealth to permit which liberties it will allow its public to take part in.

Hobbes' viewed that, it is natural law which prompts men to abandon the state of nature and to establish law and government. Natural law comprises the following rules of self-preservation:

1. Everybody should aim at securing peace.
2. Man should be willing, in concert with others, to give up his natural rights,
3. Man should keep his contracts.
4. Man should show gratitude or return beneficence for beneficence.

However, the requirements of self-preservation itself created a sense of duty in the mind of men which prompted them to form the state. Hobbes says that there is one thing that all men fear, and that is, death. Since avoiding death is an absolute condition of satisfying their other, more various desires, all rational men should seek peace, which renders premature deaths less likely. He says, 'all man agree on this, that peace is good, and therefore also the way, or means of peace'.

Hobbes, in a state of nature, stated that individuals enjoy complete liberty, including a natural right to everything, even to one another's body. The natural law was the dictate of reason. It is not the synonym of 'laws' or 'commands'. However, subsequently he argued that laws of nature were also proper laws as they were 'delivered in the word of God'. He called it the counsel of prudence. He differs with stoics on the meaning of natural law. Unlike stoics, natural laws to Hobbes do not mean internal justice, perfect morality or standard to judge existing laws. It also does not imply the existence of common good, for (hey merely created the common conditions which were necessary to fulfill each individual good. These laws were immutable. To him, there were nineteen natural laws which he called the *Article of Peace*. There were three important natural laws among them that are as follows:

1. Seek peace and follow it.
2. Abandon the natural rights to things.
3. Individuals must honour their contracts.

The other laws of nature suggest ways of establishing a peaceful and just society. The precept that one should act towards others the way we want them to treat us, aptly summarizes the natural laws. But Hobbes presents this precept in a different light. He says that the precept - 'Do not act towards others in a manner in which you would not want them to act towards you' is an effective method that can be used to evaluate moral conduct. He opined that natural laws were governed by reason, a faculty opposed to the natural instincts of human beings. For Hobbes, natural laws are

the foundation of peace. According to him, a law of nature is 'is a precept, or general rule, found out by reason, by which a man is forbidden to do that which is destructive of his life, keep away the means of preserving the same, and to omit that by which he thicket it may be best preserved.'" Hobbes creates a distinction between laws and rights saying that they are as different as obligation, and liberty. Thus, the two are not consistent with each other.

Similarly, Hobbes distinguishes natural law and civil law, and says that both may be revealed by each other. The main point of difference between the two is whether or not they are mutable. While civil laws can be changed by a sovereign, natural laws can never be changed by the sovereign, as they are the eternal laws of nature or God. An individual can understand natural law by emptying his faculty of reason, but as far as civil law is concerned, an individual will have to depend upon both the ability to reason and the ability to understand and analyse natural law.

Hobbes argues that civil law is written, while natural law is unwritten. He further says that no individual can claim that he is not aware of the natural laws to justify breaking them. This is so because natural laws must be known to all who are capable of clear reasoning. He contended that breaking the civil laws cannot be justified except when the law is unclear or equivocal. However, when the law is clear, no excuse can be given for breaking the law. Hobbes equated natural laws with moral laws. These laws included virtues such as equity, justice, mercy, humility, and other moral virtues. Another name for these laws is 'divine law', which only requires reason, revelation and faith. He equated the kingdom of God with a commonwealth where God is the sovereign, and where God rules eternally. Happiness in this kingdom depends upon obedience to God or the sovereign. Therefore, it was only in God's kingdom that an eternally perfect and spiritual commonwealth may exist. The law of nature for Hobbes meant a set of rules according to which an ideally reasonable person would pursue his own advantage, if he was perfectly conscious of all the circumstances in which he was acting and was quite unsealed by momentary impulse and prejudice. Since he assumes that by and large, men really do act in this way; the law of nature states hypothetical conditions upon which the fundamental traits of human beings allow a stable government to find it. They do not state values, but they determine casually and rationally what can be a given value in legal and moral systems. Hobbes' concept of absolute authority is informed by placing limitations on the obligation of subjects to obey and on the proper use of law and punishment. An account of this concept was elaborated in the *Leviathan* for the first time as it was not explicated in Hobbes' earlier works such as *The Elements of Law Natural and Politic* and *De Cive*. Though these works treat, certain natural rights as inalienable, the idea is not developed into anything corresponding to the 'true Liberty' of Leviathan. The limitations that Hobbes associates with absolute authority are discussed only marginally, if at all in any of Hobbes' other works. When Hobbes makes a case for the obligation of the sovereign towards his subjects, he is in a way revamping his political theory.

Hobbes argues that the innocent should not be punished because this involves a violation of the natural laws that demand equity from us, and that prohibit ingratitude and revenge. It is the duty of the sovereign to respect the natural rights of all his subjects. Hobbes talks of covenant which individuals opted for to emerge out of state of nature. Hobbes goes on to discuss the certain liberties that man is entitled to, he describes the law of nature and how liberty is part of it. Man has liberty so that he can better himself in the world. Liberty is man's nature. Therefore, Hobbes says, "A law of nature is a precept or general rule, found out by reason, by which a man is forbidden to do that which is destructive of his life or takes away the means of preserving the same, and to omit that by which he tinkets it may be best preserved". According to Hobbes, man cannot do what would be destructive to his own progress in life. If he does so, he is going against the law of nature. Establishing this law by reason, it seems only sensible that man should do

everything in his power to preserve his own life and the society in which he lives so that his life can better prosper from it.

In a perfect state of nature, a man who lives outside of a society, the man will have perfect liberty and ability to do as he pleases. However, while living in a state of nature allows for complete freedom, this does not mean it allows for complete safety. Hobbes states that “the condition of man is a condition of war of everyone against everyone”. This is because everyone is trying to act out their own liberty; man takes what will best suited him in his own life. By reasoning it is no longer intelligent to allow for such freedom when a state of nature becomes man against man, because even though there is freedom, it will be a freedom that encompasses a constant fear of death and deterioration within the world. There is no security in pure liberty.

#### 4.4: SUMMARY

- In addition to *The Prince*, all that Machiavelli wrote was fairly orthodox and filled into the conventional mould of the Renaissance.
- In *The Prince*, Machiavelli presents a view about how drastically different is the governance of a state from that of humanists of his time.
- To Machiavelli, a successful ruler was one who could make people happy, irrespective of what he really was inside. He said that 'it is sometimes better to seem good than to be good'<sup>1</sup>.
- Machiavelli was known as the father of modern political theory.
- The political and intellectual tendencies of the medieval age greatly influenced Machiavelli.
- In the period of turmoil, Machiavelli wrote his voluminous book *The Prince*.
- Machiavelli got his inspiration from Aristotle.
- Machiavelli's theory of human nature has a close family resemblance with the Calvinistic doctrine of original Sin,
- Machiavelli not only separated morality from politics, but also relegated religion to a very subordinate position in his political system and it is because of this that it is thought that the modern study of politics begins with Machiavelli.
- Machiavelli wrote *The Prince* and *The Discourses* primarily from the point of view of the preservation of the state.
- An aristocracy, specifically a landed aristocracy, was the cause of factious quarrels and civil disorder.
- Machiavelli mainly studied practical and not speculative politics.
- The intellectual career of Hobbes was very much significant because he disagreed so roundly and radically with the prevailing orthodoxy of his time, in the later days, he was inspired by the new scientific methods being applied in fields such as medicine and cosmology. *Leviathan* was published in 1651.
- The state of nature means a situation where men live or would have lived without the authority of civil law, state or political control. In the state of nature, there was no industry and no systematic production.
- If everyone has the same set of rights and a sanction to act according to their desires, the strong would rule over the weak. This would prevent the fruition of any form of human association completely.
- Natural law comprises the following rules of self-preservation-
- Everybody should aim at securing peace.
- Man should be willing, in concert with others, to give up his natural rights.

- Man should keep his contracts.
- Man should show gratitude or return beneficence for beneficence.
- While civil laws can be changed by a sovereign, natural laws can never be changed by the sovereign, as they are the eternal laws of nature or God.
- Hobbes preferred monarchy over aristocracy or democracy for the following reasons -
  - ❖ The self-indulgence of one compared to that of many would be cheaper
  - ❖ The existence of an identity of interest between the king and his subjects
  - ❖ Fewer intrigues and plots, which were normally due to personal ambitions and envy of members of the ruling elite
  
- Machiavelli was a Florentine, and therefore, he was geographically at the core of the larger Renaissance movement.
- In *The Prince* and *The Discourses*, Machiavelli insisted on the necessity of expanding the realms of the state. *The Prince* reflects Machiavelli's concept of real monarchy and *The Discourses*, that of a republic.
- Machiavelli's writings were directed more towards the art of governance rather than on the philosophy of state.
- Hobbes made his sovereign permanent, indivisible and inalienable. Though sovereign has to act according to the natural law, he is also the sole interpreter of the law.
- Hobbes emphasized that sovereign would define, divine, natural or fundamental law, since it was difficult to obtain agreement among individuals. In this way, he made power, and not right the focal issue in politics. The individual has no right against the sovereign. His political philosophy is beyond all comparison, the most imposing structure that the period of the English civil wars produced.
- It is obvious from Hobbes' writings that the advantages of government are tangible and they must accrue quite tangibility to individuals, in the form of peace and comfort and security of person and property. This is the only ground upon which government can be justified or even exist.
- A general or public good, like a public will is a figment of the imagination; there are merely individuals who desire to live and to enjoy protection for the means of life. Another main feature of his political philosophy is his individualism.
  
- Thomas Hobbes was the first of the great modern philosophers who attempted to bring political theory into intimate relations with a thoroughly modern system of thought.
- Hobbes strove to make this system broad enough to account unscientific principles, for all the facts of nature including human behavior both in its individual and social aspects. Such a project obviously put his thought quite beyond his range of occasional and controversial literature. Nor is Hobbes to be judged exclusively by the correctness of his conclusions.
- Hobbes' ideas of what constituted a sound scientific method were those of his time and are long out of date. Yet the fact remains that he had something which can only be described as a science of politics, which was an integral part of his whole conception of the natural world and was carried through with quite extraordinary clearness. For this reason, he benefited not least those thinkers who tried to refute him.
- Though Aristotle is regarded as father of political science, Hobbes is often considered as the father of modern political science. The latter used deductive and geometrical method rather than empirical and experimental method.

- In Hobbes' opinion, the passions of desire and aversion are the principle cause of the conflict among the individuals in the state of nature. The goods and wealth are limited in the state of nature. It triggers severe competition and struggle for power.
- It is revealed from Hobbes' concept of human nature that conflict is inherent in the individual nature in its blind pursuit of self-interest.
- Liberty according to Hobbes, in the state of nature is liberty to use his own power for his self-preservation. The self-preservation was a fundamental right of nature, and equally a basic law. He also termed it as a natural right.
- It is reason and rational self-preservation which prompted man to escape the state of nature and avoid the conflict. Thus, it is the law of nature which instigated the individual to renounce the state of nature and formed a covenant and there by entered into a civil society. In this process, they also discard their natural rights.

#### 4.5: Possible Questions

1. How did Machiavelli break away from the tradition upheld by Plato? Aristotle and other medieval thinkers?
2. Discuss Machiavelli's background and his reaction to medieval thought.
3. Explain Machiavelli's concept of the human nature,
4. When did Machiavelli write *The Prince*<sup>1</sup>?
5. Why did Machiavelli believe in the historical method of politics?
6. How was Machiavelli similar to John Calvin and Thomas Hobbes?
7. How did Machiavelli differentiate between the law and the law-giver?
8. How did Machiavelli separate politics from ethics and religion?
9. Hobbes made the sovereign (the Leviathan) the sole source and interpreter of laws. Discuss.
10. Discuss Hobbes' concept of sovereignty.
11. Was Hobbes an individualist or absolutist? Support your answer with valid arguments.
12. Discuss the contribution of Hobbes to the field of political philosophy.
13. Define Machiavelli's Erastianism.
14. Write a note on the spirit of the Renaissance.
15. Write in your own words the state of nature as described by Hobbes.
16. Write a summary of the natural rights as propounded by Hobbes.

#### 4.6: Further reading

- Vieira, Monica Brito. (2009) *The Elements of Representation in Hobbes*, Leiden: Brill.
- Zagorin, Perez. (2009) *Hobbes and the Law of Nature*, Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Shields, Christopher. 2007. *Aristotle*. New York: Routledge.
- Martinich, A. P. (1997) *Thomas Hobbes*, New York: St. Martin's.
- Martinich, A. P. (1999) *Hobbes: A Biography*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, Leo, Joseph Cropsey. 1987. *A History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

## UNIT-3

### LOCKE (P5), ROUSSEAU (P6)

- 5.0 Introduction
- 5.1: Views on the Law of Nature
- 5.2: Views on State of Nature
- 5.3: Views on Social Contract Theory
- 5.4: Views on Liberalism
- 5.5: Views on Punishment
- 5.6: Views on Separation of Powers and the Dissolution of Government
- 5.7: Views on Toleration
- 6.0: Life Sketch of Jean Jacques Rousseau
- 6.1: views on Morality
- 6.2: views on Insurrection against Reason
- 6.3: Rousseau's Political Philosophy
  - 6.3.1: The idea of the general will
  - 6.3.2: The development of the general will: technique, advantage and the representative
  - 6.3.3: Views on the reconciliation of freedom and specialist
  - 6.3.4: Representation and government
  - 6.3.5: Civil religion and toleration
  - 6.3.6: Language
  - 6.3.7: Education as a part of his philosophy
  - 6.3.8: Views on Civil Society
  - 6.3.9: Inheritance in the legacy
- 6.4: Summary

#### **Objectives:**

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Elucidate John Locke's life and contributions to western Political Thought
- Enlighten John Locke's state of nature and social contract theory
- Examine Rousseau as an advocator of General Will and Real Will
- Deliberate the ideas advocated by Jean Jacques Rousseau about reason, civil society and general will

#### **5.0 Introduction**

John Locke was a great experienced thinker, whose doctrines had a great impact on the period of Illumination, also known as the Age of Reason. He had a different opinion regarding natural law, mankind's natural characteristics and the purpose and structure government. He is among the most influential political philosophers of the modern period. In the Two Treatises of Government, he defended the claim that men are by nature free and equal against claims that God had made all people naturally subject to a monarch. He argued that people have rights, such as the right to life, liberty, and property that have a foundation independent of the laws of any particular society. Locke used the claim that men are naturally free and equal as part of the justification for understanding legitimate political government as the result of a social contract where people in the state of nature conditionally transfer some of their rights to the government in order to better

ensure the stable, comfortable enjoyment of their lives, liberty, and property. Since governments exist by the consent of the people in order to protect the rights of the people and promote the public good, governments that fail to do so can be resisted and replaced with new governments. Locke is thus also important for his defense of the right of revolution. Locke also defends the principle of majority rule and the separation of legislative and executive powers. In the Letter Concerning Toleration, Locke denied that coercion should be used to bring people to (what the ruler believes is) the true religion and also denied that churches should have any coercive power over their members. Locke elaborated on these themes in his later political writings, such as the Second Letter on Toleration and Third Letter on Toleration. He assumed all men are created equal and independent as per the natural law. Violence cannot be justified unless an individual's freedom is in peril. His conception of natural liberty is a moral conception of 'perfect freedom' and equality. His view of the law of nature is normative and not descriptive. To him, natural rights include life, liberty and estate that are collectively known as property. He created a limited sovereign and ruled out political absolutism and advocated that a good state is the one that exists for the people who formed it and not the vice versa. The government has to be based on the consent of the people subject to the constitution and the rule of law.

### **5.1: Views on the Law of Nature**

Natural law is also distinct from divine law in that the latter, in the Christian tradition, normally referred to those laws that God had directly revealed through prophets and other inspired writers. Natural law can be discovered by reason alone and applies to all people, while divine law can be discovered only through God's special revelation and applies only to those to whom it is revealed and who God specifically indicates are to be bound. Thus some seventeenth-century commentators, Locke included, held that not all of the 10 commandments, much less the rest of the Old Testament law, were binding on all people. The 10 commandments begin "Hear O Israel" and thus are only binding on the people to whom they were addressed (Works 6:37). As we will see below, even though Locke thought natural law could be known apart from special revelation, he saw no contradiction in God playing a part in the argument, so long as the relevant aspects of God's character could be discovered by reason alone. In Locke's theory, divine law and natural law are consistent and can overlap in content, but they are not coextensive. Thus there is no problem for Locke if the Bible commands a moral code that is stricter than the one that can be derived from natural law, but there is a real problem if the Bible teaches what is contrary to natural law. In practice, Locke avoided this problem because consistency with natural law was one of the criteria he used when deciding the proper interpretation of Biblical passages.

In the century before Locke, the language of natural rights also gained prominence through the writings of such thinkers as Grotius, Hobbes, and Puffendorf. Whereas natural law emphasized duties, natural rights normally emphasized privileges or claims to which an individual was entitled. There is considerable disagreement as to how these factors are to be understood in relation to each other in Locke's theory. Leo Strauss, and many of his followers, take rights to be paramount, going so far as to portray Locke's position as essentially similar to that of Hobbes. They point out that Locke defended a hedonist theory of human motivation (Essay 2.20) and claim that he must agree with Hobbes about the essentially self-interested nature of human beings. Locke, they claim, recognizes natural law obligations only in those situations where our own preservation is not in conflict, further emphasizing that our right to preserve ourselves trumps any duties we may have. On the other end of the spectrum, more scholars have adopted the view of Dunn, Tully, and Ashcraft that it is natural law, not natural rights, that are primary. They hold that when Locke emphasized the right to life, liberty, and property he was primarily making a point about the duties we have toward other people: duties not to kill, enslave, or steal. Most scholars also argue that Locke recognized a general duty to assist with the preservation of mankind,

including a duty of charity to those who have no other way to procure their subsistence (Two Treatises 1.42). These scholars regard duties as primary in Locke because rights exist to ensure that we are able to fulfill our duties. Simmons takes a position similar to the latter group, but claims that rights are not just the flip side of duties in Locke, nor merely a means to performing our duties. Instead, rights and duties are equally fundamental because Locke believes in a “robust zone of indifference” in which rights protect our ability to make choices. While these choices cannot violate natural law, they are not a mere means to fulfilling natural law either. Brian Tienrey questions whether one needs to prioritize natural law or natural right since both typically function as corollaries. He argues that modern natural rights theories are a development from medieval conceptions of natural law that included permissions to act or not act in certain ways.

There have been some attempts to find a compromise between these positions. Michael Zuckert’s version of the Straussian position acknowledges more differences between Hobbes and Locke. Zuckert still questions the sincerity of Locke’s theism, but thinks that Locke does develop a position that grounds property rights in the fact that human beings own themselves, something Hobbes denied. Adam Seagrave has gone a step further. He argues that the contradiction between Locke’s claim that human beings are owned by God and that human beings own themselves is only apparent. Based on passages from Locke’s other writings (especially the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*) in the passages about divine ownership, Locke is speaking about humanity as a whole, while in the passages about self-ownership he is taking about individual human beings with the capacity for property ownership. God created human beings who are capable of having property rights with respect to one another on the basis of owning their labor. Both of them emphasize differences between Locke’s use of natural rights and the earlier tradition of natural law.

Another point of contestation has to do with the extent to which Locke thought natural law could, in fact, be known by reason. Both Strauss and Peter Laslett, though very different in their interpretations of Locke generally, see Locke’s theory of natural law as filled with contradictions. In the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Locke defends a theory of moral knowledge that negates the possibility of innate ideas (*Essay Book 1*) and claims that morality is capable of demonstration in the same way that Mathematics is (*Essay 3.11.16, 4.3.18–20*). Yet nowhere in any of his works does Locke make a full deduction of natural law from first premises. More than that, Locke at times seems to appeal to innate ideas in the *Second Treatise* (2.11), and in *The Reasonableness of Christianity* (*Works 7:139*) he admits that no one has ever worked out all of natural law from reason alone. Strauss infers from this that the contradictions exist to show the attentive reader that Locke does not really believe in natural law at all. Laslett, more conservatively, simply says that Locke the philosopher and Locke the political writer should be kept very separate. Many scholars reject this position. Yolton, Colman, Ashcraft, Grant, Simmons, Tuckness and others all argue that there is nothing strictly inconsistent in Locke’s admission in *The Reasonableness of Christianity*. That no one has deduced all of natural law from first principles does not mean that none of it has been deduced. The supposedly contradictory passages in the *Two Treatises* are far from decisive. While it is true that Locke does not provide a deduction in the *Essay*, it is not clear that he was trying to. Section 4.10.1–19 of that work seems more concerned to show how reasoning with moral terms is possible, not to actually provide a full account of natural law. Nonetheless, it must be admitted that Locke did not treat the topic of natural law as systematically as one might like. Attempts to work out his theory in more detail with respect to its ground and its content must try to reconstruct it from scattered passages in many different texts.

In order to comprehend Locke’s position on the ground of natural law it must be situated within a larger debate in natural law theory that predates Locke, the so-called “voluntarism-

intellectualism,” or “voluntarism-rationalist” debate. At its simplest, the voluntarism declares that right and wrong are determined by God’s will and that we are obliged to obey the will of God simply because it is the will of God. Unless these positions are maintained, the voluntarism argues, God becomes superfluous to morality since both the content and the binding force of morality can be explained without reference to God. The intellectualist replies that this understanding makes morality arbitrary and fails to explain why we have an obligation to obey God. With respect to the grounds and content of natural law, Locke is not completely clear. On the one hand, there are many instances where he makes statements that sound voluntarism to the effect that law requires a law giver with authority (Essay 1.3.6, 4.10.7). Locke also repeatedly insists in the *Essays on the Law of Nature* that created beings have an obligation to obey their creator (ELN 6). On the other hand there are statements that seem to imply an external moral standard to which God must conform (*Two Treatises* 2.195; *Works* 7:6). Locke clearly wants to avoid the implication that the content of natural law is arbitrary. Several solutions have been proposed. One solution suggested by Herzog makes Locke an intellectualist by grounding our obligation to obey God on a prior duty of gratitude that exists independent of God. A second option, suggested by Simmons, is simply to take Locke as a voluntarism since that is where the preponderance of his statements point. A third option, suggested by Tuckness (and implied by Grant), is to treat the question of voluntarism as having two different parts, grounds and content. On this view, Locke was indeed a voluntarism with respect to the question “why should we obey the law of nature?” Locke thought that reason, apart from the will of a superior, could only be advisory. With respect to content, divine reason and human reason must be sufficiently analogous that human beings can reason about what God likely wills. Locke takes it for granted that since God created us with reason in order to follow God’s will, human reason and divine reason are sufficiently similar that natural law will not seem arbitrary to us.

Those interested in the contemporary relevance of Locke’s political theory must confront its theological aspects. Straussians make Locke’s theory relevant by claiming that the theological dimensions of his thought are primarily rhetorical; they are “cover” to keep him from being persecuted by the religious authorities of his day. Others, such as Dunn, take Locke to be of only limited relevance to contemporary politics precisely because so many of his arguments depend on religious assumptions that are no longer widely shared. More recently a number of authors, such as Simmons and Vernon, have tried to separate the foundations of Locke’s argument from other aspects of it. Simmons, for example, argues that Locke’s thought is over-determined, containing both religious and secular arguments. He claims that for Locke the fundamental law of nature is that “as much as possible mankind is to be preserved” (*Two Treatises* 135). At times, he claims, Locke presents this principle in rule-consequentialist terms: it is the principle we use to determine the more specific rights and duties that all have. At other times, Locke hints at a more Kantian justification that emphasizes the impropriety of treating our equals as if they were mere means to our ends. Waldron, in his most recent work on Locke, explores the opposite claim: that Locke’s theology actually provides a more solid basis for his premise of political equality than do contemporary secular approaches that tend to simply assert equality.

With respect to the specific content of natural law, Locke never provides a comprehensive statement of what it requires. In the *Two Treatises*, Locke frequently states that the fundamental law of nature is that as much as possible mankind is to be preserved. Simmons argues that in *Two Treatises* 2.6 Locke presents 1) a duty to preserve one’s self, 2) a duty to preserve others when self-preservation does not conflict, 3) a duty not to take away the life of another, and 4) a duty not to act in a way that “tends to destroy” others. Libertarian interpreters of Locke tend to downplay duties of type 1 and 2. Locke presents a more extensive list in his earlier, and unpublished in his lifetime, *Essays on the Law of Nature*. Interestingly, Locke here includes praise and honor of the deity as required by natural law as well as what we call good might character qualities. As we turn

to the state of nature argument of John Locke, we find a very different view, indeed. To Locke's conception of natural liberty is a moral conception of 'perfect freedom' and equality. His view of the law of nature is normative rather than descriptive—a discussion of what people living up to their duty to God, ought to do. State of nature to John Locke, is not gloom and pessimistic. In Locke's view, it is not a state of constant warfare. He points out that it is a state of 'peace, goodwill, mutual assistance and preservation'. He further says it is a state of liberty, not a state of license. The state of nature is a state of equality amongst men. Locke maintains 'The state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges everyone, and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind who will but consult it, that all being equal and independent, no one will harm another in his life, health, liberty or possession; for all men being the workmanship of one omnipotent and infinitely wise Maker; all servant! of one sovereign Master sent into the world by His order and about His business; they are His property' . Unlike Hobbes, Locke says that the majority of the people of this stage obey the law of nature. The law of nature, to Locke is the law of the inward morality. Individuals to Locke are rational beings. However, Locke advocates there are few persons who do not follow the rules of morality and give priority to their self-interest. It becomes very difficult to deal with such offenders as in the state of nature, there is no established authority. If everybody thinks that he is the judge over his own case, justice will not be done to anybody. Thus, the state of nature becomes inconvenient to stay with. To overcome this problem, individual decides to renounce the state of nature and enter into a civil and political society by making a contract. Though individual is not controlled by any superior power, he is subject to the law of nature.

Individual derives natural rights from the law of nature. To Locke, natural rights include life, liberty and estate, which are collectively known as property. The individual has an idea about the law of nature through his power of reason. It is this power of reason, which directs them towards their 'proper interest'. At the same time, individuals have some natural rights to perform. According to Locke, liberty is not the freedom to do what one chooses but to act within the bounds of law of nature. Locke points out that personal independence and freedom is fundamental human right. No one has a right to coerce and dominate others in a state of nature. Everyone has an equal right to one's natural freedom, without being subjected to the will or authority of any other man. Locke clarified that the law of nature is dictated by reason. Since rights and | duties are derived from the laws of nature, the most important of these is the right to hold others responsible for a breach of the law and to punish them accordingly. Though Locke categorically rejects the right of a person to kill oneself, he grants the right to inflict penalties, including the death penalty, on others who violate the law in general or if another person's life is threatened. Locke explicitly rejects the right of the individual to commit suicide and murder.

Locke in his depiction of state of nature states that individuals had initially a right to appropriation which was limited to three things. Firstly, an individual could appropriate only that much he needed, and would leave enough goods for others. Secondly, an individual had a right only to that much for which he had mixed the labour of his body and the work of his hand. Thirdly, labour not only created property but also determined its value. Locke argued that it was labour that made the world different by creating conveniences and increasing productivity. In the state of nature, Locke argues the individual had perfect freedom to dispose of their possessions, and persons, as they thought fit. According to Locke, property was a natural right derived from natural law. It was there before the formation of government. He concedes individual rights to do as they pleased within the bounds of the law of nature. Thus, rights were not absolute and hence limited to the extent that they did not harm themselves or others. As a result of the introduction of

money, one could possess more regardless of the use of the product and hoard without injuring anyone. It also divorced right from convenience. Locke states that property represented human entitlement and, in fact, the great and chief end of men's uniting into Commonwealth and putting themselves under government is the preservation and protection of their property. It was the social character of property that enabled Locke to defend a minimal state with limited government and individual rights and reject the hereditary principle of government. It was the protection of liberties and property that men entered into an agreement instructing the government to recognize these rights and embody in a statutory form. Locke also justifies and defends class differentials in right and rationality and wage, in the process of providing the moral basis for capitalist society. It is an attempt to inform the proper structure of government and above all to develop a theory of political obligation from a consideration of what rational people would invent if they were living without a government and wanted to devise one.

## **5.2: Views on State of Nature**

Locke's concept of the state of nature has been interpreted by commentators in a variety of ways. At first glance it seems quite simple. Locke writes "want of a common judge, with authority, puts all persons in a state of nature" and again, "Men living according to reason, without a common superior on earth, to judge between them, is properly the state of nature." (Two Treatises 2.19) Many commentators have taken this as Locke's definition, concluding that the state of nature exists wherever there is no legitimate political authority able to judge disputes and where people live according to the law of reason. On this account the state of nature is distinct from political society, where a legitimate government exists, and from a state of war where men fail to abide by the law of reason. Simmons presents an important challenge to this view. Simmons points out that the above statement is worded as a sufficient rather than necessary condition. Two individuals might be able, in the state of nature, to authorize a third to settle disputes between them without leaving the state of nature, since the third party would not have, for example, the power to legislate for the public good. Simmons also claims that other interpretations often fail to account for the fact that there are some people who live in states with legitimate governments who are nonetheless in the state of nature: visiting aliens (2.9), children below the age of majority (2.15, 118), and those with a "defect" of reason (2.60). He claims that the state of nature is a relational concept describing a particular set of moral relations that exist between particular people, rather than a description of a particular geographical territory. The state of nature is just the way of describing the moral rights and responsibilities that exist between people who have not consented to the adjudication of their disputes by the same legitimate government. The groups just mentioned either have not or cannot give consent, so they remain in the state of nature. Thus A may be in the state of nature with respect to B, but not with C. The conception of natural rights and theory of property is one of the important themes in Locke's political philosophy. According to Locke, natural right forms in the root of morality implanted in human conscience. He points out that natural right consists in the perfect freedom and equality of every man. Not only to preserve his property (life, liberty and estate) against the injuries and attempts of other men, but to judge and punish the breaches of natural law committed by others. However, when individuals decide to enter into a contract and thereby establish a political society, they surrender their natural rights to be judges. Now, that power rests with the community but the natural rights to life, liberty and property still belong to them. Locke points out that by human reason and by revelation, it is apparent that the earth and its fruits belong to God and that God gave them to the human inhabitants in common to enjoy. He also argues that it is human labour which distinguishes what is privately owned from what is commonly owned. Labour is the unquestioned property of the labourer and by mixing his labour with a piece of land, an individual acquires the right to whatever he makes. The stress is on what human beings make of the earth, how and what they leave for

prosperity. He insists, God has given human beings the earth to make it a better place, full of conveniences of life by entrepreneurship, hard work and reason. In other words, Locke emphasized that human beings were trustees or stewards who could appropriate and consume by being industrious and creative without wasting, squandering, spoiling or destroying.

Simmons' account stands in sharp contrast to that of Strauss. According to Strauss, Locke presents the state of nature as a factual description of what the earliest society is like, an account that when read closely reveals Locke's departure from Christian teachings. State of nature theories, he and his followers argue, are contrary to the Biblical account in Genesis and evidence that Locke's teaching is similar to that of Hobbes. As noted above, on the Straussian account Locke's apparently Christian statements are only a façade designed to conceal his essentially anti-Christian views. According to Simmons, since the state of nature is a moral account, it is compatible with a wide variety of social accounts without contradiction. If we know only that a group of people are in a state of nature, we know only the rights and responsibilities they have toward one another; we know nothing about whether they are rich or poor, peaceful or warlike.

A complementary interpretation is made by John Dunn with respect to the relationship between Locke's state of nature and his Christian beliefs. Dunn claimed that Locke's state of nature is less an exercise in historical anthropology than a theological reflection on the condition of man. On Dunn's interpretation, Locke's state of nature thinking is an expression of his theological position, that man exists in a world created by God for God's purposes but that governments are created by men in order to further those purposes.

Locke's theory of the state of nature will thus be tied closely to his theory of natural law, since the latter defines the rights of persons and their status as free and equal persons. The stronger the grounds for accepting Locke's characterization of people as free, equal, and independent, the more helpful the state of nature becomes as a device for representing people. Still, it is important to remember that none of these interpretations claims that Locke's state of nature is only a thought experiment, in the way Kant and Rawls are normally thought to use the concept. Locke did not respond to the argument "where have there ever been people in such a state" by saying it did not matter since it was only a thought experiment. Instead, he argued that there are and have been people in the state of nature. (Two Treatises 2.14) It seems important to him that at least some governments have actually been formed in the way he suggests. How much it matters whether they have been or not will be discussed below under the topic of consent, since the central question is whether a good government can be legitimate even if it does not have the actual consent of the people who live under it; hypothetical contract and actual contract theories will tend to answer this question differently.

### **5.3: Views on Social Contract Theory**

In the social contract theory Locke had introduced many alternatives. In section 13 of the theory says: "I easily grant that civil government is the proper remedy for the inconveniences of the state of nature, which must certainly be great where men may be judges in their own case."

The proper remedy to the inconveniences of the state of nature is the erection of a civil government and the civil government alone cannot be the provider of remedy, a civil society was necessary. The members of the state of nature felt that a judge was badly needed because only a judge with sufficient authority can put everything in order which was lacking in the state of nature. Though Locke refuted Hobbes's idea of state of war in the state of nature we hear him saying men living together according to reason, without a common superior on earth with authority to judge

between them, are properly the state of nature. But force upon the person of another, where there is no common superior to appeal for relief, is the state of war....To avoid this state of war...is one great reason of men's putting themselves into society and quitting the state of nature, for where there is an authority, a power on earth...there the continuance of the state of war is excluded. We thus see that Locke is, here, quite clear about his intention regarding the erection of civil society. Power was the best remedy to all evils that plagued the people of the state of nature. Why?

He says – “Political power, I take to be a right of making laws with penalties of death and consequently, all less penalties for the regulating and preserving of property and of employing the force of the community in the execution of such laws and in the defense of the commonwealth from foreign injury.” If we go through the entire process of social contract we shall find certain basic features. It was felt by the people of the state of nature that setting up of a civil society was the proper remedy to all inconveniences that people witnessed.

Hence we can conclude that social contract was a sort of mechanism that was used by the people to save from certain difficulties. Hobbes also saw this in the same light. In the opinion of Dunning the Lockean social contract was pre-political but not pre-social. That is, people of the state of nature maintained amongst themselves social behavior and manner which means that there was sociability among them. Contract politicized the society. Social contract was itself a mechanism or weapon. Again, the contract empowered the people to control the government to act in accordance with the conditions laid down in the contract.

According to the term of the contract people may or can demand security in various forms. If we go through the contract we shall find that everyone gave consent to the preparation of the contract and it is called the tacit consent. Some interpreters of Locke's philosophy argue that the inhabitants of the state of nature did two contracts—one is written and the other is unwritten. Before making social contract people did an unwritten contract among themselves and the objective of that contract was they desire to set up a civil society through a contract for better and safe living. Recent interpreters of Locke's political thought have said that Locke thought of double contract. The source of this idea comes from the words stated in sections 95, 97 and in several other sections. In section 97 we find him saying – “everyman, by consenting with others to make one body-politic under one government, puts himself under an obligation to everyone of that society to submit to the determination of the majority and to be concluded by it, or else, this original compact whereby he with others incorporates into one society.”

Here the two words— “original compact” are very significant. We can easily assume that he had in mind the existence of another contract, otherwise he could not use the word “original”. We can assume that after making one compact, the people made another compact. The first compact set up a body-politic or civil society and the second compact enabled them the modus operandi of the management of body-politic. John Locke was not satisfied by setting up a body-politic or commonwealth or civil society. The civil society to him was not simply a state, it must be a complete democracy and it is assumed that to achieve this compact was made. Having described the state of nature as a condition of peace and mutual head and having defined natural rights, Locke next proceeded to derive civil society from the consent of its member. The consent, by which each person agrees with the other to form a Body Politic, obligated him to submit to the majority. The compulsion to constitute a civil society was to protect and preserve freedom and to enlarge it. The state of nature was one of liberty and equality but it was also one where peace was not secured being constantly upset by the 'corruption and viciousness of degenerate men'. It led three important wants: the want of an established, settled, known law; the want of a known and indifferent judge and the want of an executive power to enforce just decisions. Through a contract, individuals consented to submit to majority rule and organized themselves as a community or civil

society. Locke says men being by nature free, equal and independent, none can be put out of this estate (state of nature) and subjected to political power of another without his own consent. After the formation of civil society, this common consent becomes the consent of the majority. As a result of the contract, all men unanimously agreed to incorporate themselves in one body and conducted their affairs by opinion of the majority. They surrendered their powers partially, namely, the three specific rights that constituted the natural right to enforce the laws of nature. At first, individuals established a civil society, and then a government to act as a judge in the nature of a fiduciary power for promoting certain ends. Thus, Locke envisioned two contracts, one by which the civil society is established and the other which creates the government. According to Jeremy Waldron, a university professor of law & philosophy at the New York University School of Law, contract and consent have three stages in Locke's description: first, man must agree unanimously to come together as a community and pull their natural powers show that they can act together to uphold one another's right; second, the members of this community must agree by a majority vote to set up legislative and other institutions; third, the owners of property in a society must agree, either personally or through their representatives to whatever taxes are imposed on the people. In Locke's theory, state and society were created in different steps. In the first stage, civil society was found and, in the second stage, only government was established. This is the reason why, when a government is dissolved, society remains intact. By drawing a distinction between the process of formation of society and the state, Locke placed, government under the control of society, so there is no scope for absolutism unlike Hobbes. The relationship between society and the government is expressed by the idea of trust because it obviates making the government a party to the contract and giving it an independent status and authority. Within the government, the legislative power was supreme, since it was the representative of the people, having the power to make laws. There was also an executive which consisted of usually one person who has the power to enforce the law. According to Locke, the executive which included the judicial power had to be always in session. It enjoyed prerogatives. Locke also advocated for the separation of power between the executive and legislature. Besides the legislature and executive, there was a third wing of (the government, which is called the federative power. It means the power to make treaties and conduct external relation. Locke created a limited sovereign and ruled out political absolutism. He advocated that a good state is the one which existed for the people who formed it and not the vice versa. The government has to be based on the consent of the people subject to the constitution and the rule of law. It will act as a trustee of the people's right. Powers of the government are derived from the people. Natural laws and individual rights act as a limitation on the government's power. Locke advocated that supreme power resided in the people, and the people as a community had the inalienable right to constitute and dismiss a government. Locke justifies resistance to unjust political power. After overthrowing government, individuals can establish a new one.

In section 132 he further said that, By commonwealth it must be understood to mean not a democracy or any form of government but any independent community which the Latins signified by the word civitas.” According to Locke the word civitas means commonwealth. The administration and control of the body-politic shall be in the hands of the people. Perhaps this was in the mind of Locke and in order to do this there arose the necessity of another contract and Locke has done this. Locke was out and out a democrat. He had no intention to follow the footsteps of Hobbes, that is, to set an absolute power through the contract. One compact will lay the foundation of a civil society and another compact will make it a civitas or commonwealth.

### *Criticisms*

Locke's management of possessions is usually thought to be among his most noteworthy input in political thought. Nevertheless, it is also one of the features of his thinking that has been most profoundly condemned. There are essential debates over what precisely Locke was trying to achieve with his theory. According to C.B. Macpherson, an influential Canadian political scientist, Locke was a supporter of unrestricted capital accumulation. According to Macpherson, Locke set limits on the amassing of property in the state of nature. They are three such limits and they have been enumerated below:

- we may only be suitable as much as one can use before it spoils
- we must leave 'enough and as good' for others (the adequacy restriction)
- we may (supposedly) only accumulate property through one's own labour

Macpherson states that as the debate advances, each of these limits is surpassed. The creation of money leads to the spoilage limit ceasing to be a significant restriction since value can now be stored in a medium that does not expire. The adequacy restriction is also surpassed as the formation of private property augments productivity in such a way that even the landless who cannot obtain land will have more opportunities to gain what one needs for survival. Macpherson states that the 'enough and as good' prerequisite is itself just a derivative of a previous principle guaranteeing the chance to acquire, through labour, the life's necessities. Macpherson goes on to state that Locke did not truly believe in the third restriction at all. Although Locke seems to make labour the foundation of property rights when he suggests that one can only possess property in what one has individually laboured on, Locke also evidently recognizes that even in the state of nature, 'the Turfs my Servant has cut' can become my property. Locke thus was undoubtedly hinting towards the alienation of labour. Unsurprisingly, Macpherson also critiques the possessive individualism that Locke's theory of property stands for. According to Macpherson, its consistency depends upon separating society along different classes and also on the assumption of differential rationality between the capitalist class and wage-labourers. These restraints force Locke to include only the holders of property as the voting population of society.

Macpherson's analysis of Locke has been criticized by many people. According to Professor of Politics at the University of Oxford Alan Ryan, in Locke's view, property comprised of life, liberty and estate; thus even the landless could still be associates of political society. The most important critique of Macpherson's analysis of Locke was provided by James Tully.

### ***Tully's arguments***

James Tully, teacher and Canadian philosopher of civic freedom and political struggles, critiqued Macpherson's understanding of Locke. Tully pointed out that the *First Treatise* specifically contains a 'duty of assistance' to people who have no means of survival. While such a responsibility is consistent with requiring the poor to work for low salaries, it does negate the assertion that those who have capital have no social duties to others.

Tully also wanted a primary reinterpretation of Locke's hypothesis. Preceding accounts had highlighted on the claim that since individuals own their own labour, when they combine their labour with that which is disowned it turns out to be theirs properly. Harvard professor of politics Robert Nozick criticized this suggestion by giving the example of mixing tomato juice with the sea. According to Robert Nozick, if he spills his can of tomato juice in the sea in such a way that the molecules of tomato juice mix with the sea that does not mean that he will own the sea. When we combine what we own with what we do not, why should we believe we gain property as an alternative of losing it? On Tully's explanation, focus on the combining metaphor

misses Locke's stress on what he calls the 'workmanship model.' Locke considered that makers have property rights regarding what they make just like God has property rights as regards human beings since he is their maker. Human beings are crafted in the image of God and share with God, though to a much smaller degree, the capability to shape and mould the physical setting in line with a rational pattern or plan.

Waldron has criticized this explanation by saying that it would make the rights of Human makers supreme in the same way that God's right over his creation is supreme. Professor of Philosophy at Duke University Gopal Sreenivasan supports Tully's argument against Waldron's reply by asserting a difference between creating and making. According to Sreenivasan, absolute property right can only be produced by creating, and only God can create. On the other hand, making is comparable to creating and constructs an analogous right which may be seen as weaker.

Another contentious part of Tully's analysis is his explanation of the sufficiency condition and its inferences. For Tully, Locke's argument becomes acceptable only because of the sufficiency argument. Since Locke's assertion begins with the supposition that all individuals own the world, individual property is only justified if it is proved that no one has been made worse off by the deed. According to Locke's supposition, in conditions where there is much water or land accessible, an individual's taking some part of it does no harm to others. For Locke, where such conditions are not met, those who are denied access to land do have a lawful objection to its appropriation. In Tully's analysis, Locke recognized that when land becomes limited, the previous rights acquired by labour no longer hold since 'enough and as good' is no longer available for others. The Commonwealth Professor of Philosophy and Law A.J. Simmons favoured Waldron's analysis and argued against Tully and Sreenivasan while rejecting the workmanship model. According to Simmons, Locke thinks that God had all rights as he was the creator while humans have diverse restricted rights as they were just trustees and not makers. Simmons based this statement on his reading of two different arguments, which are as follows:

- The first argument for Simmons justifies property based on God's will and essential human needs
- The second based on 'mixing' labour

Returning to the previous argument, in any case some property rights can be justified by showing that a system allowing appropriation of property without approval has useful consequences for the conservation of mankind. According to Simmons, this argument is overdetermined, i.e., it can be understood either theologically or as an easy rule-consequentialist argument. With respect to the latter view, Simmons takes labour not to be a substance that is actually 'mixed' but rather as a purposive activity focused at satisfying requirements and conveniences of life. Like Sreenivasan, Simmons views this as flowing from a prior right of people to guard their survival, but Simmons also adds a prior right to self-government.

#### **5.4: Views on Liberalism**

J. S. McClelland (History of Western Political Thought) writes: "Liberals have always shown a certain fondness for Locke, and it is easy to see why. Certain assumptions which Locke makes, certain attitudes which he held and certain arguments which he uses, fit in well with the doctrine which at the beginning of the nineteenth century came to be called liberalism." J. S. McClelland wants to say that in the Second Treatise Locke makes several comments which clearly lay the foundation of liberalism.

Pie says that property is a natural right and simultaneously it is inviolable. Property can, however, be taken but behind this there must be free and voluntary consent of the owner. Locke has said that in the state of nature people enjoyed the facilities of private property but because of certain inconveniences of the state of nature the enjoyment of the benefits of private property very often faced interruptions. This situation inspired them to set up a system of administration that could give guarantee right to property. The right to property was so important to Locke that without the consent of people' or owner of the property nobody had any right to levy taxes on property. That is levy of tax must be preceded by owner's consent. John Locke wrote a book Letter Concerning Toleration. This book conveys his idea about liberalism. He has said that everybody should practice toleration about others and this toleration will teach people not to intervene in the private affairs of other individuals. To put it in other words, the right to privacy is a basic right and the democratic states have admitted it and made it a part of the constitutional rights. Rationality or rational behaviour is an essential feature of liberalism and its existence in Lockean philosophy has encouraged them to find out liberalism in Locke. The liberals claim that in the Lockean analysis of contract there is enough emphasis on rationality. The individuals are well-aware of their rights as well as responsibility to other fellow citizens and society.

The liberals call it rationality. Another manifestation of Locke's idea of rationality is that they formed a civil society for the proper protection and utilization of natural rights and somehow they were confident that only in a civitas it is possible and for that purpose they made a second compact. It indicates their rationality. It is also said that to live in a civil society implies obligations. That is, in the state of nature the people had no feeling of obligation. But in civil society everyone must have the feeling of obligation; Locke's people had that feeling.

Another element of Locke's theory of social contract is "Lockean model of society is competitive capitalist model. Men are free to acquire and are encouraged by God to do so." Free competition and capitalism are important parts or aspects of liberal philosophy. In Locke's time capitalism was in embryonic stage and its proper development required congenial atmosphere and Locke, through the instrumentality of contract, wanted to ensure this. A very important element of Locke's liberalism is to be found in his concept of state as a fiduciary trust. He thought that the general public was the source of government's power. Again, the government is always accountable to the people for all its policies and acts.

The people have also the power to dislodge the government if it fails to act according to the terms and conditions of the contract. Locke's concept of fiduciary trust is unique and this has introduced the famous idea of constitutionalism which is the main feature of the American constitution. Its central idea is that both the rulers and the ruled are bound by the principles laid down in the constitution.

Locke's separation of power is another important part of his liberalism and needless to say that it is an important part. In section 134 he has said that men left the state of nature and set up a civil society for the purpose of protection, and enjoyment of property peacefully. But this cannot be done without laws and it is the chief function of the legislature to enact laws.

Its implication is that legislature constitutes a branch of state and supreme power is vested in this organ. But the execution of laws shall be vested in a body of persons which is separate from the legislative body. The legislative and executive powers are separated from each other. Though these two organs are separate from each other both are governed by the same laws.

Locke says that after the formation of civil society a state or body-politic will have to establish relation with other states to deal with war and peace and for the purposes of making alliances.

Locke calls this function federative. In other words what we call today international or foreign affairs function Locke calls it federative.

We thus, in Lockean model, get three departments or organs of government— legislative, executive and federative. Hence we find that much before Montesquieu (1689-1755) Locke initiated the idea of separation of power. The framers of the American constitution later on made it a part of their constitution. In the eighteenth century the idea was regarded as key to the principle of bringing state authority under control. It was also thought that if powers are separated from each other that will put proper check on the government. Democracy is a part of Lockean theory of liberalism. We want to mention few features of Locke's idea of democracy:

(1) Locke has said that the contract has been finalized by taking the consent of everyone. Subsequently some may differ from others but this difference of opinion may be taken as normal.

(2) The opinion of the majority shall be the principle of day-to-day administration.

(3) The state shall be administered by the principle of law and terms laid down in the contract. This is the constitutionalism. It is believed that constitutionalism is the basic aspect of democracy and the liberals of all types emphasize it as a very crucial part of democracy.

(4) An important aspect of Locke's idea of democracy is that people are the real source of government's power. Today many may call it as a type of popular sovereignty. Implication is the entire state shall be managed by the will of the people.

(5) Locke has called the newly created civil society as a trust. It means the state acts only for the benefit and welfare of people. In other words, it is the custodian of people's interests. Locke thought of a continuous relation between the ruler and the ruled. Government cannot do anything against people's interests.

(6) In today's democracy we talk about the protection of certain basic rights and Locke said so. To him right to property, security and life was essential and any authority worthy of its name must make arrangement for the protection of these three basic rights.

(7) Locke was quite cautious of the rights and privileges of citizens and in a democratic state all these are quite safe but not in an autocracy. That is why we find that from the very beginning he framed principles which will control the state authority He did not think about making sovereign power absolute

### **5.5: Views on Punishment**

Locke defined political power as “a Right of making Laws with Penalties of Death, and consequently all less Penalties” (Two Treatises 2.3). Locke's theory of punishment is thus central to his view of politics and part of what he considered innovative about his political philosophy. But he also referred to his account of punishment as a “very strange doctrine” (2.9), presumably because it ran against the assumption that only political sovereigns could punish. Locke believed that punishment requires that there be a law, and since the state of nature has the law of nature to govern it, it is permissible to describe one individual as “punishing” another in that state. Locke's rationale is that since the fundamental law of nature is that mankind be preserved and since that law would “be in vain” with no human power to enforce it, it must therefore be legitimate for individuals to punish each other even before government exists. In arguing this, Locke was

disagreeing with Samuel Pufendorf. Samuel Pufendorf had argued strongly that the concept of punishment made no sense apart from an established positive legal structure.

Locke realized that the crucial objection to allowing people to act as judges with power to punish in the state of nature was that such people would end up being judges in their own cases. Locke readily admitted that this was a serious inconvenience and a primary reason for leaving the state of nature (Two Treatises 2.13). Locke insisted on this point because it helped explain the transition into civil society. Locke thought that in the state of nature men had a liberty to engage in “innocent delights” (actions that are not a violation of any applicable laws), to seek their own preservation within the limits of natural law, and to punish violations of natural law. The power to seek one’s preservation is limited in civil society by the law and the power to punish is transferred to the government. (128–130). The power to punish in the state of nature is thus the foundation for the right of governments to use coercive force. The situation becomes more complex, however, if we look at the principles which are to guide punishment. Rationales for punishment are often divided into those that are forward-looking and backward-looking. Forward-looking rationales include deterring crime, protecting society from dangerous persons, and rehabilitation of criminals. Backward-looking rationales normally focus on retribution, inflicting on the criminal harm comparable to the crime. Locke may seem to conflate these two rationales in passages like the following. so thus in the State of Nature, one Man comes by a Power over another; but yet no Absolute or Arbitrary Power, to use a Criminal when he has got him in his hands, according to the passionate heats, or boundless extravagancy of his own Will, but only to reattribute to him, so far as calm reason and conscience dictates, what is proportionate to his Transgression, which is so much as may serve for Reparation and Restraint. For these two are the only reasons, why one Man may lawfully harm to another, which is that [which] we call punishment. Locke talks both of retribution and of punishing only for reparation and restraint. Simmons argues that this is evidence that Locke is combining both rationales for punishment in his theory. A survey of other seventeenth-century natural rights justifications for punishment, however, indicates that it was common to use words like “reattribute” in theories that reject what we today would call retributive punishment. In the passage quoted above, Locke is saying that the proper amount of punishment is the amount that will provide restitution to injured parties, protect the public, and deter future crime. Locke’s attitude toward punishment in his other writings on toleration, education, and religion consistently follows this path toward justifying punishment on grounds other than retribution. Tuckness claims that Locke’s emphasis on restitution is interesting because restitution is backward looking in a sense (it seeks to restore an earlier state of affairs) but also forward looking in that it provides tangible benefits to those who receive the restitution. There is a link here between Locke’s understanding of natural punishment and his understanding of legitimate state punishment. Even in the state of nature, a primary justification for punishment is that it helps further the positive goal of preserving human life and human property. The emphasis on deterrence, public safety, and restitution in punishments administered by the government mirrors this emphasis.

A second puzzle regarding punishment is the permissibility of punishing internationally. Locke describes international relations as a state of nature, and so in principle, states should have the same power to punish breaches of the natural law in the international community that individuals have in the state of nature. This would legitimize, for example, punishment of individuals for war crimes or crimes against humanity even in cases where neither the laws of the particular state nor international law authorize punishment. Thus in World War II, even if “crimes of aggression” was not at the time recognized as a crime for which individual punishment was justified, if the actions violated that natural law principle that one should not deprive another of life, liberty, or property, the guilty parties could still be liable to criminal punishment. The most common interpretation has

thus been that the power to punish internationally is symmetrical with the power to punish in the state of nature.

Tuckness, however, has argued that there is an asymmetry between the two cases because Locke also talks about states being limited in the goals that they can pursue. Locke often says that the power of the government is to be used for the protection of the rights of its own citizens, not for the rights of all people everywhere (Two Treatises 1.92, 2.88, 2.95, 2.131, 2.147). Locke argues that in the state of nature a person is to use the power to punish to preserve his society, mankind as a whole. After states are formed, however, the power to punish is to be used for the benefit of his own particular society. In the state of nature, a person is not required to risk his life for another (Two Treatises 2.6) and this presumably would also mean a person is not required to punish in the state of nature when attempting to punish would risk the life of the punisher. Locke may therefore be objecting to the idea that soldiers can be compelled to risk their lives for altruistic reasons. In the state of nature, a person could refuse to attempt to punish others if doing so would risk his life and so Locke reasons that individuals may not have consented to allow the state to risk their lives for altruistic punishment of international crimes.

## **5.6: Views on Separation of Powers and the Dissolution of Government**

Locke claims that legitimate government is based on the idea of separation of powers. First and foremost of these is the legislative power. Locke describes the legislative power as supreme (Two Treatises 2.149) in having ultimate authority over “how the force for the commonwealth shall be employed” (2.143). The legislature is still bound by the law of nature and much of what it does is set down laws that further the goals of natural law and specify appropriate punishments for them (2.135). The executive power is then charged with enforcing the law as it is applied in specific cases. Interestingly, Locke’s third power is called the “federative power” and it consists of the right to act internationally according to the law of nature. Since countries are still in the state of nature with respect to each other, they must follow the dictates of natural law and can punish one another for violations of that law in order to protect the rights of their citizens.

The fact that Locke does not mention the judicial power as a separate power becomes clearer if we distinguish powers from institutions. Powers relate to functions. To have a power means that there is a function (such as making the laws or enforcing the laws) that one may legitimately perform. When Locke says that the legislative is supreme over the executive, he is not saying that parliament is supreme over the king. Locke is simply affirming that “what can give laws to another must needs be superior to him”. Moreover, Locke thinks that it is possible for multiple institutions to share the same power; for example, the legislative power in his day was shared by the House of Commons, the House of Lords, and the King. Since all three needed to agree for something to become law, all three are part of the legislative power. He also thinks that the federative power and the executive power are normally placed in the hands of the executive, so it is possible for the same person to exercise more than one power (or function). There is, therefore, no one to one correspondence between powers and institutions.

Locke is not opposed to having distinct institutions called courts, but he does not see interpretation as a distinct function or power. For Locke, legislation is primarily about announcing a general rule stipulating what types of actions should receive what types of punishments. The executive power is the power to make the judgments necessary to apply those rules to specific cases and administer force as directed by the rule (Two Treatises 2.88–89). Both of these actions involve interpretation. Locke states that positive laws “are only so far right, as they are founded on the Law of Nature, by which they are to be regulated and interpreted” (2.12). In other words, the executive must interpret

the laws in light of its understanding of natural law. Similarly, legislation involves making the laws of nature more specific and determining how to apply them to particular circumstances ( 2.135) which also calls for interpreting natural law. Locke did not think of interpreting law as a distinct function because he thought it was a part of both the legislative and executive functions.

If we compare Locke's formulation of separation of powers to the later ideas of Montesquieu, we see that they are not as different as they may initially appear. Although Montesquieu gives the more well-known division of legislative, executive, and judicial, as he explains what he means by these terms he reaffirms the superiority of the legislative power and describes the executive power as having to do with international affairs (Locke's federative power) and the judicial power as concerned with the domestic execution of the laws (Locke's executive power). It is more the terminology than the concepts that have changed. Locke considered arresting a person, trying a person, and punishing a person as all part of the function of executing the law rather than as a distinct function.

Locke believed that it was important that the legislative power contain an assembly of elected representatives, but as we have seen the legislative power could contain monarchical and aristocratic elements as well. Locke believed the people had the freedom to create "mixed" constitutions that utilize all of these. For that reason, Locke's theory of separation of powers does not dictate one particular type of constitution and does not preclude unelected officials from having part of the legislative power. Locke was more concerned that the people have representatives with sufficient power to block attacks on their liberty and attempts to tax them without justification. This is important because Locke also affirms that the community remains the real supreme power throughout. The people retain the right to "remove or alter" the legislative power . This can happen for a variety of reasons. The entire society can be dissolved by a successful foreign invasion, but Locke is more interested in describing the occasions when the people take power back from the government to which they have entrusted it. If the rule of law is ignored, if the representatives of the people are prevented from assembling, if the mechanisms of election are altered without popular consent, or if the people are handed over to a foreign power, then they can take back their original authority and overthrow the government They can also rebel if the government attempts to take away their rights .Locke thinks this is justifiable since oppressed people will likely rebel anyway and those who are not oppressed will be unlikely to rebel. Moreover, the threat of possible rebellion makes tyranny less likely to start with (2.224–6). For all these reasons, while there are a variety of legitimate constitutional forms, the delegation of power under any constitution is understood to be conditional.

Locke's understanding of separation of powers is complicated by the doctrine of prerogative. Prerogative is the right of the executive to act without explicit authorization for a law, or even contrary to the law, in order to better fulfill the laws that seek the preservation of human life. A king might, for example, order that a house be torn down in order to stop a fire from spreading throughout a city (Two Treatises 1.159). Locke defines it more broadly as "the power of doing public good without a rule" (1.167). This poses a challenge to Locke's doctrine of legislative supremacy. Locke handles this by explaining that the rationale for this power is that general rules cannot cover all possible cases and that inflexible adherence to the rules would be detrimental to the public good and that the legislature is not always in session to render a judgment (2.160). The relationship between the executive and the legislature depends on the specific constitution. If the chief executive has no part in the supreme legislative power, then the legislature could overrule the executive's decisions based on prerogative when it reconvenes. If, however, the chief executive has a veto, the result would be a stalemate between them. Locke describes a similar stalemate in the case where the chief executive has the power to call parliament and can thus prevent it from meeting by refusing to call it into session. In such a case, Locke says, there is no judge on earth

between them as to whether the executive has misused prerogative and both sides have the right to “appeal to heaven” in the same way that the people can appeal to heaven against a tyrannical government (2.168).

The concept of an “appeal to heaven” is an important concept in Locke’s thought. Locke assumes that people, when they leave the state of nature, create a government with some sort of constitution that specifies which entities are entitled to exercise which powers. Locke also assumes that these powers will be used to protect the rights of the people and to promote the public good. In cases where there is a dispute between the people and the government about whether the government is fulfilling its obligations, there is no higher human authority to which one can appeal. The only appeal left, for Locke, is the appeal to God. The “appeal to heaven,” therefore, involves taking up arms against your opponent and letting God judge who is in the right.

### **5.7: Views on Toleration**

In Locke’s Letter Concerning Toleration, he develops several lines of arguments that are intended to establish the proper spheres for religion and politics. His central claims are that government should not use force to try to bring people to the true religion and that religious societies are voluntary organizations that have no right to use coercive power over their own members or those outside their group. One recurring line of argument that Locke uses is explicitly religious. Locke argues that neither the example of Jesus nor the teaching of the New Testament gives any indication that force is a proper way to bring people to salvation. He also frequently points out what he takes to be clear evidence of hypocrisy, namely that those who are so quick to persecute others for small differences in worship or doctrine are relatively unconcerned with much more obvious moral sins that pose an even greater threat to their eternal state. In addition to these and similar religious arguments, Locke gives three reasons that are more philosophical in nature for barring governments from using force to encourage people to adopt religious beliefs (Works 6:10–12). First, he argues that the care of men’s souls has not been committed to the magistrate by either God or the consent of men. This argument resonates with the structure of argument used so often in the Two Treatises to establish the natural freedom and equality of mankind. There is no command in the Bible telling magistrates to bring people to the true faith and people could not consent to such a goal for government because it is not possible for people, at will, to believe what the magistrate tells them to believe. Their beliefs are a function of what they think is true, not what they will. Locke’s second argument is that since the power of the government is only force, while true religion consists of genuine inward persuasion of the mind, force is incapable of bringing people to the true religion. Locke’s third argument is that even if the magistrate could change people’s minds, a situation where everyone accepted the magistrate’s religion would not bring more people to the true religion. Many of the magistrates of the world believe religions that are false.

Locke’s contemporary, Jonas Proast, responded by saying that Locke’s three arguments really amount to just two, that true faith cannot be forced and that we have no more reason to think that we are right than anyone else has. Proast argued that force can be helpful in bringing people to the truth “indirectly, and at a distance.” His idea was that although force cannot directly bring about a change of mind or heart, it can cause people to consider arguments that they would otherwise ignore or prevent them from hearing or reading things that would lead them astray. If force is indirectly useful in bringing people to the true faith, then Locke has not provided a persuasive argument. As for Locke’s argument about the harm of a magistrate whose religion is false using force to promote it, Proast claimed that this was irrelevant since there is a morally relevant difference between affirming that the magistrate may promote the religion he thinks true and affirming that he may promote the religion that actually is true. Proast thought that unless one was

a complete skeptic, one must believe that the reasons for one's own position are objectively better than those for other positions. Jeremy Waldron, in an influential article, restated the substance of Proast's objection for a contemporary audience. He argued that, leaving aside Locke's Christian arguments, his main position was that it was instrumentally irrational, from the perspective of the persecutor, to use force in matters of religion because force acts only on the will and belief is not something that we change at will. Waldron pointed out that this argument blocks only one particular reason for persecution, not all reasons. Thus it would not stop someone who used religious persecution for some end other than religious conversion, such as preserving the peace. Even in cases where persecution does have a religious goal, Waldron agrees with Proast that force may be indirectly effective in changing people's beliefs. Much of the current discussion about Locke's contribution to contemporary political philosophy in the area of toleration centers on whether Locke has a good reply to these objections from Proast and Waldron.

Some contemporary commentators try to rescue Locke's argument by redefining the religious goal that the magistrate is presumed to seek. Susan Mendus, for example, notes that successful brainwashing might cause a person to sincerely utter a set of beliefs, but that those beliefs might still not count as genuine. Beliefs induced by coercion might be similarly problematic. Paul Bou Habib argues that what Locke is really after is sincere inquiry and that Locke thinks inquiry undertaken only because of duress is necessarily insincere. These approaches thus try to save Locke's argument by showing that force really is incapable of bringing about the desired religious goal. Other commentators focus on Locke's first argument about proper authority, and particularly on the idea that authorization must be by consent. David Wootton argues that even if force occasionally works at changing a person's belief, it does not work often enough to make it rational for persons to consent to the government exercising that power. A person who has good reason to think he will not change his beliefs even when persecuted has good reason to prevent the persecution scenario from ever happening. Richard Vernon argues that we want not only to hold right beliefs, but also to hold them for the right reasons. Since the balance of reasons rather than the balance of force should determine our beliefs, we would not consent to a system in which irrelevant reasons for belief might influence us. Other commentators focus on the third argument, that the magistrate might be wrong. Here the question is whether Locke's argument is question begging or not. The two most promising lines of argument are the following. Wootton argues that there are very good reasons, from the standpoint of a given individual, for thinking that governments will be wrong about which religion is true. Governments are motivated by the quest for power, not truth, and are unlikely to be good guides in religious matters. Since there are so many different religions held by rulers, if only one is true then likely my own ruler's views are not true. Wootton thus takes Locke to be showing that it is irrational, from the perspective of the individual, to consent to government promotion of religion. A different interpretation of the third argument is presented by Tuckness. He argues that the likelihood that the magistrate may be wrong generates a principle of toleration based on what is rational from the perspective of a legislator, not the perspective of an individual citizen. Drawing on Locke's later writings on toleration, he argues that Locke's theory of natural law assumes that God, as author of natural law, takes into account the fallibility of those magistrates who will carry out the commands of natural law.

## **6: JEAN ROUSSEAU**

### **6.0: Life Sketch of Jean Jacques Rousseau**

J.J. Rousseau is a very well-known philosopher's, who made his own life the subject of a number of his writings, including his great autobiographical work, the Confessions. He was born in 1712 in Geneva. His mother died a few days after his birth, and he was raised by his father, a clockmaker, who cared for learning and had Rousseau read classical Greek and Roman literature. His father was forced to leave Geneva while Rousseau was still young. Apprenticed to an engraver, Rousseau eventually left Geneva in 1728, fleeing to Annecy. There at the age of sixteen he met Françoise-Louise de Warens, a woman who would become his benefactor and mistress. Over the next ten years, he earned money as a lackey, engraver, and music teacher. Mme. de Warens sent him during this period to Turin, where he renounced his Calvinism and converted to Roman Catholicism.

As great theorists, that France has ever produced, Jean Jacques Rousseau was a keen moralist who was ruthless in his criticism of the 18th century French society. He was one of the most controversial thinkers, as is evident from the conflicting, contradictory and often diametrically opposite interpretations that existed of the nature and importance of his ideas. He was an 18th century philosopher, writer and composer in who thrived in the era of Romanticism. He was born in Geneva, Switzerland on 28 June 1712. During that period, Geneva was a city-state and a protestant associate of the Swiss Confederacy. But he was proud that his middle class family had a right to vote in the city. Throughout his lifetime, Rousseau considered himself to be the citizen of Geneva. Isaac Rousseau, his father was a watch maker and also well-educated and a lover of music. Rousseau remarked 'A Genevan watchmaker, is a man who can be introduced anywhere; a Persian watchmaker is only fit to talk about watches'. Rousseau lost his mother to puerperal fever while he was only nine days old. Rousseau moved to Paris in 1742 to pursue a career as a musician and composer. In Paris, he soon befriended Diderot, who would go on to fame as an editor of the Encyclopédie. Diderot commissioned Rousseau to write most of the articles for the Encyclopédie on musical subjects, as well as an article on political economy. Rousseau's time in Paris was interrupted from 1743 to 1744, when he served as Secretary to the French ambassador in Venice.

Rousseau's rise to fame came with the appearance of his Discourse on the Arts and Sciences, named the winning entry in an essay competition by the Academy of Dijon in 1750. In a famous letter, he describes how, on a journey to Vincennes to visit Diderot, he had an extraordinary vision upon reading the notice of the essay competition: "All at once I felt myself dazzled by a thousand sparkling lights; crowds of vivid ideas thronged into my head with a force and confusion that threw me into unspeakable agitation; I felt my head whirling in a giddiness like that of intoxication." He claimed that this vision marked a fundamental turning point in his life, and foreshadowed to him the basic principles he would unfold in his First and Second Discourse and his Emile, which he called his three "principal writings." In 1752 his short opera *Le Devin du Village* ("The Village Soothsayer") was performed at the French court and his comedy *Narcisse* was performed at the Théâtre Français. The following year, Rousseau wrote his *Letter on French Music* (1753), which contrasted Italian opera favorably with that of France. The work sparked a public controversy and even resulted in Rousseau's being hanged in effigy, as it was viewed as politically seditious.

In 1754, he completed his *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*. He returned to Geneva and to the Protestantism of his youth, which allowed him to regain the right to citizenship he had lost with his conversion to Catholicism. In 1755, both the *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality* and his work *Political Economy* appeared (the latter in the fifth volume of Diderot and d'Alembert's *Encyclopédie*). In 1756 Rousseau settled in a cottage, the *Hermitage*, on the estate of Mme. d'Épinay, a friend of many of the philosophes. There he began work on his novel *Julie, or the New*

Heloise. After quarrels with Mme. d'Épinay and with Diderot, Rousseau moved to the country home of the Duke of Luxembourg at Montmorency. In 1758 his Letter to M. d'Alembert on the Theatre was published. It offered a critique of d'Alembert's article on Geneva in the Encyclopédie. This work made final Rousseau's public break with most of the philosophes. Julie was published in 1761 and soon becomes one of the best-selling works of the century. Rousseau received thousands of letters from admiring readers, many of whom refused to believe that the characters of the love story were mere literary inventions. This period was to become Rousseau's most productive. In 1762 both On the Social Contract and Emile were published. Owing especially to each work's heterodox discussion of Christianity, both were condemned by the authorities and publicly burned in Geneva and Paris. The French government ordered Rousseau's arrest. As a result, Rousseau fled to Neuchâtel, and then governed by Prussia.

At Neuchâtel from 1763 to 1765, Rousseau, among other writing, drafted his Constitutional Project for Corsica. At this time he also began work on his autobiography, the Confessions. In the period following, Rousseau endured increasingly hostile attacks from various leading writers, and eventually decided to leave for England, accepting an offer from the philosopher David Hume to join him there. After two years in England, Rousseau, having quarreled with Hume, whom he (falsely) suspected of drafting an anonymous pamphlet attacking him, returned to France in 1767. During his final ten years of life, Rousseau completed a number of other works. He composed the Considerations on the Government of Poland and Dialogues: Rousseau Judge of Jean-Jacques in 1772, although both were published only posthumously. He composed his final work, The Reveries of a Solitary Walker, in 1777. Rousseau died suddenly on July 2, 1778. The publication of the Du Peyrou-Moultou edition of his collected works appeared in 1782, and made available to the public for the first time many of his autobiographical writings and later political works, as well as letters, fragments, and other shorter works. In 1794, Rousseau's ashes were moved to the Panthéon. His paternal aunt Suzanne and his father bought both him and his elder brother Francois up. His father went to Nyon in the territory of Bern from Geneva along with his aunt. Rousseau stayed with his maternal uncle after this. His uncle Abraham Bernard, took him to Hamlet outside Geneva with his own son for two years. Here the children took the subjects mathematics and drawing for their study. At that period, he was deeply influenced by religious services and he also considered becoming a protestant minister. His parents were Protestants, but he got converted to Catholicism under the influence of Madame de Warens. Subsequently, he became her lover. His life was not smooth as he led the life of a vagabond. In his book *Confessions* he said that it is only after many years that he began to educate himself. He went to Paris when he was 30 years old. There he met Diderot and became his friend. His writing on music featured in *Encyclopedia* was written by Diderot. In 1743, he became the Secretary to the French Ambassador in Venice. He came in contact with Therese le Vasseur in 1745 and had five children from her who were abandoned in an orphanage. He married Vasseur much later. His eccentric, egoistic and overbearing personality made him sever his friendships with his former friends. Thus, he was a controversial person and his life was very complex. However, he rose to fame with his prize winning essay *Discourse on the Science and Artx*. In this essay, he rejected progress based on the Arts and Sciences, as these did not elevate the moral standards of human beings. He traced the rise of inequality and the consequent fall of the human individual. He wrote a novel namely *La Noitvelle Helaise* in 1761. In this novel, the themes of his early essays reappeared, and his preference for nature and the simple pleasures of country life became evident. It is only after his death that the *Confessions* were published. He accomplished many things during his lifetime which included writing on music, politics and education. His fame primarily rests on his writings. He also composed some operas. He remained the mainstay of the Paris opera for years to come. He also wrote a dictionary of music and devised a new system of music notation. He wrote *The Social Contract*, his most famous book in Paris in 1762. He died in the year 1778. Rousseau returned to France in June 1767 under the protection of the Prince de Conti. Wandering from place to place,

he at last settled in 1770 in Paris. There he made a living, as he often had in the past, by copying music. By December 1770 the *Confessions*, upon which he had been working since 1766, was completed, and he gave readings from this work at various private homes. His last work, *Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, begun in 1776 and unfinished at his death, records how Rousseau, an outcast from society, recaptured "serenity, tranquility, peace, even happiness." In May 1778 Rousseau accepted Marquis de Girardin's hospitality at Ermenonville near Paris. There, with Thérèse at his bedside, he died on July 2, 1778, probably from uremia, a severe kidney disease. Rousseau was buried on the Île des Peupliers at Ermenonville. In October 1794 his remains were transferred to the Panthéon in Paris. Thérèse, surviving him by twenty-two years, died in 1801 at the age of eighty.

### **6.1: views on Morality**

The person who sleeps have no share was not the principle of Rousseau's morality. They are not the full complement of passions in Rousseau's thinking. Once people have achieved consciousness of themselves as social beings, morality also becomes possible and this relies on the further faculty of conscience. The fullest accounts of Rousseau's conception of morality are found in the *Lettres Morales* and in sections of the *Confession of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar*, a part of *Emile*. In the most primitive forms of human existence, before the emergence of balance among all and balances or restrains self-interest. It is, to that extent, akin to a moral sentiment such as Humean sympathy. But as something that is merely instinctual it lacks, for Rousseau, a genuinely moral quality. Genuine morality, on the other hand, consists in the application of reason to human affairs and conduct. This requires the mental faculty that is the source of genuinely moral motivation, namely conscience. Conscience impels us to the love of justice and morality in a quasi-aesthetic manner. As the appreciation of justice and the desire to act to further it, conscience is based on a rational appreciation of the well-orderedness of a benign God's plan for the world. However, in a world dominated by inflamed amour prosper, the normal pattern is not for a morality of reason to supplement or supplant our natural proto-moral sympathies. Instead, the usual course of events in civil society is for reason and sympathy to be displaced while humans' enhanced capacity for reasoning is put at the service, not of morality, but of the impulse to dominate, oppress and exploit. The theme of both the *Second Discourse* and the *Letter to d'Alembert* is the way in which human beings can deceive themselves about their own moral qualities. So, for example, theatre audiences derive enjoyment from the eliciting of their natural compassion by a tragic scene on the stage; then, convinced of their natural goodness, they are freed to act viciously outside the theater. Philosophy, too, can serve as a resource for self-deception. It can give people reasons to ignore the promptings of all or, as in Rousseau's essay *Principles of the Right of War*, it can underpin legal codes (such as the law of war and peace) that the powerful may use to license oppressive violence whilst deadening their natural feelings of compassion.

### **6.2: views on Insurrection against Reason**

Rousseau is perhaps most famous or even infamous for two features associated with his work and its influence. Among casual readers, he is known as the muse of the Jacobins in the French Revolution. The popular image persists of Robespierre quoting passages from the *Social Contract* while simultaneously ordering executions. Among more familiar readers, he is known for the many paradoxes and ambiguities that cover most corners of his oeuvre. He can be found advancing ancient and modern devices, celebrating the solitary life while insisting on the social, condemning the arts while writing novels and operas, and insisting that freedom involves being forced against one's evident will. These two features come together in the new edited volume, *Rousseau and Revolution*, which probes the many ambiguities in Rousseau's political writings to

explore whether or not he is properly understood as a muse for revolutionaries, whether in France or elsewhere. The volume, written by scholars from Europe and the United States and drawn from a 2009 conference held in Aarhus, Denmark, consists of eleven essays plus an introduction.

However, Rousseau and the general will were very clearly in the air during the French Revolution -- on both sides. This spirit is well-captured by Eric Thompson, who observes, "From 1789 onwards it [the 'general will'] became a constant phrase on the lips of the Palais Royal orators; it was repeated endlessly in the popular journals and in the speeches of deputies in the Assembly itself. It was constantly heard in the Jacobin Club and in the branches later established by it throughout the country." To make any claims to legitimacy, one had to associate one's own principles with Rousseau's general will. In January of 1789, the Abbé Sieyès demanded that if France were really serious about the general will, then it had to bolster the power of the Third Estate. By July of the same year, this demand was manifested in the Decree upon the National Assembly, which now posited that the "interpretation and presentation of the general will of the nation belong" to the National Assembly. The very next month, the same National Assembly would issue its Declaration of the Rights of Man, which expressly asserted, "The law is an expression of the general will." To understand the power of Rousseau's immediate influence, however, one need only consult the response of Louis XVI before the National Assembly, where he promised to "defend and maintain constitutional liberty, whose principles the general will, in accord with my own, has sanctioned.". Rousseau was a clear presence throughout the Revolution.

Rousseau projected the contradiction and maladjustments of his own nature upon the society about him and sought an anodyne from his own painful sensitivity. For this purpose, he adopted the familiar contrast between natural and the actual current in all the appeals to reason. But he did no! Appeal to reason. On the contrary, he termed the contrast into an attack upon reason. Against intelligence, the growth of knowledge, and the progress of science, which the enlightenment believes to be the only hope of civilization, he said amiable and benevolent sentiments, the good will and reverence. He criticized the idea of enlightenment since his early period. As mentioned above, in his prize winning essay *Discourses on the Science and Art*, he depicted the drawbacks of science and arts including its impact on morality. According to him, science had brought moral degradation among men. He criticized the idea that science has brought progress. He termed it as an illusion.

For him, it was not progress and in fact was regression. The advancement of science and modern civilization had made individual life unhappy. It had made him less virtuous. He advocated for a simple society. He said that virtue can be prevalent only in a simple society. In his criticism of modern advanced society, he alleged that man has been growing corrupt day by day. With the advancement of the civilization, man has become corrupt. He advocated that abundance in the world has brought more evil than good. According to him, luxury was the fertile source of corruption. It not only negatively impacts man, but also undermines the nations. He cited the example of Athens. It is because of its luxury, wealth, science and elegance that brought vices which led to its downfall in the long run. He also cited the example of Rome. As long as Rome was simple and devoid of luxury, it had respect all over the empire but the time it embraced luxury and wealth, it began to decline. He severely criticized the advancement of art and science. He argued that the minds of the human beings have been corrupted as the arts and science have advanced through the ages. To him, the much-vaunted politeness, the glory of civilized refinement was a 'uniform perfidious veil' under which he saw jealousy, suspicion, fear, wildness, fraud and hate. Science brought intelligence and knowledge revolution. The supporter of enlightenment eulogized it. But against this notion, Rousseau gave preference to amiable and benevolent

sentiments, reverence and goodwill. He preferred sentiments and conscience to reason. He argued intelligence was dangerous because it undermined reverence. He termed science as destructive because it undermined faith. Reason was bad to him because it undermined morality. For Rousseau, morality is nothing other than the ability to see oneself through the eyes of others and act appropriately. This is a fascinating description of morality. Learning to live with others is the essence of morality. Humans have the capacity to act morally, but it is not natural in the sense of being fully fixed in all humans from birth. It is capacity that has to be developed and nurtured.

### **6.3: Rousseau's Political Philosophy**

Rousseau has suffered as much as anyone from critics without a sense of history. He has been cried up and cried down by democrats and oppressors with an equal lack of understanding and imagination. His name, a hundred and fifty years after the publication of the *Social Contract*, is still a controversial watchword and a party cries. He is accepted as one of the greatest writers France has produced; but even now men are inclined, as political bias prompts them, to accept or reject his political doctrines as a whole, without sifting them or attempting to understand and discriminate. He is still revered or hated as the author who, above all others, inspired the French Revolution. Rousseau's contributions to political philosophy are scattered among various works, most notable of which are the *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*, the *Discourse on Political Economy*, *The Social Contract*, and *Considerations on the Government of Poland*. However, many of his other work both major and minor, contain passages that amplify or illuminate the political ideas in those works. His central doctrine in politics is that a state can be legitimate only if it is guided by the "general will" of its members. This idea finds its most detailed treatment in *The Social Contract*.

In *The Social Contract*, Rousseau sets out to answer what he takes to be the fundamental question of politics, the reconciliation of the freedom of the individual with the authority of the state. This reconciliation is necessary because human society has evolved to a point where individuals can no longer supply their needs through their own unaided efforts, but rather must depend on the cooperation of others. The process whereby human needs expand and interdependence deepens is set out in the *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*. In that work, the final moment of Rousseau's conjectural history involves the emergence of endemic conflict among the now-interdependent individuals and the argument that the Hobbesian insecurity of this condition would lead all to consent to the establishment of state authority and law. In the *Second Discourse*, this establishment amounts to the reinforcement of unequal and exploitative social relations that are now backed by law and state power. In an echo of Locke and an anticipation of Marx, Rousseau argues that this state would, in effect, be a class state, guided by the common interest of the rich and propertied and imposing on freedom and subordination on the poor and weak. The property less consent to such an establishment because their immediate fear of a Hobbesian state of war leads them to fail to attend to the ways in which the new state will systematically disadvantage them.

The *Social Contract* aims to set out an alternative to this dystopia, an alternative in which, Rousseau claims, each person will enjoy the protection of the common force whilst remaining as free as they were in the state of nature. The key to this reconciliation is the idea of the general will: that is, the collective will of the citizen body taken as a whole. The general will is the source of law and is willed by each and every citizen. In obeying the law each citizen is thus subject to his or her own will, and consequently, according to Rousseau, remains free.

#### **6.3.1: The idea of the general will**

Rousseau's account of the general will is marked by clarities and ambiguities that have attracted the interest of commentators since its first publication. The principal tension is between a democratic conception, where the general will is simply what the citizens of the state have decided together in their sovereign assembly, and an alternative interpretation where the general will is the transcendent incarnation of the citizens' common interest that exists in abstraction from what any of them actually wants. Both views find some support in Rousseau's texts, and both have been influential. Contemporary epistemic conceptions of democracy often make reference to Rousseau's discussion in Book 2 chapter 3 of the *Social Contract*. These accounts typically take Condorcet's jury theorem as a starting point, where democratic procedures are conceived of as a method for discovering the truth about the public interest; they then interpret the general will as a deliberative means of seeking outcomes that satisfy the preferences of individuals and render the authority of the state legitimate. The tension between the "democratic" and the "transcendental" conceptions can be reduced if we take Rousseau to be arguing for the view that, under the right conditions and subject to the right procedures, citizen legislators will be led to converge on laws that correspond to their common interest; however, where those conditions and procedures are absent, the state necessarily lacks legitimacy. On such a reading, Rousseau may be committed to something like an a posteriori philosophical anarchism. Such a view holds that it is possible, in principle, for a state to exercise legitimate authority over its citizens, but all actual states—and indeed all states that we are likely to see in the modern era—will fail to meet the conditions for legitimacy. The creation of popular sovereignty by vesting it in the general will is a unique contribution of Rousseau which led the foundation of modern democracy. The concept of general will is the central theme of Rousseau's doctrine. It is distinguished from the other types of human will. According to him, the general will can never be wrong, that is the will that one has as a citizen when one thinks of the common good and not of one's own particular will as a private person. Many later thinkers have used the distinction between actual will and real will in order to explicate Rousseau's distinction between particular will and general will. The existence of these two types of wills is a source of conflict within the minds of man. Actual will is motivated by his immediate, selfish interest, whereas real will is motivated by his ultimate collective interest. Actual will is concerned with his ordinary self, whereas real will is associated with his better self. The satisfaction of his desire is the aim of his actual will, but real will induces him to acts of reason. The characteristics of actual will are being transient, unstable and inconsistent, whereas real will is stable, constant, consistent and determined. The actual will is detrimental to human freedom. Thus, in order to attain freedom, the individuals should follow the direction of the real will. His real freedom is reflected by the real will. The real will is concerned with the interest of the community and subordinates his self-interest. The problem is that individuals at times may not be able to discriminate between their actual will and real will. This problem can be eliminated by the transition from the 'particular' to 'general' will. The general will is the harmonization of the interest of each with those of all. However, it is not a 'compromise' or the lowest common factor. It is an expression of the highest in every man. It reflects the true spirit of citizenship. Unlike particular will, the general will always guide individuals through a proper way.

Rousseau opined that the emergence of a unified collective view was inevitable when general will was allowed to function on its own. Rousseau envisaged a relatively simple society of farmers and artisans where there was no distinction of being rich or poor, a condition that he considered the sovereign was required to maintain. Conflicts would be avoided in the society because everybody was equal, thus facilitating all to treat each other with love, kindness and compassion. According to him, the general will would be the source of all laws. Human beings would be truly free if they followed the dictates of the law. Civil liberty meant freedom from the assault of others, from following the arbitrary will of another person and obedience to one's notion of liberty.

With the passage of time if one had to be free, then one had to obey one's own will which means that one's will and the laws of a state would have to be in harmony. The Free State would be a consensual and participatory democracy. Rousseau categorically said that general will could emerge only in an assembly of equal law makers. It could not be alienated. The 'executive will' could not be the 'general will'. Only the legislative will, which was sovereign, could be the general will. For Rousseau, it was the direct democracy that embodied the legislative will. The individual participated in the articulation of the general will for citizenship was the highest that one could aspire for. The general will could not be the will of the majority. In fact, it didn't represent the will of all; it was the difference between the sum of judgments about the common good and the more aggregate of personal fancies and individual desires. It would always aim and promote the general interest and will of its members.

Rousseau interpreted that obedience to the general will creates freedom. He spoke of a total surrender but not to a third party. Unlike Hobbes, he vested sovereign power in the political community. He created a sovereign that was inalienable and indivisible. But it was not vested in a man or a group of men; rather, it was vested in a body politic. The people cannot give away, or transfer, to any person or body their ultimate right of self-government, of deciding their own destiny. Thus, he expounded the concept of popular sovereignty. His concept of inalienable and indivisible sovereignty does not permit the people to transfer their legislative function, the supreme authority of the state to the organs of government, unlike Locke. So far as the judicial and executive functions are concerned, they have to be exercised by special organs of the government. However, they are completely subordinate to the sovereign people. Sovereign power cannot be represented. He maintained that representative assemblies ignore the interest of the community and are often concerned with their particular interest. This is the reason why he advocated direct democracy. Sovereignty originated with the people and stayed with them. For him, the government and sovereign were different. According to him, the government was the agent of the general will which is vested in the community. Sovereign to him was the people constituted as a political community through social contract.

However, Rousseau, in his book 'The Discourse on Political Economy', first coined the term general will. He points out in the book that general will tends always to the preservation and welfare of the whole end of every part, and is the source of the laws, constituted for all the members of the state in relation to one another and to it, the rule of what is just and unjust. It is an outcome of the moral attitude in the heart of citizens to act justly. Here, individual sacrifices his private interest and embraces the public interest. The general will is emerged from all and applied to all. It comprises rational will of all the members of the community. He pointed out that if someone objected to adhere to the general will, it would not be wrong to force him to do so. He famously advocated that man can be forced to be free. When a man is being compelled to obey the general will, it essentially means that he is being asked to follow his own best interest because it is by obeying the general will that he can express his moral freedom. Obedience to the general will is not the corrosion of their liberty because obedience to the general will essentially implies obedience to part of their own selves.

With the background, Rousseau advocated a policy that would aim for the general rather than (he particular interests of its members. The freedom that the noble savage enjoyed in the state of nature would be possible under the right kind of society governed by the general will. Society and the individual, in his theory were complementary. Rousseau argues that in order for the general will to be truly general it must come from all and apply to all. This thought has both substantive and formal aspects. Formally, Rousseau argues that the law must be general in application and universal in scope. The law cannot name particular individuals and it must apply to everyone within the state. Rousseau believes that this condition will lead citizens, though

guided by a consideration of what is in their own private interest, to favor laws that both secure the common interest impartially and that are not burdensome and intrusive. For this to be true, however, it has to be the case that the situation of citizens is substantially similar to one another. In a state where citizens enjoy a wide diversity of lifestyles and occupations, or where there is a great deal of cultural diversity, or where there is a high degree of economic inequality, it will not generally be the case that the impact of the laws will be the same for everyone. In such cases it will often not be true that a citizen can occupy the standpoint of the general will merely by imagining the impact of general and universal laws on his or her own case.

### **6.3.2: The development of the general will: technique, advantage and the representative**

In *The Social Contract* Rousseau envisages three different types or levels of will as being in play. First, individuals all have private wills corresponding to their own selfish interests as natural individuals; second, each individual, insofar as he or she identifies with the collective as a whole and assumes the identity of citizen, wills the general will of that collective as his or her own, setting aside selfish interest in favor of a set of laws that allow all to coexist under conditions of equal freedom; third, and very problematically, a person can identify with the corporate will of a subset of the populace as a whole. The general will is therefore both a property of the collective and a result of its deliberations, and a property of the individual insofar as the individual identifies as a member of the collective. In a well-ordered society, there is no tension between private and general will, as individuals accept that both justice and their individual self-interest require their submission to a law which safeguards their freedom by protecting them from the private violence and personal domination that would otherwise hold sway. In practice, however, Rousseau believes that many societies will fail to have this well-ordered character. One way in which they can fail is if private individuals are insufficiently enlightened or virtuous and therefore refuse to accept the restrictions on their own conduct which the collective interest requires. Another mode of political failure arises where the political community is differentiated into factions (perhaps based on a class division between rich and poor) and where one faction can impose its collective will on the state as a whole.

*The Social Contract* harbors a further tension between two accounts of how the general will emerges and its relation to the private wills of citizens. Sometimes Rousseau favors a procedural story according to which the individual contemplation of self-interest (subject to the constraints of generality and universality and under propitious sociological background conditions such as rough equality and cultural similarity) will result in the emergence of the general will from the assembly of citizens. In this account of the emergence of the general will, there seems to be no special need for citizens to have any specifically moral qualities: the constraints on their choice should be enough. However, Rousseau also clearly believes that the mere contemplation of self-interest would be inadequate to generate a general will. This may partly concern issues of compliance, since selfish citizens who can will the general will might still not be moved to obey it. But Rousseau also seems to believe that citizen virtue is a necessary condition for the emergence of the general will in the first place. This presents him with a problem for which his figure of the legislator is one attempted solution. As a believer in the plasticity of human nature, Rousseau holds that good laws make for good citizens. However, he also believes both that good laws can only be willed by good citizens and that, in order to be legitimate, they must be agreed upon by the assembly. This puts him in some difficulty, as it is unlikely that the citizens who come together to form a new state will have the moral qualities required to will good laws, shaped as those citizens will have been by unjust institutions. The legislator or lawgiver therefore has the function of inspiring a sense of collective identity in the new citizens that allows them to identify with the whole and be moved to support legislation that will eventually transform them and their children into good citizens. In this story, however, the new citizens at first lack the capacity to discern the

good reasons that support the new laws and the lawgiver has to persuade them by non-rational means to legislate in their own best interests. The figure of the legislator is a puzzle. Like the tutor in *Emile*, the legislator has the role of manipulating the desires of his charges, giving them the illusion of free choice without its substance. Little wonder then that many critics have seen these characters in a somewhat sinister light. In both cases there is a mystery concerning where the educator figure comes from and how he could have acquired the knowledge and virtue necessary to perform his role. This, in turn, raises a problem of regress. If the legislator was formed by a just society, then who performed the legislator's role for that society, and how was that legislator formed? How did the tutor acquire his education if not from a tutor who, in turn, was educated according to Rousseau's program by an earlier tutor?

### **6.3.3: Views on the reconciliation of freedom and specialist**

Rousseau's claims that freedom and authority are reconciled through obedience to the general will. In a deliberately paradoxical expression in his Book 1 chapter 7 of *The Social Contract*, he writes of citizens being "forced to be free" when they are constrained to obey the general will. The opening words of *The Social Contract* themselves refer to freedom, with the famous saying that "Man is born free, but is everywhere in chains". This ringing declaration, however, is almost immediately followed by a note of paradox, as Rousseau declares that he can make this subjection "in chains" legitimate. The thought that Rousseau's commitment to freedom might not be all that it first appears is strengthened by other passages in the book, most notably his declaration that those subject to the general will are "forced to be free." The value of freedom or liberty is at the center of Rousseau's concerns throughout his work. Since he uses the notion in several distinct ways, though, it is important to distinguish several uses of the term. First, we should note that Rousseau regards the capacity for choice, and therefore the ability to act against instinct and inclination, as one of the features that distinguishes the human race from animal species and makes truly moral action possible. In the *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*, for example, he characterizes animal species in essentially Cartesian terms, as mechanisms programmed to a fixed pattern of behavior. Human beings on the other hand are not tied to any particular mode of life and can reject the promptings of instinct. This makes possible both the development of the human species and also its fall from grace, since individuals can ignore benign impulses if they wish to. The freedom to act contrary to the "mechanism of the senses", and the power of willing and choosing is, for Rousseau, something entirely outside the laws of the physical world and is therefore not subject to scientific explanation. Rousseau also takes this freedom to choose to act as the basis of all distinctively moral action. In *The Social Contract* the connection between freedom of choice and morality is central to his argument against despotic government, where he writes that the renunciation of freedom is contrary to human nature and that to renounce freedom in favour of another person's authority is to "deprive one's actions of all morality". In Book I chapter 8 of the *Social Contract*, Rousseau tries to illuminate his claim that the formation of the legitimate state involves no net loss of freedom, but in fact, he makes a slightly different claim. The new claim involves the idea of an exchange of one type of freedom (natural freedom) for another type (civil freedom). Natural freedom involves an unlimited right to all things, an idea that is reminiscent of Hobbes's "right of nature" in *Leviathan*. Since all human beings enjoy this liberty right to all things, it is clear that in a world occupied by many interdependent humans, the practical value of that liberty may be almost nonexistent. This is because any individual's capacity to get what he or she wants will be limited by his or her physical power and the competing physical power of others. Further, inevitable conflict over scarce resources will pit individuals against each other, so that unhindered exercise of natural freedom will result in violence and uncertainty. The formation of the state, and the promulgation of laws willed by the general will, transforms this condition. With sovereign power in place, individuals are guaranteed a sphere of equal freedom under the law with protection for their own persons and security for their property.

Provided that the law bearing equally on everyone is not meddlesome or intrusive (and Rousseau believes it will not be, since no individual has a motive to legislate burdensome laws) there will be a net benefit compared to the pre-political state.

Further Rousseau claims that in conditions of civil society the citizen achieves “moral freedom,” by which he means obedience to a law that one has prescribed to oneself. Although this latter claim is presented almost as an afterthought, it is the form of freedom most directly responsive to the challenge Rousseau had set for himself two chapters earlier, which involved finding “a form of association” in which each citizen would “obey only himself.” Naturally, this raises the question of whether the citizen does in fact obey only he when he obeys the general will. On the face of it, this claim looks difficult to reconcile with the fact of majorities and minorities within a democratic state, since those citizens who find themselves outvoted would seem to be constrained by a decision with which they disagree. Rousseau’s solution to this puzzle is found much later, in Book 4 chapter 3 of *The Social Contract*, where he argues that those who obey laws they did not vote for remain bound by a will that is their own, since the democratic process has enabled them to discover the content of a general will in which that they share. Many commentators have not found this argument fully convincing.

Rousseau’s invocation of three types of freedom that is natural, civil, and moral in the text of *The Social Contract* can appear confusing. The picture is further complicated by the fact that he also relies on a fourth conception of freedom, related to civil freedom but distinct from it, which he nowhere names explicitly. This is “republican freedom” and consists, not in my being subject to my own will, but rather in the fact that the law protects me from being subject to the will of any other particular person in the manner of a slave or serf. To find Rousseau’s explicit endorsement of this idea, we have to look not to *The Social Contract*, but rather to some of his unpublished notes. Yet the concept is clearly implicit in the notorious “forced to be free” passage in Book 1 chapter 7, since he there explains that when each citizen is constrained to obey the general will, he is thereby provided with a guarantee against “all personal dependence”.

#### **6.3.4: Representation and government**

Rousseau’s political philosophy has proved least persuasive to later thinkers are his doctrine of sovereignty and representation, with his apparent rejection of “representative government”. At the center of Rousseau’s view in *The Social Contract* is his rejection of the Hobbesian idea that a people’s legislative will can be vested in some group or individual that then acts with their authority but rules over them. Instead, he takes the view that to hand over one’s general right of ruling oneself to another person or body constitutes a form a slavery, and that to recognize such an authority would amount to an abdication of moral agency. This hostility to the representation of sovereignty also extends to the election of representatives to sovereign assemblies, even where those representatives are subject to periodic re-election. Even in that case, the assembly would be legislating on a range of topics on which citizens have not deliberated. Laws passed by such assemblies would therefore bind citizens in terms that they have not themselves agreed upon. Not only does the representation of sovereignty constitute, for Rousseau, a surrender of moral agency, the widespread desire to be represented in the business of self-rule is a symptom of moral decline and the loss of virtue.

However, in the practical difficulties of direct self-rule by the entire citizen body are obvious. Such arrangements are potentially onerous and must severely limit the size of legitimate states. It is noteworthy that Rousseau takes a different view in a text aimed at practical politics: *Considerations on the Government of Poland*. Nevertheless, it is not entirely clear that the widespread interpretation of Rousseau as rejecting all forms of representative government is

correct. One of the key distinctions in *The Social Contract* is between sovereign and government. The sovereign, composed of the people as a whole, promulgates laws as an expression of its general will. The government is a more limited body that administers the state within the bounds set by the laws, and which issues decrees applying the laws in particular cases. If the laws are conceived of as the people setting a constitutional framework for society, with the government's decrees comprising the more normal business of "legislation," then the distance between a Rousseauian republic and a modern constitutional democracy may be smaller than it at first appears. In effect, the institution of the sovereign may be inconsistent with a representative model, where the executive power of the government can be understood as requiring it. Such a picture gains credibility when the details of Rousseau's views on government are examined. Although a variety of forms of government turn out to be theoretically compatible with popular sovereignty, Rousseau is skeptical about the prospects for both democracy (where the people conduct the day to day running of the state and the application of the laws) and monarchy. Instead, he favors some form of elective aristocracy: in other words, he supports the idea that the day-to-day administration should be in the hands of a subset of the population, elected by them according to merit.

The two important issues arise in relation to Rousseau's account of relations between sovereign and government. The first of these concerns his political pessimism, even in the case of the best-designed and most perfect republic. Just as any group has a collective will as opposed to the individual private will of its members, so does the government. As the state becomes larger and more diffuse, and as citizens become more distant from one another both spatially and emotionally, so the effective government of the republic will need a proportionally smaller and more cohesive group of magistrates. Rousseau thinks it almost inevitable that this group will end up usurping the legitimate sovereign power of the people and substituting its corporate will for the people's general will. The second issue concerns how democratic Rousseau envisaged his republic to be. He sometimes suggests a picture in which the people would be subject to elite domination by the government, since the magistrates would reserve the business of agenda-setting for the assembly to themselves. In other cases, he endorses a conception of a more fully democratic republic. Although Rousseau rejects Hobbes's view of the sovereign as representing or acting in the person of the subject, he has a similar view of what sovereignty is and its relation to the rights of the individual. He rejects the idea that individuals associated together in a political community retain some natural rights over themselves and their property. Rather, such rights as individuals have over themselves, land, and external objects, are a matter of sovereign competence and decision. Individual rights must be specified by the sovereign in ways that are compatible with the interests of all in a just polity, and Rousseau rejects the idea that such rights could be insisted on as a check on the sovereign's power.

### **6.3.5: Civil religion and toleration**

The final full chapter of *The Social Contract* expounds Rousseau's doctrine of civil religion. Contemporary readers were scandalized by it, and particularly by its claim that true (original or early) Christianity is useless in fostering the spirit of patriotism and social solidarity necessary for a flourishing state. In many ways the chapter represents a striking departure from the main themes of the book. First, it is the only occasion where Rousseau prescribes the content of a law that a just republic must have. Second, it amounts to his acceptance of the inevitability of pluralism in matters of religion, and thus of religious toleration; this is in some tension with his encouragement elsewhere of cultural homogeneity as a propitious environment for the emergence of a general will. Third, it represents a very concrete example of the limits of sovereign power: following Locke, Rousseau insists upon the inability of the sovereign to examine the private beliefs of citizens. The tenets of Rousseau's civil religion include the affirmation of the existence of a

supreme being and of the afterlife, the principle that the just will prosper and the wicked will be punished, and the claim that the social contract and the laws are sacred. In addition, the civil religion requires the provision that all those willing to tolerate others should themselves be tolerated, but those who insist that there is no salvation outside their particular church cannot be citizens of the state. The structure of religious beliefs within the just state is that of an overlapping consensus: the dogmas of the civil religion are such that they can be affirmed by adherents of a number of different faiths, both Christian and non-Christian.

Despite Rousseau's concern for religious toleration both in the chapter and elsewhere, modern readers have often been repelled by one striking note of intolerance. Rousseau argues that those who cannot accept the dogmas can be banished from the state. This is because he believes that atheists, having no fear of divine punishment, cannot be trusted by their fellow citizens to obey the law. He goes even further, to suggest the death penalty for those who affirm the dogmas but later act as if they do not believe them.

### **6.3.6.: Language**

Rousseau's writings on language and languages are contained in two places, the unpublished *Essay on the Origin of Languages* and in a section of the *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*. In the *Essay*, Rousseau tells us that human beings want to communicate as soon as they recognize that there are other beings like themselves. But he also raises the question of why language, specifically, rather than gesture is needed for this purpose. The answer, strangely enough, is that language permits the communication of the passions in a way that gesture does not, and that the tone and stress of linguistic communication are crucial, rather than its content. This point enables Rousseau to make a close connection between the purposes of speech and melody. Such vocabulary as there originally was, according to Rousseau, was merely figurative and words only acquire a literal meaning much later. Theories that locate the origin of language in the need to reason together about matters of fact are, according to Rousseau, deeply mistaken. While the cry of the other awakens our natural compassion and causes us to imagine the inner life of others, our purely physical needs have an anti-social tendency because they scatter human beings more widely across the earth in search of subsistence. Although language and song have a common origin in the need to communicate emotion, over time the two become separated, a process that becomes accelerated as a result of the invention of writing. In the south, language stays closer to its natural origins and southern languages retain their melodic and emotional quality (a fact that suits them for song and opera). Northern languages, by contrast, become oriented to more practical tasks and are better for practical and theoretical reasoning.

In Part I of the *Second Discourse*, Rousseau's focus is slightly different and occurs in the context of a polemic against philosophers (such as natural law theorists like Condillac) who attribute to primitive human beings a developed capacity for abstract reasoning. Rousseau proposes need as the cause of the development of language, but since language depends on convention to assign arbitrary signs to objects, he puzzles about how it could ever get started and how primitive people could accomplish the feat of giving names to universals.

### **6.3.7: Education as a part of his philosophy**

Rousseau's ideas about education are mainly expounded in *Emile*. In that work, he advances the idea of "negative education", which is a form of "child-centered" education. His essential idea is that education should be carried out, so far as possible, in harmony with the development of the child's natural capacities by a process of apparently autonomous discovery. This is in contrast to a model of education where the teacher is a figure of authority who conveys knowledge and skills

according to a pre-determined curriculum. Rousseau depends here on his thesis of natural goodness, which he asserts at the beginning of the book, and his educational scheme involves the protection and development of the child's natural goodness through various stages, along with the isolation of the child from the domineering wills of others. Up to adolescence at least, the educational program comprises a sequence of manipulations of the environment by the tutor. The child is not told what to do or think but is led to draw its own conclusions as a result of its own explorations, the context for which has been carefully arranged. The first stage of the program starts in infancy, where Rousseau's crucial concern is to avoid conveying the idea that human relations are essentially ones of domination and subordination, an idea that can too easily be fostered in the infant by the conjunction of its own dependence on parental care and its power to get attention by crying. Though the young child must be protected from physical harm, Rousseau is keen that it gets used to the exercise of its bodily powers and he therefore advises that the child be left as free as possible rather than being confined or constrained. From the age of about twelve or so, the program moves on to the acquisition of abstract skills and concepts. This is not done with the use of books or formal lessons, but rather through practical experience. The third phase of education coincides with puberty and early adulthood. The period of isolation comes to an end and the child starts to take an interest in others (particularly the opposite sex), and in how he or she is regarded. At this stage the great danger is that excessive amour propre will extend to exacting recognition from others, disregarding their worth, and demanding subordination. The task of the tutor is to ensure that the pupil's relations with others are first mediated through the passion of pitié (compassion) so that through the idea of the suffering others, of care, and of gratitude, the pupil finds a secure place for the recognition of his own moral worth where his amour propre is established on a non-competitive basis. The final period of education involves the tutor changing from a manipulator of the child's environment into the adult's trusted advisor. The young and autonomous adult finds a spouse who can be another source of secure and non-competitive recognition. This final phase also involves instruction into the nature of the social world, including the doctrines of Rousseau's political philosophy.

### **6.3.8: Views on Civil Society**

Rousseau maintained that liberty in the state of nature was a great boon. However, with the increasing population and the depletion of the treasures of nature, it was no longer possible for man to enjoy natural liberty as before. Thus, in the changed circumstances, natural liberty was threatened when (the forces of nature no longer sustained them, they had to consolidate their own force to save themselves. They, therefore, created a civil society to maintain their freedom. According to him, vanity among human beings and difference in property and possessions led to inequality. The rich became richer and the poor became poorer. Laws were enacted to protect property rights. The civil society degenerated into a state of war, extreme inequality, ostentation, cunning, ambition and enslavement. Through laws and other political devices, the rich were able to corner power and dominate, while the poor descended into slavery. Civilized man was born a slave and died as one. In the state of nature, the man was a 'noble savage'. He lived in isolation and had limited desires. According to him, it was neither a condition of plenty nor scarcity. There was no conflict for cooperative living. Individuals had no language or knowledge. They had no idea of any art or science. He argued that in this type of situation, man was neither happy nor unhappy. He had no conception of just and unjust, vice and virtue. He was not guided by reason, but guided by self-love or the instinct of self-preservation. This state of nature was not perennial. Gradually, individuals discovered the utility and usefulness of labour. Man began to collaborate and created a provisional order. It led to a patriarchal stage when men began to build shelter for themselves and families stayed together. They began to use language and reason. The division of labour came into being. It led men from the subsistence economy to an economy of productive development. Individuals learned metallurgy and agriculture. It gave man iron and corn and made him civilized.

However, it ruined humanity and morality. The growth of agriculture and division of labour created the idea of property. Rousseau famously remarked that 'the first man who after fencing of a piece of land, took it upon himself to say "this belongs to me" and found people simple minded enough to believe was the true founder of civil society'. The man's talents and skills created inequality among the people. The longing for possession and wealth led to enslavement of some people thus leading to conflict and competition. It is this conflict, which led a demand for a system of law to ensure order and peace. The rich people especially demanded it to save their possession and wealth. Thus, the social contract envisioned by the rich was to maintain their status and position. As a result of this demand and social contract, the civil society and law was originated. It became a bane for the poor and a boon for the rich. It destroyed natural liberty.

According to Rousseau, the emergence of civil society degenerated the human society. He argued that the natural man lost his ferocity once he began to live in the society. As a result, he became weak. He lost natural independence as his desires were expanded and comforts became a necessity. He became dependent which created problems in human relationship as they became vain and contemptuous. Their vanity brought various social ills. Vanity overpowered man and guided his actions which degenerated individual's mind and the society. Rousseau also severely criticized enlightenment which believes in human progress of reason through science and technology. According to him, it brought down moral improvement thereby leading to unhappiness. This is well represented in his book *Emile*. He stated that though God has made all things good, it was man who meddled with them and made them evil. It is in his *The Second Discourse on the Origins of Inequality* that Rousseau developed his views expressed earlier in his prize winning essay *Discourses on the Science and Arts*. In this work, he narrated the fall of man. He highlighted how nature got twisted, warped and corrupted with the emergence of civil society. The civil society was necessitated by the rise of the institution of private property and the need to defend it by institutionalizing social inequality through law. Thus, he underlined the difference of 'natural man' and 'civilized man'. He appreciated the natural man and severely criticized the civilized man who was created as a result of the emergence of the civil society.

### **6.3.9: Inheritance in the legacy**

Rousseau's intellectual capacity has had a philosophical and insight influence on later philosophers and political theorists, although the tensions and ambiguities in his work have meant that his ideas have been developed in radically incompatible and divergent ways. In modern political philosophy, for example, it is possible to detect Rousseau as a source of inspiration for liberal theories, communitarian ideas, civic republicanism, and in theories of deliberative and participatory democracy. Hostile writers have portrayed Rousseau as a source of inspiration for the more authoritarian aspects of the French revolution and thence for aspects of fascism and communism. Rousseau's most important philosophical impact was on Immanuel Kant. A portrait of Rousseau was the only image on display in Kant's house, and legend has it that the only time that Kant forgot to take his daily walk was when reading *Emile*. Instances of direct influence include Kant's idea of the categorical imperative, the third formulation of which in the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (the so-called formula of the kingdom of ends) recalls Rousseau's discussion of the general will in *The Social Contract*. Ironically, Kant's detachment of the idea of universal legislation from its context in the particularity of single society reverses Rousseau's own approach, since Rousseau had, in preparatory work for *The Social Contract* rejected the idea of a general will of the human race as that notion appeared in Diderot's article "Natural Right" in the *Encyclopédie*. Rousseau's influence can also be seen in Kant's moral psychology, especially in work such as *Religion within the Limits of Reason Alone*, in Kant's own thinking about conjectural history, and in his writings on international justice which draw on Rousseau's engagement with the work of the Abbé St. Pierre. The cases of Hegel and Marx are

more complex. Hegel's direct references to Rousseau are often uncomplimentary. In the *Philosophy of Right*, while praising Rousseau for the idea that will is the basis of the state, he misrepresents the idea of the general will as being merely the idea of the overlap between the contingent wills of private individuals. In the *Encyclopedia Logic* he demonstrates an awareness that this was not Rousseau's view. Hegel's discussion of the master-slave dialectic and the problem of recognition in the *Phenomenology of Spirit* also draws on Rousseau, in this case on the notion of amour propre and the ways in which attempts to exact respect and recognition from others can be self-defeating. Karl Marx's concerns with alienation and exploitation have also been thought to bear some kind of relationship to Rousseau's thinking on related topics. Here the evidence is more indirect, since the references to Rousseau in Marx's work are few and insubstantial.

However, in contemporary political philosophy, it is clear that the thinking of John Rawls, especially in *A Theory of Justice* reflects the influence of Rousseau. A good example of this is the way in which Rawls uses the device of the "original position" to put self-interested choice at the service of the determination of the principles of justice. This exactly parallels Rousseau's argument that citizens will be drawn to select just laws as if from an impartial perspective, because the universality and generality of the law means that when considering their own interests they will select the measure that best reflects their own interests.

#### 6.4: Summary

- John Locke thinks that natural rights include life, liberty and a state. These things are collectively known as property.
- The conception of natural rights and theory of property is one of the important themes in Locke's political philosophy.
- According to Locke, natural right forms in the root of morality implanted in human conscience. He points out that natural right consists in the perfect freedom and equality of every man.
- Locke's conception of natural liberty is a moral conception of 'perfect freedom' and equality. His view of the law of nature is normative rather than descriptive.
- According to Locke, the law of nature is the law of inward morality and all the individuals are rational beings.
- According to Jeremy Waldron, contract and consent have three stages in Locke's description: first, man must agree unanimously to come together as a community and pull their natural powers show that they can act together to uphold one another's right; second, the members of this community must agree by a majority vote to set up legislative and other institutions; third, the owners of property in a society must agree, either personally or through their representatives to whatever taxes are imposed on the people.
- Locke's treatment of property is generally thought to be among his most important contributions in political thought, but it is also one of the aspects of his thought that has been most heavily criticized.
- Macpherson's analysis of Locke has been criticized by many people. According to Professor of Politics at the University of Oxford Alan Ryan, in Locke's view, property comprised of life, liberty and estate; thus even the landless could still be associates of political society. The most important critique of Macpherson's analysis of Locke was provided by James Tully.
- « In Tully's analysis, Locke recognized that when land becomes limited, the previous rights acquired by labour no longer holds since 'enough and as good' is no longer available for others. Therefore, once land becomes limited, property can only become legal if a political society is established.

- Locke permits taxation to go on by the consent of the majority rather than requiring undisputed consent.
- The political doctrine and practice of unlimited, centralized authority and absolute sovereignty, as vested especially in a monarch or dictator. The essence of an absolutist system is that the ruling power is not subject to regularized challenge or check by any other agency—judicial, legislative, religious, economic, or electoral.
- : A perspective used by Socrates, Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau according to which the moral and/or political obligations of a person(s) are dependent on a contract or agreement among them to form the society in which they live
- An elite cultural movement that took place in eighteenth century Europe to gather together the power of reason to usher in social reform, intellectual interchange and opposition to intolerance and abuse in the Church and the state
- : Rights that are not dependent upon laws, customs and beliefs pertaining to a culture or government and are therefore universal and inalienable
- According to this theory, the world initially belongs to everyone in common and there must be some way to appropriate portions of the fruits of the Earth for private use without the consent of all
- The idea of consent plays an extremely important role in Locke's formulation of political philosophy. Locke begins his analysis with the supposition of individuals in a state of nature where they are not beholden to a universal lawful authority that has the power to legislate or arbitrate disagreements.
- In his Two Treatises of Government, Locke declares that a government's power should be restricted to the common or the public good. According to Locke, the government's power has 'no other end but preservation' and thus cannot validate killing, enslaving or plundering of residents.
- Few people have influenced the history of mankind the way Jean Jacques Rousseau has done. He is the most celebrated political philosopher of France till date. Though he started his assumption with taking the notion of the state of nature, he was not similar to that of Hobbes and Locke, in regard to the nature of man, creation of civil society and sovereignty.
- Rousseau rightly focused on the drawbacks brought by art and science, enlightenment and modernity. He was more concerned with individual's morality and that of community as a whole.
- Sovereignty for Rousseau, is not a mere legal thing; it is the sum total of all virtues and even freedoms.
- The individual and the state were two themes in Rousseau's theory. Both were simultaneously sovereign. Both were needed to realize a just social and political order.
- Rousseau also pointed out the close relationship between liberty and equality, and the fact that without equality, liberty would be nonexistent. He abandoned his initial hostility to property, and accepted it as an essential institution of society.
- Rousseau was critical of the advancement of the civilization as it was detrimental to the morals of the individual as well as the community and its competing impact upon them. At the same time, he was critical of civil society because it embodied private interest and property which promoted social inequality, injustices and exploitation.
- Rousseau envisioned a social contract to lay down the blueprint of the required political society. The political society was created out of a social contract. He brilliantly assigned sovereignty in the community in the form of General Will which always aimed at general good or good of the community.
- : According to this theory, people choose to remain in a 'territory' controlled by a society with a government, which is what gives legitimacy to such a government
- : An artistic and intellectual movement originating in Europe in the late 18th century and characterized by a heightened interest in nature, emphasis on The individual's expression

of emotion and imagination, departure from the attitudes and forms of classicism, and rebellion against established social rules and conventions

- : The faith, doctrine, system, and practice of a Catholic church, especially the Roman Catholic Church
- Rousseau was seen as the spiritual father of the French Revolution of the 1789. Burke famously referred to him as 'the insane Socrates of the National Assembly'.
- For Rousseau, the state represented the pinnacle of human existence, the source of all morality, freedom and community.

### 6.5: Possible Questions

1. Write a short note on the life and times of Rousseau.
2. What were the drawbacks of the emergence of civil society?
3. Discuss the contribution of Rousseau to political philosophy.
4. According to Rousseau, luxury was the fertile source of corruption. Discuss
5. Describe Locke's view of the law of nature.
6. Discuss the most important theme of Locke's political philosophy.
7. State the main features of the social contract theory.
8. Identify the contentious aspect of James Tully's understanding of Locke.
9. Compare and contrast between Hobbes' notion of sovereignty and that of Rousseau.
10. Evaluate the role of the concept of consent in Locke's political philosophy.
11. Examine Rousseau's views on democracy.
12. State Macpherson's analysis of Locke.

### 6.6: Further reading

- Ashcraft, Richard, 1987, *Locke's Two Treatises of Government*, London: Unwin Hyman Ltd.
- Butler, M.A. "Early Liberal Roots of Feminism: John Locke and the Attack on Patriarchy", *American Political Science Review*, 72: 135–150.
- Casson, Douglas, 2011, *Liberating Judgment: Fanatics, Skeptics, and John Locke's Politics of Probability*, Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Creppell, Ingrid, 1996, "Locke on Toleration: The Transformation of Constraint", *Political Theory*, 24: 200–240.
- Colman, John, 1983, *John Locke's Moral Philosophy*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cranston, Maurice, 1957, *John Locke, A Biography*, London: Longmans, Green.
- Yolton, J. W., ed., 1969. *John Locke: Problems and Perspectives*. Cambridge, United Press.
- Simpson, Matthew (2006). *Rousseau's Theory of Freedom*. London: Continuum Books.

## UNIT-5 Bentham (P7), Mill (P8)

### Objectives

- 7.0: Introduction
- 7.1: Brief Life Sketch of Bentham
- 7.2: The Utilitarian Principles
- 7.3: Political Philosophy of Bentham
  - 7.3.1: The principle of Utility
  - 7.3.2: Views on political society
  - 7.3.3: Views on state, law and liberty
  - 7.3.4: Views on jurisprudence and punishment
  - 7.3.5: Views on Human Nature
  - 7.3.6: Views on Moral Philosophy
  - 7.3.7: Views on Government, Law and Liberty
- 8.0: Life Sketch of J.S.MILL
- 8.1: Views on Equal Rights for Women
- 8.2: Mills view on Individual Liberty
- 8.3: Views on Individual Liberty and Truth
  - 8.3.1: Kinds of Liberty:
  - 8.3.2: Views on Self-Regarding and Other-Regarding Actions
  - 8.3.3: Views on Threats to Liberty:
  - 8.3.4: Criticism the theory of liberty
- 8.4: Views on the Representative Government
  - 8.4.1: The Principle of Participation
  - 8.4.2: The Principle of Competence
  - 8.4.3: The Theory of Government
  - 8.4.4: The Theory of Development
  - 8.4.5: Modern and Traditional Conceptions of Democracy
  - 8.4.6: The Reason behind the Representative Government according to Mill
  - 8.4.7: Views on Happiness and Higher Pleasures
- 8.5: Let us sum up
- 8.6: Possible questions
- 8.7: Further reading

### Objectives

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Explain the philosophical outlook of Bentham and the contemporary period
- Enlighten Bentham's utilitarian principle and political philosophy
- Explain Mill's ideas concerning equal rights for women, their identity, liberty of the individual and the representative government.
- Understand Mills Contribution to the Western Political Thought.

### 7.0: Introduction

Jeremy Bentham is the father of Utilitarian school of thought. He had presented a great theory that actions are right insofar as they produce pleasure or prevent pain, and is an explanation of a political theory that the purpose of civil or criminal laws is to maximize the amount of pleasure or happiness which may be enjoyed by society. He argues that if utility is defined as the ability to

produce happiness, then the rightness of an action is determined by its utility. Bentham also argues that if happiness is viewed as the only thing which is intrinsically good, then the principle of utility is the only right principle of human action. Bentham advocates a doctrine of psychological hedonism, that all human actions are motivated by the desire to enjoy pleasure or prevent pain, and that the enjoyment of pleasure or the avoidance of pain is the only rational aim of human action. He also advocates a doctrine of ethical hedonism, that the rightness or wrongness of an action is determined by whether the action tends to promote happiness or unhappiness. If an action conforms to the principle of utility (i.e. if the action tends to promote happiness or prevent unhappiness), then the action is morally right, or at least is not morally wrong. If an action does not conform to the principle of utility (i.e. if the action tends to prevent happiness or promote unhappiness), then the action is morally wrong, or at least is not morally right. Bentham maintains that the principle of utility is the only sufficient ground for deciding whether an action is morally right or wrong. The principle of sympathy and antipathy (i.e. the feeling of instinctive approval or disapproval for the expected consequences of an action) is not a sufficient ground for judging the moral rightness or wrongness of an action. According to Bentham, the principle of sympathy and antipathy is merely a disposition to approve or disapprove of an action and is not an affirmative principle of moral conduct.

Further Bentham, this unit covers the ideas propounded by J.S. Mill. John Stuart Mill was a British philosopher, political economist and civil servant who actively contributed to social theory, political economy and political theory. He advocated utilitarianism, and wished to offer a solution to issues related to probabilistic or inductive reasoning, such as the tendency of people to support information that conforms to their beliefs (also called confirmation bias). Therefore, he was of the opinion that falsification is a key component in science. A political philosopher who contributed to liberalism, he was also a Member of Parliament. His work *On Liberty* is also considered one of the classic texts on liberal philosophy. He is considered the most influential English philosopher of the nineteenth century. 'Liberty', as conceived by Mill, justified the freedom of the individual as opposed to boundless state control.

However, Mill was a notably gifted child. He began his studies of Greek at the age of 3 under the strict supervision of his father. His vision was to make every man and woman a business owner. He was a prolific writer and wrote on different branches of knowledge with equal mastery. His famous works are: (i) *System of Logic* (1843); (ii) *Principles of Political Economy* (1848); (iii) *Essay on Some Unsettled Questions in Political Economy*; (iv) *On Liberty* (1859); (v) *Considerations on Representative Government* (1861); (vi) *Utilitarianism* (1865); (vii) *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* (1863); (viii) *The Subjection of Women* (1869). The intellectual prodigy who started his education at the tender age of 3 enriched the philosophical treasures by his clear understanding and deep insight into things.

### **7.1: Brief Life Sketch of Bentham**

Jeremy Bentham is the founder of utilitarianism, also played the multiple roles of a philosopher, a jurist, a social reformer and an activist. A leading theorist in Anglo-American philosophy of law, Bentham is to be seen as a political radical whose ideas paved the way for the development of prosperities. He is most popularly associated with the concept of utilitarianism. His position entailed arguments in favour of individual and economic freedom, usury, the separation of church and state, freedom of expression, equal rights for women, the right to divorce, and the decriminalizing of homosexual acts. He also fought for the abolition of slavery and the death penalty and for the elimination of physical punishment, including that of children. Even though he was on the side of extension of individual legal rights, he was against the idea of natural law and

natural rights, referring to them as 'nonsense upon stilts.' He can be seen as one of the most influential utilitarian, and his ideas were brought to the fore through his works and that of his students. Here we have his secretary and collaborator on the utilitarian school of philosophy, James Mill; James Mill's son J. S-Mill; John Austin, legal philosopher; and several political leaders, including Robert Owe, a founder of modern socialism. He is considered the godfather of University College London (UCL). Bentham is often seen in relation with the foundation of the University of London specifically University College of London (UCL), even though when UCL opened in 1826, he was 78 years old and played no active part in its foundation. The probable explanation is that UCL may not have been possible without his inspiration. Among Bentham's strong beliefs was that education should be more widely available, specifically to those who were not wealthy or who did not belong to (he established church - two requirements that had to be fulfilled by both the students by Oxford and Cambridge. UCL, being the first English university to open its doors to all irrespective of race, creed or political belief, can be seen, thus, to be largely in consonance with Bentham's vision. He is credited with overseeing the appointment of one of his pupils, John Austin, as the first professor of Jurisprudence in 1829.

Born February 15, 1748, in London in a prosperous middle class family, Bentham's mother died when he was ten. His father was very strict and demanding and arranged a thorough education for Bentham. Such an upbringing rendered Bentham's childhood monotonous and gloomy. Even as a child, Bentham could be seen as deriving his primary source of enjoyment from reading books with no inclination to play, reflecting his serious outlook.

An incident from his childhood suggests that he was nothing short of a child prodigy: Once, he was found sitting at his father's desk perusing a multi-volume history of England. Further, he even began studying Latin at the age of three. He had close relations with Samuel Bentham, his one surviving sibling. He had training as a lawyer and, was called to the bar in 1769 despite the fact that he never even practiced. The English legal code, given its complexity, met with his approbation and was termed the 'Demon of Chicanery'. When the American colonies published their Declaration of Independence in July 1776, the British government instead of issuing an official response covertly commissioned London lawyer and pamphleteer John Lind to publish a rebuttal. His 130-page tract was sent for distribution in the colonies and included an essay titled 'Short Review of the Declaration', penned by Bentham, a friend of Lind's, which condemned and satirized America's political philosophy.

Bentham began learning Latin at the age of three and proceeded to Queens College, Oxford, at the mere age of twelve. It is on being stationed there, that he began developing his critical stance towards ancient or traditional ideas and institutions. He espoused the view that the entire system of law needs an overhauling. He had a keen interest in science, particularly in Chemistry and Botany. He was inspired and influenced by the French Philosopher *Claude Adrien Helvetius* and *Cesare Bonesana*, Marquis of Beccaria. He also drew inspiration from *Fenelon's Telemaque*. From Helvetius, he took the lesson which proclaimed legislation as the most significant of all worldly pursuits. It is from the early 1770s, that we may trace the study of legislations becoming an important concern with Bentham. Though, he refrained from practicing law, he nonetheless concentrated on charting out what the law should be, rather than delving in what it was. The period from the early 1770s to the mid-1780s can be seen as marking an important phase of development of Bentham's ideas. During this time, he concentrated on trying to comprehend the rational basis of law, in England as well as in and other countries. During the mid-1770s, at the age of 28, he wrote a lengthy piece criticizing William Blackstone's - *Commentaries on the Laws of England*. A portion of his piece was appeared in 1776 as *A Fragment on Government*. This work had a profound influence on the Earl of Shelbourne, a Whig aristocrat, who henceforth became his close friend. During his close association with Earl of

Shelbourne, *Bentham* got attracted to lady Shelbourne's niece *Caroline Fox*. This was his second love, the first being *Marry Dunkley*. However, neither of the relationships led anywhere, and he remained a bachelor.

He began to give his time and commitment to practical areas like public administration, economic, social policy, in addition to working on developing a theory of law and legislation. He laid down details for the construction of a prison or factory or work house which is referred to as the Panopticon or the inspection house. The panopticon was viewed as the pivotal hinge of utilitarianism, for it would aid in scientifically meting out philosophic calculus by measuring pain justly. Though he welcomed the French Revolution and sent forth his reform proposals, none were accepted. Yet, he was made an honorary citizen of France in 1792 for his *Draught of a New Plan for the Organization of the Judicial Establishment of France* (1790). The early 1800s were witness to an increase in his popularity and reputation, which began to garner attention even in far off places like Russia and countries in Latin America. In 1809, a close relationship between *Bentham* and *James Mill* (1773-1836) started taking root, with Mill being convinced of the urgent need for reforms. It is under Mill's influence, that Bentham can be seen as having become more radical. In 1817, he published Plan of Parliamentary Reform in the form of catechism, and 1819 saw the completion of the draft proposals of the Radical Reform Bill. An attack on the establishment church can be witnessed in the Church of England in 1818. The codification of law occupied a high priority for Bentham from the 1780s to the 1830s. He continued with his life long devotion to legal reform, looking upon it as a game. Other developments ascribed to Bentham include inventing devices like primitive telephones, suggesting reforms for the London police, the London sewage and drainage systems, devising a central heating system, running a law school from his home, laboring on a scheme for lowering the national debt, securing low interest loans for the poor, planning a national public education system, a national health service, and a national census, etc.

Even though leading an ascetic life himself, given that saints were idlers, he is to be seen as having regarded ascetic with contempt. He looked down upon spiritualism and claimed that spiritualism glorified unhappiness and distrusted pleasure. Spiritualism is, men, to be seen as being in opposition to Bentham's unwavering belief in happiness as the goal of all individuals. He helped in providing funds to the University of London. He also composed humorous songs and was fond of rituals; It is with progression in age that he is seen to have become light-hearted and causal. He began, and financed, the *Westminster Review* in 1824 with the aim of furthering his utilitarian principles.

### **His Works:**

The list of books penned by him include - An Introduction to the principles of Morals and Legislation (1789), Anarchical Fallacies (1791), Discourse on Civils and Penal Legislation (1802), The Limits of Jurisprudence (1802), Indirect Legislation (1802), A Theory of punishments and Rewards (1811), A treaties on Judicial Evidence (1813), Papers Upon Codification and Public Instruction (1817), The Book of Fallacies (1824). He also wrote Rational of Evidence (1827), which was edited by J. S. Mill. He also had several correspondences with the Indian minker Ram Mohan Roy, who was his friend. Ram Mohan supported Bentham's negation of the natural right theory and the distinction between law and morals. He was also appreciative of the principle of utilitarianism. Bentham lived till the age of 84 and died on June 6, 1832.

Bentham left manuscripts which account for some 5,000,000 words. Since 1968, the Bentham's project at University College London has been working on an edition of his collected works. The Project is now attempting to bring about a digitization of the Bentham papers and outsource their transcription. So far, 25 volumes have come up; and there may be many more

waiting in the wings to come out before the project is completed. While most of his work was never published in his lifetime; much of that which was published was readied for publication by others. Several of his works first came in French translation, prepared for the press by Etienne Dumont. while some made their first appearance in English in the 1820s drawing from back-translation from Dumont's 1802 collection of Bentham's writing on civil and penal legislation. The works which were published in Bentham's lifetime include: (i) 'Short Review of the Declaration' (1776) was an attack on America's Declaration of Independence; and (ii) 'A Fragment on Government' (1776) which served as a scathing critique of some introductory passages relating to political theory in William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*. The book, published anonymously, got a good acceptance, and was ascribed to some of the greatest minds of the time. Bentham disagreed with several of the ideas propounded by Blackstone, such as his defense of judge-made law and legal fictions, his theological formulation of the doctrine of mixed government, his appeal to a social contract and his use of the vocabulary of natural law. Bentham's 'Fragment' was only a small part of a 'Commentary on the Commentaries', which remained unpublished until the twentieth century, (iii) *Introduction to Principles of Morals and Legislation* (printed for publication 1780, published 1789). (iv) *Defense of Usury* (1787). Jeremy Bentham wrote a series of thirteen 'Letters' addressed to Adam Smith, published in 1787 as *Defense of Usury*. Bentham's main argument against the restriction was premised on the view that 'projectors' generate positive externalities. Gilbert K. Chesterton identified Bentham's essay on usury as marking the very advent of the 'modern world.' Bentham's arguments were had a far reaching influence. Many eminent writers moved to pile an end to the restriction, and a repeal was strived for in stages and fully achieved in England in 1854. There is little evidence corroborating Smith's reaction. He did not revise the offending passages in *The Wealth of Nations*, but Smith made little or no substantial revisions after the third edition of 1784. (v) *Panopticon* (1787, 1791) (vi) *Emancipate your Colonies* (1793) (vii) *Traite de Legislation Civile et Penale* (1802, edited by Etienne Dumont. 3 vols) (viii) *Punishments and Rewards* (1811) (ix) *A Table of the Springs of Action* (1815) (x) *Parliamentary Reform Catechism* (1817) (xi) *Church-of-Englandism* (printed 1817, published 1818) (xii) *Elements of the Art of Packing* (1821) (xiii) *The Influence of Natural Religion upon the Temporal Happiness of Mankind* (1822, written with George Grote and published under the pseudonym Philip Beauchamp) (xiv) *Not Paul But Jesus* (1823, published under the pseudonym Gamaliel Smith) (xv) *Book of Fallacies* (1824) (xvi) *A Treatise on Judicial Evidence* (1825).

In 1952-54, Werner Stark published a three-volume set, *Jeremy Bentham's Economic Writings*, in which he tried collating all of Bentham's writings on economic matters, including both published and unpublished material. Not trusting Bowring's edition, he undertake great labour in reviewing thousands of Bentham's original manuscripts and notes; a task rendered much more difficult because of the way in which they had been left by Bentham and organized by Bowring. John Bowring, a British politician who had been Bentham's trusted friend, was appointed his literary executor and given the task of bringing forth a collected edition of his works. This appeared in II volumes in 1838-1843. Instead of basing his edition on Bentham's own manuscripts, Bowring based his edition on previously published editions (including those of Dumont), and he did not bring out any reprint of Bentham's works on religion. Even though Bowring's work includes significant writings, such as the one on international relations as Bentham's *A Plan for the Universal and Perpetual Peace*, written 1786-89. Which forms part IV of the *Principals of International Law*, it has received criticism.

## 7.2: The Utilitarian Principles

Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. They alone point out what we ought to do and determine what we shall do; the standard of right

and wrong, and the chain of causes and effects, are both fastened to their throne. They govern using all we do, all we say, all we think; every effort we can make to throw off our subjection ·to pain and pleasure· will only serve to demonstrate and confirm it. A man may claim to reject their rule but in reality he will remain subject to it. The principle of utility recognises this subjection, and makes it the basis of a system that aims to have the edifice of happiness built by the hands of reason and of law. Systems that try to question it deal in sounds instead of sense, in caprice instead of reason, in darkness instead of light. But enough of metaphor and declamation, It is not by such means that moral science is to be improved.

The school of thought called Utilitarianism dominated English political thinking from the middle of the 18th century to the middle of the 19th century. Some of the early utilitarian was Francis Hutcheson, Hume, Helvetius, Priestly, William Paley and Baccarat. However, it was Bentham who established the theory of Utilitarianism and rendered it popular on the basis of his endless proposals or reform. As Russell has rightly pointed out, Bentham's significant contribution is to be located not so much in the doctrine but in his vigorously applying it to various practical problems. It was through his friendship with James Mill, the father of John Stuart Mill, that Bentham became acquainted with the two greatest economists of his time - Malthus and David Ricardo - and was able to learn classical economics from them. This group of thinkers referred to themselves as philosophic radicals and aimed to bring about a revolutionary transformation of England into a modern, liberal, democratic, constitutional, secular state based on market economics. Utilitarianism was used interchangeably with philosophic radicalism, individualism, laissez faire, and administrative nihilism.

The seminal assumptions of utilitarianism postulated that human beings, naturally so, sought happiness, (hat pleasure alone was good, and that the only right action was that which produced the greatest happiness of the greatest number. In espousing such assumptions, the utilitarian thinkers can be seen reiterating the ideas of the Greek thinker - Epicures. Bentham lent a scientific colour this pleasure - pain theory and brought it in application in the context of the policies of the state, welfare measures, and the administrative, penal and legislative reforms. He brought to the fore a psychological perspective on human nature. He conceived of human beings as creatures of pleasure. In his analytical inquiry, he used the benchmark of utility. His book. Introduction to the principles of Moral and Legislation provides an explanation of his theory of utility. The central principal undergirding his theory states that the state is useful only so long as it caters to the 'Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number'. The 'Greatest Happiness Theory', in turn, is based on a psychological and hedonistic theory of pleasure and pain.

Bentham's ambition in life was to create a 'Pannomion' - a complete utilitarian code of law. Bentham not only brought to the fore many legal and social reforms, but also elaborated on an underlying moral principle on which they should be based. The argument being put forward here stated that the right act or policy was one which would lead to the greatest good for the greatest number of people, also known as 'the greatest happiness principle' or the 'principle of utility'.

Bentham also brought to the fore a procedure which would aid in gauging the moral status of any action, which he referred to as the Hedonistic or felicific calculus. Utilitarianism was revised and expanded by Bentham's student John Stuart Mill, and it is in Mill's hands, 'Benthamism' became a primary component which was deployed in the liberal conception of state policy objectives.

Bentham proposed a classification of 12 pains and 14 pleasures and 'felicific calculus' by which we might test the 'happiness factor' of any action. Nonetheless, it should not be forgotten that Bentham's 'hedonistic' theory unlike Mill's, is often said to be devoid of a principle of fairness,

which is entrenched in a conception of Justice. In 'Bentham and the Common Law Tradition', Gerald J. Postema states: 'No moral concept suffers more at Bentham's hand than the concept of justice. There is no sustained, mature analysis of the notion . . .' In the light of this, we have some critics objecting to Bentham's proposition in that it seems to suggest that it would be acceptable to torture one person if this would produce an amount of happiness in other people outweighing the unhappiness of the tortured individual. However, as argued forcefully by P. J. Kelly in his book, *Utilitarianism and Distributive Justice: Jeremy Bentham and the Civil Law*, Bentham had a theory of justice that aimed at prevention and circumvention of such consequences. According to Kelly, for Bentham the law 'provides the basic framework of social interaction by delimiting spheres of personal inviolability within which individuals can form and pursue their own conceptions of well-being.' It gives security, which serves as a necessary pre-condition for the formation of expectations. As is witnessed in the hedonic calculus, which shows 'expectation milky' to be much higher than natural ones, we can see that Bentham does not favour the sacrifice of a few to the benefit of the many.

Bentham's *Principles of Legislation* highlights the principle of utility and explains the way this view of morality feeds into legislative practices. His principle of utility hails 'good' as that which aids the production of the greatest amount of pleasure and the minimum amount of pain, while 'evil' is conceived as that which produces the most pain without the pleasure. This concept of pleasure and pain is defined by Bentham as being of both a physical as well as spiritual nature. Bentham delineates this principle as it manifests itself within the legislation of a society. He lays bare a set of criteria for gauging the extent of pain or pleasure that a certain decision will create.

Organizing these measurements, he takes a review of the concept of punishment and tries to fathom when it should be used, and whether a punishment will end up creating more pleasure or more pain for a society. He gives out a call for legislators to determine whether punishment can lead to an even more evil offense. Instead of bringing down evil acts, Bentham is arguing that certain unnecessary laws and punishments could ultimately lead to new and more dangerous vices that those being punished to begin with. These statements are followed by propositions explaining how antiquity, religion, reproach of innovation, metaphor, fiction, fancy, antipathy and sympathy, and imaginary law are not a sufficient justification for the creation of legislature. Rather, Bentham is calling upon legislators to measure the pleasures and pains associated with any legislation and to bring forth form laws in order to enable the greatest good for the greatest number. He argues that the conception whereby the individual pursues his or her own happiness cannot be necessarily declared 'right', since often these individual pursuits can lead to greater pain and less pleasure for the society as a whole. Hence, the legislation of a society is integral to maintaining a society with optimum pleasure and the minimum degree of pain for the greatest amount of people.

Pleasure and pain theory, which is quite abstruse, is brought to the fore by Bentham in a simple and accessible manner. He points out those human beings are creatures of feeling and sensibility, while reason is only a handmaiden of feeling or passion. All experiences are either to be seen as pleasurable or painful. That action is deemed good which increases pleasure and decreases pain, whereas, that action is deemed bad which decreases pleasure and increases pain. The benchmark for judging the goodness or badness of every individual's actions is the pleasure-pain theory. Bentham advocated (that 'nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters - pain and pleasure. It is incumbent on them atone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. So, we have on the one hand, the standard of right and wrong, and on the other, the chain of causes and effects. Achievement of pleasure and avoidance of pain are, however, not to be seen as the sole motivating forces of human behavior; they also set the standards of values in life'. According to him, what applies to (he individual's morals, applies with equal force statecraft. He further pointed out that the action of the state is to

be adjudged well, if it can be seen increasing pleasure and decreasing the pain of the largest number of the individuals comprising it. All action must be then be judged by significant yardstick. If the pushes for the greatest good of the greatest number, then it is to be hailed as good; and if matters are to the contrary, then it is bad. Sabine in his book *History of Political Theory* points out that this principle was held by the utilitarian to be the only rational factor, guiding both private morals and public policy. The seminal function of jurisprudence is sensorial, while the criticism of the legal system is carried out keeping in mind its improvement. For such criticism to function, a standard of value is required, and that can be gathered only from the principle of utility. He pointed out that it is the greatest happiness of the greatest number which is the basis, then, by which we may ascertain the issue of right and wrong. All actions of the state should be geared towards providing the greatest good of the greatest number. Hence, utilitarianism is to be seen as implying both individualism and democracy.

In Bentham's framework, pleasure and pain can be quantitatively and arithmetically calculated and measured, and a comparison can be drawn between the two qualities. In order to gauge pleasure and pain, he advocated the doctrine of felicific calculus. The sum of the interests of the several members composing it is the interest of the community. The calculation here would entail that the happiness of each person is to count for one and none is to account for more than one. He delineated a list of some factors which would be used to measure pleasure and pain: (i) intensity (ii) duration (iii) certainty or uncertainty (iv) nearness or remoteness (v) purity (vi) extent (vii) fecundity. While the four factors are clear, the fifth factor *purity* means that pleasure is one which is not likely to be followed by pain. The sixth factor *extent* refers to the number of persons who might be affected by this particular pleasure or pain. The seventh factor *fecundity* refers to productivity. Bentham's formula of calculation entails that we should make an addition of the values of all the pleasures on the one side, and those of all the pains on the other. The balance or surplus of any of the sides will be an indication if it is to be deemed good or bad. Based on his felicific calculus, he has tried to render ethics and politics as exact sciences like physics and mathematics. In the words of Wayper, 'The doctrine of utility is a doctrine of quantitatively conceived hedonism - it can recognize no distinction between pleasures except a quantitative one. He contended that human beings by nature were marked by hedonism. Each of their actions drew from a desire to seek pleasure and avoid pain. Every human action could be traced to embody a cause and a motive. He saw hedonism not only as a principle of motivation, but also as a principle of action. He listed 14 simple pleasures and 12 simple pains, which were then classified into self-regarding and other regarding groups. Only two benevolence and malevolence were put under other-regarding action. Under self-regarding motives, he listed physical desire, pecuniary interest, love of power and self-preservation. Self-preservation would include fear of pain, love of life, and love of ease. He described four sanctions which would serve as sources of pain or pleasure, such as physical sanction, political and legal sanction moral or popular sanction and religious sanction. He postulated that an adult individual is to be hailed as the best judge of his own happiness, and to be seen worthy of pursuing it without harming the happiness of others. He traced an essential connection between the happiness of an individual and that of the community, and offered the principle of utility as a standard which would aid in framing laws which would be geared to obtain the overall happiness and welfare of the community. It was constantly emphasized by him, that a person's actions and policies had to be judged against his intention geared towards furthering the happiness of the community. The end and the goal of legislation were to follow the rule: 'each is to count for one and no one for more than one'. His defense of the principles of utility led him to plead a case for democracy, manhood, and, later on, universal suffrage, including female enfranchisement. As Bentham postulated, suffrage and democracy were to be seen as integral for the realization of the greatest happiness principle. Bentham argues that the principle of utility is a morally right principle of action for every situation. He says that the principle of utility may also

be described as the greatest happiness principle, in that it asserts that the only morally right and proper goal of action is to achieve the greatest happiness of all individuals whose interest is affected by the action.

Bentham rejects the notion that the law of reason is a sufficient principle of morality. For Bentham, such concepts as common sense, the rule of right, the law of reason, and the law of nature are only theoretical or speculative principles and cannot be practically applied to every moral situation. Bentham describes a quantitative method (or hedonistic calculus) by which the moral rightness or wrongness of an action may be calculated according to the amount of pleasure or pain which is produced by the action. Bentham explains that the quantity of a pleasure or pain may depend on the intensity, duration, certainty or uncertainty, propinquity, fecundity, and purity of the pleasure or pain. The fecundity of a pleasure or pain may be determined by the likelihood that the pleasure or pain will be followed by pleasures or pains of the same kind. The purity of a pleasure or pain may be determined by the likelihood that the pleasure or pain will not be followed by pleasures or pains of the opposite kind.

According to Bentham, actions which are morally right tend to produce the greatest possible amount of pleasure and the least possible amount of pain, while actions which are morally wrong tend to produce either a lesser amount of pleasure or a greater amount of pain than other actions which could be performed. The total amount of pleasure or pain which is produced by an action may depend on the total amount of pleasure or pain which is experienced by all individuals whose interest is affected by the action. Bentham provides a classification of the various kinds of pleasures and pains. Pleasures and pains may be caused by various kinds of sensations, thoughts, emotions, memories, expectations, and associations. Simple pleasures and pains may be combined to form complex pleasures and pains. Pleasure may also be caused by the relief of pain, and pain may be caused by the cessation of pleasure. Pleasure may be caused by the satisfaction of desire, and pain may be caused by the frustration of desire.

Bentham explains that the sensitivity to pleasure or pain may vary among individuals, and that each individual may respond differently to the same pleasure or pain. If rewards for good conduct or punishments for bad conduct are to be administered fairly, then these rewards or punishments must account for the differences that may occur among individuals in their sensitivity to pleasure or pain. Bentham also provides a classification of motives for action. However, many of his arguments for the theory that motives are morally neutral are not only misdirected but morally repugnant. For example, he argues that there is no difference between the aim to avoid punishment by telling the truth and the aim to avoid punishment by telling a lie, because the aim in either case is to avoid punishment. He argues that there is no difference between the aim to preserve oneself from danger by helping another person and the aim to preserve oneself from danger by not helping another person, because the aim in either case is to preserve oneself from danger. He argues that there is no difference between the aim to gain a person's favor by being kind to that person and the aim to gain a person's favor by being cruel to the enemy of that person, because the aim in either case is to gain the person's favor.

According to Bentham, pleasure is intrinsically good, and pain is intrinsically evil. The motives which individuals may have for their actions are only good or evil if they have good or evil consequences. Motives may not be intrinsically good or evil and their consequences may vary according to each situation and according to each individual's sensitivity to pleasure or pain.

Bentham tries to justify the oppression of women by men by arguing that women may be more sensitive to smaller pleasures and pains and those women may thus have less "firmness of mind. Bentham also argues unsuccessfully that women are more likely to confirm their actions to the

principle of sympathy and antipathy, and that they are less likely to confirm their actions to the principle of utility. Bentham asserts that if good intentions are produced by a motive, then the motive may be described as good. If bad intentions are produced by a motive, then the motive may be described as bad. The goodness or badness of an intention to perform a particular action may depend on the material consequences of that action. The material consequences of an action are the sensations of pleasure or pain which are produced by that action. Good actions produce pleasure, while bad actions produce pain. According to Bentham, motives produce intentions, and the sum of an individual's intentions may produce a disposition to perform, or not to perform, a particular action. Whether or not an individual performs a particular action may depend on his or her disposition to perform that action and on the particular circumstances which may affect the expression of that disposition.

Bentham divides motives into two kinds: 1) seducing (or corrupting), and 2) tutelary (or preservative). Seducing motives may cause an individual to perform wrongful acts, while tutelary motives may cause an individual not to perform wrongful acts. Tutelary motives may be either standing (i.e. constant) or occasional. Standing tutelary motives may govern an individual's conduct in most (or all) situations, but occasional tutelary motives may govern an individual's conduct in only some situations. According to Bentham, the weaker the temptation that is required for an individual to perform a wrongful act, the more that performance of this wrongful act may testify to the corruption of the individual's disposition. The stronger the temptation that is required for an individual to perform a wrongful act, the less that performance of this wrongful act may testify to the corruption of the individual's disposition. The wrongfulness of an act may be determined by calculating how much pain is gained and how much pleasure is lost as a consequence of the act.

Bentham defines ethics as the art of producing the greatest possible amount of happiness for oneself and for others. Ethics is both the art of fulfilling one's duty to oneself (by exhibiting prudence) and the art of fulfilling one's duty to others (by exhibiting probity and beneficence). While private ethics is concerned with the personal happiness of an individual, public ethics and the art of legislation are concerned with the happiness of all individuals. If an act of legislation conforms to the principle of utility, then it tends to increase the total happiness of all individuals.

Bentham enumerates five classes of illegal offenses against society: 1) private offenses against individuals, 2) semi-public offenses against groups of individuals, 3) self-regarding offenses against the rights of the individual, 4) public offenses against the community, and 5) offenses by acts of falsehood or by breaches of trust. Bentham argues that private offenses against individuals may include those against: 1) person, 2) property, 3) reputation, 4) condition (by breach of duty), 5) person and property, and 6) person and reputation. Semi-public offenses may include wrongful acts which endanger the well-being and security of a particular class or group of individuals. Public offenses may include wrongful acts which endanger public security, justice, general happiness, social harmony, economic prosperity, or national sovereignty. Bentham argues that the punishment of illegal offenses against society should be proportional to the amount of harm which is caused by these offenses. Punishment of offenses is not justified if it is disadvantageous or needless. The amount of punishment for an offence should be sufficient to deter further offences but should not be unjust or arbitrary.

Bentham also contends that any form of punishment for violating civil or criminal laws should conform to the principle of utility. Any punishment which is inflicted upon an offending individual should have a sufficient ground for the infliction of pain upon that individual. The purpose of punishing illegal offenses against society is not only to prevent similar or greater offenses but to offer satisfaction to those who have been injured and to discipline and reform the

offender. His views regarding monetary economics are to be seen as being at great variance from those of David Ricardo; however, they both exhibited certain affinities with Thornton. He focused on monetary expansion as a means of helping to create full employment. Bentham also underlined the relevance of forced saving, propensity to consume, the saving-investment relationship, and other matters that underlie the content of modern income and employment analysis. His monetary view can be seen as having a close affinity with the fundamental concepts deployed in his model of utilitarian decision making. His work is to be seen as occupying the center stage of modern welfare economics. Bentham stated that pleasures and pains can be graded according to their value or 'dimension' such as intensity, duration, certainty of a pleasure or a pain. He was occupied with thinking out the maxima and minima of pleasures and pains; and this engagement triggered the trajectory which would see a future employment of the maximization principle in the economics of the consumer, the firm, and the search for an optimum in welfare economics.

### **7.3: Political Philosophy of Bentham**

More popular of Bentham's works are fragments on Government and Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, in which he has laid out his political philosophies which can be discussed under following heads.

#### **73.1: The principle of Utility**

It has been shown that the happiness of the individuals of whom a community is composed, i.e. their pleasures and their security, is the only goal that the legislator ought to have in view; and insofar as legislation affects how individuals behave, the legislator should aim to have their behavior conform to this same standard. But there is nothing by which a man can ultimately be made to do something, whatever its goal is, except pain or pleasure. Having taken a general view of these two grand objects namely pleasure and what comes to the same thing immunity from pain in their role as final causes, we now have to take a view of pleasure and pain in their role as efficient causes or means.

Though, the principle of utility has been discussed above in detail, we can retrace here a brief outline since it is one of the most significant political ideas propounded by Bentham. As said earlier, he was not the originator of this idea. He borrowed it from Priestley and Hutcheson. However, Bentham reworked the idea, and owing to his attributing to it great significance, this idea became an integral part of his philosophical system and also a watch-word of the political movement of the later 18th and early 19th century. The keynote of this principle postulates that the state is useful only so long as it caters to the 'greatest happiness of the greatest number'. The 'greatest happiness' theory in turn is based on a psychological and hedonistic theory of 'pleasure and pain'. Bentham highlighted that, that action is good which increases pleasure and decreases pain. The yardstick of judging the goodness or badness of every individual's action is the pleasure-pain theory. According to him, what applies to the individual morals, applies with equal force to statecraft. The seminal idea which needs to be grasped here is that pleasure and pain can be quantitatively and arithmetically calculated and measured.

#### **7.3.2: Views on political society**

With respect to the origin of the political society, Bentham blatantly rejected the contract theory as absorbed. He rejected the view which saw children as being bound by the oral or written words of their forefathers. He brought to the fore a harsh criticism of the theory of natural rights. According to him, the state is founded on the selfish interest of the individuals. People obey the demands of

the state as it furthers their selfish interest, their life, and property. In his view, the political society has existed and will continue to exist because it is believed to promote the happiness of the individual who compose it. Hence, succinctly put, the origin of the state is in the interest, welfare, and happiness of individuals which comprise it. It is the principle of utility which is to be credited with binding individuals together. The utilitarian concept conceives of the state as a group of persons organized for the promotion and maintenance of the greatest happiness of the greatest number of individuals comprising it. Bentham's view of the state entails that 'any corporate body, such as slate all society is evidently fictitious. Whatever is done in its name is done by someone, and it's good, as he said, is the sum of the interests of the several members who compose it'.

### **7.3.3: Views on state, law and liberty**

According to Bentham, the modern state is to be viewed as an ideal, and an aspiration which examines the technique of state building and the method that would promote modernization. He regarded diversity and fragility within political order as inevitable. He saw the state as a legal entity with individualism as its ethical basis. He saw modernization as entailing two things: on the one hand, it required a broad based and diversified legal system which would take stock of individuals desires; and on the other hand, it comprised institutions that would extend support to the legal system, aiding in namely the burocratization of public service and legislation as a continual process, accommodating both change and diversity. He kept secure the individualist notion of moral autonomy with due priority given to individual interest. According to Hume, 'Bentham's theory brought together in a particular way the two great themes of modern political thought: individualism and the modern sovereign state'.

He came up with ideas and devises geared to guarantee governmental protection of individual interest, ensuring that public happiness should be seen as the object of public policy. Government is to be seen as a trust with legislation as the primaryfunction and uniformity, clarity, order and consistency were to be seen as crucial for both law and order. He was equally conscious of the need for institutional safeguards which would see to it that the government pursued public interest. He championed universal adult franchise and recommended it to all those who could read the list of voters. Further, he conceived of the stale as comprising a number of persons who are supposed to be in the habit of paying obedience to a person, or an assemblage of persons, of a known and certain description. Such a group of persons taken together is to seen comprising a political society. In his *Constitutional Code*, Bentham reserved for the people the power to select and dismiss their leader, and to ensure that the interest of the rulers wasclosely linked with those of the people. For furthering this, he' recommended the abolition of monarchy and the house of lords, checks on legislative authority, unilateralism, secret ballot annual elections, equal electoral districts, annual parliaments and election of the prime minister by the parliament. He saw representative government as providing a solution to the problem. He considered constitutional representative democracy as an overall political arrangement which was seen secured by measures like widespread suffrage, an elected assembly, frequent elections, freedom of the press, and of associations providing a guarantee against misrule. He regarded constitutional democracy as being of great significance to all nations and all governments who were in possession of liberal opinions.

Bentham postulated that the state was the only source of law. The main purpose of the state is to frame laws which attend to the greatest happiness of the greatest number. According to him, law is to be seen as comprising the command of the sovereign, and binding on the subjects. But the individuals obey the law of the state only because it furthers their interest. In the words of Wayper. 'Because law is a command, it must be the command of a supreme authority.' Indeed it is only in the case where such an authority is regularly obeyed, that Bentham is prepared to admit the existence of civil society. His stale, thus, is to be seen as a sovereign state. It is the sign of a

sovereign state that nothing it does can be illegal. Law is the sole source of all rights of the individuals. There is no such thing as natural rights, and all rights are civil rights. The individuals can never plead natural law against the state. According to Bentham, natural rights are not to be ascribed any significance. The basis of the political obligation comprises partly habitual obedience of the laws of the state by the individuals and partly the calculated self-interest of the individuals. Even though Bentham strongly believed that rights cannot be maintained against the state, yet he justified opposition to the state if that opposition will end up producing less pain than continued obedience. According to him, liberty is not to be perceived as an end in itself. Happiness is the only final criterion and liberty must bow to that criterion. The end of the state is maximum happiness and not maximum liberty. This concept of a state can only be a democracy and that too a representative democracy. In such a state all men should have equal rights. However, the concept of equality of rights is not premised on any abstract notion of natural law, but rather rests on the concrete idea that every individual seeks to pursue his interest to the best of his mind. All individuals are invested with equal rights including right of property in the eyes of law, despite the fact that by nature they may not be equal. Protection of property is one of the ways to ensure a furtherance of one's happiness. Bentham defined liberty as signifying an absence of restraints and coercion. Crucial to his concept of liberty was the idea of security, which brought together his idea of civil and political liberty. For him, the principle of utility provided the objective moral standard, which was seen as being considerably at variance from other theories that supplied purely subjective criteria. Even though Bentham downplayed the sanctity of natural rights formulations, he acknowledged the importance of right as being essential for the security of the individual. He rejected not just the idea of natural and inviolable right to property, but also the idea of absolute right to property since the government had the right to interfere with property to usher in security. He backed the need for adequate compensation in case of a violation of the individual's right to property. Property, for Bentham, was neither natural, nor absolute, and nor inviolable.

However, Bentham also believed that law should strive for facilitating an equal distribution of property and removal of gross inequalities. In opposition to natural rights and natural law, Bentham recognized legal laws and rights that were enacted and enforced by a duly constituted political authority or the state. He defined law as comprising the command of the sovereign and postulated that the power of sovereign be seen as indivisible, unlimited, inalienable, and permanent.

#### **7.3.4: Views on jurisprudence and punishment**

One of the most significant aspects of Bentham's political philosophy is located in the sphere of jurisprudence and reforms in criminal law and prison. There was no Limitation imposed on the legislative power of the state, not even in the customs and conventions. While the state may take help from customs and established institutions, there were no checks on the legislative competence of the state. Bentham brought to the fore his popular distinction between 'descriptive' and 'sensorial' jurisprudence; namely what the law ought to be or whether a particular law was bad or good, to establish the validity of moral propositions about legal rights. Bentham's greatest achievement comprises his attempt to apply the principle of greatest happiness of the greatest number to all the branches of law - civil and criminal, procedural law as well as to the organization of the judicial system. For furthering this end, he suggested several reforms in civil and criminal laws and procedures. He was entirely for simplification of English law and international law. As a jurist and legal reformer, he brought to the fore liberal reforms in antiquated British law and procedure. The whole of the 19th Century legislation of England is can be seen as resulting from his laborious endeavors. Bentham suggested diverse ways and means by which justice could be administered cheaply and expeditiously. He postulated that justice delayed is justice denied. He suggested that acts of the parliament should be framed in simple and easily

accessible language to ensure that the lawyers not cheat the public at large. The highly technical, rigid, obscure, capricious and dilatory legal procedures existing at large in his time were nothing short of a conspiracy on the part of the legal profession to misguide the public. Bentham suggested that there should be single-judge courts, since the multi-judge courts led to a shirking of responsibility. He also furthered the suggestion that judges and other officers of the court should be paid regular salaries instead of ad hoc fees. Further, he also attacked the jury system.

In the context of punishment, he maintained that penalty is an evil but a necessary one. It is an evil since it engenders pain, but it can be justified if it is seen as either preventing a greater future evil or repairing an evil already committed. Bentham strongly believed that punishment should be in consonance with the crime committed, and that under no circumstance should it exceed the damage done. He was not for death penalty, except in very rare cases. He was also in favour of doing away with other savage penalties from the British legal system, and suggested diverse reforms in the treatment being doled out to the prisoners. Here, the state was required to tailor the punishment with regard to the offence in such a manner which would restrain the offender from committing it, or at least from repeating it. To aid in the furtherance of these reforms, Bentham has given a detailed account of various punishments to be given in particular circumstances.

### **7.3.5: Views on Human Nature**

For Bentham, morals and legislation can be described scientifically, but such a description requires an account of human nature. Just as nature is explained through reference to the laws of physics, so human behavior can be explained by reference to the two primary motives of pleasure and pain; this is the theory of psychological hedonism.

There is, Bentham admits, no direct proof of such an analysis of human motivation—though he holds that it is clear that, in acting, all people implicitly refer to it. At the beginning of the Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, Bentham writes:

Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think: every effort we can make to throw off our subjection, will serve but to demonstrate and confirm it. From this we see that, for Bentham, pleasure and pain serve not only as explanations for action, but they also define one's good. It is, in short, on the basis of pleasures and pains, which can exist only in individuals, that Bentham thought one could construct a calculus of value.

Related to this fundamental hedonism is a view of the individual as exhibiting a natural, rational self-interest—a form of psychological egoism. In his "Remarks on Bentham's Philosophy" (1833), Mill cites Bentham's *The Book of Fallacies* (London: Hunt, 1824, pp. 392-3) that "[i]n every human breast... self-regarding interest is predominant over social interest; each person's own individual interest over the interests of all other persons taken together." Fundamental to the nature and activity of individuals, then, is their own well-being and reason as a natural capability of the person—is considered to be subservient to this end. Bentham believed that the nature of the human person can be adequately described without mention of social relationships. To begin with, the idea of "relation" is but a "fictitious entity," though necessary for "convenience of discourse." And, more specifically, he remarks that "the community is a fictitious body," and it is but "the sum of the interests of the several members who compose it." Thus, the extension of the term "individual" is, in the main, no greater and no less than the biological entity. Bentham's view, then,

is that the individual—the basic unit of the social sphere is an "atom" and there is no "self" or "individual" greater than the human individual. A person's relations with others even if important—are not essential and describe nothing that is, strictly speaking, necessary to its being what it is.

Finally, the picture of the human person presented by Bentham is based on a psychological associations indebted to David Hartley and Hume; Bentham's analysis of "habit" (which is essential to his understanding of society and especially political society) particularly reflects associationist presuppositions. On this view, pleasure and pain are objective states and can be measured in terms of their intensity, duration, certainty, proximity, fecundity and purity. This allows both for an objective determination of an activity or state and for a comparison with others.

Bentham's understanding of human nature reveals, in short, a psychological, ontological, and also moral individualism where, to extend the critique of utilitarianism made by Graeme Duncan and John Gray (1979), "the individual human being is conceived as the source of values and as himself the supreme value."

### **7.3.6: Views on Moral Philosophy**

As Elie Halévy (1904) notes, there are three principal characteristics of which constitute the basis of Bentham's moral and political philosophy: (i) the greatest happiness principle, (ii) universal egoism and (iii) the artificial identification of one's interests with those of others. Though these characteristics are present throughout his work, they are particularly evident in the Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, where Bentham is concerned with articulating rational principles that would provide a basis and guide for legal, social and moral reform.

To begin with, Bentham's moral philosophy reflects what he calls at different times "the greatest happiness principle" or "the principle of utility" a term which he borrows from Hume. In adverting to this principle, however, he was not referring to just the usefulness of things or actions, but to the extent to which these things or actions promote the general happiness. Specifically, then, what is morally obligatory is that which produces the greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people, happiness being determined by reference to the presence of pleasure and the absence of pain. Thus, Bentham writes, "By the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question: or, what is the same thing in other words, to promote or to oppose that happiness." And Bentham emphasizes that this applies to "every action whatsoever". That which does not maximize the greatest happiness (such as an act of pure ascetic sacrifice is, therefore, morally wrong. Unlike some of the previous attempts at articulating a universal hedonism, Bentham's approach is thoroughly naturalistic.

Bentham's moral philosophy, then, clearly reflects his psychological view that the primary motivators in human beings are pleasure and pain. Bentham admits that his version of the principle of utility is something that does not admit of direct proof, but he notes that this is not a problem as some explanatory principles do not admit of any such proof and all explanation must start somewhere. But this, by itself, does not explain why another's happiness or the general happiness should count. And, in fact, he provides a number of suggestions that could serve as answers to the question of why we should be concerned with the happiness of others.

First, Bentham says, the principle of utility is something to which individuals, in acting, refer either explicitly or implicitly, and this is something that can be ascertained and confirmed by

simple observation. Indeed, Bentham held that all existing systems of morality can be "reduced to the principles of sympathy and antipathy," which is precisely that which defines utility. A second argument found in Bentham is that, if pleasure is the good, then it is good irrespective of whose pleasure it is. Thus, a moral injunction to pursue or maximize pleasure has force independently of the specific interests of the person acting. Bentham also suggests that individuals would reasonably seek the general happiness simply because the interests of others are inextricably bound up with their own, though he recognized that this is something that is easy for individuals to ignore. Nevertheless, Bentham envisages a solution to this as well. Specifically, he proposes that making this identification of interests obvious and, when necessary, bringing diverse interests together would be the responsibility of the legislator.

Finally, Bentham held that there are advantages to a moral philosophy based on a principle of utility. To begin with, the principle of utility is clear (compared to other moral principles, allows for objective and disinterested public discussion, and enables decisions to be made where there seem to be conflicts of prima facie legitimate interests. Moreover, in calculating the pleasures and pains involved in carrying out a course of action the "hedonic calculus", there is a fundamental commitment to human equality. The principle of utility presupposes that "one man is worth just the same as another man" and so there is a guarantee that in calculating the greatest happiness "each person is to count for one and no one for more than one." For Bentham, then, there is no inconsistency between the greatest happiness principle and his psychological hedonism and egoism. Thus, he writes that moral philosophy or ethics can be simply described as "the art of directing men's action to the production of the greatest possible quantity of happiness, on the part of those whose interest is in view."

### **7.3.7: Views on Government, Law and Liberty**

Bentham had a very less concentration on the forms of government but a great interest on the Law, Liberty and Government. The notion of liberty present in Bentham's account is what is now generally referred to as "negative" liberty freedom from external restraint or compulsion. Bentham says that "Liberty is the absence of restraint" and so, to the extent that one is not hindered by others, one has liberty and is "free." Bentham denies that liberty is "natural" in the sense of existing "prior to" social life and thereby imposing limits on the state or that there is an a priori sphere of liberty in which the individual is sovereign. In fact, Bentham holds that people have always lived in society, and so there can be no state of nature (though he does distinguish between political society and "natural society" and no "social contract" a notion which he held was not only unhistorical but pernicious. Nevertheless, he does note that there is an important distinction between one's public and private life that has morally significant consequences, and he holds that liberty is a good that, even though it is not something that is a fundamental value, it reflects the greatest happiness principle. Correlative with this account of liberty, Bentham as Thomas Hobbes before him viewed law as "negative." Given that pleasure and pain are fundamental to indeed, provide the standard of value for Bentham, liberty is a good (because it is "pleasant" and the restriction of liberty is an evil because it is "painful". Law, which is by its very nature a restriction of liberty and painful to those whose freedom is restricted, is a prima facie evil. It is only so far as control by the state is limited that the individual is free. Law is, Bentham recognized, necessary to social order and good laws are clearly essential to good government. Indeed, perhaps more than Locke, Bentham saw the positive role to be played by law and government, particularly in achieving community well-being. To the extent that law advances and protects one's economic and personal goods and that what government exists is self-government, law reflects the interests of the individual.

Bentham's views on rights are, perhaps, best known through the attacks on the concept of "natural rights" that appear throughout his work. These criticisms are especially developed in his *Anarchical Fallacies* (a polemical attack on the declarations of rights issued in France during the French Revolution), written between 1791 and 1795 but not published until 1816, in French. Bentham's criticisms here are rooted in his understanding of the nature of law. Rights are created by the law, and law is simply a command of the sovereign. The existence of law and rights, therefore, requires government. Rights are also usually though not necessarily correlative with duties determined by the law and, as in Hobbes, are either those which the law explicitly gives us or those within a legal system where the law is silent. The view that there could be rights not based on sovereign command and which pre-exist the establishment of government is rejected.

According to Bentham, then, the term "natural right" is a "perversion of language." It is "ambiguous," "sentimental" and "figurative" and it has anarchical consequences. At best, such a "right" may tell us what we ought to do; it cannot serve as a legal restriction on what we can or cannot do. The term "natural right" is ambiguous, Bentham says, because it suggests that there are general rights that is, rights over no specific object so that one would have a claim on whatever one chooses. The effect of exercising such a universal, natural "right" would be to extinguish the right altogether, since "what is every man's right is no man's right." No legal system could function with such a broad conception of rights. Thus, there cannot be any general rights in the sense suggested by the French declarations. Bentham concludes, therefore, that the term "natural rights" is "simple nonsense: natural and imprescriptible rights, rhetorical nonsense, nonsense upon stilts." Rights what Bentham calls "real" rights are fundamentally legal rights. All rights must be legal and specific (that is, having both a specific object and subject). They ought to be made because of their conduciveness to "the general mass of felicity," and correlatively, when their abolition would be to the advantage of society, rights ought to be abolished. So far as rights exist in law, they are protected; outside of law, they are at best "reasons for wishing there were such things as rights." While Bentham's essays against natural rights are largely polemical, many of his objections continue to be influential in contemporary political philosophy

Moreover, the notion of natural rights is figurative. Properly speaking, there are no rights anterior to government. The assumption of the existence of such rights, Bentham says, seems to be derived from the theory of the social contract. Here, individuals form a society and choose a government through the alienation of certain of their rights. But such a doctrine is not only unhistorical, according to Bentham; it does not even serve as a useful fiction to explain the origin of political authority. Governments arise by habit or by force, and for contracts and, specifically, some original contract to bind; there must already be a government in place to enforce them. Finally, the idea of a natural right is "anarchical." Such a right, Bentham claims, entails a freedom from all restraint and, in particular, from all legal restraint. Since a natural right would be anterior to law, it could not be limited by law, and since human beings are motivated by self-interest if everyone had such freedom, the result would be pure anarchy. To have a right in any meaningful sense entails that others cannot legitimately interfere with one's rights, and this implies that rights must be capable of enforcement. Such restriction, as noted earlier, is the province of the law.

Nevertheless, Bentham did not dismiss talk of rights altogether. There are some services that are essential to the happiness of human beings and that cannot be left to others to fulfill as they see fit, and so these individuals must be compelled, on pain of punishment, to fulfill them. They must, in other words, respect the rights of others. Thus, although Bentham was generally suspicious of the concept of rights, he does allow that the term is useful, and in such work as *A General View of a Complete Code of Laws*, he enumerates a large number of rights. While the meaning he assigns to

these rights is largely stipulate rather than descriptive, they clearly reflect principles defended throughout his work.

## J.S. MILL (P8)

### 8.0: Life Sketch of J.S.MILL

John Stuart Mill was born the oldest of nine children on May 20, 1806, in London, England, to James and Harriet Burrow Mill. His father, originally trained as a minister, had come from Scotland to take up a career as a journalist. In 1808 James Mill began his lifelong association with Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832), the utilitarian a philosophy saying that anything useful is positive and that to determine if an action is right, the usefulness of its consequences is the answer) philosopher. Mill shared the common belief of nineteenth-century psychologists that a child's character and performance are the result of the experiences and relationships he or she has as a child. With this view, he attempted to make his son into a philosopher by totally supervising his education. John began the study of Greek at the age of three and took up Latin between his seventh and eighth years. From six to ten each morning the boy recited his lessons, and by the age of twelve he had mastered material that was equal to a university degree in classics. He then took up the study of logic, mathematics, and political economy with the same energy. In addition to his own studies, Mill also tutored his brothers and sisters for three hours daily. Throughout his early years, Mill was treated as a younger equal by his father's friends, who were among the greatest intellectuals in England.

Only later did Mill realize that he never had a childhood. The most satisfying experiences he recalled from his boyhood were walks, music, reading Robinson Crusoe, and a year he spent in France. Before going abroad, Mill had never associated with anyone his own age. A year with Bentham's relatives in France gave young Mill a taste of normal family life and another language. When he was sixteen, Mill began a debating society of utilitarian to discuss and make popular the ideas of his father, Bentham, and others. He also began to publish on various issues, writing nearly fifty articles and reviews before he was twenty. But in 1823, at his father's insistence, Mill cast off his interest in a political career and accepted a position at East India Company (a successful trading firm), where he remained for thirty-five years. Hoping to remedy the problems found in an inductive approach to science, such as a confirmation bias, he clearly set forth the premises of falsification as the key component in the scientific method. Mill was also a Member of Parliament and an important figure in liberal political philosophy. The essayist, economist and reformer John Stuart Mill was born in London on 20 May 1806. His father, James Mill, was also a political philosopher and a contemporary of Jeremy Bentham. Mill had eight younger siblings. The senior Mill came to London from Scotland with the desire to become a writer. He tried journalism and then concentrated on writing *History of British India* (1818) which had a great influence on the young Mill. In fact India influenced the life of the young Mill greatly and subsequently also determined his career. After the publication of *History of British India*, James Mill was appointed as an assistant examiner at the East India House. This solved James Mill's financial problems and allowed him the lime to give attention to his areas of interest: philosophical and political problems. It also allowed him to consider a liberal profession for his elder son - J.S. Mill. James Mill first thought of a career in law for his son, but when another vacancy arose for another assistant examiner in 1823, John Stuart Mill grabbed the opportunity to serve the British government until his retirement. He started his educational career at the delicate age of 3. He studied Greek at the age of 3 under the strict supervision of his father whom J.S. Mill describes as the 'most impatient of men'. At the age of 8, he studied Latin, algebra and geometry and also read philosophy, including Plato's, Herodotus', Socrates', Diogenes' and Xenophon's. In English, he

read the ideas of Gibbon and Hume. At the age of 12, Mill began the study of logic and read Aristotle's *Treaties on Logic* in the original Greek. He also read some books on experimental science. At the age of 13, Mill's primary subject of study was political economy, particularly that of Adam Smith and David Ricardo, the latter being a close friend of Mill's father. He then went to France with Samuel Bentham, brother of Jeremy Bentham, where he learned the French language and studied higher mathematics, chemistry and botany. After returning to Britain at the age of 15, Mill took up the study of psychology and attended a series of lectures delivered on jurisprudence by John Austin. He then decided to be a lawyer and began to study for the bar. He lost his interest in this, and at the age of 17, he joined the staff of the East India Company as a clerk. He became the head of the department in 1856. After two years, he retired from his position. Most of his great literary output was produced when he held a full-time job. In 1865, he was requested by a body of voters in Westminster to stand for the membership of the House of Commons. Contrary to his expectations, he, nevertheless, won with a small majority. Mill served for three years in the Parliament, making unpopular speeches on unpopular subjects and generally devoting himself to things he thought needed to be done but no one else would do. In the election of 1868, he was defeated but he confessed in his autobiography that he was less surprised by his defeat than by his having been elected the first time.

In 1830, he met Harriet Taylor, who became a life-long friend and companion. When they first met, Harriet was married to John Taylor. But, despite her marriage, the couple became close and spent much time together. Despite maintaining a chaste relationship, the close friendship scandalized Victorian society and because of this, they were partly excluded from some social circles. The friendship with Taylor was built on a strong intellectual sympathy. They shared similar ideas and Mill treated Taylor as intellectual equal. Mill had a strong belief that women should be treated equally and should be given the vote. This was a very radical position for the first part of the Nineteenth Century. Mill credited Harriet with influencing many of his works, such as 'On Liberty'. Some works, such as the 'Subjection of Women' (1869) were mainly written by Taylor, but Mill's name was put on it. In 1851, after the death of John Taylor, the couple married but unfortunately, after the marriage, Harriet developed Tuberculosis and she died after only seven years of marriage. After Harriet's death in 1858, her daughter Helen gave up a career as an actress to be Mill's secretary and personal assistant. The two worked well together.

Mill describes his education in his autobiography. At the age of 3, he learned Greek. By the age of 8 he read Aesop's Fables, Xenophon's Anabasis, the works of Herodotus and also acquainted himself with Lucian, Diogenes Laertius, Isocrates and six dialogues of Plato. He also read a great deal of history in English and was also taught arithmetic. At the age of 8 he learned Latin, Euclid and algebra, and was appointed as the teacher to the younger children of the family. His main reading was still history, but he went through all the commonly taught Latin and Greek authors and by the age of 10 could read Plato and Demosthenes with ease. His father also thought that it was important for Mill to study and compose poetry. One of Mill's earliest poetry compositions was a continuation of the Iliad. In his spare time, he also enjoyed reading about natural sciences and popular novels, such as Don Quixote and Robinson Crusoe. His father's work, *The History of British India* was published in 1818: immediately thereafter, at about the age of 12, Mill began a thorough study of the scholastic logic, at the same time reading Aristotle's logical treatises in the original language. In the following year, he was introduced to political economy and studied Adam Smith and David Ricardo with his father, ultimately completing their classical economic view of factors of production. When Mill was 14 years old he went for a year to France and stayed with the family of Sir Samuel Bentham, brother of Jeremy Bentham. The mountain scenery of the place left a lifelong impression on him. In Montpellier, he attended the winter courses on chemistry, zoology, logic of [the *Faculte des Sciences*, and also took a course in higher mathematics. While on his French trip Mill also stayed with the noted economist Jean-

Baptiste Say in Paris. In Paris he was introduced to many notable Parisian intellectuals like Henri Saint-Simon.

The rigorous and exhaustive study that Mill went through at a young age had an effect on Mill's mental and physical health. When Mill was 20 he suffered a nervous breakdown. In his celebrated *Autobiography*. Mill claims that this was caused by the great physical and mental arduousness of his studies which suppressed any feelings he might have developed normally in his childhood. Eventually his health got better and Mill began to find comfort in the poetry of the Romantic poet William Wordsworth and in the *Memoires* of Jean-Francois Marmontel. In the 1820s Mill went on to engage in a pen-friendship with the founder of positivism and sociology Auguste Comte. Comte's *Sociologies* was more an early philosophy of science than we perhaps know it today, and the *positive* philosophy aided in Mill's broad rejection of Benthamism. Mill refused to study at the University of Oxford or the University of Cambridge, because he was not ready to take Anglican orders. Instead he followed his father to work for the East India Company until 1858.

Between the years 1865 and 1868 Mill served as lord Rector of the University of St. Andrews. During the same period, he was a Member of Parliament for the City of Westminster, and often remained associated with the Liberty Party. During his time as a Member of Parliament, Mill advocated easing the burdens on Ireland and in 1866 became the first person in The Parliament (to call for women to be given the right to vote. Mill became a strong advocate of women's rights and social reforms such as labour unions and farm cooperatives. In *Considerations on Representative Government*, J.S. Mill called for various reforms of the parliament and voting, especially proportional representation, the Single Transferable Vote, and the extension of suffrage. He was the godfather to Bertrand Russell. In 1873, he breathed his last, at the age of 67.

Towards the end of his life, he was the acknowledged philosopher leader of British liberalism and in Lord Morley's words one of the greatest teachers of his age. In his thinking, he was greatly influenced by the dialogues and dialectics of Plato and the cross-questioning of Socrates. The poetry of Wordsworth and the philosophical lubrications of Coleridge played their respective roles. An indelible effect on his mind was left by *Treaties on Legislation* written by Dumoulin which contains Bentham's ethical and political speculations. His studies of *Roman law* by John Austin. *Wealth of Nation* by Adam Smith and *Principles* by Ricardo largely affected his reasoning. He imbibed Bentham's principle from his father and from Bentham himself, and he found the principle of utility and the key stone of his beliefs. He outlined in his own words 'I now had a creed, a doctrine, a philosophy, a religion, the inculcation and diffusion of which would be made the principal outward purpose of my life.'

Harriet Taylor, a mother of three who was to become Mill's companion in life, strongly supported equal rights for women and other social reforms. She first met Mill in 1830 at a party in her home and from that point on, she worked constantly with Mill, helping him write and edit his articles and books. After Mill and Harriet Taylor's companionship began, Mill began to make an immediate impact on intellectual world of Britain. Mill wrote the essay *The Spirit of the Age* in 1831. In the essay Mill used history to bring light on the transition from feudalism to a 'new age' that Britain was going through. After his father's death in 1836 Mill took over his father's job at the East India House. The death of Mill Sr. was a sort of liberation for J.S. Mill. He started publishing books on economics and logic - all of which with Harriet's help - which helped Mill to become a far more important philosopher and thinker than his father.

Mill's books on economics critiqued the selfish and single minded pursuit of money. Mill's argument was that the purpose, of wealth must be individuality, i.e..The higher objective of self-

development. Mill's wished for more and more people to become business-owners in a free-market economy. For the working class he advised that they pool in (heir money and buy out private enterprises and operate them as cooperatives. In such cooperatives Mill envisioned that the workers would elect their managers and the wages given to them would be part of the profits of the enterprise. Such a system would allow such cooperatives 10 compete with other privately owned businesses. Mill today is often classified by historians as a Utopian Socialist. However, in his time Mill was an opponent of government central planning. Central planning was something pretty much every European Socialist supported. Rather. Mill's vision was to make every individual a business owner. This he believed would allow the cultivation of the highest objective of man - self-development.

After twenty years of companionship Mill and Harriet finally married in 1851. Unfortunately, tuberculosis resulted in their marriage being cut short. Harriet died of the disease in 1858 while both of them were on a trip to France.

Mill's wife made a deep impact on his life and thinking. He used to call her a perfect embodiment of wisdom, intellect and character. She was a remarkable woman who touched the emotional depth of his nature and provided the sympathy he needed. His exaggerated tributes to her can only be regarded as his cry of anguish alters her death in 1858. Her influence on his work appeared to have been smaller than his thought. She humanized his political economy, and suggested the chapter on *The Probable Futurity of the Laboring Classes*. She helped him in writing *On Liberty*, published in 1859, the year after her death, and she certainly inspired him to write the book *The Subjection of Women*. The other great influence on the minds of Mill proceeded from the discussions and deliberations of the Utilitarian Society and Speculative Debating Society founded by him. The Political Economy Club was also equally important which functioned under his fostering care. It was here that he began his public speaking. It was in these societies and clubs that topics pertaining to utility, logic, political economy and psychotogy were discussed with a view to have clear knowledge about this subjects. He was a prolific writer and he wrote on different branches of knowledge with equal mastery. His famous works are: (i) *System of Logic*(1843); (ii) *Principles of Political Economy* (1848); (iii) *Essay on Some Unsettled Questions in Political Economy*; (iv) *On Liberty* (1859); (v) *Considerations on Representative Government* (1861); (vi) *Utilitarianism* (1865); (vii) *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* (1863); (viii) *The Subjection of Women* (1869). The intellectual prodigy who started his education al a tender age of 3 enriched the philosophical treasures by his clear understanding and deep insight into things. He had a reverence for his intellectual age but with a difference, projecting his own personality and ideas in the prevailing theories. He died in 1873 in Avignon, France.

### **8.1: Views on Equal Rights for Women**

J.S.Mill compares the position of women in society and particularly their position in the marital relationship in the nineteenth century (Victorian society) to that of slaves subject to the will of their masters. In the *Subjection of Women*, Mill argues that marriage is the legal equivalent of slavery. Mill says that “the wife is the actual bondservant of her husband” which is no different from what the law calls slave. This analogy is grounded on the argument that “the wife vows a lifelong obedience to him at the altar, and is held to it all through her life by law”. “She can do no act whatever but by his permission”. “She can acquire no property for herself but for him.”

This is what happens with a slave- belonging to the master, owned by the master as an extension of his property and can be used as the master wishes. However, Mill says that the condition of the wife in the nineteenth century Victorian society is worse than slaves. In fact, women had no right to care about anything except ‘how they may be the most useful and devoted servants of some men’. Women’s capacities were spent ‘seeking happiness not in their own life, but exclusively in

the favour and affection of the other sex, which is only given to them on the condition of their dependence’.

The nineteenth century Victorian society was based on complete patriarchal social relationships. Women were completely subordinated to men. The laws of marriage deprived a woman of many of the normal powers of autonomous adults, from controlling her earnings, to entering contracts, to defending her bodily autonomy by resisting unwanted sexual relations.” The position of married women thus resembled that of slaves on many counts:

The social and economic system was such that women were completely dependent upon men. Therefore, women had little alternative except to marry. Once married, their legal personhood was subsumed in that of her husband. According to the then English Common Law, the spousal unity after marriage makes both man and woman one body. But this one body becomes represented by that of the husband. This eliminated the need for women’s suffrage. There was little or no scope for women to take legal help against the violence by their husbands. Rape was impossible within the marriage. Women were not allowed to own property. However, Mill in his pragmatic principles of liberalism to issues of political and sexual equality for women. He was as much interested in social reforms as in political speculations. His sense of justice was stirred early in his life by the social discrimination meted out to women. In the mid-Victorian period, the condition of the women in the British society was appalling. Mill argued that women's submissive nature was the result of centuries of subjugation and a lack of opportunities. This inequality he regarded as highly unjust. He regarded birth as no basis of excluding women from the rights that they deserve. According to Mill, no person is deliberately created by nature for a particular profession. If women, however, differ from men on the grounds of sex, this distinction should not be made as a basis of distinction everywhere. He was eager to emancipate women and was the first to plead their cause in the parliament. He believed that if women were given equal opportunities to men, the result would be beneficial for women, since freedom alone gives happiness and is valuable to the community in general, since the society would benefit from the contributions made by the mental capacities and characteristics of women. The higher education of women, the increased opportunities open to their talents, and the extension to them of the franchise and eligibility to public office were largely added by his arguments and his efforts. The property she inherits from her parents becomes her husband’s property. Even the children were the husband’s. There were fewer grounds for divorce from the side of the wife. But the husband could keep the wife away for a long time. However, the most apparent feature of ‘slavery’ of women in domestic life during the nineteenth century Victorian society was their lack of sovereignty over their bodies. Mill’s discussion of marital rape is important here. According to him, “by raping ‘his’ wife the husband reinforces his status as ‘owner’ and her status as ‘instrument’.” Morales points out that the slavery analogy is appropriate in this context because, historically, the power of the slave master was not deemed to be complete in the absence of absolute power over the slave’s body. Morales continues to say that this power gave the master the ‘right’ to claim ‘use’ of the slave’s body for his own purposes, whether as a labor instrument or a sexual one. Mill claimed that this same power is given by law to every husband. It is presumed in a patriarchal marriage that the husband has absolute control over the wife’s body. Therefore, while it is considered the exercise of ‘right’ for men to have sex with the wife, it is considered the rendering of a ‘service’ for women.

Mill, tried on improving the position of women in society by providing them with suffrage, education and employment opportunities was a stepping stone to progress and civility. Mill considered the improvement in the position of women as an issue which concerned the whole of

society. In this regard, his work *The Subjection of Women* made a strong claim for women's right to vote and women's right to equal opportunities in education and employment. The two themes that are prevalent throughout the writings of Mill are Liberty and self-determination. Mill believed that freedom was the most spacious and crucial issue for a human's wellbeing. In this context, Mill asserted that women were the subjugated sex who were not given access to their own potential and were subjected to their unquestioned prejudices and biases in society. Mill's main concern was equality as a legal right between the sexes. He referred to women as both the subject and the enslaved class for he believed that their position was worse than that of slaves. According to Mill, unlike slaves, women were in a 'chronic state of bribery and intimidation combined.' He pointed out that the women's capacity was spent in seeking happiness not in their own lives, but exclusively in winning the favour and affection of the other sex, which they gained at the cost of their independence. A woman was not free within her marriage, nor was she free to remain unmarried. He explained how unmarried women in the 19th century were deprived of avenues for living a good and independent life. He deplored the lack of freedom of choice for women and contended that equality should be the ordering principle of societal and personal relationships. He pointed out that opposition to sexual equality was not based on any reason. Mill asserted that to dismiss equality of sexes as a mere theoretical opposition did not lend credibility to the argument that women were weaker and hence subordinate.

Mill also agreed that the majority of the opinions favoured inequality but this he contended went against reason. According to Mill, the way men dominate women was entirely inappropriate and altogether based on force. Women also accepted it voluntarily without any complaint and became consenting parties to their subordination. Men on their part expected not only obedience but also affection from women. This was ensured through education, training and the socialization process. Women from childhood were taught to be submissive, yielding and accommodating, rather than being independent with self-will and self-control. They were taught to live for others, their husband and children. Selfless devotion was considered to be the best feminine trait, the glory of womanhood. In the case of a pre-contractual social arrangement, birth determines one's position and privileges, while the modern society was characterized by the principle of equality. Individuals enjoyed greater freedom of choice to pursue their own life and improve their faculties. However, women continued to be denied of this opportunity, for they were not free to do what they chose to. It seemed paradoxical that the modern world accepted the general social practice of women's equality, but not gender equality. Mill emphatically said that denying women an equal position only demeaned a man. Like Mary Wollstonecraft, he believed that women could earn their liberation with the support of men.

However, Mill extended it by pleading for a relationship based on mutual friendship and respect. He subscribed to the view that by and large the human nature and character were decided by the circumstances in which individuals were found, and unless and until women were granted freedom, they could not express themselves. The process itself could take longer, but that could not be the basis for denying women the freedom and opportunities for their complete development. He believed that women were as bright and gifted as men, and once granted the same 'eagerness for fame', women would achieve the same success. Decision regarding the capacities and talent in women could be made only after generations of women benefited from equal opportunities through education and employment. He rejected the idea that it was natural for a woman to be a mother and wife, and felt that it was the women who should be able to decide whether to marry and manage a house or to pursue a career. He lamented that it was society, however, that decided marriage to be the ultimate aim of women. He articulated and defended the right of women to be considered as a free rational being capable of choosing the life they would like for themselves, rather than being dictated by what the society thought they should be or do. He was of the opinion

that women, even if granted freedom and opportunities, would not fail to perform their traditional functions. When he was a member of the British Parliament, he supported a married women's property bill.

Mill said both the law and the custom prohibited women from seeking any means of livelihood, other than being a mother and a wife. Besides equal opportunity for women in education and property, he also pleaded for political rights to vote and to participate in the government as administrators and rulers. In his book, *The Representative Government*, he commented that the difference of sex could not be the basis of political rights. He desired that the subjection of women be ended not only by the law, but (also by education, opinion, habits and finally a change in the family life itself. In his book, *Principles*, he observed the need to open industrial occupations for both sexes.

Mill saw women's issues as important and began to write in favour of greater rights for women. In his work, *The Subjection of Women*, which was published in 1869, he talks about the role of women in marriage and how he felt that it needed to be changed. In that work Mill comments on three major facets of women's lives that he felt were hindering them: society and gender construction, education and marriage. Mill is also famous for being one of the earliest and strongest supporters of ever greater rights for women. Mill contested and won a seat in The British Parliament in 1865 on a Liberal Party ticket. He used his Parliamentary position as a platform to give voice to his opinions on social and political reform, especially on issues relating to women. As a parliamentarian Mill helped found the first women's suffrage society in Britain in 1867. Many of Mill's speeches in parliament on issues were many years ahead of his time. He had become a parliamentarian on the condition that he would vote according to his conscience, unfortunately, he was defeated for re-election in 1868 after serving only one term.

With the publication of *View on Liberty* in 1859 Mill turned his attention towards reforms in the political sphere. It could be said that many of his political opinions were contradictory in nature. Although Mill was a strong supporter of giving voting rights to all, especially women, he advocated a contentious voting system. Mill wanted a voting system where people with an education had more voting power than those who did not. Moreover, Mill was not a supporter of the public schooling system believing that such a system would enforce social conformity. At the same time he supported government subsidies to parents who could not afford schooling for their children. Mill was also an opponent of slavery, something that Britain had abolished in 1833, and was sympathetic to the American North in the American Civil War. When the American Civil War was raging, Mill wrote that if the American South won then this 'would be a victory of the powers of evil, which would give courage to the enemies of progress'. Mill left the British parliament and published perhaps his most famous work *The Subjection of Women*. The pamphlet in detail delineates Mill's argument for equality for men and women in society. In it Mill stressed that both women and men should have the same rights to develop their individuality. This entailed both men and women having equal rights to their own property, earn a college education, choose any occupation, and participate fully in politics. Mill's position on the rights of women Mill was sharply different from his father. Mill Sr. believed that women should not have a right to vote since their husbands represented them when they voted. J.S. Mill on the other hand stated that a wife's interests are often different from those of her husband, and thus she should have an equal right to vote. *The Subjection of Women* and many other works that preceded it galvanized society and played a huge part in breaking patriarchal mindsets and forcing the male dominated society to finally give in to the demand of women's suffrage.

However, Mill argues that the progress of society requires that all people, men and women, not be imprisoned in the "fixed social position" in which they are born but instead be given opportunities to develop their talents and to pursue their desires as long as they pose no threat to the rights of others. To the naysayer who doubts the potential of women to match the achievements of men in literature, science, government, medicine, education, and the arts, Mill retorts that this is self-serving speculation. The only way to measure the potential of women is to free them from domestic bondage, give them the same opportunities as men, and observe the results. History confirms that Mill's confidence in the outcome was prescient. To the skeptic who opines that the liberation of women will destroy marriage and the family, Mill answers that a marriage which is attractive to women, one based on equality and mutual respect instead of subordination, will prosper indefinitely. To those who argue that authority to make decisions in any organization must ultimately rest in a single person, Mill replies that this is certainly not the case in successful partnerships in business, and that even if it were; this does not mean that the controlling voice on a given matter must be the husband's.

Further, in a nutshell, then, Mill argued nearly 150 years ago that the liberation of women will produce two important results. It will benefit society by triggering the contributions of women in many fields, and it will benefit women by granting them the autonomy that is essential to happiness. In my view he was right on both counts.

## **8.2: Mills view on Individual Liberty**

Mill, in his work *On Liberty* placed much emphasis on individual liberty and its vital role in political society. To Mill, this phrase may be defined as the liberty of the individual to be the final judge over his actions; to decide what is right and wrong and to act upon that standard. On a secondary level, it also implies one's freedom to pursue one's own individuality. Mill believed in a society in which each individual leads his own distinctive life according to his own unique talents; unfettered by regulations upon thought, opinion, actions etc. However, Mill asserts an important caveat; that which he calls 'the very simple principle'. He writes, 'That show more content value of Individual Liberty. Indeed, Mill asserted that the cultivation of one's individuality should be the goal of human existence. He wrote *On Liberty* as an argument against repressive laws which inhibit voluntary association and suppress original ideas and ways of thinking, in a bid to protect the freedom of the individual from stifling social conventions, oppressive legal controls and censorship. In the view of Isaiah Berlin it is generally believed that Mill's *Essay on Liberty* was fundamentally written with the determination of protecting the idea of negative liberty. It is true that Mill advanced a notion of positive liberty but he valued choice and independence as ends in themselves, and not because they promoted general happiness. He did not propose a single all-embracing principle or values which normally attended theories of positive liberty. The theme on liberty was not the absence of restraints but the denial of individual independence by the coercion exercised by moral majority and/or an intrusive public opinion. It is criticized that Mill's linkage between individuality and liberty made him conclude that only a minority were in a position to enjoy freedom. The mainstream of the people remained enslaved in customs, and hence untrue. However, in spite of his elitism, he remained an uncompromising liberal for he ruled out paternalism, the idea that the law and society could intervene in order to do good to the individual. He explicitly ruled out interference in self-regarding actions. Mill slated that the right to liberty could be sacrificed only for some 'other right', a point that has been reiterated by Rawls. However, he tried to analyses and launches a association between freedom and responsibility. It is also argued that Mill failed to specify the proper limits of legislation, and was unclear when it came to

actual cases. Designed for illustration, he reinforced obligatory education, guidelines of business and manufacturing in the interest of public welfare and good, but regarded prohibition as an intrusion on liberty. Barker has criticized Mill as the 'prophet of an empty liberty and an abstract individual'. This observation stemmed from the interpretation that the absolutist statements on liberty like (he rights of one individual against the rest were not authenticated when one accessed Mill's writings in their entirety).

Mill stated that the sole end of mortality is permissible, independently or cooperatively, to affect with the liberty of action of any of their number is self-preservation. However, the sole fortitude for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized communal, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own respectability, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant. He cannot lawfully be obligated to do or refrain because it will be better for him to do so, because it will make him better-off, because, in the opinion of others, to do so would be wise, or even right. The only part of the conduct of anyone, for which they are amenable to the society, is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns them, their independence is absolute. Over himself, and over his own body and mind, the individual is ultimate.

In the same way Mill also pronounces an emotional defense of free speech. For Mill, free speech is a necessary condition for intellectual and social progress. According to Mill, 'We can never be sure that a silenced opinion does not contain some element of the truth'. He also suggests that the airing of false or uninformed opinions is productive for two reasons. Firstly, he states that an open and frank exchange of ideas will result in people abandoning incorrect beliefs. Furthermore, Mill argues that debate forces people to examine and affirm their own opinions and thus prevents these beliefs from diminishing into mere philosophy. In Mill's view, it is simply not good enough if one believes in something that happens to be true; one must also know why the belief in interrogation is accurate.

### **8.3: Views on Individual Liberty and Truth**

Firstly, Mill believes that individual liberty is instrumental in the attainment of truth. No one can claim an infallibility of knowledge or a definite truth. Falsehoods are often sprinkled with specks of truth; and truth may exist as half-truths held by different people, and it is only through controversy that the truth in the parts can be unified into a larger canvas of the ultimate truth. If one's actions were to be censored completely, society would lose those specks of truth amongst the falsehoods, which would be disadvantageous to society. In this connection Mill's in his Essay on Liberty is one of the finest discourses on the definition of freedom in general and freedom of thought and expression in particular. He was an ardent champion of liberty. According to him, free discussion alone can nourish fruitful ideas. He pointed out that not even the whole of humankind can coerce even a single dissentient into accepting the majority's view point as nobody knows that majority views may be incorrect. He said the truth will certainly come out of free discussions, but if somebody's views are suppressed, then not only the truth will never come out, but also that particular individual's development will be retarded. There cannot be any self-realization or self-development of individuals without liberty. He passionately advocated the right of the individual to freedom. In its negative sense, it meant that the society has no right to coerce an unwilling individual, except for self-defense. In his words he is being left to oneself: all restraints qua restraints are an evil.' In its positive sense, it meant the grand of the largest and the greatest amount of freedom for the pursuit of the individual's creative impulses and energies and for self-development. If there is a clash between (he opinion of the individual and that of the community, it is the individual who is the ultimate Judge, unless the community could convince without resorting to threat and coercion. Mill's ideas on liberty had a direct relationship with his theories of utility or happiness. He regarded liberty as a necessary means for the development of

individuality which will become the ultimate source of happiness. There was only one road for him to take and that was the road of higher utility. He has done a distinction between higher and lower utility which may better be understood, respectively, as conducting to the good of the society and the good of individuals. He was keen to good of the society and of the individuals *as well*. Happiness, for Mill, is the ability of individuals to discover their innate powers and develop these while exercising their human abilities of autonomous thought and action. For Mill, happiness means liberty and individually. Liberty is regarded as a fundamental prerequisite for leading a good, worthy and dignified life. J. Gray says. 'The contention of the *Essay on Liberty* is that happiness so conceived is best achieved in a free society governed by the principle of liberty.'

J.S. Mill was a devoted proponent of individual liberty. His essay "On Liberty" remains one of the finest treatises ever written on the idea of freedom. Liberty for him is the life breath of society. However in *On Liberty* Mill recognized numerous natures of authorities. They are reckoned below:

- Freedom of integrity, morality and conscience
- Freedom of understood and sensitivity
- Explanation on the unreserved independence of judgment
- Freedom of communicating and dissemination estimations
- Measures sovereignty to unite, for any purpose
- Authorization of manufacture the disposition of the foolish, perverse, or wrong deeds of the society.

### **8.3.1: Kinds of Liberty:**

Mill identifies two kinds of liberty: negative and positive. In its negative sense, liberty imply non-restriction in the activities of the individual. Positively it implies area within which individuals can use their energies for creative activities and self-development. Mill insisted on the liberty of thought and expression as well as the liberty of conduct. He defended the liberty of thought and expression on two important grounds. In the first place, he argued that it is useful to the society. He asserted that rational knowledge is the basis of social welfare, and the only way of confirming the correctness of the knowledge is to submit all ideas, old and new, to the test of free discussion and debate. In the second place, he advocated the liberty of thought and expression on the grounds of human dignity. On the liberty of conduct, he took another line of argument. He drew a distinction between two types of actions of a man: 'self-regarding actions' and 'other-regarding actions'. He advocated complete freedom of conduct for the individual in all matters not affecting the community, i.e. in the case of 'self-regarding actions'. However, in the case of 'other-regarding actions', i.e. in matters that do affect the community, Mill conceded the right of the community to coerce the individual if his conduct is prejudicial to its welfare. In this way, he defended complete freedom of conduct for the individual unless it adversely affects the community. But the state could also interfere in the self-regarding action if it is thought to be very injurious for an individual. He wrote in his *Essay on Liberty*, 'the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others.' However, Mill discusses liberty broadly under three heads. They are as follow:

1. Firstly, the liberty to thought and expression.
2. Secondly, Liberty of tastes and pursuits.
3. Thirdly, Freedom of Association 'on liberty'. It is essential not only for the development of the individual personality but also for the health and vigor of the society. It is not necessary for its instrumentality in ensuring effective government, but is good for its intrinsic worth. Moreover, it helps in establishing the truth.

### **8.3.2: Views on Self-Regarding and Other-Regarding Actions**

Mill supposed that people should have the right to have a say in the administration's pronouncements. For Mill then Community authorization meant preventive the power of rulers so that they may not be able to use power based on whims and thereby bring harm to society. Mill wrote that social authorization is, 'the nature and limits of the power which can be reasonably exercised by society over the individual'. Mill believed that to bring about this social liberty one needed the recognition of certain invulnerabilities, called political liberties or rights and also by establishing a system which had 'constitutional checks'. While going towards the preventive of a management's power is not enough for Mill. Mill whispered that a civilization can and does execute its own mandates, and if it issues wrong mandates instead of right, or any mandates at all in things with which it ought not to meddle, it results in a social oppression more fearsome than many kinds of dogmatic command, since, though not usually upheld by such dangerous consequences, it leaves fewer means to escape, piercing much more extremely into the details of life, and enslaving the soul the aforementioned.

However, Mill goes on to scrutinize a new unruly that would arise with people being controller of their supervisions. Deeply influenced by the works of Alexi's deTocqueville, especially his Democracy in America, Mill fears that will of the people in democracies would result in the 'will of the majority'. Mill whispered that an oppression of the majority is a huge threat to individual liberty and self-development if the mainstream started acting to oppress underground viewpoints and lifestyles. To overcome this threat, Mill proposed what philosophers today call 'harm principle'. Mill's harm principle stated that, 'the only purpose for which power can be technically exercised over any member of a cultured unrestricted, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. This principle for Mill negates the tyranny of the majority and thus would wedge self-governing preponderances from meddlesome with the authorization of any grown-up unless that person susceptible harm to others. According to Mill, in case of a clash between an individual's opinions with that of the community, the individual will be the ultimate judge unless the community can convince him without threat to violence or coercion. Moreover, he makes differentiation between self-regarding and other- regarding actions. He favored complete freedom of conduct for the individual in the sphere of self- regarding actions unless it was dangerous to him. Individuality revenues the power or capacity for critical investigation and accountable thought. It destined self-development and the countenance of free will. He stressed absolute liberty of conscience, belief and expression for they were crucial to human progress. He presented two arguments for the liberty of expression in the liberty of truth; (i) the dissenting opinion could be true and its suppression would rub humankind of useful knowledge; (ii) even if the opinion was false, it would strengthen the correct view by challenging it. With respect to other-regarding actions, Mill conceded the right of the community to coerce the individual if his conduct was contrary to its welfare.

### **8.3.3: Views on Threats to Liberty**

Mill identifies threat to liberty mainly from two sources one, state laws that could restrict freedom and two, society which expresses the general but unorganized opinion. But, he accepts reasonable interference to individual liberty to prevent harm to other people. Mill suggested the singular threat to an individual's liberty was from the tyranny of the majority in their quest for extreme egalitarianism and social conformity. This made him realize the inadequacy of early liberalism. He pointed out that in the area of thought and discussion the active and inquiring mind had become morally timid, for it concealed the true opinion when discussed in public. He further said, 'our merely

social intolerance kills no one, roots out no public, but induces men to disguise them, or to an extent from any active effort for their diffusion.

### **8.3.4: Criticism the theory of liberty**

1. Mill offers an elitist conception of liberty. For, people enslaved to customs are not free.
2. Barker labels Mill as “a prophet of an empty liberty and an abstract individual”.
3. As an ardent liberal he is more concerned with protecting individual’s private sphere than with common good as people like Green envisaged.
4. Mill’s conception of liberty fails to complement it with claims of peace and order in society.

However, the doctrine of freedom that has become an integral part of every theory on politics is incomplete with J.S. Mill. In fact, he has remained of the reference point for new theorization on the idea of liberty. For, he acknowledges its universal as well as progressive aspect. Mill defended the right of distinctiveness, which means the right of choice. He explained that as far as self-regarding actions are concerned, coercion would be disadvantageous to self-development. First, the evils of coercion far outweighed the good achieved. Second, individuals are so diverse in the needs and capacities for happiness that coercion would be futile. Since individuals are the best judge of their own interest, they possess the information and the incentives to achieve them. Third, since diversity is in itself good, other things being equal, it should be invigorated. Finally, freedom is the most important obligation in the life of a rational person. He contended that positive liberty, i.e. autonomy and self-mastery, is inherently desirable and it is possible if individuals are allowed to develop their own talents and invent their own lifestyles, i.e. a great deal of negative liberty. Hence, he made a strong case for negative liberty, and the liberal state and liberal society are essential prerequisites. Mill justified restricted interference because of his inherent distrust of authority, and especially of democratically controlled authority. His contention was that individuals in democracy are swamped in general. Democracy prevents them from developing their individuality. From the arguments of Mill and his definitions of liberty, it became very clear that he was a reluctant democrat and all the more a prophet of empty liberty. Mill stated that 'liberty consists in what one desires. You would be justified in preventing a man crossing a bridge that you know to be unsafe. Liberty consists in doing what one desires, and he does not desire to fall into the river.' He had gone far towards admitting the extreme idealist contention that one can be forced to be free. C.L. Wayper in his book *Political Thought* elaborates that Bentham must have gyrated in his grave much faster than ever he did from room to room at the thought that his favourite follower could ever contemplate such a non-utilitarian position. Another writer Davidson commenting on Mill's freedom of action writes that his freedom of action or conduct is admirable and his working-out of the theme is skillfully done. But there are certain points that lead themselves to criticism. First, in his argument he identified individual energy with 'genius' or originality. However, he forgot that this energy may be mere eccentricity rather than encouragement. Second, he did not sufficiently recognize that whereas men's desires and impulses are indispensable to the development of their nature, they are not a sure guide to the proper outlet for their activities. Mill observed the liberty of morality, freedom to express and distribute one's opinion, liberty to live as one pleases and the freedom of association essential for a meaningful life and for the pursuit of one's own good. His defense of the freedom of thought and expression was one of the most powerful and

eloquent expositions in the western intellectual tradition. In his words, 'If all humankind minus one were of one opinion, humankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, then he, if he had the power, would be justified in quieting humankind.

#### **8.4: Views on the Representative Government**

Mill inducted his representative Government by stating it as the best form of government is, by examining which form of government fulfills most adequately the purposes of government. For Mill, the point of having a government was that it performed two main functions: it must use the existing qualities and skills of the citizens to best serve their interests, and it must improve the moral, intellectual and active qualities of these citizens. A despotic government may be able to fulfill the first purpose, but will fail in the second. Only a representative government is able to fulfill these two functions. It is a representative government that combines judiciously the two principles of participation and competence which is able to fulfill the two functions of protecting and educating the citizens. Mill originated his conversation of this subject by announcing Bentham's concept of menacing interests. How does representative government ensure that the common interest of society is being furthered instead of the partial and sinister interest of some group or class? Even though Mill distinguished between short term and long term interests, he was certain that every individual and every class is the best judge of its own interests. He scoffed at the idea that some human beings may not be aware of their 'real' interests, retorting that given these persons' current habits and dispositions, what they choose are their real interests. It follows then that participation in the political process must be as extensive as possible, so that every individual has a say in controlling the government and thus protecting his interests. It is on this basis that Mill demanded the right to vote for women. He advocated the extension of the suffrage to cover everyone except those who could not read and write, did not pay taxes. It was this same impetus for wanting everyone to be represented that made Mill support Hare's system of proportional representation for electing deputies to Parliament. Under the current system Mill pointed out, minorities went unrepresented, and since they too needed to protect their interests, another electoral mechanism should be found to ensure their representation. Whereas his belief in participation led him to advocate a widening of the franchise, his belief in competence led him to recommend plural voting.

However, Representative Government is shown to be more coherent and systematic than has generally been assumed. In the first two chapters the author examines separately Mill's views of political participation and competence. He then considers the philosopher's effort to combine participation and competence at any particular time in a theory of government and to reduce conflict between them over time in a theory of development. Basic features of Mill's view are subjected to critical scrutiny, and modifications are suggested to overcome the deficiencies noted. Throughout, Mill's claims are compared with the ideas and findings of recent social science, leading to the conclusion that his theory remains a valuable resource for contemporary thinking about democracy. Mill stated that the best form of government is the representative government. An authoritarian administration however benevolent can never be a good management as its focuses suffer in their knowledgeable, moral and political capacities. There is no such thing as a good dictatorship. An ideal demonstrative government must safeguard the cumulative interest of the society as a whole. The representative government must be supported by any active and critical body of citizens. The government should not be the representative of a minority but of the entire community. The representative body should represent all classes. According to Mill, the first element of a good government was the virtue and intelligence of the human beings composing the community, and it is the foremost duty of the state to foster these elements in the members of the

community. He argues that the sovereign power of the state should reside in the organ of the government which is representative of the people. He was in favour of a representative government, but it does not mean that the representative government could be uniformly applied to all people. This government should be adopted by people who are sufficiently advanced and trained in self-government.

#### **8.4.1: The Principle of Participation**

Mill's enthusiasm for participation pervades the third chapter of *Representative Government*, where he seeks to show "that the only government which can fully satisfy all the exigencies of the social state, is one in which the whole people participate; that any participation, even in the smallest public function, is useful." Mill so warms to the subject that the chapter approaches a vindication of direct democracy; not until the last sentence, which intrudes almost as an afterthought, does Mill dismiss that kind of democracy because it is impracticable except in small towns. Mill of course resists direct democracy for another.

#### **8.4.2: The Principle of Competence**

The principle of competence expresses Mill's belief that a democracy should give as much weight as possible to superior intelligence and virtue in the political process.<sup>1</sup> Ideally, greater participation would realize the aim of the principle of competence by making all citizens competent, but realistically Mill recognizes that special provisions must be made so that competence gets its due in the present operation and the future development of a democracy. Mill does not think that such provisions alter the "fundamentally democratic" character of a constitution; indeed, they are needed to sustain democratic participation itself.

#### **8.4.3: The Theory of Government**

The active citizens are equally and highly competent, the principles of participation and competence may conflict to meet the present situations. If participation becomes more extensive, the influence of the competent minority may decrease; or if the influence of the competent remains strong, participation may not be very extensive. But Mill refuses to reject either principle. He in effect criticizes earlier theorists for failing to recognize that both these principles have an essential role in political theory. Plato's strength, Mill writes, is his belief that government requires special skill or competence, but his weakness is his refusal to recognize the legitimacy of giving political power

#### **8.4.4: The Theory of Development**

The general theory or philosophy of politics," Mill writes, "supposes a previous theory of human progress is the same thing with a philosophy of history." Although Mill never elaborates a theory of this kind in *Representative Government*, he implicitly relies on one at many crucial points in his argument, and he sometimes explicitly appeals to one as well. This chapter explains Mill's view of the nature of such a theory and its significance for his democratic theory. Neither "progress" nor "history," however, is a suitable designation for the theory as Mill uses it in *Representative Government*.

#### **8.4.5: Modern and Traditional Conceptions of Democracy**

Adler and Wolff explain how modern and traditional theories differ in their conceptions of democracy. After observing that *Representative Government* is the first of the great books on

political philosophy to expound the modern theory of democracy and the first one to defend this kind of government as the best form of government, Both Plato and Aristotle were acquainted with forms of government that they called democracies. To them a democratic form of government exists when “the many” rule. However “the many” doesn’t comprise every adult or even every adult male in the state, and so this form of government is democratic only in comparison to the kinds of government to which it is opposed, such as monarchy and oligarchy. However to Mill democracy meant nothing less than universal suffrage.

In addition neither Plato nor Aristotle favours democracy, but Mill unequivocally endorses it. Plato calls it “a charming form of government, full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a sort of equality to equals and unequal’s alike”. And although Aristotle recognizes democracy as better than oligarchy, he calls the form of democracy in which the citizens are very numerous “the...worst form of democracy” But Mill says:“There is no difficulty in showing that the ideally best form of government is that in which the sovereignty, or supreme controlling power in the last resort, is vested in the entire aggregate of the community, every citizen not only having a voice in the exercise of that sovereignty, but being, at least occasionally, called on to take an actual part in the government, by the personal discharge of some public function, local or general” .

#### **8.4.6: The Reason behind the Representative Government according to Mill**

In Representative Government Mill deals with two preliminary problems, the solution of which will help explain why Mill favoured representative government how far governments are subject to human choice and the criteria by which we judge the goodness of a particular form of government. With regard to the first problem, Mill concludes that men can do something about their governments but that not every form of government is possible for every kind of people. He identifies three conditions which must be taken into account in considering whether a form of government is suitable for a given country:

“The people for whom the form of government is intended must be willing to accept it; or at least not so unwilling as to oppose an insurmountable obstacle to its establishment. They must be willing and able to do what is necessary to keep it standing. And they must be willing and able to do what it requires of them to enable it to fulfill its purposes.” He concludes that within the limits set by these three conditions “institutions and forms of government are a matter of choice”. With regard to the second problem, Mill concludes that the best government is one which fulfills the purposes for which governments are established. He then considers what the purposes of government are and concludes: “The merit which any set of political institutions can possess...consists partly of the degree in which they promote the general mental advancement of the community, including under that phrase advancement in intellect, in virtue, and in practical activity and efficiency; and partly of the degree of perfection with which they organize the moral, intellectual, and active worth already existing, so as to operate with the greatest effect on public affairs” . Andrew Hacker stated that Mill tried to reconcile the principle of political equality with individual freedom Mill asserted that all citizens regardless of their status were equal and that only popular sovereignty could give legitimacy to the government. Democracy was good because it made people happier and better. Mill had identified several conditions for the representative government. First, such a government could only function with citizens who were of an 'active self-acting character The must be willing to accept it. The passive citizens in backward civilizations would hardly be able to run a representative democracy. Second, they must be willing and able to do what is necessary to keep it functional. Third, the citizens must be willing and able to do what it requires from them to enable it to fulfill its purpose. Mill was an advocate for liberal democracy where the powers of legally elected majorities were limited by the protection of individual rights against majorities. Mill pleaded for balancing the numerical majority in a

democracy by adjusting franchise. For Mill, it was only through political participation that a citizen's intellectual qualities of reason and judgment are developed. Therefore, People had to be free to be able to participate in the government of their country, the management of their work place and to act as bulwarks against the autocracy of modern-day bureaucracy. This feeling of belonging to a community could only come about if all were granted the right to vote. At the same time Mill worried about the consequences that granting universal adult franchise would entail, namely the trampling of wise and educated minorities by the mass of people. He prescribed compulsory elementary education for that would make citizens wise, competent and independent judges. Mill always emphasized that representative democracy was only possible in a state that was small and homogeneous. Mill also advocated for open ballots for voting. Mill also argues that the representative form of government best fulfills these two purposes and thus is the ideally best form of government. Regarding the former, he claims that the best and happiest kind of person is one who is not content merely to remain what he is but who constantly tries to improve himself and that this active type of character is encouraged by self-government but suppressed in varying degrees by other forms of government. Regarding the latter, he claims that self-government uses the existing good qualities of a people in the best way because it promotes the common good by enlisting the energies of all the people. This just shows the superiority of democracy over other forms of government, but In Mill's third chapter of *On Representative Government*, he outlines his argument for representative government. Firstly, Mill provides a strong rebuttal against the idea of a despotic ruler, or a "leviathan" as Hobbes would write. For Mill, the possibility of a "good despot" is highly unlikely, due to the fact this one individual must be in charge of a vast plane of people and land, know all the goings-on of his state, and have the ability to choose the best men out of the millions in his land to serve their government.

According to J.S. Mill, people may be unwilling or unable to fulfill the duties which a particular form of government requires from them. Rude people, though in some degree alive to the benefits of a civilized society, may be unable to practice the forbearance which it demands: their passions may be too violent, or their personal pride too exacting, to forego private conflicts and leave to the law the avenging of their real or supposed wrongs. In such a case, a civilized government, to be really advantageous to them, requires to be despotic to a considerable degree: to be one over which they do not themselves exercise control, and which imposes a great amount of forcible restraint upon their actions. Again, people who do not cooperate actively with the law and the public authorities in the repression of evil doers must be considered unfit for more than limited and qualified freedom; who are more disposed to shelter a criminal than to apprehend; who perjure themselves to screen those who has robbed them, rather than taking trouble or exposing themselves to vindictiveness by showing evidence against them; and who are revolted by an execution, but not shocked at an assassination require that the public authorities should be armed with much sterner powers of repression than elsewhere, since the first indispensable requisites of civilized life have nothing else to rest on. These deplorable states of feeling in any person who has emerged from savage life, are, no doubt, usually the consequence of the previous bad government, which has taught them to regard the law as made for other ends than their good, and its administrators who are worse enemies than those who openly violate it. However, little blame may be given to those in whom these mental habits have grown up, and those habits may be ultimately conquerable by a better government, yet while they exist people so disposed cannot be governed with as little power exercised over them as people whose sympathies are on the side of the law, and who are willing to give active assistance in its enforcement. Again, representative institutions are of little value, and may be a mere instrument of tyranny or intrigue, when the generality of electors is not sufficiently interested in their own government to give their vote, or, if they vote at all, they do not bestow their suffrages on public grounds, but sell them for money, or vote at the beck of someone who has control over them, or whom for private reasons they desire to propitiate.

Popular election thus practiced, instead of a security against miss movement, is but an additional wheel in its machinery.

However, the most important point of excellence which any form of government can possess is to promote the virtue and intelligence of the people themselves. The first question in respect of any political institutions is how far they tend to foster in the members of the community the various desirable qualities: moral and intellectual, or rather moral, intellectual and activeness. The government that does this the best has every likelihood of being the best in all other respects, since it is on these qualities, so far as they exist in the people, that all possibility of goodness in the practical operations of the government depends. The goodness of a government is measured by the degree by which it tends to increase the sum of good qualities in the governed, collectively and individually; since besides that their well-being is the sole objective of the government, their good qualities supply the moving force which makes the machinery work. The study on Mill's ideas of a representative government reveals that he was a reluctant and distrustful democrat. Besides these moral hindrances, mechanical difficulties are often an insuperable impediment to forms of government. In the ancient world, though there might be, and often was, great individuals or local independence, there could be nothing like a regulated popular government beyond the bounds of a single city community, because there did not exist the physical conditions for the formation and propagation of a public opinion, except among those who could be brought together to discuss public matters in the same agora. This obstacle is generally thought to have ceased by the adoption of the representative system.

A government is said to preserve its orders if it succeeds in getting itself obeyed. But there are different degrees of obedience, and it is not every degree that is commendable. Only an unmitigated despotism demands that the individual citizen shall obey unconditionally every mandate of persons in authority. We must at least limit the definition to such mandates as are general and issued in the deliberate form of laws. Orders, thus understood, express, without any doubt, an indispensable attribute of the government. Those who are unable to make their ordinances obeyed cannot be said to be governing. Although a necessary condition, this is not the objective of the government. That it should make itself obeyed is a requisite, in order that it may accomplish some other purpose.

It is a quality in which different nations, and different stages of civilization, substantially differ from one another. The capability of any individual of fulfilling the conditions of a given form of government cannot be pronounced by any sweeping rule. Knowledge of particular people, and general practical judgment and sagacity, must be the guides. There is also another consideration not to lose sight of. People may be unprepared for good institutions, but to kindle a desire for them is a necessary part of the preparation. To recommend and advocate a particular institution or form of government, and set its advantages in the strongest light, is one of the modes, often the only mode within the reach of educating the mind of the nation not only for accepting or claiming, also for running the institution. But this mode of stating the problem gives less aid to its investigation than might be supposed, and does not even bring the whole of the question into view. For, in the first place, the proper functions of a government are not fixed, but vary from state to state in a society, much more extensive in a backward than in an advanced state. Second, the character of a government or set of political institutions cannot be sufficiently estimated while we confine our attention to the legitimate sphere of governmental functions. Though the goodness of a government is necessarily circumscribed within that sphere, its badness unhappily is not.

Thus, on Representative Government, Mill outlines his argument for representative government. Firstly, Mill provides a strong rebuttal against the idea of a despotic ruler, or a "leviathan" as Hobbes would write. For Mill, the possibility of a "good despot" is highly unlikely, due to the fact

this one individual must be in charge of a vast plane of people and land, know all the goings-on of his state, and have the ability to choose the best men out of the millions in his land to serve their government. Mill argues political participation allows for greater education; an idea that echoes somewhat of Rousseau's participatory democracy in the Social Contract for Mill, this education must begin at local level, before one participates in national politics. However, unlike Rousseau, Mill does not see democracy as being fully participatory. Rousseau wrote his Social Contract from the perspective of a Genevan: at the time a city-state like the ancient democracies of Greece, Geneva was one of the democracies in which it was possible for the populace to become involved in each of the political issues raised in the city.

However, Mill's critique of Rousseau stems from the size to which democracies in the 19th century had reached, and so Mill believes representative government, with a high amount of participation, to be of most practical benefit to the democracy, but also to the citizenry. In such a system, sovereignty would remain vested in the people, not a despot, and the citizen would be called upon "occasionally" to allow his voice to be heard in the government. These opportunities would allow for Bentham's ideas of utilitarianism to be actualized, whereby the citizen can pursue his pleasures, but also minimize his pains by raising his voice against infringements on his rights and liberties. Therefore, we conclude that Mill agrees with Rousseau in that participation has a moral and intellectual benefit to the individual, and allows for the defense of his rights and liberties, but realizes the problems that arise with direct or participatory democracy in the larger states of the 19th century in which Mill was writing. The second question Mill raises is how to best allow the voices of each section of a society to be heard, and so guard against a tyranny of the majority. "Tyranny of the majority" is a term most closely associated with Mill, but which has strong ties to Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* a book which Mill praised highly. De Tocqueville noted in his writings of the power exercised by the majority in America, and how the American system of government actually allowed the majority to thrive: the majority were able to decide who was put in power, at legislative and executive level; the majority set the agenda on how politicians acted, for the latter would be moved to appeal to the majority so as to be re-elected; and the majority had greater say over the definitions of right and wrong over the individual.

#### **8.4.7: Views on Happiness and Higher Pleasures**

Mill also disagrees with the Radicals about the nature of happiness. Though he never abandons the utilitarian tradition of the Radicals, Mill modifies their assumptions about happiness. He explains his commitment to utilitarianism early in Chapter II of *Utilitarianism*. The creed which accepts as the foundations of morals "utility" or the "greatest happiness principle" holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness; wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By happiness are intended pleasure and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain and the privation of pleasure.

This famous passage is sometimes called the Proportionality Doctrine. It sounds like Bentham. The first sentence appears to endorse utilitarianism, while the second sentence appears to endorse a hedonistic conception of utilitarianism. Hedonism implies that the mental state of pleasure is the only thing having intrinsic value (and the mental state of pain is the only intrinsic evil). All other things have only extrinsic value; they have value just insofar as they bring about, immediately or directly, intrinsic value (or disvalue). It follows that actions, activities, etc. can have only extrinsic value, and it would seem that their value should depend entirely upon the quantity of pleasure that they produce, where quantity is a function of the number of pleasures, their intensity, and their duration. This would mean that one kind of activity or pursuit is intrinsically no better than another. If we correctly value one more than another, it must be because the first produces more

numerous, intense, or durable pleasures than the other. Mill worries that some will reject hedonism as a theory of value or happiness fit only for swine. In particular, he worries that opponents will assume that utilitarianism favors sensual or voluptuary pursuits over higher or nobler pursuits. Mill attempts to reassure readers that the utilitarian can and will defend the superiority of higher pleasures.

If I am asked what I mean by difference of quality in pleasures, or what makes one pleasure more valuable than another, merely as a pleasure, except its being greater in amount, there is but one possible answer. If one of the two is, by those who are competently acquainted with both, placed so far above the other that they prefer it, even though knowing it to be attended with a greater amount of discontent, and would not resign it for any quantity of the other pleasure which their nature is capable of, we are justified in ascribing to the preferred enjoyment a superiority in quality so far outweighing quantity as to render it, in comparison, of small account.

This certainly goes beyond Bentham's quantitative hedonism. In fact, it is not even clear that Mill's higher pleasures doctrine is consistent with hedonism. Mill's position here is hard to pin down, in part because he uses the term 'pleasure' sometimes to refer to (a) a certain kind of mental state or sensation and at other times to refer to (b) non-mental items, such as actions, activities, and pursuits that do or can cause pleasurable mental states (consider the way in which someone might say that surfing was her greatest pleasure). We might call (a)-type pleasures subjective pleasures and (b)-type pleasures objective pleasures. What's unclear is whether Mill's higher pleasures are subjective pleasures or objective pleasures. His discussion concerns activities that employ our higher faculties. What's unclear is whether higher pleasures refer to mental states or sensations caused by higher activities or the activities themselves.

It might seem clear that we should interpret higher pleasures as subjective pleasures. After all, Mill has just told us that he is a hedonist about happiness. The Radicals may not have always been clear about the kind of mental state or sensation they take pleasure to be, but it seems clear that they conceive of it as some kind of mental state or sensation. Some, like Bentham, appear to conceive of pleasure as a sensation with a distinctive kind of qualitative feel. Others, perhaps despairing of finding qualia common to all disparate kinds of pleasures, tend to understand pleasures functionally, as mental states or sensations the subject, whose states these are, prefers and is disposed to prolong. James Mill held something like this functional conception of pleasure (*An Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind II*, p. 184). Pleasures, understood functionally, could have very different qualitative feels and yet still be pleasures. Insofar as Mill does discuss subjective pleasures, he is not clear which, if either, of these conceptions of pleasure he favors. Nonetheless, it may seem natural to assume that as a hedonist he conceives of pleasures as subjective pleasures. According to this interpretation, Mill is focusing on pleasurable sensations and then distinguishing higher and lower pleasures by references to their causes. Higher pleasures are pleasures caused by the exercise of our higher faculties, whereas lower pleasures are pleasures caused by the exercise of our lower capacities. But this interpretation of the higher pleasures doctrine is problematic.

One concern is raised by Henry Hedonism is committed to the idea that one pleasure is better than another because it is more pleasurable. But this sounds like a quantitative relation. If higher pleasures are better than lower pleasures, but not because they involve a greater quantity of pleasure, how can this be squared with hedonism? One answer is that Mill thinks that there are two factors affecting the magnitude of a pleasure: its quantity, as determined by its intensity and

duration, and its quality or kind. On this proposal, one pleasure can be greater than another independently of its quantity by virtue of its quality.

We can distinguish among pleasures between those that are caused by the exercise of our higher faculties and those that are caused by the exercise of our lower faculties. But why should this difference itself affect the pleasurable nature of the state in question? If Mill holds a preference or functional conception of pleasure, according to which pleasures are mental states that the subject prefers and other things being equal would prolong, then perhaps he could claim that pleasures categorically preferred by competent judges are more pleasurable pleasures. However, he says that competent judges have this preference for the higher pleasure, “even though knowing it to be attended with a greater amount of discontent” (U II 5). This suggests that higher pleasures may not be more pleasurable even for competent judges, and in any case it's not clear we could infer what was more pleasurable for someone who was not a competent judge from what was more pleasurable from someone who was. So, even if we can distinguish higher and lower pleasures, according to their causes, it remains unclear how the hedonist is to explain how higher pleasures are inherently more pleasurable.

However, a related concern is how this interpretation of the higher pleasures doctrine makes sense of Mill's contrast between happiness and contentment or satisfaction. After explaining higher pleasures in terms of the categorical preferences of competent judges and insisting that competent judges would not trade any amount of lower pleasures for higher pleasures, he claims that this preference sacrifices contentment or satisfaction, but not happiness. Mill does not say that the preference of competent judges is for one kind of contentment over another or that Socrates has more contentment than the pig or fool by virtue of enjoying a different kind of contentment. Instead, he contrasts happiness and contentment and implies that Socrates is happier than the fool, even if less contented.

Insofar as Mill's higher pleasures doctrine concerns objective pleasures, it appears anti-hedonistic for two reasons. First, he claims that the intellectual pursuits have value out of proportion to the amount of contentment or pleasure (the mental state) that they produce. This would contradict the traditional hedonist claim that the extrinsic value of an activity is proportional to its pleasurable nature. Second, Mill claims that these activities are intrinsically more valuable than the lower pleasures. But the traditional hedonist claims that the mental state of pleasure is the one and only intrinsic good; activities can have only extrinsic value, and no activity can be intrinsically more valuable than another.

## 8.5: Let us sum up

- *Jeremy Bentham* generally acknowledged as the originator of utilitarian Philosophy. He is the philosopher, jurist, social reformer and the famous social activist and a distinctive artist of the utility. He is most popularly associated with the concept of utilitarianism. An ethical theory which states that the right course of action is the one that maximizes the overall 'good' consequences of the action; it thus promotes that the moral worth of an action is determined by its resulting outcome
- He is often seen in relation with the foundation of the University of London specifically University College of London (UCL). The period from the early 1770s to the mid-1780s can be seen as marking an important phase of development of Bentham's ideas. During

this time, he concentrated on trying to comprehend the rational basis of law, in England as well as in and other countries.

- He is one of the most significant utilitarian, whose philosophies were brought to the fore through his works and that of his students. Here we have his secretary and collaborator on the utilitarian school of philosophy, James Mill; James Mill's son J. S. Mill; John Austin, legal philosopher; and several political leaders, including Robert Owen, a founder of modern socialism.
- Utilitarianism, conceived as a school of thought dominated English political thinking from the middle of the 18th century to the middle of the 19th century. Francis Hutcheson, Hume, Helvetius, Priestly, William Paley and Beccaria were some of the early utilitarians. However, it was Bentham who is credited with systematically working to establish the theory and render it popular on the basis of his endless proposals for reform.
- As a leading an ascetic life, he is given that saints were idlers and he is to be seen as having regarded asceticism with contempt. He looked down upon spiritualism and claimed that spiritualism glorified unhappiness and distrusted pleasure
- He lent a scientific shape to the pleasure - pain theory, and conveyed it in presentation in the framework of the guidelines of the government, welfare measures, and the administrative, penal and legislative reforms and innovations. Bentham pointed out that human beings are creatures of feeling and sensibility; since reason is only a handmaid of feeling or passion, all experiences are either pleasurable or painful and (that action is good which increases pleasure and decreases pain, whereas, that action is bad which decreases pleasure and increases pain.
- His *Principles of Legislation* highlights the principle of utility and explains the way this view of morality feeds into legislative practices. His principle of utility hails 'good' as that which aids the production of the greatest amount of pleasure and the minimum amount of pain, while 'evil' is conceived as that which produces the most pain without the pleasure.
- Pleasure and pain can be quantitatively and arithmetically calculated and measured, and a comparison can be drawn between the two qualities. In order to gauge pleasure and pain, he advocated the doctrine of felicific calculus.
- Bentham said about the modern state is to be viewed as an ideal, and an aspiration which examines the performance of state building and the method that would sponsor reconstruction.
- J.S. Mill is one of the greatest and most enlightened champions of individualism and individual liberty, and ranks with Milton, Voltaire, Rousseau, Paine and Jefferson. He observed that the existence of a state depends on the all round development of its individuals. He came up with ideas and devices geared to guarantee governmental protection of individual interest, ensuring that public happiness should be seen as the object of public policy.
- There is no denying the fact that J.S. Mill was a great man and a great political thinker. His contribution to the growth of political thought is really remarkable. Mill through his writings gave a new direction to the utilitarian tenants so as to enable them to be acceptable in the high political and intellectual circles in particular and the masses in general,
- One of the most significant aspects of Bentham's political philosophy is located in the sphere of jurisprudence and reforms in criminal law and prison.
- J.S. Mill is one of the greatest liberals and individualists in the history of political thought. The state, according to him, exists for the individual and not the individual for the state.
- J.S. Mill's contribution remains unparalleled in history so far his recognition of the value of human personality and his insistence on the development of a full individual as the goal of the government is concerned.

- He is one of the greatest and most progressive supporters of distinctiveness and specific liberty, like Milton, Voltaire, Rousseau, Paine and Jefferson. He investigated that the presence of a state depends on the all-round development of its personalities

### 8.6: Possible questions

1. Give a brief life sketch of Bentham and his philosophy.
2. Discuss the Pleasure and pain theory of utilitarianism.
3. Examine Bentham's contribution to political philosophy.
4. Draft the life of J.S. Mill in your own words.
5. Examine J.S. Mill as a political thinker and champion of political liberty
6. Critically examine Mill's concept of liberty.
7. Discuss Mill's contributions towards the emancipation of women.
8. Discuss the Principle of greatest happiness of the greatest number stated by Bentham.
9. Discuss Mills view on Representative Government.
10. Discuss the role of women in Bentham Philosophy.

### 8.7: Further reading

- Spencer, H., 1896, *The Principles of Sociology*, 3 vols. New York: Appleton.
- Stephen, J.F., 1874, *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Stephen, L., 1900, *The English Utilitarians*, vols. I–III, New York: Augustus Kelley, 1968.
- Sturgeon, N., 2010, “Mill's Hedonism,” *Boston University Law Review*, 90: 1705–29
- Sumner, W., 1996, *Welfare, Happiness, & Ethics*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ten, C.L., 1980, *Mill on Liberty*, Oxford: Clarendon Press. Parekh, Bhikhu (ed.), 1993. *Jeremy Bentham: Critical Assessments*. London: Routledge.
- Sabire, G H. 1973. *A History of Political Theory*. New Delhi: Oxford- IBH.
- Smith GW. 1998. *John Stuart Mill's Social and Political Thought: Critical Assessments*. London; Routledge.
- Feldman, F., 2004, *Pleasure and the Good Life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gray, J., 1983, *Mill on Liberty: A Defence*, London: Routledge.
- Green, T.H., 1883, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, D. Brink (ed.), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003.
- Hall, E., 1949, “The ‘Proof’ of Utility in Bentham and Mill,” *Ethics*, 60: 1–18.
- Hare, R.M., 1981, *Moral Thinking: Its Levels, Methods, and Point*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hart, H.L.A., 1963, *Law, Liberty, and Morality*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Zakaras Alex and Urbinati Nadia. 2007. 7.5. *Mill's Political Thought: A Bicentennial Reassessment*. New Delhi: Cambridge University Press.