

Political Thought

BA - Political Science

I Year

Paper Code: BAPS 1914



Pondicherry University

(A Central University)

Directorate of Distance Education

R.V. Nagar, Kalapet, Puducherry – 605 014

Advisory Committee

1. Prof. Gurmeet Singh
*Vice-Chancellor,
Pondicherry University.*
2. Prof. Rajeev Jain
*OSD, C&CR,
Pondicherry University.*
3. Prof. C.K. Ramaiah
*Director, Directorate of Distance Education,
Pondicherry University.*

Reviewer Committee

1. Prof. C.K. Ramaiah
*Director, DDE,
Pondicherry University.*
2. Prof. A. Subramanyam Raju
*Programme Coordinator,
Centre for South Asian Studies,
Pondicherry University.*

Academic Support Committee

1. Dr. A. Punitha
*Asst. Professor, DDE,
Pondicherry University.*
2. Dr V. Umasri
*Asst. Professor, DDE,
Pondicherry University.*
3. Dr. Sk. Md. Nizamuddin
*Asst. Professor, DDE,
Pondicherry University.*

Administrative Support Committee

1. Lt Cdr Raj Kumar
*Deputy Registrar, DDE,
Pondicherry University.*
2. Dr. Arvind Gupta
*Asst. Director, DDE,
Pondicherry University.*

COURSE WRITER

Pratap Kumar Lenka, HOD, Political Science, Biju Pattanaik College, Jagatsinghpur, Odisha.

- © This book may not be duplicated in any way without the written consent of the publisher and Pondicherry University except in the form of brief excerpts or quotations for the purpose of review. The information contained herein is for the personal use of the DDE students, Pondicherry University and may not be incorporated in any commercial programs, other books, databases, or any kind of software without written consent of the publisher. Making copies of this book or any portion, for any purpose other than your own is a violation of copyright laws. The author and publisher have used their best efforts in preparing this book and believe that the content is reliable and correct to the best of their knowledge.

Printed and Published by:

Mrs. Meena Pandey

Himalaya Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.,

"Ramdoot", Dr. Bhalerao Marg, Girgaon, Mumbai - 400 004.

Phone: 022-23860170, 23863863; **Fax:** 022-23877178

E-mail: himpub@bharatmail.co.in; **Website:** www.himpub.com

For:

Pondicherry University

Directorate of Distance Education,

R.V. Nagar, Kalapet, Puducherry – 605 014.

Tel. 0413-2654 439/440; E-mail: director.dde@pondiuni.edu.in

Website: <https://dde.pondiuni.edu.in>

SYLLABUS - BOOK MAPPING TABLE

Political Thought

Syllabus	Mapping in Book
Unit I: Greek Political Thought <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Salient Features of Greek Political Thought (b) Plato's Republic: Ideal State; Education and Communism, Justice (c) Aristotle's Politics: Classification of Governments; The Best Practicable State; Cause of Revolution 	Unit I: Greek Political Thought (Pages 1 - 50)
Unit II: Medieval Political Thought <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Salient Features of Medieval Political Thought (b) St. Thomas Aquinas: Church, State and Law (c) Machiavelli: State Sovereignty; Power Politics; Separation of Ethics and Politics 	Unit II: Medieval Political Thought (Pages 51 - 74)
Unit III: Early Modern Political Thought <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Thomas Hobbes: State of Nature, Social Contract of Sovereignty of the Leviathan (b) John Locke: State of Nature; Social Contract, Natural Rights: The Idea of Limited Government (c) J.J. Rousseau: State of Nature, Social Contract, General Will 	Unit III: Early Modern Political Thought (Pages 75 - 106)
Unit IV: Later Modern Political Thought <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Bentham: Utilitarianism; Political and Legal Reforms (b) J.S. Mill: On Liberty; Representative Government; Women's Rights (c) Karl Marx: Dialectical Materialism; Class Struggle; Proletarian Revolution Historical Materialism 	Unit IV: Later Modern Political Thought (Pages 107 - 140)
Unit V: Indian Political Thought <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Kautilya: Theory of Kingship; Amoral Statecraft; Mandal Theory (b) M.K. Gandhi, Ahimsa; Satyagraha; Swaraj; Village Democracy; Trusteeship (c) Sir Syed Ahmad Khan: Compulsions of his Times: Collaboration with the British; Avoidance of Imitational Politics; Concentration on Education and Social Reforms 	Unit V: Indian Political Thought (Pages 141 - 192)

CONTENTS

Unit I: Greek Political Thought

1 – 50

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Salient Features of Greek Political Thought
- 1.3 Plato
 - 1.3.1 Plato's Republic
 - 1.3.2 Ideal State of Plato
 - 1.3.3 Rule of Philosopher King
 - 1.3.4 Plato's Second Best State
 - 1.3.5 Plato's Views on Education
 - 1.3.6 Plato's Views on Communism
 - 1.3.7 Plato's Theory of Justice
 - 1.3.8 Contribution of Plato to the Political Philosophy
- 1.4 Aristotle
 - 1.4.1 The Politics of Aristotle
 - 1.4.2 Classification of Government Material
 - 1.4.3 The Best Practicable State
 - 1.4.4 Aristotle's Ideal State vs. Plato's Second Best State
 - 1.4.5 Aristotle's Theory of Revolution
 - 1.4.6 Aristotle's Contribution to the Political Thought
 - 1.4.7 Comparison between Aristotle and Plato
- 1.5 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 1.6 Summary
- 1.7 Key Terms
- 1.8 Self-Assessment Questions and Exercises
- 1.9 References

Unit II: Medieval Political Thought

51 – 74

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Salient Features of Medieval Political Thought
- 2.3 St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274 A.D.)
 - 2.3.1 Thomas Aquinas' Views on Church
 - 2.3.2 Thomas Aquinas' Views on State
 - 2.3.3 Relations between Church and the State
 - 2.3.4 Thomas Aquinas' Views on Law
 - 2.3.5 Contributions to Political Thought

- 2.4 Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527 A.D.)
 - 2.4.1 Machiavelli's Method
 - 2.4.2 Factors Influencing the Thinking of Machiavelli
 - 2.4.3 Machiavelli on Human Nature
 - 2.4.4 Machiavelli's Views on State Sovereignty
 - 2.4.5 Machiavelli on Power Politics
 - 2.4.6 Separation Ethics and Politics
 - 2.4.7 Machiavelli's Contribution to Political Thought
 - 2.4.8 Position of Machiavelli on Political Thought
- 2.5 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.6 Summary
- 2.7 Key Terms
- 2.8 Self-Assessment Questions and Exercises
- 2.9 References

Unit III: Early Modern Political Thought

75 – 106

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Thomas Hobbes
 - 3.2.1 Methodology of Hobbes
 - 3.2.2 Hobbes' Views on Human Nature, State of Nature and Social Contract
 - 3.2.3 Hobbes' Concept of Sovereignty of the Leviathan
 - 3.2.4 Hobbes and Individualism
 - 3.2.5 Contribution of Hobbes of Political Thought
- 3.3 John Locke
 - 3.3.1 The Social Contract Theory of John Locke
 - 3.3.2 Locke's Idea of Limited Government
 - 3.3.3 Natural Rights of John Locke
 - 3.3.4 Locke on Revolution
 - 3.3.5 Locke on Property
 - 3.3.6 Locke and Liberalism
 - 3.3.7 Contribution of John Locke to the Political Thought
- 3.4 Jean Jacques Rousseau
 - 3.4.1 Rousseau's Idea on Social Contract
 - 3.4.2 Rousseau's General Will
 - 3.4.3 Rousseau's Views on Sovereignty
 - 3.4.4 Contribution of Rousseau to Political Thought

- 3.4.5 Comparison of the Views of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau
- 3.5 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 3.6 Summary
- 3.7 Key Terms
- 3.8 Self-Assessment Questions and Exercises
- 3.9 References

Unit IV: Later Modern Political Thought

107 – 140

- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Jeremy Bentham
 - 4.2.1 Bentham's Views on Utilitarianism
 - 4.2.2 Political and Legal Reforms Suggested by Bentham
 - 4.2.3 Bentham's Contribution to Modern Political Thought
- 4.3 John Stuart Mill
 - 4.3.1 Mill's Ideas on Liberty
 - 4.3.2 Mill on Representative Government
 - 4.3.3 Mill on Women's Right
 - 4.3.4 Mill on Democracy
 - 4.3.5 Contribution of J.S. Mill to Western Political Thought
- 4.4 Karl Marx
 - 4.4.1 Dialectical Materialism of Karl Marx
 - 4.4.2 Historical Materialism of Karl Marx
 - 4.4.3 Karl Marx's Theory of State
 - 4.4.4 Theory of Surplus Value
 - 4.4.5 Karl Marx's Views on Class Struggle
 - 4.4.6 Marx's Views on Proletarian Revolution
 - 4.4.7 Dictatorship of the Proletariat
 - 4.4.8 Karl Marx on Religion
- 4.5 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 4.6 Summary
- 4.7 Key Terms
- 4.8 Self-Assessment Questions and Exercises
- 4.9 References

Unit V: Indian Political Thought

141 – 192

- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Kautilya

- 5.2.1 Arthashastra of Kautilya
- 5.2.2 Social Order of Kautilya
- 5.2.3 Theory of Statecraft
- 5.2.4 Theory of Kingship
- 5.2.5 Concept of Law
- 5.2.6 Concept of Justice
- 5.2.7 Mandal Theory
- 5.2.8 Theory of Danda (Punishment)
- 5.2.9 Kautilya's Foreign Policy
- 5.2.10 Relationship between Ethics and Politics
- 5.3 M.K. Gandhi
 - 5.3.1 Ends and Means Relationship
 - 5.3.2 Gandhi on Ahimsa or Non-violence
 - 5.3.3 Gandhi on Satyagraha
 - 5.3.4 Gandhi on Sarvodaya
 - 5.3.5 Gandhi on Swadeshi
 - 5.3.6 Gandhi on Swaraj
 - 5.3.7 Gandhi on Village Democracy/Gram Swaraj
 - 5.3.8 Gandhi's Views on Trusteeship
 - 5.3.9 Gandhi on State (Ram Rajya)
 - 5.3.10 Ends and Means Relationship
 - 5.3.11 Gandhi on Nationalism and Internationalism
 - 5.3.12 Relevance of Gandhism
 - 5.3.13 Western Modernity of Gandhism
- 5.4 Sir Syed Ahmad Khan
 - 5.4.1 Compulsions of his Times
 - 5.4.2 Collaboration with British
 - 5.4.3 Avoidance of Imitational Politics
 - 5.4.4 Social and Educational Reforms
 - 5.4.5 Two Nation Theory
- 5.5 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 5.6 Summary
- 5.7 Key Terms
- 5.8 Self-Assessment Questions and Exercises
- 5.9 References

Unit I Greek Political Thought

Learning Objectives:

After studying this unit, you should be able to understand

- Salient Features of Ancient Greek Political Thought
- Life history of Plato and the environment that compelled him to be a philosopher
- Analysis of Plato's Republic, the greatest work of Plato
- Ideal State of Plato and Role of the Philosopher King
- Plato's Theory of Education
- Plato's Theory of Communism
- Plato's Theory of Justice
- Contribution of Plato to the Political Thought
- Life history and the environment that compelled Aristotle to be a Political Philosopher
- Analysis of 'The Politics', the greatest work of Aristotle
- Classification of Government
- The Best Practicable State of Aristotle i.e., Ideal State of Aristotle
- Aristotle's Theory of Revolution
- Aristotle's view on Slavery, Citizenship and Property
- A comparison between Aristotle and Plato

Structure:

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Salient Features of Greek Political Thought
- 1.3 Plato
 - 1.3.1 Plato's Republic
 - 1.3.2 Ideal State of Plato
 - 1.3.3 Rule of Philosopher King
 - 1.3.4 Plato's Second Best State
 - 1.3.5 Plato's Views on Education
 - 1.3.6 Plato's Views on Communism
 - 1.3.7 Plato's Theory of Justice
 - 1.3.8 Contribution of Plato to the Political Philosophy
- 1.4 Aristotle
 - 1.4.1 The Politics of Aristotle

NOTES

- 1.4.2 Classification of Government Material
- 1.4.3 The Best Practicable State
- 1.4.4 Aristotle's Ideal State vs. Plato's Second Best State
- 1.4.5 Aristotle's Theory of Revolution
- 1.4.6 Aristotle's Contribution to the Political Thought
- 1.4.7 Comparison between Aristotle and Plato
- 1.5 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 1.6 Summary
- 1.7 Key Terms
- 1.8 Self-Assessment Questions and Exercises
- 1.9 References

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Western Political Thought particularly the Greek Political thought is considered as one of the oldest Political Philosophy which has been preserved by the world. Barker goes to the extent of suggesting that "Political thought begins with the Greeks. Its origin is connected with the calm and clear rationalism of the Greek mind." Plato and Aristotle are two celebrated Political Philosophers. Plato, a follower of Socrates and a teacher of Aristotle, is one of ancient Greece's finest philosophers. Plato's ideas were communicated through dialogues and lectures. He was one of the greatest logicians and dialecticians of the west and tried to eradicate the prevailing false beliefs. Plato's political thought was greatly influenced by the contemporary intellectual climate and particularly by the ideas of predecessors like Pythagoras, Heraclitus and Socrates. 'The Republic' is the greatest work of Plato and presents his thought fully.

Aristotle, the ablest of Plato's disciples wrote extensively on subjects like metaphysics, psychology, poetry, biology, moral science, politics etc. But we are primarily concerned with his political writings. In this regard also we are greatly handicapped in so far as most of the works produced by Aristotle in the early part of his life have since perished. The only important work of Aristotle which has come down to us and provides valuable information about his political philosophy is 'Politics'. 'The Politics' has been described as a "treatise on the science and art of government." Aristotle in his book 'The Politics' first developed a systematic study of political science. So, Aristotle is regarded as the Father of Political Science.

1.2 SALIENT FEATURES OF GREEK POLITICAL THOUGHT

Some of the important features of the Ancient Greek Political Thought are:

1. **Exclusively Political Treatise:** The Ancient Greek Political Thought differs from the political thought of other ancient countries like Egypt,

NOTES

India, China, Babylonia etc. in so far as the political ideas in these countries were never presented in treatises which are purely political in nature. The political ideas of other countries except Greek were the mixture of the mythology and other religious literature. For example in India, the Ramayan, the Mahabharat and Manusmriti deal with political problems which are not totally political treatises but religious scriptures. But in Greek political thought, there were existence of number of independent treatises which were exclusively concerned with political problems.

2. **Concentration on Nature of state:** Another distinguishing trait of ancient Greek political thought is that it was primarily concerned with the nature of the state and the notion that man is a political animal. Political intellectuals at the time were not concerned with issues such as the state's relationship with the church or the state's relationship with industry, which later thinkers addressed. Because they saw man as a social animal, they didn't see him as an isolated or self-contained entity. They were continually attempting to comprehend man in terms of the social whole, i.e. the state. The state, unsurprisingly, became the focus of Greek political thinkers. They examined the beginning and end of states, as well as the differences between various types of states such as monarchy, aristocracy, oligarchy, democracy, and tyranny.
3. **Social Nature of Man:** The Greek Political Thinkers placed a strong focus on man's social nature. They saw the state as important both for the purpose of life and for the sake of a happy life. They never considered an individual as an isolated and independent unit. To them an individual could attain perfection only in a healthy state.
4. **The City-state:** Another distinguishing element of Greek political thought was that it was centred on city-states, in which a society of men lived together. The city-state had a fully functional social structure in which individuals actively participated. The distinction between the state and society was not made by Greek political theorists. Similarly, the city-state was not dissimilar to the church. It was the be-all and end-all of its citizens' activities, encompassing all of the citizens' collective actions. The city-state was a whole outside which members could not be envisaged.
5. **Importance of Education:** The Greek Political Thinkers attached great importance to education. They emphasised the necessity of education in bringing people up to speed with the constitution's spirit. They emphasised the importance of a practical educational system that may aid in the promotion of modesty, self-control, patriotism, sociability, and other comparable attributes. To them, the state was responsible for the promotion of education among the citizens. They saw the state as both a moral and a political institution, as well as an educational one. They emphasised the importance of a state-controlled educational system.

NOTES

6. **Concept of Law:** The belief in reason was inextricably related to the Greek concept of law. Law was seen by Greek thinkers as the state's life-breath, since it characterised the state of rational being. Law was inspired by divine power, and law was also a manifestation of God. Law and justice are two sides of the same coin to them. They also viewed justice to be what is done in accordance with the law.
7. **Rationalism:** In their thinking, the Greek Political Thinkers gave rationality a prominent place. They believed that reason is the essence of providence, and that a man is only free as long as he has the ability to reason freely. The man's reason enabled him to identify with corporate life while ignoring his own interests. As a result, the Greek intellectuals placed a high value on reason and were opposed to accepting anything that was not justified by reason.
8. **Importance of Justice:** In Ancient Greek political thought, justice played a significant role. The celebrated Greek Philosopher Plato says "Justice was the virtue of soul and injustice its vice". Justice was regarded as a valuable virtue by the Greek thinkers, as it allowed a citizen to carry out his obligations appropriately. To them, justice entails willing compliance with state laws.
9. **Views on Citizenship:** The Greek Political Thinkers viewed that citizenship entailed more than just paying taxes and exercising one's right to vote. It suggested direct participation in state management as a soldier, judge, or lawmaker in person, rather than through a Deputy. They did not believe in the system of representative Government. They also did not extend citizenship right to the slaves. Because they lacked a speculative mind, even the labouring classes were denied the right to rule. Citizenship, to them, meant actively participating in the activities of the state. As a result, the concept of citizenship in Greek political thought was relatively limited.
10. **Belief in Inequality:** Egalitarianism was viewed as impossible, unnatural, and undesirable by the Greek Political Thinkers. They believed that the bulk of people who were poor, lazy, and unfit for education might be sacrificed on the altar of a small group of brilliant and wise people. They also accepted inequality as natural, allowing Greeks to rule over barbarians, freemen to rule over slaves, gentlemen to rule over workers, and so on. The Greek permitted equality within a class.
11. **Faith on Individualism:** Individualism constituted an important feature of the ancient Greek Political Thought. In their thinking, the Greek Political Thinkers gave the individual a major place. They also allowed the individuals to formulate their own thoughts and to express their thoughts publicly. Plato, the famous Greek philosopher, emphasised in his rules that society is a collection of individuals, each of whom is self-determined.

- 12. Importance to Discussion:** Another distinguishing element of Ancient Greek political thought was that it placed a high value on debate. They used a discussion format to express their ideas and beliefs. Only correct logic and conversation, they believed, could lead to the discovery of truth. The Greek Political Thinkers believed that truth goes in hide in the absence of discussion, it comes to light through discussion.

The above features of the Ancient Greek Political Thought shows that the Greek Political Thinkers were great realists. They tried to analyse the problems present before the city-state with great foresight and penetration still more important is that the ideas and the concept which they developed formed the basis of most of the development of political thought which took place thereafter. In fact, several of the ideas and concepts articulated by the ancient Greek Thinkers are still being debated in political circles today.

NOTES

1.3 PLATO

Plato, a student of Socrates and a teacher of Aristotle, is one of ancient Greece's finest philosophers. He was born in Athens around 427 B.C. to a prominent, aristocratic, but not wealthy family. He had royal blood in his veins, something he could brag about. Ariston, his father, traced his pedigree back to the early kings of Athens, even to Poseidon, the sea God. Perictione, his mother, was a defendant before Solon, Athens' great lawgiver. After Athens' defeat in the Peloponnesian War, Perictione's brother Charmides and uncle Critias were among the 30 tyrants that ruled the city. Plato had two brothers and one sister.

Aristotle was Plato's true name, which meant "best and distinguished." Because of his broad and muscular shoulders, he was given the nickname "Plato," which is derived from "Platys." He was well-known for his attractiveness and engaging demeanour. Music, mathematics, poetry, and rhetoric were all areas in which he excelled. He served in three wars and received a bravery award. He never had a wife.

Plato's period was an era of great historical importance. Two years after his birth the great Athenian General Pericles died and Athens had to face a humiliating defeat in the Peloponnesian War. During his life time he witnessed the most trusted period of Greek history and before he died he could see Macedonian Militarism sweeping everything before it. The other important developments of his life time were the defeat of Athens in wars against Spartas, the establishments of tyrannical rule of reactionaries, execution of his master by the reactionaries. All these developments greatly disturbed him and he was convinced that only way out was to establish the rule of Philosopher King. His disdain for democracy and mob rule was heightened by the murder of Socrates. He left his home country and spent the majority of his time in Greece, Egypt, and Italy. In 386 B.C., he returned to Athens and founded the Academy, which is frequently referred to as the first university of

NOTES

the ancient world. He spent the most of his time and effort organising and running the Academy. In 347 B.C., he died while at the wedding feast of one of his students.

The Political Philosophy of Plato is mainly contained in 'The Republic', (386 B.C) 'The Statesman' (347 B.C) and 'The Laws' (360 B.C), though the problems of individual and state are also discussed in Apology and Crito. Plato's thinking was impacted profoundly by the intellectual milieu of the time, particularly the ideas of predecessors such as Pythagoras, Parmenides, Heraclitus, and Socrates. But it was Plato's instructor, Socrates, who had the most influence on him. He embraced Socrates' three doctrines: virtue is knowledge, the philosophy of actuality, and the theory of knowledge. Although Plato inherited essential concepts from Socrates, according to Barker, he developed these ideas in his own way and came to his own conclusions.

1.3.1 Plato's Republic

Plato's largest and most well-known work, The Republic, Concerning Justice, was written in the form of an analogue, an important strategy for clarifying concerns and proving truth. This work is often regarded as Plato's masterpiece. It's a political science and jurisprudence treatise. It was referred to by Rousseau as a dissertation on education. It's also a polemic aimed at present political teachers and practitioners. Plato created his 'Republic' during an era when Greece was decaying and disintegrating politically, socially, and intellectually, owing in great part to the sophists' doctrines. In this book, he discusses every possible thing on earth like conception of good, location of justice, place of education and finally eugenics, abortion, nudism and what not. It is a book dealing with metaphysics, ethics, education and political philosophy.

'The Republic' of Plato starts with the proposition what is a good man and how one can become so. As no one can become citizen outside the state this naturally leads him to the problem as to what is a good state? Plato says that a good state must have a philosopher king, who possesses the knowledge of good and reality. As regard, the methods through which the state can take the individual to the ultimate good, Plato advocates, the instruments of education which produces good citizens and solves many of our social and economic problems. Thus in Republic, Plato starts with ethics and enters in the domain of Politics, Sociology, Mathematics, Education etc. Plato is able to deal with so many subjects in Republic because during his times no rigid division of subjects was made. Further the life in the Greek city states was so much unified that no distinction was made between politics and religion.

'The Republic' is based on actual conditions of Greece. Greek states were in Plato's views, diseased because in them elements reason and appetite were overgrown. Plato wanted to cure those diseased states by rule of reason. Training of reason by scientific and philosophic education and liberation of reason from greed and appetite by a system of communism are the other remedies employed by Plato to remedy defects in existing city states. This statement of cure like the statement of disease is based on actual fact. Training suggested and the mode of education is

NOTES

same as was actually given in Academy. The system of Communism, though it goes beyond anything that existed in Greece, is but an extension of elements that Greece had known or knew. So, Republic is not only a deduction from first principles, it is also the induction from facts of Greek life.

‘The Republic’ was also meant to influence actual life. Political reform was the pre-occupation of Plato’s mind. If he was practical idealist he was in intention an actual politician. He fell short of a perfect idealism just because he was so eager to realise his idea. Plato said about his ‘Republic’, “It is not impossible, nor do we speak of things that are impossible, though even by ourselves. “they are admitted to be difficult in enactment. What has been said about state and government is not a mere dream but it is possible only when kings become philosophers or philosopher kings.”

At the end of the IX book Plato says Ideal city is founded on wards because on earth it nowhere exists. Plato doubted whether ideal, as it is, can be realised, but idea in spirit as a permeating force in all societies, certainly he hoped to realise. The investigation is for the sake of an ideal, not to prove that such a thing exists in reality. Fact must fall short of theory, and action must lag behind intellect in its pursuit of complete truth. Our minds can conjure up images of those situations, and our minds can conjure up images of the world as they would be if true human life principles were given full rein. Such a vision is not a dream, but it is abstraction nonetheless, and everything depends on the society in which we live. If that society will put away those old conditions and adopt new, then dream may come true. But even if this impossible the dream has still its value. It tell us what is good and what should be our aim and thus directs us to move in right direction. It directs us to differentiate between different elements of life and gives us control our lives.

But Plato wanted to abolish things which we still regard as inevitable. private property, family and democracy exist even now. No civilised society or no state can be turned into a single family. Human nature has at its core, the sense of personality. This sense also demands voice in the direction of public control. So, we see Plato goes for from realities when he wants to abolish these three things.

In Republic, Plato regarded state as an organic but did not recognise organic growth. He had a state ideal and did not think that state can develop into an ideal by the passage of time. So Plato thought too much in terms of creation and believed in a permanent ideal and did not believe in evolution. Further, Plato’s Ideal state discussed in the Republic is divorced from actuality.

‘In Republic’ Plato has also tried to discuss and define justice. According to him, justice is not only proper definition of Law or its implementation or execution but it is virtue as shown and practised in our dealing with others. According to him, it is eternal justice of lasting importance. He did not agree with the ideal that justice consisted in giving each person for his due. Justice to him was the health of state and thus of utmost significance.

There are explicit individualistic tendencies in Republic which aim at promoting individualism. According to Plato’s Philosophy, state is a creation of

NOTES

man and necessary for his satisfaction. It exists because man requires it as a matter of need and necessity. According to him state is nothing but individual magnified and glorified. The people have different capacities and it is the duty of the state to develop them all. A state which fails to manifest inherited tendencies of its individuals cannot claim itself to be a state. It has then no justification to claim unqualified obedience from its citizens.

In his Republic, Plato elaborates on his idea of human nature. He says, human nature is composed of three psychological characteristics; reason, spirit, and appetite. Reason dominates in the guardians, spirit in the soldiers and appetite in the workers and artisans. Thus he identified human inequality and therefore prescribed for division of labour and functional specialisation.

Plato in his "Republic" has tried to develop the special and unique attributes of each class and advocated a system of state regulated education. While discussing about Philosopher King Plato finds them distracted by two social institutions, family and property and this led him to discuss on communism.

An explanation of Platonic 'Republic' makes it clear that he took clue from the existing conditions on many topics. For instance, his thought on education is only a running commentary on the existing institution, his advocacy of the communism of property was a direct reaction to the corruption of the Athenian rulers. Dunning says that "Plato's Republic is a mere romance." Nettleship says, "The Republic represent a dramatised philosophy of human life." George Calton says, "The Republic is an ethical treatise."

However, the Republic contains, so vast idea and principles that it is difficult to give a label. No doubt it is a treatise on politics, human philosophy, psychology, education and metaphysics. Sabine correctly pointed out that "Republic" is a novel that defies categorization. It does not fit into any of the mainstream social studies or science divisions. It has an impact on all sides. It deals with the whole of human life. Thus, it is one of the Plato's master pieces and the greatest of all his works.

1.3.2 Ideal State of Plato

Plato weary of the functioning of the city states of his days, constructs in "Republic" an ideal state which was to serve as an inspiration and a model for states for all times and climates. The "Ideal State" of Plato was not only a philosophical idea but also a nice dream. The working of Greek city states in his days made Plato search for virtue. Therefore, Plato gave his concept of "Ideal State" to assert the superiority of virtue. Plato's Ideal State was Utopian in character and it sought to inspire the future generations.

The Ideal State of Plato represents a new social order in which the upper two classes Philosopher guardians and military guardians like in a state of special regimentation, Plato constructs his ideal state on the analogy between the individual and the state. He believed that the state represented the highest exposition and development of human virtue. The perfect state alone gave the perfect individual. He assumes that human soul consists of three elements of reason, spirit and appetite

and he also classified the citizens into three classes, the philosopher kings, auxiliaries and artisan's functioning within their proper bounds.

Basis of Ideal State

Plato's Ideal State is based on following:

- (a) Division of labour and functional specialization.
- (b) Establishment of Justice
- (c) State controlled education and
- (d) Communism of property and family.

The purpose behind the ideal state was to maintain justice and order in society and to satisfy the needs and requirements of the people.

Features of Ideal State

Plato's Ideal State has following salient features:

1. **Functional Specialization:** Plato advocated for a complete functional specialisation system. He didn't like the idea of every man continuing to perform functions that were not suited to his temperament or preference. He said in the Ideal State different men have different attitudes and temperament. To him an individual has three traits wisdom, spirit, and appetite. But these qualities are found in different quality in human beings. Those who dominates in wisdom or reason are called the guardians, more who represent spirit are called auxiliaries and those who represent appetite are called farmers or artisans:

- (a) The Ruling class who represent reason or wisdom are highly fit for statesmanship and they represent the state.
- (b) The second class represents the auxiliaries and administrators who represent spirit.
- (c) The third class represents the artisans who has no reason, less spirit and more appetite.

Plato maintained that these three classes live in unity and there is no class-conflict in the ideal state. When each class performs its duties sincerely and effectively then the ideal state will be created.

2. **Rule of Philosopher King:** According to Plato an Ideal State must be governed by a philosopher-king, who represents reason and wisdom. He should be a passionless person and seeker of truth and wisdom. He was a symbol of human understanding who stood above all biases. He commanded respect from everyone by his acts. He commanded in himself virtue and knowledge. He had to follow the rules. Only such a king could ensure that everyone's needs were met.
3. **Subordination of the Individual before the State:** Plato in his ideal state subordinated the individual before the state. He regarded the state as an organism and through that both the state and individual possess identical virtue. Thus, he established a relationship between the

NOTES

NOTES

individual and the state. He regarded the state as supreme covering the totality of human life. So individual can realise his best only within the edifice of the state as the state is the exclusive embodiment of spirit and reason. He formulated the concept that state is the manifestation of highest form where the individual could find his best a bode and realise his best self.

4. **State Regulated Education:** According to Plato state should have full and final control over education. According to him it was the only agency which could produce philosopher kings and train the minds and thoughts of the people in the right and proper direction. Education had both social and individual aspects in his philosophy. To him education was essential for realisation of justice. In society, education should promote social welfare while individually it should bring soul closer to reality.
5. **Communism of Property and Wives:** According to Plato, the philosopher ruler should have no other interest than that of the state. He is of the opinion that the philosopher, freed from the cares of his family and private property, will devote more attention to the affairs of the state and to the acquisition of sound knowledge. The communism of property and wives among the upper two classes i.e., guardians classes was meant to keep them out of the economic and worldly temptations and ambitions so that they could concentrate on their duty to the state.
6. **Justice:** Justice is a corner-stone of Plato's ideal state. To him, a state was ideal if justice reigns supreme in it. He said, the ideal state is the visible embodiment of justice. He regards justice as a moral order in which each individual is expected to perform his duties sincerely and adhere to the profession for which he is best fit platonic justice is based on division of labour and specialisation of function and he thinks it will lead to efficiency. Thus, Plato says when justice prevails there will be harmony and unity in the state.
7. **Equality of Men and Women:** Plato gives some status to men and women in his ideal state. To him, the day of emancipation of women will be the day of unity of the state, liberty to the individual and justice to both. So, he seeks to emancipation of women in society. Plato as a Feminist, provides right status to women in the ideal state. He believes in equality of women with men and expects that the women will come out of their routine domestic work and promote their intellect and personality. He advocated for women education and recruitment to the philosopher king to be open to the women.
8. **Censorship of Art and Literature:** Plato believes that in an ideal state, the production of art and literature should be restricted. According to him no cheap unpopular or immoral literature should come before the people. The people should have only literature of a type which promoted high moral character.

Criticisms

Plato's ideal state has been criticised severely on the following grounds:

- (a) Plato's ideal state is based not merely on analogy but almost on identification between the individual and the state, which leads to confusion.
- (b) Plato was a Utopian whose ideal state was mere a dream. He was not worried about the actual form. He neither conceived any definite idea nor he took into account the hard realities of politics and life.
- (c) Ideal is undemocratic in the sense that, the guardians and soldiers enjoyed a privileged position while the lower class debarred from it.
- (d) Plato's theory of division of labour and functional specialisation seems to be illogical and unscientific.
- (e) His communism of property and wives violates human nature and instincts. These systems may be most intolerable and corrupting.
- (f) Plato's interpretation of the Rule of Philosophy is diametrically opposed to democracy, equality, and liberty.
- (g) Plato in his assigned all powers to the guardians and imposed on check on them which may give rise to dictatorship in future.
- (h) The Ideal State created by Plato is totalitarian in the sense that it completely merges the individual in the state and thus pays no regards to the individual.
- (i) Like a true aristocrat Plato has ignored the role of working classes.
- (j) Plato has practically denied the right of higher education to lower classes and has thus tried to create class distinction.
- (k) Plato has not only failed to condemn the institution of slavery but in the other hand in the framework of his ideal state has tried to perpetuate it.

Without a doubt, the criticism levelled against the theory is valid, however the most essential contribution of this theory is that it establishes a set of goals for future generations to strive for and achieve. His essential thought has remained unquestioned. Many states are currently implementing a state-controlled educational system. It is sure that the concept of ideal state of Plato heavily influenced the people to different societies. His motives was to cure the evils prevailing in the Greek city states and thus he prescribed a medicine to cure that.

1.3.3 Rule of Philosopher King

Plato, a student of Socrates and a teacher of Aristotle, is one of ancient Greece's finest philosophers. The Republic is the crowning achievement of Plato's art and philosophy. His fame greatly rest upon this book which is his masterpiece. In Republic, Plato imagined an ideal state which is to be ruled by the philosopher king. Plato's idea of philosopher kingship is a corollary of his idea of justice. Plato in his book 'Republic' divided the human mind into three elements, reason, spirit and appetite, he also accorded a position of pride to the element of reason in mind

NOTES

NOTES

as well as on the organisation of the state. Plato believed that 'virtue is knowledge', which implied that the two must go hand in hand. Plato believed that one of the major cause of the prevailing turmoil was that the ignorant were ruling over the wise. He believed that the state's troubles could only be put right if wise individuals ran the country after receiving proper instruction. Cities would never be free of their problems, he declared, until philosophers become kings or until kings and princes around the world possess the spirit and power of philosophy. As a result, Plato believed that only capable and efficient people should be allowed to govern.

Features of Plato's Rule of Philosophy

The conception of rule by the philosopher king which is described by Prof. Foster as "the most deeply original theory in all of Plato's political thought," and it has some distinguishing characteristics, which are as follows:

1. Plato did not favour democratic system of government in which every citizen had the right to participate in the affairs of the state. He denounced it as a government of the ignorants. On the other hand, he wanted to give unlimited powers to his philosopher king in his ideal state. He supported a government led by an elite with the requisite power to dominate.
2. The philosopher king being a lover of wisdom and passionate seeker after truth, is in a better position to determine what is in the interest of the community than an ordinary person. Hence the rule of the philosophy is in the interest of the society.
3. The philosopher king's and the state's interests are identical, and there is no conflict between them. In fact, the philosophers have no interests apart from the welfare of the members of the community. The element of reason which is present in them enables them to comprehend that the happiness of the part depends upon the happiness of the whole. Philosophers have attributes of selfless service and nationality, to put it simply.
4. Plato's philosopher rulers have undergone extensive and rigorous training and study over a 35-year span.
5. The philosopher rulers are assigned absolute powers by Plato and the rulers are not bound by customs or written laws, nor are they accountable to the populace. There is no rationale for public supervision of the conduct of the philosopher kings, according to Plato, because they are the embodiment of virtue and knowledge. Furthermore, they are completely aware of what is good and harmful for the community, thus there is no need to bind them to the laws. He claims that binding the hands of philosophers and rulers with norms of law would be as silly as forcing an excellent physician to write down his prescription from a medical text book.
6. Though the philosopher rulers are assigned absolute powers, Plato limits their power by stating that they must adhere to the essential provisions of

the constitution and not modify the fundamental principles upon which the state is founded. The following are some of the key ideas that philosopher rulers are required to follow:

- (i) They must keep an eye on the state's excessive inflow of property and riches.
- (ii) Maintain a state size that is consistent with unity and self-sufficiency.
- (iii) They must ensure that each citizen fulfils their assigned responsibilities, and
- (iv) They must ensure that no changes are made to the educational system. Plato, in other words, renders even philosophical kings slaves to the underlying social order.

NOTES

Criticism

The concept of rule philosopher proposed by Plato has been criticised for the following reasons:

1. By conceding absolute powers to the philosopher rulers it leads to tyrannical government and runs counter to the notions of democratic government.
2. It assumes that only few persons who have undergone a rigorous system of education are capable of governing the state. Thus, it neglects the great majority and refuses them to the status of political robots.
3. Plato's assumption that knowledge is the prerogative of a handful of persons is against the notion of equality. His scheme of education covers only a small group of elites and neglects the people are not capable of ruling themselves.
4. Plato's rejection of law as the basis of state has been condemned. By giving maximum freedom to the philosopher rulers and relegating law to the back ground he undermines the importance of law which is the embodiment of the wisdom of the people accumulated through centuries. Plato also realises his mistake and accords position of pride of law in his later book "The Laws".
5. Plato's concept of philosopher king runs counter to the principles of direct as well as indirect democracies.
6. The scheme of education outlined by Plato for our philosopher - rulers is highly defective.
7. Plato's assertion that there is no conflict between the philosopher ruler's interests and the public's interests, which is also harmful. This encourages the philosopher king to assure unlimited powers and promote his self interest at the cost of the interests of other citizens. This clearly leaves sufficient scope for the establishment of totalitarian rule.

NOTES

8. Plato's concept of philosopher king is highly utopian and we do not have any historical evidence to prove that this sort of rule of philosophy has ever existed in any part of the earth. It is indeed difficult to find a person possessing the qualities of selflessness, devotion and high ideals as Plato preaches.
9. Prof. Popper says that Plato advocated the concept of philosopher king with a selfish motive. He had the ambition to become the ruler of Athens.
10. Prof. Popper also says that Plato's rule of philosophers and a continuous supply of philosophers through his system of education are incompatible. He argues that "If philosophers were needed as permanent rulers, there would be no need for the Educational system to produce new ones."

Despite the above criticism of his concept of rule of philosophers it most profoundly original conception in the entire political thought. He rightly emphasised that only few persons who had accelerated their faculties of mind were competent to rule. The only defect with his philosophy is that he failed to provide practical training to his philosopher rulers. In short, he raised an unsound and impracticable super structure over a sound philosophy.

1.3.4 Plato's Second Best State

"The Laws" is the culminator of the development of Plato's political thought, which he wrote in the later years of his life. This reflects his maturity of judgement which is missing in his Republic. It shows Plato as a practical thinker and he originated a number of ideas which have left a deep impact on the later stage. In "The Laws" he abandoned his idealistic philosophy and came very near hard realities of life. Realising that the ideal state contemplated by him in the Republic was quite incapable of realising in actual practice he tried to depict the second best ideal state in the Laws. This state, unlike his ideal state as depicted in the Republic, can be realised on this earth. The institutional framework of his second best state can be studied under the following heads:

1. Political: The second best ideal state of Plato combines the monarchical element of wisdom with the democratic element of liberty or freedom. He places a high value on the rule of law, which both the ruler and the ruled are supposed to follow. He considers the laws important also because they enable a person to develop sufficient self control which is so vital for a smooth social life. He realised that people aren't always motivated by nationalistic concerns and are frequently selfish. As a result, it is required to conduct a check on the nature of legislation.

Plato's second best ideal state envisions the creation of a popular assembly made up of all the city-residents. State's On the basis of their property, he classifies these citizens into four categories. Members of each class were given a quota of votes based on the amount of property they owned. Military training and the ability to bear arms were required for the electorate. The Popular Assembly was primarily responsible for electing 37 Guardians of the Law and 360 members of the Council. The Assembly was planned to serve in both legislative and judicial capacities.

NOTES

The Guardians of the Law were to be chosen from among those aged 50 to 70 and serve for a period of 20 years. They were intended to work with the Council in the administration of the state.

The Council was given solely deliberative functions by Plato. It was to be divided into 12 divisions, each of which would serve as the government's principal executive organ for a month. They were also to collaborate with the Guardians of Law.

In terms of the judicial system. Plato recommended three types of courts: voluntary courts or boards of arbitration, tribe courts, and courts presided over by selected judges. It should be noted that these courts solely dealt with private lawsuits. The popular Assembly, on the other hand, had to decide on the public suits.

In addition to the above political structure, Plato also imagines a strange institution called the Nocturnal Council. The 10 eldest of the 37 Guardians of Law, the Director of Education, and a few priests noted for their morality were to make up the Council. Despite the fact that the council was outside the state's political framework, it was given authority to govern and direct all of the state's legal institutions. The members of the Council were expected to be philosophers who could best guide the destinies of the state, because they were expected to know the mysteries of Heavens. Certain examiners or censors were selected by the Nocturnal Council to keep a check on the magistrates' behaviour.

2. Social Structure: Plato classified citizens into four classes based on the value of their personal possessions. The first group was made up of people whose personal assets were equal to the value of their land. Persons in the second class have personal property worth more than the value of their land, but not more than twice the value of their land. People in the third class had personal property worth three times the value of their land. Similarly, those in the fourth class had personal property worth four times the value of their land. It should be remembered that Plato specified that no one's property should surpass four times the value of the original lot assigned to each of the 5040 people under any circumstances. The harvest from the lands was to be shared at the public mess. Furthermore, no person was allowed to sell or mortgage his or her original equal plot. Plato acknowledges the right to private property, but adds that it should be used for the common good.

Plato forbids them from working in industry or commerce. They can't hold gold or silver, and they can't lend money at a profit. All of these responsibilities are delegated by Plato to the resident aliens, who are free persons but not citizens.

Unlike Republic in which the three classes of division of labour based on psychological elements. Plato introduces the new concept which is applicable to the whole population. He assigns all political functions to citizens, leaving agriculture entirely to slaves and trade and industry to the class of resident immigrants.

Plato also concludes that communism of wives though a quite lofty ideal is difficult to achieve and therefore permits family life. He favours permanent

NOTES

management marriage under strict supervisions of the state. Plato in 'Laws' not only insists on having family but also proposes that bachelors over 35 years of age should be penalised.

Plato gives women the same status as males in society and exposes a common educational system for both. He also insists on this participation on public life as well as their military training.

In his second best state, Plato gives religious and moral ideas precedence. He does, however, believe that religion should be regulated by the state. He attaches great importance to due performance of the rites and rituals of religious and insists that authorised priests should be appointed for this purpose.

3. Scheme of Education: Plato assigns an important position to education in his Laws also, although its objective undergoes a change. Where as Republic education aimed at the development of the virtue of wisdom in the Laws it teaches the citizen self control. According to Plato, education always provides proper training of a healthy mind and guides him to receive both pleasure and pain. It attempts to promote outstanding citizenship skills such as the ability to rule and be ruled in the interests of justice, as well as to prepare young minds for higher goals. Plato believed that the educational system should only be in the hands of mature people because of the importance of education.

Plato argued for a universal system of compulsory education. He advocated for both men and women to be educated, but he opposed co-education after the age of six. His educational system was divided into two stages: primary and secondary. The primary stage of education started with the cradle and lasted upto the age of ten. The secondary education lasted from the age of 10 to 16. During this stage the children studied literature, music, astronomy, geometry and arithmetic etc. Plato also insisted on military training which was so vital for the defence of the state.

It is evident from the above account that the second best state of Plato is more realistic, even though the element of idealism is dominantly present here as well. We hardly find any drastic change in the foundations of Plato's philosophy, which one could envisage in view of the important place assigned by him to the law, customs, habits etc. in the second-best state.

1.3.5 Plato's Views on Education

Plato's "Republic" places a strong emphasis on the concept of education. It is the result of his philosophical considerations. It is inextricably linked to his beliefs about the nature of the state and the goal that every free citizen should aim for. Justice is the life breath of Plato's ideal state and it could only be realised through the instrument of education, rather state-regulated education. Here in lies the supreme importance of education in the Republic. Hence the remark of Barker that "not representation but education is the key to Platonic state." Plato considers the state to be first and foremost a learning institution. Plato devotes very minute attention to this ideal. He advocated his idea about education with great force and vigour.

NOTES

Plato's theory of education is intimately linked with his theory of justice in so far it is the positive method for the attainment of the same. Education plays a vital role in bringing about unity and harmony in the society. Plato felt that virtue was knowledge, and that it was the state's responsibility to disseminate it. He believed that all three classes in the state needed to be adequately trained and educated in order to accomplish their jobs effectively and efficiently. To put it another way, the state exists to promote education.

According to Plato, education involves both an individual and a societal component.. On the one hand it makes the individual realize knowledge which is synonymous with virtue. It enables the individual to turn the eye of his soul to the inward reality and truth. On the other hand it is social process through which the units of society become instinct with social consciousness and learn to perform the duties of their respective stations unseparably.

Methods of Plato's Education

At the time of Plato, two diametrically opposed educational techniques were popular: Athenian and Spartan. The Athenian system of education was mainly in private hands and left it entirely to the parents to educate their children in the manner they liked best. On the other hand the Spartan system of education was fully controlled by the state. The children were separated from their parents at the age of four and were placed under the care of perfects. The parents had nothing to do with the education of their children. Plato made an attempt to combine these two systems of education and made some changes in higher education. His system of education aimed at promoting social welfare and help the individual in realising the reality.

Features of Platonic System of Education

The main features of the Platonic system of education were as follows:

1. Plato believed in state controlled education. In view of the importance of education Plato insisted that all concerned must be imparted proper education. He saw education as a good tool for the ruler to shape the character of the people and instil in them a spirit of selfless commitment to their responsibilities. So, he did not favour the system of private education and pleaded for state controlled education.
2. Plato did not consider it proper to leave the education of children entirely to the discretion of the parents and insisted on making it compulsory. To him an uneducated children were likely to be a liability for the state. So, he advocated for the state controlled compulsory education for all childrens' for their mental development and for maintaining unity of the state.
3. Plato believed that men and women should be educated in the same way. He discovered no differences in natural talents between boys and girls. He was likewise in favour of women holding public office in the same way that males did.

NOTES

4. Plato's education was meant for artisans as well as peasants also.
5. Plato's schooling aims to help children develop morally as well as physically. He believed that a healthy intellect could only exist in a healthy body, and that education should promote the development of both of these faculties. Any scheme of education which promotes only one aspect was according to Plato, incomplete.
6. Plato advocated for stringent control of all literary and artistic works in order to protect children from negative moral influences. He merely wanted the appropriate kind of books to reach young people's hands.
7. The chief objectives of Plato's scheme of education was to produce the philosopher kings. The philosopher after passing through a rigorous scheme of education were expected to govern the country in the interest of all masses.

Curriculum of Education

Plato's educational curriculum could be broadly divided into two stages i.e., elementary and higher:

1. **Elementary or Basic Education:** Elementary education of Plato also divided into three stages. The first stage lasted from birth to the age 6 years. At this stage both the boys and girls were to be given education in religion and religious institutions etc. The second stage covers from the age of 6 to 18 years. During this period child was to be taught music as well as gymnastics, which were essential for the development of soul and body respectively. The third stage extended from 18 to 20 years of age. Both men and women were given compulsory military education at this stage.
2. **Higher Education:** The Higher education lasted from 20 to 35 years of age. The scheme of higher education has been described by Sabine as most original as well as most characteristic proposal of Republic. The higher education was also divided into two sub-stages the first extending from 20 to 30 and the second extent day from 30 to 35. The first stage included the study of subjects like Mathematics, Astronomy, Logic and other sciences. He insisted on the knowledge of geometry as a precondition for entrance to his academy at the age of 30 another selection test was held and only more who qualified it were given a farther training for four years viz. upto age of 35. This stage of education was essentially meant to create the philosopher king. The philosopher king was expected to rule from 35 years to 50 years of his age then retire and resume study for the contemplation of God. Thus Plato envisaged education as a life long process for the philosopher king.

Criticism

The Plato's scheme of education has been subjected to criticism on the following grounds:

1. According to opponents, Plato's educational programme was only intended for the guardian class, leaving the majority of the populace, including peasants and artisans, unaffected.
2. Plato's scheme of education is a life process. After devoting a major portion of his life to education alone the rulers are hardly left with any time to devote to other pursuits.
3. Plato's scheme of education is far removed from reality. It can only create academic theories which are incapable of dealing with hard realities of life.
4. The scheme of education envisaged by Plato is not logical in so far as there is no relationship between one stage and the other stage.
5. Plato's plea for censorship of art and literature is highly derogatory in nature.
6. Plato's uniform pattern of education is contrary to human psychology. He hardly makes any provision for technical and vocational education.

NOTES

Despite this shortcoming, Platonic education stands in his Republic as a polar static which has guided many a philosopher who followed him. It anticipated many modern theories of education. Its aim of spiritual uplift of the individual is strikingly similar to that of the modern liberal education. Platonic education was also an improvement on the systems of education found in Athens and Sparta. Sabine remarked that Plato's principle of education were a running commentary on the existing system of education. Moreover the place occupied by education in the Plato's political Philosophy brings home the truth that a good education is foundation for any ideal state.

1.3.6 Plato's Views on Communism

Plato's ideal state represents a new social order, the ruler of which are required to renounce the elements of appetite, as they represent elements of reason and spirit. This is done through communism of property and family or wives. His Communism is not the central thesis of his philosophy. In words of Barker "It is only an outwork. His central theory is about Justice and education. In order to realise them, his communism is only a necessity."

Plato was not the first communist philosopher but his idea on communism significantly influenced the future communist movement in the world. Plato's idea on communism, was influenced by the system that prevailed in Sparta and Athens. In Sparta and Athens, communism existed in the form of state-controlled private property, with the commodity putting the output to common use. Plato, on the other hand, deserves credit for developing a politically and psychologically sound conception of the community of wives and property. Plato desired that the guardian class be free of material concerns so that it might devote its complete attention to public service. At the same time, Plato realised that acquiring property and starting a family would obstruct philosopher rulers from fully dedicating themselves to the service of the community. Plato believed that combining political and economic

NOTES

power would lead to corruption and degeneration in the state, and that an effective educational system could only be implemented if economic power was completely separated from political authority. As a result, he advocates that individuals who wield political power have no economic motivations, and that those who engage in economic activities have no stake in political power.

Plato's idea of communism can be divided into two parts:

1. Communism of Property: Plato in his "The Republic" has explained about the theory of communism of property. Plato considered communism of property as necessary for the simple fact that the union of political and economic powers in one hand would be fatal to political unity and efficiency. He therefore divorced economic power from the guardian to make selfless and free. According to Plato, individuals who wield political authority should have no economic motivations, and those who engage in economic activity should not have a share in political power. As a result, Plato took away the right to property from the two governing classes. He insisted on the rulers living in barracks and dining at communal tables. They should not be allowed to own private property because it would jeopardise the value of virtue, which was the ruling class's most crucial ingredient. As a result, Plato's communism is solely for the guardian class, and it teaches them how to give up private property.

Criticism

Plato's theory of communism of property may be criticised on the following grounds:

- (a) Acquisition or ownership of private property is a natural instinct of man, and Plato's attempt to deny his guardian class the right to property goes against his basic human nature, and could be destructive to society's progress.
- (b) Plato's property communism is only for the ruling classes, excluding the workers, peasants, and those who make up the majority of society.
- (c) The eradication of private property will inevitably destroy the elements of a healthy society: kind and benevolent attitudes.
- (d) Plato's communism is a half communism as it is meant for the upper two classes. The artisans are not included in the schemes.
- (e) Communism of property may affect the natural income of the nation.
- (f) Aristotle criticises Plato for using communism to provide a material cure for spiritual ailments.

2. Communism of Wives or Family: Plato's theory of communism of property made it necessary for him to advocate communism of family because family requires property. Therefore Plato based his theory on emancipation of women and reform of marriage. Plato realised that without abolition of family mere abolition of property would have no result. Family was a source of weakness of person and could prompt a guardian to adopt corruption or to property. He therefore completely ruled out the possibility of family life of the guardians. He

said, there would be no permanent marriage in the ruling class there would be no children nor any family.

Principles of Plato's Communism of Wives

- (a) The policy, like communism of private property, is primarily aimed at the guardian class, and the vast mass of the populace is excluded.
- (b) The guardian class has no system of permanent marriage, and all women must be common to all males and vice versa.
- (c) All guardians are required to live in communal barracks.
- (d) The state was responsible for arranging a one-year temporary mating between the best of men and best of women in order to generate the required number of children.
- (e) All children were to be removed from their mothers shortly after delivery. No child was allowed to know his parents, and no parents were allowed to know their children. State will look after the children.
- (f) The children that were weak and ugly were supposed to be killed soon after they were born.

As per Plato's communism of family there would be no family but a community of family in which wives, husbands and children were held together on joint fellowship. Thus Plato's theory of communism of family aimed at the realisation of:

- (a) Equality of the male and female.
- (b) Birth of superior children in society.
- (c) Provision of maximum development of males and females and
- (d) Nationalisation of family.

Criticism

Plato's theory of communism of family was criticised on the following grounds:

- (i) Plato's theory of communism of wives was neither logical nor desirable. It is nonsensical to consider how men and women may meet for the purpose of temporary mating and then part for good.
- (ii) Abolition of family would affect the life of children who would get no love and affection and in future they would be cruel and unsocial beings.
- (iii) Applying the comparison of animals to humans and pleading for state-controlled mating is ludicrous.
- (iv) His communism of spouses, like his communism of property, applies only to the guardian class and excludes the mass of citizens.
- (v) Plato incorrectly considers marriage to be a mechanical process.
- (vi) Women participation in politics would destroy the peace and sanctity of family life as they could find no time to care for their children.

NOTES

NOTES

- (vii) Communism of wives and children is unjustified from psychological and social point of view.

Barker criticised Platonic Communism as half-communism, because he barred the artisans, farmers and working class from the system.

Despite the aforementioned criticisms of Plato's notion of wife communism, we cannot dispute that Plato appears to be extremely rational in emphasising that the state could not obtain undivided loyalty unless the family institution was abolished. But his theory is highly unrealistic and devoid of hard realities of life. According to Barker "By abolishing family and private property Plato destroys that instrument by which an individual can be known as individual."

1.3.7 Plato's Theory of Justice

As stated earlier, Plato, a student of Socrates and a teacher of Aristotle, is one of ancient Greece's finest philosophers. Plato's 'The Republic' is the pinnacle of both art and philosophy. His fame greatly rests upon his book, which is his masterpiece. There are varied views of different writers on this work. Rousseau describes it as a treatise on education, while Dunning calls it "an exercise in dialectics." Some have described it as a work on politics and jurisprudence. The work would seem to be above all concerned with ethics. As a matter of fact, "The Republic" is not a treatise of any sort. It deals with all the subjects under the sky.

Justice is the central theme of 'the Republic' round which all other subjects find their due places. Its sub-title 'Concerning Justice' indicates, that its primary purpose is not the construction of an ideal state but an inquiry into the nature and the location of justice. He was concerned with the nature and characteristics of justice and how justice can be dispensed within the society and state.

Before giving the theory of justice Plato experienced tremendous socio-political degeneration in Athens. Political corruption and selfishness were rampant. Then were confined their selfish duties. No one bothered about the state. As a true Patriot Plato searched for the remedy to save his beloved Athens from decay. While explaining his theory of Justice Plato starts by discussing the various prevailing theories of justice and rejecting them puts forward his own views. For a fuller understanding of Plato's views on justice it is desirable to examine the various prevailing theories on Justice and the grounds on which Plato rejects them.

Traditional Theory

Justice, according to Cephalus and his son Polemarchus, is defined as telling the truth and paying everyone their fair share in society. It also contended that justice should be so administered that good is done to the friends and harm to the enemies. Polemarchus said speaking truth and paying one his due is what we mean by justice. "Doing good to friends and bad to foes" is what they considered to be justice. It considered justice as an art.

Plato refutes this view, arguing that perfect justice entails doing good to everyone while doing no damage to anyone. To do evil to any body is inconsistent with the elementary principles of morality. Plato claims that distinguishing between

NOTES

adversaries and friends is not always easy. Another flaw in this theory is that it views justice as a personal rather than a communal idea. Plato also says justice should have universal application. Finally, this theory will make justice a handmade of those in power.

Radicalist Theory

Justice was considered as the interest of the stronger in the radicalism theory connected with sophists and profounded by Thrasymachus. It adheres to the notion that “might makes justice.” Because the government is the most powerful, it establishes laws to suit the rulers’ needs. Simultaneously, the sophists argue that injustice is preferable to justice. As every one would like to promote his own interests there is every possibility that he would go against justice viz the interests of the ruler. It was, therefore, proper to be just to satisfy all rather than become just to satisfy the ruler alone. Therefore, Thrasymachus argues that injustice is better than Justice and the unjust man is wiser than the just.

Plato rejects this concept of justice on the following grounds:

1. Justice is always in the interests of the weaker, not the powerful.
2. Because a just man is wiser, stronger, and happier than an unjust one, and understands his limitations, justice is always preferable to injustice.
3. Plato criticises the sophists’ radical individualism, arguing that people are not individuals but members of a larger order.
4. There can’t be two levels of justice: one for the sovereign and one for the subjects.

Pragmatic Theory

The Pragmatic Theory of justice is stated by Glaucon. Justice, he believes, is a man-made construct, a consequence of social tradition. Fear is the mother of justice, and it is founded on the need of the weak. There was no justice in the pre-civil society and it is the weaker sections who joined hand to create the state. As a result, justice is the need of the weak, not the interest of the powerful.

This view, according to Plato, ensures that justice is something external or imported. Justice, he believes, is inherent in the human mind. It is an intrinsic virtue which does not depend for its origin upon a chance convention.

Plato’s Concept of Justice

After discarding the prevailing notions of justice, Plato gives his own concept of justice. He believes that both the individual and society are responsible for justice. He seeks to explain justice in the state with the help of the state since it exists in a larger and more apparent form. Justice, according to Plato, is vested in the state. The state, according to him, has three ingredients: reason, spirit, and appetite, which are represented by rulers, soldiers, and farmers, respectively. He believes that each of these three individuals contributed significantly to the formation of the state. Society can achieve justice if each group fulfils the function to which it is most suited without intruding in the spheres of others. Justice entails a

NOTES

certain level of specialisation as well as the principles of non-interference and harmony. Plato also regarded justice as a moral concept and discussed it from individual and social aspects:

- (a) From the individual point of view justice means self-control which makes a man free from following selfish impulses and doing undesirable things. It makes him curb his social ambition and stick to the station in life for which he is best fitted by his natural endowments and make his most excellent contribution by the society in performance of his duty.
- (b) From a societal standpoint, justice entails a level of control among distinct social classes that allows each class to focus on its own function without interfering with the functions of other groups.

Platonic Idea of Justice is based on the following three principles:

- (i) Specialisation of functions according to one's capacity.
- (ii) Non interference by one class on the sphere of duty of others and it is vital for the unit or the state and welfare of its members.
- (iii) It seeks to bring harmony among the three classes and regards justice as a bond of unit that holds the society together.

Criticism of Plato's Concept of Justice

Plato's concept of justice has been subjected to searching criticism on the following grounds:

1. Plato's concept of justice is based on moral principles and lacks legal sanction in so far it is not enforceable. It does not envisage any class of individual wills and conflict between various interests.
2. This theory of justice could be possible only in the city state when it was possible to rigidly enforce the principle of division of labour. But in the present context, when the population of the state has increased so much, the three fold class division is not possible nor can fixed function be assigned to members of each.
3. Plato concedes that each individual possesses three qualities viz reason, spirit and appetite, but he wants that each individual should devote to the development of only one faculty. Thus he wants the individual to live by one third of his personality and abandon the other two-thirds of his personality.
4. Plato's justice grants the philosopher monarch a monopoly of political authority and places excessive demands on his charity. He completely refused the people's right to vote. Furthermore, he failed to recognise that entrusting absolute power to a few people, no matter how morally or spiritually educated, would inevitably lead to degeneration and corruption.
5. Plato advocated for property and wife communism to prevent the ruling classes from abusing their power. This is a total contradiction of human psychology.

6. According to Prof. Popper, "Plato's concept of justice gives rise to totalitarianism and completely ignores the humanitarian principles like equality, individualism and freedom".
7. Plato completely subordinates the individual to the state and reduces him to a mere means for the promotion of the interest of the state.
8. Plato's conception of justice is not humanitarian but only to totalitarian because it establishes privileges. It makes citizens a means and the state an end in itself. He thus reduces individual to nothingness.
9. Plato's justice creates a class-state in which ruling is a privilege of one class over another. In words of Prof. Popper "Plato calls class privilege just, while we usually mean by justice rather the absence of such privileges."
10. It has been said that his concept of justice is static. It does not move with the time and thus bound to become out dated.

NOTES

But in spite of all these, criticisms, it cannot be denied that Plato touched the very basic of evils in the state which was maladjustment of functions. If Platonic conception of justice is properly understood it shall mean devotion to duty and functional specialisation. It is this sense of devotion to duty and national love which can solve many of our present day evils. Plato's conception of justice is wide and broad based properly speaking while discussing his concept of justice he has become practical rather than ideal. Moreover, his concept of justice is based in the idea of social and collective good.

1.3.8 Contribution of Plato to the Political Philosophy

Plato, a student of Socrates and a teacher of Aristotle, is one of ancient Greece's finest philosophers. The philosophy of Plato is contained in "The Republic" (386 BC). The states man (360 B.C) and 'The Laws (347 B.C) Though most of the writing of Plato have since been lost about three dozen dialogues which have come down to us given as ample idea about his philosophy. It is often assisted that Plato's lectures, which he delivered at the Academy, were more valuable expressions of his idea because he communicated real doctrine of these lectures but unfortunately may have been lost. The current intellectual milieu impacted Plato's thinking, particularly the ideas of predecessors like as Pythagoras, Parmenides, Socrates and Heraclitus. Pythagoras' teaching that wisdom is the contemplation of the spirit and that the idea is the chief essence behind all tangible things and forms inspired Plato tremendously. But it was Plato's instructor, Socrates, who had the most influence on him. He agreed to Socrates' three doctrines, namely, the virtue of knowledge, the theory of actuality, and the theory of knowledge. Plato's greatest work, 'The Republic,' or 'Concerning Justice,' is his most complete expression of his ideas.

Plato left a deep impact on the political thought in the subsequent centuries. Some of the important ideas of Plato which have exercised profound impact in years after him includes the following:

NOTES

1. **Justice:** Plato attached great importance to the concept of justice for which he subtitled his book *The Republic* as “Concerning Justice”. His argument that society is always “a unity amidst diversity” and that each member of society should do his or her obligations to the best of his or her abilities is an incredibly insightful appraisal of society that still holds true today.
2. **Rule of Wise and Virtuous:** Plato favoured rule of wise and wanted the state to be ruled by virtue. This principle has been universally recognised and it is accepted that only the best and the most virtuous should rule the society in the largest interest of the community.
3. **Functional specialisation:** The concept of specialisation, which is intimately linked with the concept of justice is another important contribution of Plato. He emphasised that every member of society should do the functions for which his ability and training best prepared him.
4. **Importance of Education:** Plato emphasised the importance of state-controlled education and provided a detailed scheme of education which aimed at promoting the interest of the society. In modern times both democratic as well as totalitarian countries acknowledge the importance of education as an instrument for the effective working of the political system.
5. **Emancipation of Women:** Plato opened the ground for women’s emancipation by insisting that they be given the requisite education on an equal footing with men and be allowed to participate actively in public activities. This principle has now been accepted on universal basis.
6. **Nationalism:** Plato in his writings displayed great sense of nationalism and placed the nation above everything else. He was even willing to sacrifice the time honoured institutions of private property and family in the interest of the state. His concepts of philosopher king was also designed to provide a ruler who could rule in the interest of state and be above selfish motives. His attempt to introduce functional specialisation, requiring every member to devote himself to the allotted duties to the best of his capacities, was also designed to promote the interest of the state. In short nationalism runs through the entire, thought of Plato’s philosophy.
7. **Utilitarianism:** Plato’s thought also contained seeds of modern Utilitarianism. In his *Laws*, he emphasised that the laws should aim at promoting the maximum good and happiness of the maximum number of people similarly he did not consider punishment as a media or revenge and treated it as negative way of education for the unhealing mind. Plato emphasised that in a healthy society no section should thrive at the cost of others and every body should remain within his specified field.
8. **Socialism:** Plato’s thought also contained germs of socialistic thought. In fact Plato carried the communistic ideas to such an entrance by

NOTES

advocating communism of property as well as family, that even the modern communists have not been able to come any way near his fright of ideas. The modern communism covers, only property and does not include the family within its purview. The socialists borrowed their basic tenet that society is more important than the individual from Plato.

9. **Organic theory:** Plato is also considered the father of the organic theory of state. He emphasised that the state is a whole and the individuals constitute the part of the whole.
10. **Revolutionist:** Plato by openly pleading for revolt against the prevailing tyranny in Athens became the forerunner of the Modern Revolutions. He wanted to bring about revolutionary changes in the Athenian society because he was convinced that the existing idea had become outdated and was polluting the body politics. The modern revolutionists have learnt many things from Plato.
11. **Father of Modern Fascism:** Plato is often referred to as the “Father of Modern Fascism” not only because he subordinated the individual to the state and advocated for the leadership of a single man (philosopher king) with unrestricted power and control, but also because, like modern fascists, he believes in the fundamental inequality of human beings and has little faith in democracy as a political system.

1.4 ARISTOTLE

As an intellectual behemoth, Aristotle dominated antiquity. No one before him had made such a significant contribution to education. No one could ever expect to match his accomplishments. He was a multidisciplinary genius with expertise in aesthetics, biology, ethics, logic, physics, politics, and psychology. For centuries, he blended investigation and instruction, dominating the full range of human thinking. Even now, he is the beginning point for any political scientist's research.

In 347 B.C., Aristotle, the best of Plato's students, was born in Stagira. Nizomachus' father, King Amyntas III of Macedon, was a physician. This gave Aristotle an opportunity to acquire first hand information about the royal court and greatly sharpened his understanding of the working of the states. Aristotle was not an Athenian by birth, but he came to Athens at the age of 17 years and joined Plato's academy where he stayed for 20 years till the death of Plato in 347 B.C. This long association with Plato naturally left a deep impact on the mind of Aristotle.

After Plato's death, Aristotle left Athens and travelled across the world for over thirteen years, staying in various political institutions. In 342 B.C., he was summoned to Macedonia to serve as Alexander's tutor. He founded the Lyceum in 355 B.C. to promote his beliefs, concepts, and philosophies. This school continued to enjoy the patronage of Alexander. After the death of Alexander when the anti-Macedonian party came to power, Aristotle fled to Chalcis and died the same year.

NOTES

Aristotle's political philosophy shows three major sources. His thinking was influenced, first and foremost, by the demise of city states, which, even in his time, was giving way to the imperial system. The present Hellenic attitudes and beliefs had a strong influence on him. Plato, with whom Aristotle studied for almost 20 years, was the third important influence on him. Despite the fact that Aristotle was heavily influenced by his master Plato, there is an important distinction between the two political philosophers. If Plato was a preeminently radical thinker, Aristotle's political speculations were undoubtedly conservative. Plato was a deductive thinker, whereas Aristotle was an inductive thinker. Aristotle relied heavily on observation imperialism and comparison, whereas Plato employed the a priori or speculative technique and began with certain fundamentals. If Plato subjugated politics to ethics, Aristotle elevated politics to first priority.

Though Aristotle was extensively an subjects like metaphysics, psychology, rhetoric, poetry, biology, moral science, politics etc. but we are primarily concerned with his political writings. The only important work of Aristotle which has come down to us and provides valuable information about his political philosophy is politics. Aristotle's politics deals with the science and art of government. Due to Aristotle's far reaching and permanent contribution to the politics he is regarded as the father of Political Science.

1.4.1 The Politics of Aristotle

Aristotle, the ablest of Plato's disciples, wrote extensively on subjects like metaphysics, psychology, rhetoric, poetry, biology, moral science, politics etc. However, Aristotle's impact in the Western world is undeniable. Political Thought owes its existence to his monumental treatise on the science of state, titled 'Politics.' Aristotle's work has always been a pillar of light for those who came after him. All political scientists around the world have found it to be a fantastic source of inspiration. The subject of 'Politics' is not only theoretical, but it also has a lot of practical application. The Politics is not a systematic study of political philosophy but rather a treatise on the art of Government. In it, Aristotle examines the sins that plagued Greek cities, as well as the flaws in their political institutions, and offers practical advice on how to avoid potentially dangerous situations. In the light of this observation, it can, therefore, be said that 'The Politics' of Aristotle is a work of such practical reason. It's a textbook for statesmen, featuring wisdom distilled from the Greek states' cumulative political experience. Aristotle classified the Politics as a treatise on government, recognising the practical component of his work.

Though 'Politics' does not have the form of a dialogue like Plato's Republic, the arrangement of its components, known as Books and chapters, is a point of contention. While Banker recognizes the division of this monumental work into three parts, Werner Jaeger is of the view that work looks like prepared in two stages. Sir David Ross considers it as a conflation of five separate treatises. Different from both Prof. Benjamin Jowett treats it as having 8 Parts.

NOTES

Similarly, scholars of Political Science have expressed controversy opinions about the worth of the 'Politics' of Aristotle. On the one hand, Zeller gives it a supreme place in the world's stock of political ideas. According to him, Aristotle's 'Politics' is the richest treasure from antiquity and the biggest contribution to the discipline of Political Science that we have. On the other hand, Prof. A.E. Taylor gives it a very insignificant place in the annals of political writings. According to him, "No Aristotelian book is quite so commonplace in its handling of a vast subject as the Politics." There are very puzzling opinions and one fails to decide as to which one is more authentic. Prof. George Catlin is in agreement with the opinion expressed by Zeller. He regards Aristotelian Politics as "the greatest single influence upon political thought." Prof. Bowle also seems to agree with Dr. Zeller when he says that the Politics of Aristotle "is the most influential and most profound. It is the book which must be mastered before all others."

The customary sequence of the book is unlikely to be the one that Aristotle had in mind. Politics, rather than being considered as an artistically created piece of literature, should be treated as a quarry of arguments and hypotheses. It is best studied by compiling and comparing all texts that deal with the same subject. The Politics of Aristotle is divided into eight books. The book is classified into three divisions. 'The Politics' covers a wide range of subjects Political Science, Education, Ethics, Jurisprudence, Psychology and Economics. The Politics, according to Aristotle, is a treatise on government. He begins his book 'Politics' with two key concepts: (i) that the state is a community, and (ii) that it is the highest of all communities, encompassing all the others, aiming for good to a larger extent than any other, and at the highest good. Aristotle began his Politics by outlining the state's origin, nature, and purpose, considering it to be the supreme organisation of human life. Aristotle examines the various states not only in theory but in practice also.

Aristotle's Politics is not only a treatise on Political Science but on education also. He considers reason as the only differential of man. The highest development of personality is achieved when this differential i.e. the reason is fully realized. The chief purpose of education is to establish the supremacy of reason. The politics is not only meant for the statesmen and educators, but it also serves as a great handbook for moral and ethical thinkers. It says a great deal about moral virtues. The aim of all political activity was to promote a good life which was the purpose of ethics. In this way, Politics and Ethics were closely related subjects.

The Politics of Aristotle is also a great treatise on jurisprudence as sufficient space has been devoted to the discussion of justice and law. Unlike Plato, Aristotle propounded what is known as the legal theory of justice. He understood that basic issue was between the rule of law and the rule of men.

The politics of Aristotle is a great work on Psychology and Economics. His conception as to the origin of the state is founded in human psychology. Man by nature, he declares, is a social animal. It is this socially which becomes the prime cause of the origin of the state. His Justification on slavery is also founded on human nature. He supports the rule of the superior over the inferior. He also

NOTES

realizes that economic motives play considerable role in influencing political actions and determining political affiliations. With this point of view, Aristotle proceeds to regulate the economic life of the community. In *Politics*, Aristotle puts arguments in defence of private property.

The influence which the *Politics* of Aristotle exercised on subsequent thought is tremendous. His classification of states was followed almost by all political philosophers in all ages. His doctrine that the state must be based on the rule of law has been one of the most civilizing and liberalizing political influences in the 19th century. The *Politics* of Aristotle, according to Zeller, is the richest treasure that has come down to us from antiquity, the finest contribution to political philosophy that we have. In the words of Prof. Bowles, "Of all the books on the subject, the *Politics* is the most influential and the most profound. It is the book which must be mastered before others."

1.4.2 Classification of Government Material

Aristotle, the ablest of Plato's disciples explained about the state in his famous book the "*Politics*". According to him state is the highest form of Political Union. It is also external institution possessing moral authority. Aristotle viewed that state was developed from the family to satisfy the needs and desires of the people. The state aims at perfection of man and there was no contradiction between the individual and the state. In fact individual can acquire self sufficiency only in the state.

Aristotle justified the natural character of the state with the help of theoretical arguments. He asserted that the true nature of man could be realised only in the state. And since man was a rational being state was a rational institution. Aristotle also emphasised the organic nature of the state and asserts that a man finds his true meaning and significance on his life only in and through relation to the state just as an organ cannot be separated from the organism, similarly an individual cannot be separated from the state. The individual and other associations draw all their importance from the state and without it they would stagnate and die. No person can attain his fullness outside the state.

Nature of the State

The state, according to Aristotle, is the highest of all organisations because, while every association strives at some good, the state encompasses all the others and aims at the highest good in a larger degree than any other. The state is a superior association because it represents the pinnacle of social growth and also because it is where man achieves his maximum moral perfection. Unlike family and village, which exist primarily for the sake of survival and friendship, the state exists for the sake of a happy life, not just for the sake of survival. In the framework of man's own nature, political society exists for the sake of heroic activities, not only collaboration. State is the highest form of association. In the family, a man reproduces himself; in the village, he meets basic human connection needs; and in the condition of solitude, he realises his complete self, especially the highest

portion of himself. In short Aristotle considers the state as an association of men for the sake of best moral life.

Functions of the State

According to Aristotle, a man is inherently good, and the state's role is to help him develop his excellent faculties into a habit of good conduct. He stated that the state's principal goal is to create a flawless and self-sufficient life, which he defined as a joyful and honourable life. He intended the state to establish the necessary conditions for people's mental, moral, and physical development for this aim. He did not want to restrict the functions of the state to mere preservation of the rights of members against infringement by others or preservation of life and property of the members. On the other hand, he attributes the most constructive function of promoting the good to the state. It should provide proper education to its members in order for them to accomplish their duties properly. It should instil moral values in young minds and make citizens' lives magnificent and moral. He saw the state as a mother to its citizens, and that its acts might lawfully extend to all personal matters. In short, Aristotle considers state as a supreme association whose chief function is to make men moral.

Classification of State and Government

Number of Persons in whom power is vested	Pure Form or Normal Government	Reverted From
One	Monarchy	Tyranny
Few	Aristocracy	Obligatory
Many	Polity	Democracy

According to Aristotle the Polity was the best and the most practicable form of government because it possessed a healthy combination of liberty and wealth. He held that the best constitution was the one which was practicable. He was even willing to have a monarchy provided the monarch was enlightened. However, he asserts that monarchy and Aristocracy have a tendency to degenerate and do not possess the qualities of moderation and stability which is a characteristic feature of polity.

Aristotelian Cycle

Aristotle says that no form of government is permanent or overlasting and the different forms of government keep on changing. This change takes place in a circle. Just as a wheels of a cycle revolve so also do the forms of government and each succeeds another. The First Form of Government, according to Aristotle is Monarchy, When the Monarchy becomes oppressive, it degenerates into Tyranny. But a Tyrranical Government cannot continue for long. It is overthrown and substituted by the government of a few efficient and talented persons. This is Aristocracy. With the lapse of time, Aristocracy also degenerates and it is converted into Oligarchy. But the people again cannot tolerate Oligarchical rule for a long. The citizens therefore make a successful revolt and establish a Polity the best form of Government, where supreme power is vested not in the hands of any class but in the mass as a whole. When polity becomes perverted, it is transformed

NOTES

NOTES

into Democracy and Democracy is replaced by Monarchy. In this way the cycle of political change is a noble idea in political philosophy which enshrines even today, the permanent truth that no form of government is static and constant.

Criticism

Aristotle's classification of the State and Government has been subjected to criticism on the following grounds:

1. It is not a complete classification because it does not cover a number of governments like limited monarchy, totalitarian government, parliamentary government, presidential government etc.
2. Aristotle considers democracy as a degenerate or perverted form of Government, whereas in our times we consider it as the best form of government in which individual gets maximum freedom to develop his personality.
3. Aristotle offers mainly a classification of governments and not states. In this regard, he has a habit of mixing together the two phrases, government and state.
4. The classification of Aristotle is not founded on scientific considerations. It's more qualitative than quantitative.

In conclusion it can be said that Aristotle's classification of states has met with severe condemnation at the hands of modern scholars and his ideas are not fully applicable to the modern conditions, but it cannot be denied that his classification has proved most lasting. Most of the political thinkers who offered classification of states or governments have largely followed the basis adopted by Aristotle. It has been asserted that in reality all the classification of Government is merely an improvement of Aristotle's classifications rather than new classifications.

1.4.3 The Best Practicable State

Plato in his book "Republic" explained almost an "Ideal State" which was utopian and unreal in nature. Aristotle, the ablest of Plato's disciples also followed his master's foot-step in giving an exposition of an ideal state. But it was not unreal, but a practical one. The books II, III, VII of Aristotle's politics deal with the political actualities. Therefore, it is desirable to discuss Aristotle's Ideal State as well as the best practicable state.

In the portrayal of his ideal state, Aristotle clearly felt the impact of Plato, even though he was more practical and realistic than Plato. As a realist he goes more closer to Plato's Laws rather than his Republic. Hence Sabine rightly says that what Aristotle calls the ideal state is always Plato's second best state. Prof. Barker also says "It is curious and suggestive that when Aristotle depicts his best he should copy Plato's second best."

Features of Aristotle's Ideal State

Aristotle's views on ideal state lie scattered throughout books III, IV and VIII of his books and are not presented in a systematic manner at any one place. By a

careful examination of three scattered views one can find the following features of his Ideal State:

NOTES

1. **Small City State:** It is the small city-state consisting of a small and intimate group of citizens whose social life overlaps the interests of family of religion and of friendly personal intercourse.
2. **Pre-dominance of Law:** Law occupies a predominate position in Aristotle's ideal state. He does not favour the personal and despotic rule of even the most virtuous person and favour impersonal rule of law, which according to him presents the wisdom of the commodity since the ages.
3. **Moral Development of Citizens:** Aristotle regarded state as an ethical institution which aims to bring about moral improvement amongst the citizens. He holds that state alone can provide the conditions under which the individual can achieve the highest type of moral development. The Ideal State of Aristotle aims at promoting a good and happy life, by which he means a virtuous and a moral life.
4. **Importance of Education:** In the Ideal state of Aristotle education plays an important role in making the citizens virtuous. He insists on compulsory state regulated education to cultivate good habits among citizens and to make the members perfect. Such perfection can be achieved by cultivating moral and intellectual excellence by the citizens which is possible through a system of uniform, compulsory, public education.
5. **Right to private property:** In the ideal state of Aristotle right to property is conceded because he considered private property as a natural institution which must be preserved. He pleads for equal distribution of land among the citizens. Though he permits right to private property he wants that the products of the best should be distributed among the people and should be used for common welfare. In short, the private property is meant for common consumption.
6. **Division of Labour:** The division of labour is another essential feature of Aristotle's ideal state. Thus, he assigns agriculture to the slaves, commerce and trade to the resident aliens and political functions to the citizens. He justifies the institutions of slavery and insists that only the leisured class should actively participate in the exercise of the sovereignty.
7. **Manageable Population:** Aristotle's Ideal State is neither too small nor too big. However, he does not prescribe any maximum or minimum number of citizens to constitute an ideal state. He simply insists that the population should be manageable. To him every citizen of the ideal state as far as possible must know each other.
8. **Small Size Territory:** Aristotle insists that the size of the territory of an ideal state should be so much so as to make it possible for the people to

NOTES

live a free and leisured life. It must possess sufficient economic resources which can meet the needs of the population. Aristotle wants that the territory a state should be small so that it is possible to have a glance of the entire territory of the state from one place. It should not be easily accessible to the foreigners.

9. **Self Sufficient State:** The ideal state should be self sufficient and should not entertain any aggressive designs against other foreign countries. It should concentrate on the fullest development of man viz. mental, moral and economic.
10. **Dominance of Middle Class:** The Ideal State of Aristotle is dominated by the middle class. Aristotle believed that it is middle class alone which can provide ability to the state because it possesses the twin qualities of obedience as well as common. It can strike a balance between the conflicting claims of the rich and the poor.
11. **Citizenship:** The ideal state should consist of six classes viz. agriculturists, artisans, a war like class, leisured class, priest, and administrator. Aristotle does not consider the members of the first two classes as citizens. The last four classes alone constitute the citizens and enjoy the exclusive prerogative to exercise all political power. The citizens of ideal state should combine the spirit and courage with intellectual keenness.
12. **Democracy:** Aristotle has much reverence for democracy. He said the state exists for the good of citizens. The administration of the state must be constitutional and is always in the best interest of the state. The state is ruled by general principles not by arbitrary decrees. The government is the representative of the people.
13. **Climate:** The Ideal State should possess a temperate climate which is congenial to both mental and physical activities. Besides the Ideal State should have ample access to sea so that it can receive the necessary imports. However he insists that the state should not be so close to sea that its defence poses a problem.

Though Aristotle devised an Ideal State, he fully realised that the Ideal State was often unattainable and therefore provided a detailed account of the best practicable or practicable state. The best practicable state avoids the extremes of democracy and oligarchy and is described by Aristotle as "Polity" or Constitutional Government.

1.4.4 Aristotle's Ideal State vs. Plato's Second Best State

Plato in his book "Republic" explained about an Ideal state which was Utopian and unreal in nature. In the portrayal of his ideal state, Aristotle clearly felt the impact of Plato, even though he was more practical and realistic than Plato. As a realist, he goes more closer to Plato's Laws rather than his Republic. Hence Salimeti rightly says that "what Aristotle calls the ideal state is always Plato's second best state." Prof. Barker also says, "It is curious and suggestive that when Aristotle

NOTES

depicts his best he should copy Plato's second Best." It was perhaps due to Aristotle's touch for realism and did not take him to the flights of imagination to which Plato. He asserts that it cannot be pronounced as to which is the best Government for a particular society without into account the special nature of the people.

Though not ideal, in complete sense of term, as the Ideal of state is not completed through Book-III of his politics. Aristotle's state is sketched as best state following the tradition of the writers of ancient Greece and been popularised as "the best practicable state" unlike his master's ideal state, which is quite impossible against ever attainable state of the disciple.

The similarities between Ideal state of Aristotle and Plato's Second Best state are explained below:

- (a) **Law:** The first striking similarity between the second best State, of Plato and the Ideal State of Aristotle is with regards to law, not as a remake-shift but as a necessary condition for moralised and civilised life. He made law supreme in his State. He regards it as the wisdom of the ages. He applies it from marriage to the burial of the dead. In this, there is a striking parallel in Aristotle's ideal State. He declares man the best of creatures when perfected, but the worst of all when removed from law and justice. According to Aristotle, the collective wisdom of the people might be superior to that of even the wisest law-giver when drafting a law. Above the sovereignty of the people, however, Aristotle, like a true Greek, places the sovereignty of law. He accepts the supremacy of law as a mark of a good state, rather than a regrettable necessity or a surrender to human frailty. "Even the wisest ruler cannot do without the law," says Salime, "since the law has an impersonal aspect that no man, however good, can reach." "Reason undisturbed by desire" is the law.
- (b) **Communism:** Secondly, Aristotle attacks on tooth and nail the Platonic conception of communism as stated in the 'Republic'. But he is one with Communism as diluted in the Statesman and the Laws, Plato in his later works, speaks of common ownership of land, but he also recognises ownership of private property. This thing is totally given up by Aristotle in his Ideal State. But Aristotle, like Plato, would like that there should be one common meal table, because taking of meals together would promote stability and unity of the State. He planned to divide the land into two sections, one public and the other private, with half of the public area going to the public welfare and the other to "defray the cost of common meals." Although Aristotle dislikes the community of wives as given in Plato's Republic, but he is one with Plato in allowing women to have education and in being similar in intelligence with men with slight difference. One thing, about which Aristotle is not clear is whether women should be allowed an equal opportunity to take up public offices or not

NOTES

(c) **Ethics:** Thirdly, both of them gave a greater place to ethics. In offering up an ethical aim as the chief end of the State, Aristotle's political ideal differed significantly from Plato's. Because it should be an organisation of men living together to attain the best possible life, the true goal of a state should involve the moral improvement of its inhabitants. This is a state's 'idea' or meaning. The state is "self-sufficient" in the sense that it offers all of the conditions necessary for the highest level of moral development. The main difference between Plato's and Aristotle's approaches is that the former portrays his true State as law-abiding, while the latter describes it as governing for the common good. This is only minor as both of them believe that morality should cover the activities of the State.

(d) **Education:** Fourthly, in both cases, education occupies an eminent place. According to them, the state's primary responsibility should be to provide a scientific course of education aimed at cultivating moral, intellectual, and physical perfection in its inhabitants in order for them to perform their civic duties properly. A system of uniform, compulsory and public education is the first necessity of an ideal State. Aristotle's educational scheme generally resembles that of Plato. Meant as it is for leisured citizens, it aims at moral and mental culture rather than at practical or professional utility, lays stress on physical training, and attaches, to music character-building virtues. He also lays emphasis on gymnastics and music; the former helps in bringing beauty, grace and symmetry in the body and the latter in producing a sound mind.

In the case of Plato, a good deal of attention was paid in the describing at length about education; In the case of Aristotle, the details are lacking; but Salim says, it may be due to the reason that he was not able to furnish the necessary details due to his early death. It may safely be said that in education the discussion of Aristotle on liberal education and his contempt for the useful is little higher than Plato. Aristotle agrees that children have to be taught some useful things, "but to be always seeking after the useful does not become exalted. There is apparent a touch of romanticism and idealising of an aristocratic way of life.

(e) **City-States in Mind:** Fifthly, both of them conceive the States in the setting of Greek city-States. When Plato spoke of his second best State and Aristotle of his ideal State they were having only the city States in mind and not any bigger unit. Even Aristotle failed to see that the future lay for bigger states, and not for the city-States as shown by the conquests of his disciple, Alexander the Great.

(f) **Similarity in details:** There is a wholesale similarity in the details as given by Plato for his second best State and the ideal State of Aristotle. Plato speaks how that his second best State cannot be located on the sea-shore. It must be agricultural and it should have all the machinery of a democracy like the Assembly. The Council of Elders, Magistrates etc.

While accepting all these things, Aristotle does not all in line with the first detail their viz. thus the State should be only inland.

- (g) **Democracy:** Seventhly Plato in his 'Statesman and the 'Laws' states a mixed State consisting of the principles of monarchy and democracy, i.e., he preserved the spirit of the philosopher kings as absolute and making it function through a democratic apparatus, In the case of Aristotle, the belief in democracy is much greater, because the State exists for the good of the citizens. The subject's political connection must be such that he does not completely relinquish his judgement and accountability. Personal or dictatorial rule is incompatible with the dignity of the subject, whereas constitutional rule is. Aristotle defines constitutional governance as being in the public or general interest. As it is the government of voluntary subjects, it is carried out through general regulations rather than arbitrary decrees. In contrast to a tyrant, the constitutional monarch governs by consensus. This is a great advance on Platonic thought, but unfortunately it was not examined systematically and thoroughly.

- (h) **Classification of States:** It can also be said that the division of States into six categories by Plato was totally copied by Aristotle; the only difference being that Plato describes his true States as law-abiding and Aristotle as existing for the general good.

The concept of separation of powers was also discussed, as well as the proper organisation and functions of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government.

Because males yearn for equality, individuals who see others enjoying privileges they do not have experience a sense of injustice. As a result, the right distribution of political power is critical to the state's security.

- (i) **Slavery:** Both Plato and Aristotle cannot conceive of a State without being based on the system of slavery. Their States can not function without leisured citizens who can get leisure only by employing slaves for their household and other duties regarding their livelihood.

Thus, the combination of factual findings with the more theoretical consideration of political objectives was the essence of Aristotle's new paradigm. Moral principles are always for Aristotle's objectives, for which the State should exist; nonetheless, he recognised that realising these standards was extremely hard. In the words of Salime. "Ideals must not exist like Plato's pattern in the heavens but as forces working in and through agencies by no means ideal". In short, Aristotle's States annotated, underlined and con-firmed Plato's Second Best State.

1.4.5 Aristotle's Theory of Revolution

Aristotle's ideas on revolutions and their causes were formed in response to frequent changes in the governments of Greek city-states as a result of degradation and decadence in political life. His opinions on revolution are found in Book V of 'the Politics,' and are largely based on his research into the workings of 158 Greek city-state constitutions. In this book, he demonstrates incredible filtering skill and

NOTES

NOTES

masterful analysis in dealing with the causes of revolutions, as well as ripe political insight in advocating preventive measures.

Meaning of Revolution

The term 'revolution' was given a fairly broad definition by Aristotle, who suggested two interpretations:

- (i) Any large or minor constitutional change, such as the transition from monarchy to oligarchy.
- (ii) Even though there was no change in the government or constitution, a change in the ruling power was considered a revolution.

As a result, a transition from monarchy to dictatorship, or vice versa, is referred to as a revolution.

Causes of Revolution

Aristotle has enumerated a number of causes of revolution which can broadly be studied under the following three heads:

- 1. General causes of Revolution:** According to Aristotle, the natural desire of people to be treated as equal is one of the major general cause of revolution. People always envy the privileges and superior position of the few and want to do away with the existing system. If a substantial section of the society feels that justice is not being done to them there is every possibility of a revolution. So, Aristotle rightly asserts that more the equality more stable the state is.
- 2. Particular causes of Revolution:** Aristotle has enumerated the following particular causes of revolution:
 - (a) Demand for social, political and economic equality with those in authority, while those who are in power want to acquire more privileges. This is bound to result in revolution.
 - (b) Grant of undue prominence to some people is resented by the people and they mobilise the public opinion which poses a serious threat to the unity and solidarity of the state.
 - (c) Grant of absolute power to one of few individuals ultimately paves the way for revolution.
 - (d) Misuse of authority by those in power is also likely to promote the spirit of revolution.
 - (e) Disproportionate increases of any part-territorial, social, economic or otherwise of the state.
 - (f) The use unscrupulous methods in elections for capture of power also invites revolution.
 - (g) Careless of admission of corrupt and disloyal officers to civil and military posts can generate revolution.

NOTES

- (h) The rivalry among members of various races living in a state leads to revolution.
- (i) Excessive and irrational use of force is dangerous in so far as people may tolerate it for sometime but ultimately they are bound to rise against the authority.
- (j) Dynamic quarrels also pave the way for revolution because the different claimants come to be supported by different factions.
- (k) The neglect of minor changes can sometimes assume serious dimensions and culminate in revolution.
- (l) Free flow of immigrants can also lead to revolution.
- (m) The conquest of one nation by another nation also contains seeds of revolution.

3. Revolution in a Particular kind of State: Aristotle also discussed the causes of revolution in particular types of state viz. Democracies, Oligarchies, Aristocracies and Polities:

- (a) In democracies revolutions are caused due to excessive use of powers by the ruler.
- (b) In oligarchies revolutions take place either due to rivalry and dissensions among the ruling oligarchies or due to oppressive and dictatorial nature of their rule.
- (c) In Aristocracies the revolutions are spearheaded by those who are denied honour which are conferred only on the few.
- (d) In Polity the revolution is caused due to defective balance of the different elements in the constitution. In other words the revolutions in polity are due to mal-admixture of the Oligarchic and democratic elements.
- (e) Revolts in Monarchy and Tyranny are caused by two factors viz hatred and contempt generated in the minds of the people due to insolent and oppressive behaviour of the rulers or influence of the foreign state of opposite character.

Prevention of Revolution

Aristotle not only highlights the various causes which lead to revolution but also outlines the measures that can help in preventive the revolution. Aristotle suggested two broad methods for checking the revolution:

1. General means of Prevention: Aristotle suggested the following general means for the prevention of revolution:

- (a) An effort should be made to gain the confidence of all the sections of society by eliminating all system of in justice and treating the various classes with consideration. All the offices should be open to all.

NOTES

- (b) By cultivating and maintaining a spirit of law abidingness among the citizens.
- (c) Citizens should be imparted necessary education in the spirit of the constitution. If they know how their constitution works, they will adjust themselves accordingly and there shall be very little possibility of revolution.
- (d) Even petty changes in the statusquo should be seriously viewed and attended to because their neglect can ultimately result in complete revolutions.
- (e) No person or class of persons should be permitted to assume too much of power.
- (f) The government office should not be permitted to become sources of gain, all the offices should be made honorary.
- (g) Public offices should not be granted on permanent basis.
- (h) As far as possible promotions to political posts should be gradual because sudden and quick promotions are likely lead to resentment.
- (i) High and important posts should not be given to the outsiders and strangers.
- (j) Efforts should be made to keep the spirit of patriotism alive among the citizens.
- (k) As inequalities of wealth and honour drive men to rebellion, the rewards and offices should be distributed as widely as possible.
- (l) The details of administration particularly those of public finance should be open to public scrutiny.

Particular Methods for Prevention of Revolution

After suggesting general methods of prevention of revolution Aristotle proceeds to suggest particular methods for the prevention of revolutions in different forms of Governments:

1. In democracy the rich should be made to feel that their property estates shall not be redistributed. They should be allowed to participate in the administration of the country.
2. In Aristocracy and Oligarchy the people should be treated with fairness and no single person or group of persons should be permitted to become too powerful. The poor people should also be associated with the administration.
3. In Polity revolution can be avoided by proper blending of the democratic and Oligarchic elements.
4. Aristotle suggests following methods to check revolution under tyranny:
 - (i) Providing good espionage system including women spies.
 - (ii) Following policy of aggression and expansion.

- (iii) Creating a sense of constant danger and treat from a powerful energy among the masses.
- (iv) Development of intellectual life of the citizens.
- (v) Keeping people busy in non-political activities.
- (vi) Creating sense of hospitality and dishonest among various sections of the people.
- (vii) Participating in public worship and religious ceremonies.
- (viii) Enlisting a large social support as possible.
- (ix) Earning reputation for military virtues.
- (x) Showing favours personally but punishing through others.
- (xi) Personally bestow favours on others to gain popularity.
- (xii) Chopping off the heads of the inconvenient powerful leaders.

NOTES

The above study of Aristotle's views on revolution shows that he possessed great insight into the human mind and offered the most penetrating analysis of the causes of revolutions and the means for their prevention. In this regard he can be treated as a fore-runner of Machiavelli.

1.4.6 Aristotle's Contribution to the Political Thought

Political Science is an ancient field of learning first began in the Greek city-states before 5th and 4th century B.C. Greek thinkers like Socrates, Plato and Aristotle made scientific study of the several aspects of Political Science. Plato in his book "The Republic" justified moral significance of the state, its supremacy over the individual. Aristotle is said to be the intellectual child of Plato. He pioneered a methodical study of Political Science as a distinct academic subject by separating politics from ethics in his classic work "The Politics." Aristotle's ideas have had a significant impact on future generations of political theorists, as well as on the evolution of political thinking. Aristotle is known as the "Father of Political Science" because of his extensive and long-lasting contributions to the area.

Aristotle was the first pragmatic thinker to base his conclusions on data, facts, figures, and other evidence, and to apply a scientific approach to the subject's research. Some of the important principles of universal nature which are accepted even today, contained in the thought of Aristotle are as follows:

- 1. Concept of Rule of Law & Constitutional State:** The concept of rule of law and constitutional state which is universally accepted in all the democratic states at present was his more important legacy to the posterity. Aristotle emphasised the supremacy of law and asserted that no constitution could exist without law. Thus he emphasised the principle of constitutionalism which was further developed by thinkers like Aquinas, Hooker and Locke.
- 2. Natural Origin of State:** Aristotle emphasised the principle of natural origin of state. He claimed that man is a political animal, and that sex and appetite drives have played a significant role in the formation of states.

NOTES

3. **Harmony between Liberty and Authority:** For the first time, Aristotle succeeded in reconciling the notions of liberty and authority; he rejected the notion that liberty consists of living as one pleases and maintained that constitutional control is the individual's salvation. He took liberty as "the subjection to unselfish and constitutional authority and obedience to right and proper law". He assigned an important role to the people in the formulation of laws as members of the popular assembly. He also gives them the power to elect their own rulers and judges and exercise necessary supervision over their working. In short he sought to bring about a happy blending of authority and liberty.
4. **Utilitarianism:** Aristotle was the first to emphasise the principle of maximum happiness of the maximum number of people. Thus he not only became the forerunner of the utilitarian philosophy but also anticipated the principles adopted by the modern welfare state. He was not happy with the state performing merely negative functions and assigned to it positive functions so that the moral development of the citizens could be achieved.
5. **Importance of Public Opinion:** Aristotle appreciated the importance of the public opinion and asserted that the multitude of people have always better knowledge and judgement than a single or a handful of persons. Thus he emphasised the importance of the masses and public opinion.
6. **Separation of Powers:** Aristotle anticipated the theory of separation of powers by dividing the governmental functioning into deliberative magisterial and judicial. The influence of Aristotle is quite evident in Montesquie's theory of separation of powers.
7. **Father of Conservatism:** Aristotle is considered as the God father of modern conservatives. He was the first to insist that the existing institutions must be presented because they represented the collective wisdom of generations. He argued that since these institutions had existed for such a long time it was by itself a sufficient proof of their utility.
8. **Importance to Middle Class:** Aristotle was first to emphasise the importance of the middle class as a balancing force for the preservation of the political institutions. He considered Polity as the best practicable state because it was a middle class state. These views of Aristotle have been testified by history because only the states dominated by middle class have been stable, while those dominated by extremely rich or poor people have proved short-lived.
9. **Justification of Private Property:** Aristotle offered more effective justification for the institution of private property and made a strong plea for its retention. To him private property should be used for the good of the community. His views on private property and its use for the good of the community have come to be universally accepted in our times.

NOTES

10. **As a Realist:** Aristotle was the first realist who took note of the things as they were rather than concentrating on the things as they should be. Therefore, he moved from the particular to the general. He completely rejected the ideal state of Plato and accepted his second best state as his ideal state because it was practicable and attainable.
11. **Separation of Politics and Ethics:** The Political Thought of Plato was a mixture of politics and ethics. But Aristotle is the first political philosopher who separated politics from ethics. This idea was further developed by Machiavelli and Hobbes.
12. **Supporter of individualism:** Aristotle was a great individualist and held that the individual was historically prior to the state and the latter exists for the moral development of the former. He rejects Plato's concept that the individual was merely a means to an end and treats the individual as an end. He considers state as a means for the moral development of the individual.
13. **Close Relationship between Politics and Economics:** Aristotle emphasised the close relationship between politics and Economics and asserted that economics activities were bound to influence the political organisations as well as actions. This is evident from his assertion that where there was concentration of wealth and power, political stability and not be possible. Again he asserts that inequality. He says that political stability is possible only in a state where, there are no extremes of wealth or poverty. In emphasizing the influence of Economics on politics Aristotle anticipates Marx.
14. **Use of Comparative Method:** Aristotle also laid the foundations of the comparative method of study of political institutions. His views were mainly based on the study of 158 constitutions of the Greek city states.

Scholars have showered high praise on Aristotle for his contributions to political thought. Aristotle's politics, according to Zellter, is the richest treasure that has come down to us from antiquity, and it is one of the greatest contributions to the area of political science that we have. Due to above contributions of Aristotle to the study of politics, he is regarded as the father of Political Science.

1.4.7 Comparison between Aristotle and Plato

Aristotle was Plato's most illustrious follower. At the age of 18, Aristotle enrolled in Plato's Academy and lasted for 20 years, until Plato's death. This long association with Plato naturally left a deep impact in the mind of Aristotle. As Plato's greatest follower, Aristotle drew inspiration from him on a variety of subjects. However, there is a significant distinction between the two political theorists. If Plato was a preeminently radical thinker, Aristotle's political speculations were undoubtedly conservative. Plato is a deductive thinker, but Aristotle is an inductive thinker. The chief difference between the two are as follows:

NOTES

1. Plato was an idealist who attached great importance to idea as the source and basis of the knowledge of reality. It means he conceived an idea without concrete manifestation. Aristotle as a realist loved facts and attached great importance to their collection and examination. Aristotle built up his system of thought on observation and analysis of facts and the scientific interest dominates his political thought. While Plato built a Philosophy from general to particular, Aristotle propounded a philosophy of particular to general.
2. Plato suggests some radical and novel institutions which were never known to the Greek world. His rule of the philosopher king, ideas on communism of wives and prosperity were new ideas. But Aristotle repudiates the novel institutions suggested by Plato. He criticises Plato for the departure from common experience. Thus, while Plato would like to have new institutions which do not accord with the existing political experience. Aristotle is essentially conservative in this regard.
3. Plato over emphasises the unity of the state. His scheme of functional specialisation, rule of philosopher king and special training and environment for the guardians etc. are all directed towards the goal of achieving a strong sense of unity. Aristotle on the other hand is opposed to the idea of such a high degree of unity. He believes that the state is built up of a variety of men, not just a large number of them, because the same men do not make up the state. It is very nature of the state to be plurality of dissemblers. Aristotle condemns Plato's scheme of functional specialisation and assents it would lead to disunity rather than unity. He also does not agree with Plato that the division of labour brought to the state into existence because this presupposed the existence of the individual prior to the state. Aristotle on the other hand holds that by definition, the state comes before the family and the person.
4. Aristotle does not agree with Plato that property and family were the chief causes of social disharmony and the communism of property and wives would do away with this disharmony and prove the way for unity of the state. According to Aristotle, the state's unity can be attained not by destroying time-honored institutions such as private property and family, but by ensuring that individuals are properly educated in the spirit of the constitution. He considers the ownership of property as a natural human instinct and treats it as essential for the fullest moral development of the individuals. Aristotle also favour retention of property and family because, it gives rise to sentiments of charity and benevolence.
5. Aristotle also does not agree with Plato's notion of communism of wives because it was neither scientific, nor rational. He argues that the institution of family is a time honoured institution and possesses certain obvious advantages. Abolition of this institution would give rise to confusion and disharmony under the communism of wives. The children are bound to be neglected.

6. Aristotle does not approve of the arrangement envisaged by Plato in his Ideal State in which the overwhelming majority of the population viz the peasants are completely neglected and the scheme of education as well as communism of property and wives is meant only for the guardian class. Aristotle argues that this is bound to lead to an unbridgeable gulf between the guardians and non-guardians and create two hostile states within the same state. Aristotle also views that if majority of the population is not given any chance to develop their personality, dissatisfaction is bound to arise which can pose a serious threat to the unity and harmony of the state. Aristotle asserts that a unity arising out of the elimination of all diversities in individual is fatal to the state just as identity in musical tones is fatal to musical harmony.

NOTES

Points of Argument between the Two

Though Aristotle criticises numerous ideas and pronouncements of his master Plato, still Aristotle agrees with Plato on the following points:

- (a) Man is by nature social and must live an associated life. Society being an integral part of man's life he cannot live without it.
- (b) State is indispensable for the development of human faculties. It insists for the moral perfection of the individuals.
- (c) There is no contradiction between the interest of the individual and the state.
- (d) A good life could be payable in a city state of a moderate state.
- (e) Democracy is not an ideal form of government because it associates all with government.
- (f) Education plays an important role in the state. It not only promotes virtue but also, imparts training to the mind in the proper direction.
- (g) Slavery is essential so that the citizens may be able to concentrate on mental work, manual labour should be done by the slaves alone.
- (h) There was a close link between the political and ethical problems and the two could not be separated.
- (i) Mixed constitution was the best guarantee for the development of a healthy state.
- (j) Both are metaphysical in so far as they say that nations had made some men of gold, silver and copper.
- (k) With different methods both aim at unity equate state and safety and give no right to man against the state.

NOTES

Check Your Progress

I. Multiple Choice Questions

1. Which one of following is written by Plato?
 - (a) The Politics
 - (b) The Republic
 - (c) The Arthashastra
 - (d) The Social Contract
2. 'Academy' is an educational institution established by _____.
 - (a) Plato
 - (b) Aristotle
 - (c) Kautilya
 - (d) Gandhi
3. _____ describes Plato's Republic as a treatise on education.
 - (a) Banker
 - (b) Rousseau
 - (c) Aristotle
 - (d) Bentham
4. _____ was the Tutor of Plato?
 - (a) Aristotle
 - (b) Socrates
 - (c) Cephalus
 - (d) Thrasymachus
5. Which theory of justice is rejected by Plato?
 - (a) Traditional Theory of justice by old Cephalus,
 - (b) Sophists theory of justice by Thrasymachus
 - (c) Glaucon's Theory
 - (d) All the above
6. Which one of the following is not a feature of Plato's ideal state?
 - (a) Rule of Philosopher king
 - (b) State-Regulated Education
 - (c) Inequality of men and women
 - (d) Functional specialisation
7. _____ was the tutor/master of Aristotle.
 - (a) Plato
 - (b) Socrates
 - (c) Phillip
 - (d) Alexander
8. Which one of the following book is written by Aristotle?
 - (a) Republic
 - (b) Lae
 - (c) Politics
 - (d) Leviathan
9. _____ is regarded as the father of Political Science.
 - (a) Plato
 - (b) Aristotle
 - (c) Socrates
 - (d) Rousseau
10. 'Lyceum' is an educational institution established by _____.
 - (a) Socrates
 - (b) Plato
 - (c) Aristotle
 - (d) Hobbes
11. _____ said "man is a social animal."
 - (a) Socrates
 - (b) Plato
 - (c) Rousseau
 - (d) Aristotle

12. 'The Politics' is written by _____.

- (a) Plato (b) Aristotle
(c) Locke (d) Bethan

II. True or False

1. 'The Politics' is written by Plato.
2. Plato Republic is known as concerning justice.
3. Plato did not believe in state controlled education.
4. Aristotle is regarded as the Farther of Political.
5. Aristotle was blind follower of his teacher Plato.

III. Match the Following

(A)

1. Plato
2. Aristotle
3. The Republic
4. Philosopher King
5. Monarchy

(B)

- (a) Ideal state of Plato
- (b) Concerning Justice
- (c) Tyranny
- (d) The Republic
- (e) The Politics

NOTES

1.5 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

I. Multiple Choice Questions

1. (c)
2. (a)
3. (b)
4. (b)
5. (d)
6. (c)
7. (a)
8. (c)
9. (b)
10. (c)
11. (d)
12. (b)

II. True and False

1. False
2. True
3. False
4. True
5. False

NOTES

III. Match the Following

1. (d)
2. (e)
3. (b)
4. (a)
5. (c)

1.6 SUMMARY

It is evident from the above discussion that Plato has left a deep impact on political thought and most of the ideologies which emerged in the subsequent centuries felt the impact of his writings. No doubt, sometimes, Plato is condemned for giving certain Utopian ideas, but does not in any way undermine his permanent contributions to political philosophy. Prof. Maxey has rightly observed “There was much in Plato of the ephemeral and the provisionable, but the mid rib of his philosophy was timeless and universal”.

Scholars have showered high praise on Aristotle for his contributions to political thought. Aristotle’s politics, according to Zellter, is the richest treasure that has come down to us from antiquity, and it is one of the greatest contributions to the area of political science that we have. Aristotle is known as the “Father of Political Science” because of his contributions to the study of politics.

1.7 KEY TERMS

- **Pragmatic Theory:** The Pragmatic Theory of Justice is stated by Galucon.
- **Barrack:** All guardians are to live together in common barracks.
- **Utilitarianism:** Aristotle was the first to emphasise the principle of maximum happiness of the maximum number of people.

1.8 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short Type Questions

1. Greek city states
2. Plato’s Philosopher king
3. Plato’s views on communism of property
4. Features of Platonic system of Education.
5. Traditional theory of Justice
6. Aristotle’s views on Nature of the state
7. General causes of Revolution as stated by Aristotle.

NOTES**Long Type Questions**

1. Discuss the salient features of Greek Political Thought.
2. Discuss briefly the Philosophy and subject matter of Plato's Republic.
3. Examine Plato's Theory of Justice.
4. Discuss the Plato's theory of Education.
5. Examine Plato's views on Communism of Property and Wives.
6. Make a comparison between Plato's Communism and Modern Communism.
7. Discuss Plato's conception of Ideal State.
8. Explain the contributions of Plato to the history of Western Political Philosophy.
9. Examine Aristotle's Classification of Government.
10. Write an essay on Aristotle's Ideal State.
11. Write an essay on Aristotle's theory of Revolution.
12. "Aristotle's Ideal state is always Plato's Second Best state." Justify.
13. Discuss the contribution of Aristotle to the Political Thought.
14. "Aristotle is the father of Political Science". Explain.

ACTIVITY

Provide two real-life examples to prove how:

1. "Plato's view of the rule of Philosopher King is based on his psychological analysis of human nature." Elucidate.
2. "Aristotle's Ideal state is always Plato's Second Best state" Justify.
3. "Aristotle is the father of Political Science". Explain.

CASE STUDY**"Plato Attached Great importance to the Concept of Justice."**

Plato placed a high value on the concept of justice, as seen by the fact that his book Republic is subtitled "On Justice." The discovery of the nature and habitat of Justice is, in reality, the central question of the Republic. Plato begins his explanation of his idea of justice by reviewing the various existing doctrines of justice, then rejecting them and presenting his own views. He believes that justice can be found in both the person and society. Justice, according to Plato, is the essential social principle. As a result, the Republic is known as a treatise on justice.

Question:

1. "Plato's theory of education is intimately linked with his theory of Justice". Explain.

NOTES

1.9 REFERENCES

1. E. Barker. (1918). "Greek Political Theory of Plato and his Predecessors". London: Methuen & Co.
2. E. Barker. (1906). "Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle". London: Methuen & Co.
3. F.W. Coker. (1938). "Readings in Political Philosophy". New York, Macmillan Co.
4. R.G. Gettell. (1953). "History of Political Thought". London: Allen and Unwin.
5. W.W. Willoughby. (1903). "Political Theories of the Ancient World". Longmans, Green & Co.

Unit II Medieval Political Thought

Learning Objectives:

This unit devotes the discussion the basic Features of Medieval Political Thought, Political Thought of two Medieval Philosopher St. Thomas Aquinas and Machiavelli. After studying this unit, you should be able to understand:

- Salient Features of Medieval Political Thought
- Political Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas, particularly his views on Church, State and Law
- Political Thought of Niccolo Machiavelli with special reference to his views on State Sovereignty, Power Politics and Separation of Ethics and Politics

Structure:

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Salient Features of Medieval Political Thought
- 2.3 St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274 A.D.)
 - 2.3.1 Thomas Aquinas' Views on Church
 - 2.3.2 Thomas Aquinas' Views on State
 - 2.3.3 Relations between Church and the State
 - 2.3.4 Thomas Aquinas' Views on Law
 - 2.3.5 Contributions to Political Thought
- 2.4 Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527 A.D.)
 - 2.4.1 Machiavelli's Method
 - 2.4.2 Factors Influencing the Thinking of Machiavelli
 - 2.4.3 Machiavelli on Human Nature
 - 2.4.4 Machiavelli's Views on State Sovereignty
 - 2.4.5 Machiavelli on Power Politics
 - 2.4.6 Separation Ethics and Politics
 - 2.4.7 Machiavelli's Contribution to Political Thought
 - 2.4.8 Position of Machiavelli on Political Thought
- 2.5 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.6 Summary
- 2.7 Key Terms

NOTES

2.8 Self-Assessment Questions and Exercises

2.9 References

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The period of Medieval Political Thought was the period between the end of classical antiquity and the beginning of the Renaissance, around 500 A.D. to 1450 A.D. The Medieval Political Thought assumed of a universal society in Political matters and a universal ecclesiastical system. Because non-political activity predominated throughout this time, researchers have inclined to believe that political ideas did not advance during this time. They believed that political ideas did not advance during this time. The rulers possessed a general lack of intelligence, and education was neglected. As a result, there were few fresh ideas in the political arena. But in actual practice, a lot of development took place during this period. These ideas affected our attitudes, values and institutions.

St. Thomas Aquinas is often described as the representative of the totality of the medieval thought. He was one of the most scholarly and logical thinkers of the medieval age. His philosophy most naturally embodies the moral and religious ideals that underpin mediaeval civilisation. Besides him, Marsiglio of Podua is also considered one of the most outstanding philosophers of the Middle Ages. But with Niccolo Machiavelli a new phase in the development of Political Philosophy sets in medieval period. Machiavelli was the first Modern Political Philosopher. In fact, rather than being a Political Philosopher, he was a Practical Politician.

2.2 SALIENT FEATURES OF MEDIEVAL POLITICAL THOUGHT

Some of the important features of the Ancient Greek Political Thought are:

- (i) **Origin of State:** During the medieval period, various theories regarding origin of state were developed but in the main the medieval thinkers believed in contractual origin of the state. The political thinkers during this period completely rejected the Platonic and Aristotelian concept that the state originated in nature and aimed at fulfilment of human nature. The Church fathers tried to present the state as a contemptible institution. Thomas Aquinas made a radical change in this concept of the origin of state. He challenged the Christian concept of sinful origin of the state and asserted that the state was natural to man. Thus during the medieval theories regarding the origin of state were in vogue.
- (ii) **Theory of Monarchy:** During the mediaeval period, monarchy was regarded as the greatest and most natural form of government and political structure. The medieval thinkers drew a distinction between the monarchy and monarch. The people were expected to render full obedience to the monarchy although they could disobey and resist the unjust monarch. The king was allowed to exercise absolute powers and

was subject to limitations of the law of nature and community. He could not ignore and disregard the customs which represented the wisdom of ages. The medieval thinkers preferred monarch over democracy because they thought only monarch could meet the anarchic conditions of medieval times.

NOTES

- (iii) **Concept of Law:** In mediaeval political thinking, the concept of law was extremely important. The concept of law was very different from what we have today. The scope of law, natural law, customary laws etc. At that time, the laws were considered as superior to the king and even the king was expected to obey it. However, Thomas Aquinas held that no will whether Divine or human could be the source of law. To him, law was essentially an expression of reason.
- (iv) **Faith in Universalism:** Another notable features of the Medieval Political Thought was faith in the existence of a cosmopolitan society. The political thinkers of this period held that the Church and the state were indivisible parts of the society. These two organizations, headed by the king and the pope, respectively, worked in complete cooperation for the spiritual salvation of man. Universalism recognized the existence of a single universal society technically called a *respublica christiana* under the supremacy of the pope.
- (v) **Theory of Sovereignty:** The concept of sovereignty that we understand in the present time was absent in the medieval political thought. The medieval political thinkers never conceived political authority in absolute terms. They considered divine reason and moral orders as serious checks on the political authority. The Laws of Nature the supremacy of church also acted as limitation on the authority of sovereignty. Further the Feudal Lords also posed check on the authority of the king. The community, also enjoyed control over the king and could change a despotic king. As a result, an idea of restricted or constitutional sovereignty existed.
- (vi) **Supremacy of Church:** The church was the most powerful institution during the Middle Ages. It maintained control over all other institutions. The state was also subordinated to the church. The decision of the church on all issues of politics, economics and religion was final. The church fathers were supposed to lead a spiritual life, but in practice they led a luxurious life. Thus, in the medieval period, church fathers subjected politics and economics to religion and morality as well as ethics and the church would be in overall charge of the state. Similarly the rise of feudalism contributed to the growth of the church's powers because their interests demanded the presence of weak kings on the throne and they naturally extended support to church.

In the medieval period, the battle between the church and the state, as well as the church's relationships with common people, learned people,

NOTES

feudal landlords, and students of educational institutions, supplied ample live materials for political philosophy.

- (vii) **Co-existence between the Divine Right Theory and Social Contract Theory:** The co-existence between the Divine Right Theory and social contract theory was very popular in the medieval period. The monarchy in the middle ages was limited by two forces i.e. Divine Right Theory and Social Contract Theory. But, in practice, most of the kings resorted to autocratic tactics and ultimately made them dictator.
- (viii) **Predominance of the Law of Nature:** The primacy of natural law is another major element of mediaeval political thinking. The fathers of the church and mediaeval thinkers saw nature's rule as supreme in society. They did not, however, follow the law of nature in its original version, which prohibited slavery and private property, despite the fact that all of these things existed throughout the Middle Ages.
- (ix) **Theory of Representation:** The theory of representation was another outstanding feature of medieval political thought. The growth of this theory was rendered possible due to the fall of the Roman Empire and the constituent disintegration of state authority. This paved the way for the rise of ecclesiastical authorities and Feudal Lords etc. Gradually, this marked the beginning of the institution of representation as well as modern parliament.
- (x) **Rise of Feudalism:** Feudal institutions emerged during medieval period. There were feudal villages ruled by feudal lords in place of an organised and sovereign state. The majority of feudal Lords were powerful, and some even had sovereign authority. The Feudal Lords sought power because of the strife between the church and the state. As a result, the institution of Feudalism shaped mediaeval philosophy and institutions. As stated by Prof. Sabine, "Feudal institutions dominated in the Middle Ages as completely as the city-state dominated antiquity."
- (xi) **Scholasticism:** Scholastic thought was a way of thinking in which purely rational philosophy was subordinated to accepted theological notions. Scholasticism arose in the Middle Ages as a result of the harmonisation of early church fathers' doctrinal traditions with classical antiquity's intellectual achievements. The most outstanding thinkers who made valuable contributions to the growth of scholasticism were Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus. They argued that philosophy did not come in conflict with theology and assigned important position to theology.

St. Thomas Aquinas and Marsiglio of Padua were two most scholarly and logical thinkers of the medieval period.

2.3 ST. THOMAS AQUINAS (1225-1274 A.D.)

St. Thomas Aquinas, a Christian philosopher known for his master work of synthesis of the medieval thought and systematization of Latin theology. He

NOTES

was one of the most scholarly and logical thinker of the medieval age. It was, in fact, he who represented the totality of medieval thought. He was born in 1227 A.D. at Rocca Sicca near Naples in a family that belonged to the highest Italian aristocracy. The family was related to many European kings and emperors. From his very early age he was brought up by ecclesiastics. He studied in the universities of Naples, Bologna and Paris. In Paris, he became well known as a teacher of philosophy and theology.

At that time nationalism was striking roots and position of the church was declining. Within the church also there was cleavage. In 1261 Pope Urban IV invited St. Aquinas to Rome to effect reconciliation with the Greek church and expose the fast dying cause of church. Aquinas accomplished this task with remarkable success. In 1261 he wrote his treatise *Against the Errors of Greeks* with a view to effect reconciliation between the Greek church and the church of Rome. In 1265 he wrote *Summa Theologica* in which he highlighted that was important in Christianity. In this work he also propounded his doctrine of law. Another important work of Thomas Aquinas was 'Rule of Prince', a purely political treatise. His works also show deep influence of Aristotle on him. He is also known by the titles of 'Christianised Aristotle of the Middle Ages' and 'Sainted Aristotle of the Thirteenth Century'. He died in 1274 A.D. comparatively at a very young age of forty seven only.

2.3.1 Thomas Aquinas' Views on Church

The 13th century was a time of immense religious and intellectual change, and St. Thomas Aquinas flourished at that time. Scholasticism was at its pinnacle during the time. Scholasticism was in fact the logical interpretation of religious dogmas. Its goal was to use the development of intellectual power to bring reason to the support of faith and to improve religious life and the church. It aimed at silencing all doubts and questions about the church through argumentations. Its chief characteristics were two, namely, the church dogma was infallible and unquestionable; and dogma was not contrary to reason. The scholasticism was a master key to the understanding of medievalism.

A great supporter of Papal claims to supremacy, St. Thomas Aquinas was one of the two leaders in the development of church doctrine. Augustinianism is the fusion of Plato and Christianity, Thomism is the synthesis of Aristotle and Christianity. Aristotle stood for the supremacy of reason and Christianity for the supremacy of faith. Thomas Aquinas said that reason and faith were not contradictory. They were rather complementary and supplementary to each other. Aristotle stood for scientific enquiry and Christianity for divine revelation. What St. Thomas did was to combine and harmonize the teaching of divine revelation on the one hand, and the philosophical and scientific enquiry on the other. By blending the religious and rational ideas in a single system of thought St. Thomas Aquinas affected a high point of equilibrium that was compatible with the long term interests of the church. The stand thus taken by him was an enormous concession to rationalism. All throughout he maintained the faith of Christianity with rationalism of Aristotle. It led Prof. Maxey to remark that Aquinas was the Sainted Aristotle of

NOTES

Middle Ages. For centuries, Thomas Aquinas' thorough synthesis of Christian theology and Aristotelian philosophy shaped Roman Catholic dogma and was regarded as the church's official philosophy. Thomas Aquinas gave to the papal authority a position of overwhelming pre-eminence. He suggested the supremacy of the Pope over all persons and all classes in society.

2.3.2 Thomas Aquinas' Views on State

The state, according to Thomas Aquinas, was not the outcome of human sins. To him, the state is a natural expansion that serves to improve people's lives. He assigned a positive role to the state and also assigned it the duty of making the citizens virtuous and moral. He thought that the state is responsible for maintaining social order. The state establishes a space for people to flourish and develop, free from the hazards of violence and instability, by establishing clear norms, rights, and responsibilities. According to him, the general welfare of everyone is dependent on state power.

He asserted that happiness lies not only in virtue but also in the availability of adequate material goods. He wanted the state to provide order and peace without which virtue was not possible. He wanted the ruler to frame and enforce such laws which could stop wickedness and were conducive to virtue.

Again it was the duty of the state to keep the people safe from enemies and take necessary steps for their defence. As poverty and exploitation hinder the advancement of the community, Aquinas insisted on just wages and just prices. He considered illiteracy yet another impediment to good life and pleaded for education of people. He directs the rulers to correct whatever is wrong, to supply whatever is lacking and to strive to perfect whatever can be improved.

Thomas Aquinas offered a theory of origin of state which was fundamentally different from the theory of state offered by the church fathers. He refuted their claim that the state arose as a result of man's fall and crimes, claiming that man is by nature and necessity a social animal, and that the state arose naturally. He also rejected the contention of church fathers that state was introduced for the punishment of sin and asserted that the restraint which the political society imposed upon its members was not a hindrance but an indispensable means to their moral development.

He further argued that if the rule of the more virtuous and higher in excellence knowledge and status over the lower one is in accordance with nature, the state was a natural institution. While asserting its natural character he also tried to establish that state was a creation of God, in so far as political society results from the social instinct that God has implanted in man. This concept of the natural origin of the state did not find ready approval with the subsequent philosophers.

Regarding government in a state, Aquinas followed the Aristotelian principle of classification of governments and divided the governments into normal and perverted. He classified monarchy, aristocracy, and polity as natural governments, whereas tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy were classified as perverted

NOTES

governments. However, he considered monarchy as the best form of government only because it can establish unity, which no other form of government can achieve and it ensures continuity of experience. He defended monarchy as the finest form of administration, claiming that cities and provinces under democratic control have been riven by discord, whereas kingdoms have reunited in peace and prosperity. However he does not vest the king with absolute authority and makes him responsible to God. He said that responsibility of the king to God is demonstrated by the fact that he is made subordinate to the Pope, the representative of God on earth. Aquinas also makes the king responsible to the people and provides the power to the people to check a tyrant. Thus, the imposition of various restrictions on the authority of the king and assignment of positive duties on monarch, clarity proves Thomas Aquinas favoured a constitutional monarchy.

As a result, Aquinas backed the establishment of a state with a monopoly on military and police violence. He felt that the state is responsible for establishing a good social order. To him, the general welfare of everyone is dependent on state power. State, according to him, is a natural growth that serves to improve the welfare of the people.

2.3.3 Relations between Church and the State

The relationship between the church and the state was a dominant feature of the writing of all medieval political thinkers. Naturally Thomas Aquinas expressed his views on the relationship between the church and the state. As a supporter of Papal rule, Aquinas took the side of pope and subordinated the state to the church. He also imposed some limitation on the Papal jurisdiction over the secular rulers and permitted it to interfere only in matters involving sin. He was opposed to the idea of Pope's power to interfere in all temporal matters. To him, the temporal end of all human being is earthly happiness and this could be achieved through the temporal ruler. But the superior most end of spiritual salvation could be achieved only through the church. He pointed out that the main reason of conflict between the church and the state was that both of them aim at moral upliftment of the individual. To him, if the task of moral well being had been assigned to one and temporal happiness to the other there would not have been any conflict between the two. He expressed the view that state was subordinate to the church in so far as their spheres overlap. He explained the subordinate position of the state to church by comparing the functions of the temporal ruler with the carpenter of the ship who is expected to keep the ship in repair while on voyage, while the church was like the pilot who steered the ship to the goal of its voyage. Thus, Thomas Aquinas considers the state as a vassal of the church.

2.3.4 Thomas Aquinas' Views on Law

The most essential component of St. Thomas Aquinas' political ideas is his notion of law and justice. His views on laws was one of the most lasting contribution to the political thought because he conceived state in terms of law and not law in terms of the state. According to him, "Law is an ordinance of reason of the common good promulgated by him who has the care of the community." It

NOTES

means there are two features of law i.e. it is an ordinance of reason and that it can be promulgated only by an authority empowered to do so. Thus, a law promulgated by the ruler which is against the precepts of reason is not a true law to Aquinas. Similarly the precepts of reason do not become law unless they are promulgated by the ruler. So, law combined the dictates of reason and authority of ruler. A critical examination of the definition of law by Thomas Aquinas is found to imply three things:

1. Law is product of reason.
2. Law is the command of sovereign.
3. The common good is the basis of law.

Thus, his definition marks a new stage of development in the conception of law. To the Greeks, law was a rational conclusion, not a declaration of will. As a result, it was fundamentally impersonal in nature. It was either a rational conclusion or a statement of will to the Roman jurists. However, for Thomas Aquinas, it is both a rational conclusion and an expression of will. It brings together both practical and philosophical elements. It implies common good is the end of law. It must have its origins in either society as a whole or in a public figure who wields power over society.

Classification of Law by Aquinas

According to Aquinas there are four different forms of reason which express itself in the form of four kinds of laws at different level of cosmic reality. Accordingly he classifies law as:

- (i) **The Eternal Law:** It is the controlling plan of the Universe existing in the mind of God. It emanates from the divine reason. It represents the plan according to which the God has created the universe and sustains. It rules over both the live and inanimate realms, as well as the entire cosmos.
- (ii) **The Natural Law:** It is man's involvement in the everlasting law as a rational being, through which he distinguishes between good and evil and searches for his real aim. It reflects the divine reason reflected in human beings. It is a reflection of the Eternal law in the created universe and is written in the heart of man as well as animals, plants and in other objects.
- (iii) **The Human Law:** It is the positive man-made law which is quite akin to the natural law and derives a portion of its cogency from the natural law. It is the application of natural law precepts to concrete terrestrial circumstances by human reason.
- (iv) **The Divine Law:** It consists of commands of God communicated to man by revelation. it is not the outcome of natural reason but a gift from God. However, the revelation does not destroy reason, it only supplements it. The divine law is concerned with the spirit aspect and not secular activities.

NOTES

Only theologians are concerned with the first and last of these four types of law. However, Thomas Aquinas made a significant addition to political thinking by revitalising and polishing the Roman doctrine of natural law and emphasising the rational aspects in human law. His view of natural law is that it is a collection of reasonable precepts that can vary and grow as human reason and conditions change and develop, rather than a set of universal and unchanging canons of good reason. Human law is the common law that regulates men in society; nevertheless, this does not mean that any irresponsible person's logic can give birth to law. The rationale for human law's sanction must come from society's collective thought and will.

Thomas Aquinas views on law is his concept of justice. He asserted that justice was the basis of law. He described justice as the unwavering and unwavering desire to grant everyone their own right. Like Aristotle he held that justice was eternal and gave every one its due. As a result, his conception of law was broader than simply a tool of controlling human relationships. His law was an integral part of the divine government system that governs everything in heaven and on earth.

Thus, Aquinas theory of law has been described as the most valuable and original contribution to political thought which exercised profound influence on the subsequent thinkers. He emphasised the rational element of law and also gave due importance to the moral element. He made common good on basis of law and permitted the people to sit on judgement over the laws of their state. He permitted them to disobey the law if it went against the natural Law and Justice. In this sense, Thomas Aquinas' theory of law and justice serves as a conduit for the transmission of Aristotle's stories, Cicero's Roman Imperial Jurists, and St. Augustine's beliefs to current times.

2.3.5 Contributions to Political Thought

St. Thomas Aquinas was a brilliant mediaeval political thinker who contributed more to the development of political thinking than any other theologian or philosopher. In the true sense of the phrase, he was a scholastic philosopher. Even now, he is regarded as the pre-eminent guardian and glory of the catholic church. His contribution to the medieval thought was hid bid to reconcile church and state authorities. He also made notable contributions to the development of concepts of constitutional government and welfare state. Probably the most important contribution of Thomas Aquinas was his concept of natural law. To sum up, "Thomas philosophy conveys most organically the moral and religious principles upon which mediaeval civilisation was formed."

2.4 NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI (1469-1527 A.D.)

Niccolo Machiavelli is regarded as the father of Modern Political Philosophy because with Machiavelli a new phase in the development of political philosophy sets in. He was a realist thinker, distinguished statesman, dynamic diplomat and great reformer. He was more of a pragmatic politician than a philosopher of politics.

NOTES

In the annals of political thought, no other theorist had a more ominous reputation than him.

Niccolo Machiavelli was born in 1469 in Florence, Italy, to a poor family. His father worked as a lawyer. Machiavelli did not obtain a good education as a child, so he studied the Latin classics, particularly those on Roman history, with the help of his father. In 1498, he entered the public service and was appointed Secretary to Ten in the Florence Government. The nature of his responsibilities allowed him to become well-versed in statecraft, since he represented his country as an ambassador twenty-three times, and was dispatched to Paris, Rome, and the court of Caesar Borgia, among other places.

Machiavelli, a sensitive man with acute observation skills, was heavily impacted by the intellectual and political currents of his time, as indicated by the character and tendency of his political philosophy. Machiavelli, according to Dunning, was the child of his period in every way.

The end of middle age and the beginning of the modern era are marked by two remarkable incidents i.e. Renaissance which burst out in Italy by the revival of ancient thought and learning had made man the subject of study instead of God and made it possible to study Political philosophy on a purely secular basis and Reformation, which freed politics from influence of religion. It is rightly said Machiavelli is the child of Renaissance. Machiavelli's masterpiece, 'The Prince,' was published in 1513, and eight years later, he published 'Discourses.' He died in 1527.

2.4.1 Machiavelli's Method

Machiavelli was largely influenced by Aristotle, who had already impressed a number of mediaeval scholars and thinkers. He drew on him freely. He simply brushed aside the teachings of Christian Scriptures and of the church fathers. He was unconcerned about the problem of conflict of church and the state. He abandoned deductive reasoning and abstract principles. Human nature and, as a result, human issues, according to Machiavelli, remain the same, namely egoistic, in all places and periods. Therefore he analysed the contemporary politics in the light of the past and then came to conclusions. His method was that of generalisation from particulars. Unlike mediaevalists, he did not appeal to the revealed will of God, but relied mainly on history and reason.

He himself claimed to have followed the historical method. He felicitated himself that he was the first to perceive the true relation between History and Politics. But strictly speaking his historical method was neither complete nor scientific. Dunning says, "In fact, Machiavelli's method was historical rather in appearance than in reality." What all he did was that of illustrating from history his already arrived at conclusions. Secondly, when he borrowed from the history, he completely neglected the mediaeval history, but drew on the past of classical antiquity, ancient Greek and Roman, which furnished him convenient political parallels. Here the influence of the Renaissance is most visible. Sabine also says that it is misleading to suppose that Machiavelli followed the historical method but

NOTES

in a sense he may be called unhistorical. Sabine adds, "His method, in so far as he had one, was observation guided by shrewdness and commonsense." He was without a doubt the most astute observer and analyst on the team. His conclusions were based on actual evidence and then bolstered by historical references. All the same, Dunning remarks that "Machiavelli's teachings, like Aristotle was generally sound even when the story was the weakest."

Apart from this claim of his, it must be said that certain ideas coloured his thought. Firstly, it was said of him that he possessed the instinct of hero worship. During his life time he possessed a blind admiration for Caesar Borgia, the ruler of Romagna. Secondly, he had also a nostalgia for the pagan civilisation. It is for this reason that whatever facts he borrowed from history to prove his principles were from this period. "Yet Machiavelli in restoring the history of the Greeks and Romans to its proper place in the edification of the human race; himself erred on the other side in leaving almost entirely out of account the history of the peoples in whose development Christianity played so large a part.":

2.4.2 Factors Influencing the Thinking of Machiavelli

Machiavelli, a man of scepticism and sharp observation, was heavily impacted by the intellectual and political currents of his time, as seen by the character and tendency of his political philosophy. The following are some of the factors that inspired Machiavelli's thinking and philosophy:

- (a) **Conditions in Italy:** The Italian Peninsula was divided at the time of Machiavelli into a number of small but independent nations that were continuously at war. These states had a variety of governments, some of which were republics and others which were ruled by autocratic kings. Although some type of integration of these states had been reached by the beginning of the 16th century, they were still split into five groups: the Kingdom of Naples, the Territory of the Roman Catholic Church, the Duchy of Milan, the Republic of Venice, and the Republic of Florence. Apart from internal strife among these republics, the presence of powerful states such as France and Spain on their borders posed a severe threat to their survival. Machiavelli aspired to bring these warring republics together and make himself powerful enough to deal effectively with foreign powers. Machiavelli created volumes like *The Art of War*, *Discourses on Levy*, and *The Prince* with this goal in mind, laying out the ideals he intended these states to follow in order for them to prosper and develop. Despite the fact that Machiavelli was born in a Republic, he advocated for a strong ruler who could unite the country and repel foreign invaders. He saw the papacy as a major impediment to secular unity and advocated for a gradual transfer of power from the Church to the Monarch.
- (b) **Impact of Renaissance:** Machiavelli was greatly inspired by the rotten politics of Italy, but he was also materially influenced by the Renaissance's burgeoning spirit in Italy. The Renaissance movement,

NOTES

which advocated for the resurrection of ancient values and culture, had a significant impact on Machiavelli since it was centred in Florence. This movement not only resurrected what had been neglected during the mediaeval period, but also established a new sense of liberty and new values of life in which man became the centre of all studies and God was pushed to the background. This was a kind of defiance against the church's authority. Machiavelli's strong call for a gradual transfer of power from the church to the state reflects the Renaissance's influence on him.

Machiavelli was deeply influenced by the advent of strong kings who had centralised all political power in their own hands, which had previously been held by feudatories and corporations. Despite the fact that the concentration of absolute power in the hands of the rulers meant the end of mediaeval representational institutions, Machiavelli saw it as the only way to bring Italy together.

- (c) **Emergence of strong Monarchies:** The emergence of strong and powerful monarchs also influence upon Machiavelli's thought. Machiavelli advocated for those powerful monarchy as he considered it indispensable for the unification of Italy.

Besides, the above, he was influenced by the writings of Aristotle, Marsiglio and to a great extent by the prevailing conditions. Italy was leaderless and Machiavelli was the only political theorist. He held the Church responsible for the bad state of affairs and separate politics from the influence of religion. He was determined to secure the unit at Italy.

Apart from these contemporary influences, Aristotle and Marsiglio's writings impacted Machiavelli. Aristotle taught him the concept of separating ethics from politics. The theory that the state was the ultimate organisation of human beings, the three-fold division of states as Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy, and the famous historical method were all adopted from Aristotle. In the same way, he sensed Marsiglio's impact in terms of secularism and the political utility of religion.

But, without a question, he bore the full brunt of the current situation. Machiavelli was rightfully described as the epidermic of his day. Machiavelli, more than any other thinker, was profoundly impacted by modern politics.

2.4.3 Machiavelli on Human Nature

Machiavelli was not a systematic political thinker and he expressed detached views in the various works. His political ideas are given below:

1. **Machiavelli on Human Nature or Man:** Machiavelli expresses views about human nature in his book "The Prince". Humans are selfish, nasty, depraved, and opportunists to him. He claims that man is not social, but antisocial, and that he is always looking out for his own interests. He has

NOTES

the option of using a variety of tactics to promote his interest. Every individual wishes to keep what he already has and acquire more. This will surely result in conflict and anarchy. Men are also evil because they are willing to put their individual interests ahead of the collective's.

According to Machiavelli, men value their property more than their family. A person is more likely to forgive his father's murder than the loss of his inheritance. Human beings are by nature jealous and cannot see others prosper. This is the chief cause of strife and bickering among human beings.

In fact the human beings as depicted by Machiavelli are no less than animal. Machiavelli makes no intellectual contributions to the study of human nature, and his observations are based on the deteriorated conditions of his time. If Machiavelli has been born in some other country or at a different time, his concept of human nature would certainly have been different.

2.4.4 Machiavelli's Views on State Sovereignty

Machiavelli was the first modern thinker who gave the concept of sovereign state which enjoyed supreme power over all institutions in society. He saw the state as the highest organisation to which the subjects must fully surrender, and the state commands the subjects' respect. It was an artificial creation that came into being to check human people's selfish interests. It was supposed to boost the people's material well-being. The prosperity of the people can be used to assess a state's success or failure. A successful state, according to Machiavelli, is one that is formed by a single individual and whose laws reflect the state's national character. In other words, he supported monarchy and despised aristocracy.

Machiavelli divided the states into two categories: regular and perverted. According to him, a normal state is one in which inhabitants are loyal and the law is followed. They possessed spirit of patriotism and were prepared to defend their motherland at all costs. On the other hand in a perverted state three qualities were conspicuously absent. He held that a normal state had a tendency to expand and grow. In fact expansion was a symbol of the health of a normal state. Therefore, if a state did not pursue the policy of expansion it implied that there was something wrong with it. A normal state was also expected to be self-sufficient.

Machiavelli also lays down specific guidelines for the state's preservation and strengthening. The following are some of his key recommendations for this purpose:

Firstly, the state should have a reliable army made up of homegrown troops rather than relying on mercenary forces from other countries.

Secondly, he considered the Republican state to be the greatest, but under the circumstances of the time, he preferred the Monarchical state. He says "The only way to establish any kind of order there is to found a monarchical government; for where the body of the people is so thoroughly corrupt that the laws are powerless for restraint, it becomes necessary to establish some superior power which, with a

NOTES

royal hand, and with full and absolute power, may put a curb upon the excessive ambition and corruption of the powerful.” However, he does not consider the despotic government permanent and argues that only a Republican government in which people have some share in the conduct of the business of government and enactment of laws, can be permanent. Sabine has rightly observed that Machiavelli was persuaded by two contradictory admirations for the competent dictator and the free self-governing people. He pieced the two together dangerously as theories for building a state, reforming a corrupt state, and preserving it after it was founded or reformed, respectively. In other words, “he had one theory for revolution and another for government”. It indeed goes to his credit that he was able to reconcile the two apparently self-contradictory theories and to convince his readers, though late, about the same.

Thirdly, Machiavelli does not credit any otherworldly basis for the state’s existence, it is purely secular. He valued the interplay of materialistic interests so much that he even subjected the Church to the state. However, realising that Church was still a powerful institution he advises the Prince to respect the religion followed by his subjects. He treats religion as a convenient instrument to exercise power over the people. It cultivates among the citizens the qualities of humility, submissiveness, obedience of law etc. He advises the ruler to make use of this powerful instrument to curb the antisocial activities of the citizens. He describes it as the “best check upon men’s evil and anarchic tendencies”. He considers religion essential for the health and prosperity of the state. In the words of Foster “he attributes to religion an important place in the state; but a place within the state, not above it or beside it.”

Fourthly, the state has a natural tendency to expand or grow in power. This tendency is present both in the Republican as well as Monarchical. In Monarchy the Prince resorts to policy of expansion because of his insatiable craving for power, whereas in Republican system it has to follow policy of expansion per force of consideration of its existence in the competitive world. He treats the ancient Roman Republic as the best example of a healthy state. To him the acquisition of an Empire is as natural to a state as growth to a human body. To quote Machiavelli. “All free governments have two principal ends-one of which is to enlarge their dominions and the other to preserve their liberties”.

Fifthly, in Machiavelli’s state, law plays a significant role. Despite the fact that Machiavelli saw force and intimidation as crucial tools in administration, he also saw sound laws as the cornerstones of the state. He holds that a law enacted by a law-giver is not helpful in regulating and controlling the actions of the citizens but also helps in the growth of civil and moral virtues among the citizens and the development of national character.

Thus Machiavelli’s concept of state was more a theory on the part of government than on state. He was more concerned with the preservation of the state rather than the excellence of the constitution.

2.4.5 Machiavelli on Power Politics

Niccolo Machiavelli is often considered as the founder of modern political thought. A new phase in the evolution of political philosophy begins with Machiavelli. In truth, rather than being a political philosopher, he was a pragmatic politician. He was primarily interested in the art of governance. He was the first contemporary thinker to propose the concept of a sovereign state with absolute control over all social institutions. He regarded the state as the highest association which commands respect from the subjects. He made a passing allusion to state theory and went into great detail about the ideals that the Prince should follow in order to stay in power. The following are some of Machiavelli's recommendations to the Prince:

1. The Prince should wield an iron fist to squash any challenge to his rule and should not be afraid to use brutal force. He should enforce his will without bothering about the privations of his subjects.
2. As force is an expensive and inefficient method of attaining the objective, Machiavelli says that a shrewd ruler should also use methods of propaganda and religion to pull the people into submission. He believes that judicious application of these gadgets can eliminate the necessity for force. He wants both a fox and a lion as overlords.
3. Because hesitating can be exceedingly destructive, the Prince should attempt to make rapid and decisive judgments. He would like the Prince to act promptly and make mistakes rather than lose initiative through delay and uncertainty.
4. A good Prince should strive to keep the country peaceful and prosperous so that the people can live in comfort and contentment.
5. The Prince should not rely on mercenary warriors and instead maintain a well-trained regular national army of his own subjects, because the national army alone can defend the state and make it powerful.
6. The Prince should be a capable commander and soldier. Knowledge of the military strategy is something he should have and maintain best possible arms and equipments. He must also keep the morale of his forces high.
7. The Prince must work hard to retain his popularity among the people and gain their love and admiration. In the words of Machiavelli "a Prince should retain the affection of his people otherwise in any crisis he has no remedy". A Prince who is popular with the people can easily handle hostile nobles and rich men in the state.
8. Through education, religion, and propaganda, the Prince should endeavour to promote public spirit and patriotism among his inhabitants. The personal qualities of the Prince can also help a great deal in the cultivation of the public spirit.

NOTES

NOTES

9. People love a ruler as long as they receive or expect certain benefits from the ruler, hence the Prince should be feared rather than loved. On the other by creating a fear in their mind he can get their obedience for a longer duration. However Machiavelli warns that the Prince should not be hated, as the hatred can be ruinous for him.
10. In the administration of the state's business, the Prince must preserve the utmost secrecy. If his plans or strategy etc. are leaked out they will lose their effectiveness and prove harmful for the state.
11. It was not essential for the prince to be always honest. If the interests of the state so demand he should not mind resort to fraud and other dishonest means. For the sake of the state, the Prince should be willing to break his vows. To quote Machiavelli "Where there is the question of safety of motherland, there is to be no consideration of just and unjust, pityful of cruel, honourable and dishonourable; only that course is to be taken which will preserve the life and maintain the liberty".
12. The Prince should not, under any circumstances, interfere with his subjects' property or women, as both are sensitive matters. To highlight this point Machiavelli goes to the extent of suggesting that "a person will more readily forgive the murder of his father than the confiscation of his patrimony".
13. The Prince should be a good showman and project himself as the personification of virtues such as generosity, kindness, chivalry, mercy, sincerity, humanity, bravery, and religiousness, but he must be able to demonstrate these virtues. In other words he should be able to built up his reputation as a good man even though he may not actually be so.
14. The Prince must avoid the company of flatters because it has a debasing effect on his sense of judgement. He therefore wants the prince to tell every one that he wants to know the truth and does not feel offended even if the truth is bitter.
15. The Prince should not have permanent friends or enemies. Therefore, he should not hesitate to leave his friends any time the interests of the state so demand. He should make friends keeping in view the degree of interests he can promote.
16. The Prince should not listen to every tom, dick and harry, because this could undermine his respect with his subjects. He should mix up only with a handful of counsellors, who have proved their sincerity and collect all necessary information from them.
17. The Prince should try to collect correct information about the strength of his enemy through intelligence and crush him before he becomes too powerful and poses a challenge to his authority. He should never underestimate the strength of his enemies.
18. When a person embarks on conquest of new territories, he should completely destroy the freedom of the people, because the people

NOTES

accustomed to freedom can never reconcile to the loss of the same. This advice of Machiavelli is applicable only when the Prince conquers a free Republic. However, under the normal conditions he favoured the promotion of liberty and public spirit.

19. The Prince should be miser or lavish in keeping with the general feeling of the subjects. This can secure for him their praise and co-operation.
20. Finally, he wants the Prince to follow an expansionist policy. Failure to expand the state shall lead to its stagnation and ultimate decline. It was therefore, both in the interest of the prince as well as the state that he should pursue expansionist policies.

In addition to the above suggestions, Machiavelli made numerous other suggestions to his prince, but it is not possible to reproduce all of these here. We get a fairly good idea about the shrewd insight of Machiavelli from these tips to the Prince hold good even today. Prof. Maxey has rightly said that Machiavelli “is the most universally reprobated figure in the history of political literature; the man whose precepts are universally disavowed in principle, but regularly followed in practice”.

2.4.6 Separation Ethics and Politics

Machiavelli deserves the credit for freeing politics from the clutches of ethics. He differed from the earlier thinkers in so far as he attempted a formal and conscious separation between politics and morality. Machiavelli purposefully and completely separated ethics from politics. He not only disregarded the cultivation of virtues such as humility, lowliness, and contempt for earthly things, which were emphasised by mediaeval thinkers, but he also believed the pursuit of happiness in this life to be the main goal. He even allowed the Prince to employ immoral means such as deception, forgery, trickery, breach of faith, violence, and so on to achieve his goals. To put it another way, he was willing to toss morality to the wind in order to achieve the country's unification. Machiavelli believes that the state's reason is more important than moral standards. According to him the reasons of the state justify every degree of treachery and brutality. Machiavelli does not permit an individual to practice the morality of politics in his private life. Thus he does not permit murder or breach of faith among individual members of the society because it infringes the life and security of other members of the society. He expects the individuals to keep faith and act up right manner. However, he permits the Prince to violate these principles in the interest of the state.

Though the Prince is permitted to act in violation of the moral principles in the interest of the state, Machiavelli suggests that he should appear to be the embodiment of qualities which are held in esteem. He wants to use religion as an instrument for the attainment of political objectives. Thus Machiavelli proposes two different standards of morality. One for the ruler and the other for the private citizens. He has been severely condemned for open advocacy of immorality in public life.

NOTES

But if one analyses Machiavelli's view more closely it will find that he was neither moral nor immoral but immoral. As Prof. Maxey has said, "in Machiavelli's eye the state knows no ethics, what it does is neither ethical nor unethical but entirely non-ethical. It is a neuter gender so far as right and wrong are concerned. Sabine and Deeming also express similar views and hold that Machiavelli's was unmoral in Politics.

However, it cannot be denied that Machiavelli's views on ethics and Politics suffer from various short comings:

- (a) It puts premium on the misdeeds of politicians and permits them to commute all sorts of crimes under the pretext of protecting the integrity of the State.
- (b) It is not essential that interests of the ruler and the public would always be the same. There are no fixed rules to determine the interests of the State and the ruler may give effect to his personal whims and prejudices in the name of State interest.
- (c) Machiavelli's understanding of the human nature is also faulty. Criticising for this lapse Allen says, "he lacked understanding of just what he most of all needed to know".

Despite above short-comings of Machiavelli, it cannot be denied that he deserves credit for raising a serious question as to how for the rules of conduct of individuals could be made applicable in the case of State. Though Machiavelli succeeded in giving only a partially satisfactory answer to this question, yet as Prof. Allen has put it, the mere raising of the question was more important than any answer he could give". His view have been accepted by most of the clear minded political thinkers in the subsequent centuries.

2.4.7 Machiavelli's Contribution to Political Thought

Machiavelli was a child of renaissance and reformation in Europe. He was born in the Italian province of Florence in a critical situation when Italy was divided into five provinces and they were at war with one another. He was influenced by the two great revolutions like the renaissance and reformation. Renaissance revived the ancient thought while reformation changed the attitude of man towards religion. Politics become secular and church lost its supremacy. In this critical juncture Machiavelli came to the fore-front with a determination to restore the fast glory of Italy. He made a break with the past and introduced new ideas which were symbols of the modern age. As a result, he is rightfully referred to as the "first contemporary political philosopher."

Machiavelli's major contributions to the history of political philosophy, which had a lasting impact on political theorists in future centuries, can be summarised as follows:

- (a) **Supremacy of State:** Machiavelli entirely opposed the feudal concept of independent entities in favour of a territorial national and sovereign state with supreme sovereignty over all of society's institutions. Machiavelli

NOTES

was the first philosopher to coin the word state and use it properly. He regarded the state as the highest association which come into existence to check the selfish interests of the human beings. He was a monarchist and want to remain under the prevailing condition but he considered “Republic” as the best form of Government. He considered the state as the highest association to which the subjects must completely surrender.

- (b) **Political Realism:** Machiavelli was a political realist and a practical thinker. He rejected religious politics and followed history and reason. Analysing the contemporary politics in the light of past he reached conclusion this primary aim was to solve the problems facing Italy and restore its unity and strength. He therefore prescribed for an unscrupulous despotic rule in Italy.
- (c) **Subordination of Church to the State:** Machiavelli was the first modern thinker to emphatically denounce the authority of the Church and tried to reduce it to a subordinate position to the government. In the words of Allen, “Machiavelli detached the State from the Church making it an organisation of force for the attainment of merely earthly ends”. He also refused to accord any prominent position to the Divine Law in his state. He used religion as an instrument for the furtherance of interests of the state. However, he was not against the idea of using religion as an instrument for the promotion of state interests.
- (d) **Separation religion from politics:** Machiavelli deserves the credit for freeing politics from the clutches of ethics. Prior to him politics was considered a hand-maid of ethics. He for the first time asserted that there were to distinct standards of morality for the state and the individual and freed the state from the shackles of moral principles. However he insisted on the individuals to observe the ethical principles. This way of looking at politics greatly influenced the subsequent political thinkers. It indeed goes to his credit that he openly endorsed the immoral principles for the conduct of the state affairs.
- (e) **Exponents of Power Politics:** Machiavelli was the founder of the notion of “Power Politics” and the aggrandisement thesis, which stated that the state must either expand or perish. This theory has been followed by the states in the field of international politics even today and violation has normally proved suicidal and caused much suffering to the mankind.
- (f) **Importance to Law and Justice:** Machiavelli assigned an important position to law and the legal system. He based his theory of state on law, not on force fraud or deception. He considered law indispensable for the society and the state. He was aware of selfishness in human beings and regarded law as the most effective means of holding the society and the state together because of compels the erotic individual to honour his moral obligations.
- (g) **Territorial aggrandisement:** Machiavelli was in favour of territorial aggrandisement. He wanted extension on the dominion of state for the

NOTES

subjection of more and more states under one sovereign. He considered force and arms as essential for political aggrandisement and preservation of the state, but force must be judiciously combined with craft.

- (h) **Idea about origin of the state:** For the first time, Machiavelli gave a materialist view of the origin state, ignoring any metaphysical or supernatural features. Though Machiavelli's opinions on this subject were not exactly the same as Karl Marx's, they had a significant influence on Marx.
- (i) **Expediency:** Machiavelli advocated the principle expediency in western philosophy as a principle philosophical theorist. He divorced politics from morality and gave the ruler full liberty to use moral or immoral means for the greatest interest of the state. He advised the Prince to promote the happiness of his subjects. He expounded the principle of expediency and to make use of it for the preservation and prosperity of the state.
- (j) **Other Contributions:** Historical method of Machiavelli was another important contribution to the political thought. Machiavelli also placed a high value on human psychology research, advising his monarch to design policies based on the aspirations and sentiments of the people. He wanted the ruler to keep the public opinion in mind even at the stage of the execution of his policies. This was indeed a revolutionary concept which has been universally accepted in our times.

Machiavelli has received a lot of appreciation for his contributions to political thinking. Dunning, Machiavelli as "the first modern political philosopher. It is quite accurate to say that he ends the medieval era as that he begins the modern". Dunning called him, "a child of Renaissance". He was a product of his time and the influence of his surrounding moulded his philosophy to a great extent. He founded the utilitarian philosophy and he was the first thinker who ushered in the modern age with his theory of power politics. He brought political theory in line with practice. The modern study of politics began with him and he is called as father of modern political thought. Jones says, "Machiavelli, more than any other individual and despite the fact that he is hardly a political theorist, is the father of modern political theory".

2.4.8 Position of Machiavelli on Political Thought

Machiavelli, the brilliant Florentine of the 16th century, is an enigma. It is next to impossible to categorise him either as mediaeval or modern. He is an utter cynic, impassioned patriot, ardent nationalist and a convinced democrat. These incongruous elements in his philosophy are due to the fact that he stands in the no man's land. He is the tantalus of political philosophy. He is more of a mariner's compass or the weather-cock than a pioneer for a new philosophy. This peculiar position of Machiavelli is because - he is more concerned with political statecraft, but not with political science as Catlin said. His writings are flooded with maxims

for a statesman, but not with a consistent and cogent thought. Hence the remark of Sabine that his writings are more of the nature of diplomatic literature.

NOTES

It can be said of him positively that he broke totally from the ancient moorings, when he gave almost an insignificant place for morals, ethics and religion. Towards these three things, he was coolly indifferent. When he neglected them he did not state why and how. Hence Dunning says that he was more unreligious than irreligious and more unmoral than immoral. Machiavelli had not the capacity to probe into the depths of political philosophy to root out these conceptions from a strictly rational and logical point of view. That is to say, he was only fortunate in stumbling on a new ground, when he relegated the ancient conceptions. He could not suggest new lines of approach of politics. What all he did was that of translating politics into vernacular, as Janet brilliantly remarked. The task of why and how the, Concept, morals, ethics and religion should not determine political philosophy was taken up by Hobbes, That is why the remark of Sabine that Hobbes completed the unsystematic attempt of Machiavelli.

In spite of these limitations, 'Machiavelli himself claimed too tall for his own philosophy'. He himself said that he was the path-breaker in bringing the historical method. Strictly speaking, his historical method is neither complete nor scientific. Dunning says, that his historical method is only in appearance but not in reality. He only illustrates from history. He totally neglects the medieval history. Moreover, Sabine also says that he is totally unhistorical as his whole thought hinges on the premise that human nature is egoistic.

With regards to nationalism also he just groped in the dark. Here, too, he stumbled on certain characteristics of nationalism without convincingly and consciously grasping them. His belief in free-thinking, advocacy of a national army, the criterion of state as extension, his idealisation of Prince are only pointers to the new force called nationalism. This dynamic force in European history which was destined to re-map the whole of Europe and spread like a wild fire throughout the whole world is only perceivable in a dim manner in his writings.

Check Your Progress

I. Multiple Choice Questions

- Which one of following is not a basic Features of Medieval Political Thought?
 - Monarchy as best and normal form of Government
 - Concept of Law occupied in important position
 - Faith on democratic institutions
 - Growth of Papal Power
- Which one of the following is not work of Thomas Aquinas.

(a) Rule of Prince	(b) Summa Theologicq
(c) Against the Error of Greeks	(d) The Prince
- Where was St. Thomas Aquinas born?

(a) Florence	(b) Paris
(c) Rocca Sicca	(d) Berne

NOTES

4. Which breach of Theology is St. Thomas Aquinas associated with?
 - (a) Scholastic Theology
 - (b) Oriental Theology
 - (c) Positive Theology
 - (d) Patristic Theology
5. Where was Niccolo Machiavelli born?
 - (a) Paris
 - (b) Florence
 - (c) London
 - (d) Berne
6. Which one of the following is written by Machiavelli?
 - (a) The Leviathan
 - (b) The Prince
 - (c) The Politics
 - (d) The Republic

II. True or False

1. The Medieval Political Thought believed in universalism.
2. Thomas Aquinas accepted the theory of state offered by Church Fathers.
3. To Aquinas the Eternal Law emanates from the Divine reason.
4. Machiavelli was an advocate of Social Contract Theory regarding origin of the State.

III. Match the Following

(A)

1. Thomas Aquinas
2. Machiavelli
3. Marsiglio of Padua

(B)

- (a) Defensor Pacis
- (b) Summa Theologica
- (c) The Prince

2.5 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

I. Multiple Choice Questions

1. (c)
2. (d)
3. (c)
4. (a)
5. (b)
6. (b)

II. True and False

1. True
2. False
3. True
4. False

III. Match the Following

1. (b)
2. (c)
3. (a)

NOTES

2.6 SUMMARY

Political thought in the Middle Ages can appear to be a desert, commonly depicted by the sadstroms produced by the opposing genies of Papacy and Empire, and rarely relieved by a verdant oasis like Dante's book 'on monarchy' marsilicu's 'Defender of the Peace.' A great expanse of arid text exists, and a sense of unreality, as though of one wrath, hangs over it. The writers are inexperienced and unacquainted with politics; if they deal with genuine issues, it is because they have not lived through them. They appear to be students writing essays on 'Political Theory' from textbooks, and they are perplexed by the variety and multiplicity of the three texts they use: the Bible, which is based on Jewish theocracy, and Aristotle's Politics, which is based on the obligarehies and democracies of ancient Greek city states. Thomas Aquinas, who embodied the entirety of Medieval Political Thought, was the only individual of actual philosophical significance in the Middle Ages. His philosophy most naturally expresses the moral and religious ideals that established Medieval Civilisation. A new era in the development of political philosophy began with Machiavelli. In truth, rather than being a Political Philosopher, he was a practical politician. Machiavelli has received a lot of appreciation for his contributions to political thinking. He was the first Political Philosopher of the Modern Era. It's just as correct to say he ends the mediaeval era as it is to claim he starts the contemporary one.

2.7 KEY TERMS

- **Ecclesiastical:** Relating to the Christian Church.
- **Scholasticism:** A way of thinking and teaching knowledge developed in Middle Ages.
- **Feudalism:** A dominant system in Medieval Ages led by Land Lords.
- **Papal Power:** Dominance of Church and Pope.
- **Theology:** The study of the nature of God and religious belief.

2.8 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short Type Questions

1. Scholasticism
2. Thomas Aquinas views on Sovereignty
3. Machiavelli's views on Human Nature
4. 'The Prince' of Machiavelli

Long Type Questions

1. Briefly examine the salient features of Medieval Political Thought.
2. Examine Thomas Aquinas's views on State and Church.
3. Explain St. Thomas Aquinas's view on Law and its Classification.

NOTES

4. Explain Machiavelli's suggestions to the Prince regarding retention of power.
5. Discuss Machiavelli's concept of State and Sovereignty.
6. "Machiavelli was a child of Renaissance" Justify.
7. Explain Machiavelli's views on separation of Ethics and Politics.

ACTIVITY

Provide two real-life examples to prove how:

1. Scholasticism was a Prominent Feature of Medieval Political Thought. Examine.
2. "Aquinas views on Laws was one the most Lasting contribution to the Political Thought" Justify.
3. "Machiavelli's Political Philosophy was both narrowly local and narrowly dated". Justify.

CASE STUDY

"Medieval Political Thought believed in Universalism."

One of the outstanding features of Medieval Political Thought was faith in universalism or the existence of a cosmopolitan society. The Medieval thinkers held that the church and the state were indivisible parts of the society. These two organisations, headed by the King and the Pope respectively, worked in complete co-operation for the spiritual salvation of man, which was the sole arm of all human beings.

Question:

1. "In the Medieval Political Thought the Church was accorded a significant position". Justify.

2.9 REFERENCES

1. Dr. J.C. Johari. (1966) Political Thought (Ancient and Medieval). Metropolitan Book Company.
2. E. Barker. (1918). "Greek Political Theory of Plato and his Predecessors". London: Methuen & Co.
3. R.G. Gettell. (1953). "History of Political Thought". London: Allen and Unwin.
4. F.W. Coker. (1938). "Readings in Political Philosophy". New York, Macmillan Co.

Unit III Early Modern Political Thought

Learning Objectives:

This unit devotes the discussion the Political Thought of three Early Modern Political Philosophers i.e. Thomas on Hobbes, John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau. Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau each had a unique interpretation of the Social Contract Theory regarding origin of the State. After studying this unit, you should be able to understand:

- Life History and Factors Influencing political thinking of Thomas Hobbes
- Thomas Hobbes, view on Human Nature, State of Nature and Social Contract
- Hobbes, Sovereignty i.e. Leviathan
- Contribution of Hobbes to the Political Philosophy
- Life History of John Locke and influence of environment on him
- John Locke's views on Natural Rights, Human Nature, State of Nature and Social Contract
- Locke's views on Sovereignty and Limited Government
- Life History of J.J. Rousseau
- Rousseau's ideas on Human Nature, State of Nature and Social Contract
- Rousseau's views on General Will and Popular Sovereignty
- Comparison between Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau

Structure:

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Thomas Hobbes
 - 3.2.1 Methodology of Hobbes
 - 3.2.2 Hobbes' Views on Human Nature, State of Nature and Social Contract
 - 3.2.3 Hobbes' Concept of Sovereignty of the Leviathan
 - 3.2.4 Hobbes and Individualism
 - 3.2.5 Contribution of Hobbes of Political Thought
- 3.3 John Locke
 - 3.3.1 The Social Contract Theory of John Locke
 - 3.3.2 Locke's Idea of Limited Government
 - 3.3.3 Natural Rights of John Locke
 - 3.3.4 Locke on Revolution
 - 3.3.5 Locke on Property

NOTES

3.3.6 Locke and Liberalism

3.3.7 Contribution of John Locke to the Political Thought

3.4 Jean Jacques Rousseau

3.4.1 Rousseau's Idea on Social Contract

3.4.2 Rousseau's General Will

3.4.3 Rousseau's Views on Sovereignty

3.4.4 Contribution of Rousseau to Political Thought

3.4.5 Comparison of the Views of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau

3.5 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

3.6 Summary

3.7 Key Terms

3.8 Self-Assessment Questions and Exercises

3.9 References

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Thomas Hobbes was the first thinker to conceive state as a human institution. He was the first great individualist and emphasised that the state is merely a means for the promotion of the interests of the individual. He is credited to have emphasised the theory of absolute sovereignty and freed his sovereign of all the shackles. His ideas on social contract regarding origin of the state was one of the most distinctive innovations. Prof. Sabine considers Hobbes to be the best political philosopher that the English-speaking world has produced.

John Locke was the first philosopher to distinguish between society, state, and government, and to order them accordingly. His doctrine of natural rights is his contribution to political theory. He provided basis for the development of the idea of a democratic state. He is regarded as the father of liberalism. He also laid great emphasis on the principles of toleration and secularism.

The great book 'Social Contract' by Rousseau had a huge impact on the French people and helped them prepare for the Great French Revolution. He emphasised the role of the state in an individual's life. Another noteworthy contribution to Political Thought is his thesis of popular sovereignty. He coined the phrase "nation-state". His reconciliation between liberty and authority provided a new theoretical basis to society.

3.2 THOMAS HOBBS

Thomas Hobbes of England was the first among the contractualist philosopher to regard social contract as the basis of origin of the state. In 1581, Thomas Hobbes was born into an Anglican clergyman's family and died in 1679. His life took place during one of England's most chaotic periods. He was a witness to the English Civil War between monarchists and republicans, and he sided with the king.

NOTES

Because he witnessed the entire violent drama of the Civil War, it had a profound impact on his worldview. After completing his undergraduate studies, Hobbes was appointed as tutor to William Cavendish's heir, which allowed him to travel extensively and meet great minds such as Ben Jonson, Bacon, and Galileo, all of whom influenced his political ideas. Hobbes was also influenced by a number of other political philosophers, scientists, and mathematicians. He borrowed Plato's and Hooker's ideas about the social contract. The influence of Machiavelli can be seen in Hobbes' portrayal of human nature. Grotius gave him the concept of natural law, while Jean Bodin gave him the concept of sovereignty. For his materialistic theory and scientific methods he is indebted to Galileo and Descartes. It is thus evident that the philosophy of Hobbes represents a combination of the influences of his time and the ideas of a number of political thinkers, scientists and mathematicians which left an impact on his mind.

The main works of Hobbes include the *De Cive* (1642), the *Leviathan* (1651), the *De Corpore* (1655) and *De Homine* (1658). The scientific method is one of the greatest contributions of Hobbes to political theory. He was one of the greatest political thinkers of England whose philosophical ideas were relevant during his days. He was also regarded as the first modern political philosophy.

3.2.1 Methodology of Hobbes

The Scientific Method is one of the greatest contributions of Hobbes to political theory. He applied it for the first time to social sciences and tried to draw deductions from the axioms assumptions and already establish truths. No doubt, Plato before him also applied scientific method to the study of political thought. Hobbes, like Plato adopted the scientific method to analyse his concept of human nature, formation of Civil Society and possible human relationship. Neither Machiavelli nor Bodin based their conclusions on scientific basis. Bodin defended Monarchy while Machiavelli completely divorced morality and religion from politics. But Hobbes did not follow their method. He provided a scientific basis to absolutism and secularism. He did not believe that monarchic absolutism on the basis of the theory of Divine Rights of Kings is justifiable because doing so would mean constructing a structure of foundation of sands. He seemed to base it on a "incontrovertible understanding of human nature" and "according to the new mode of thought that was quickly becoming fashionable." He also provided a scientific and logical basis for the subordination of religion to the state. He adopted the method of geometry 'as the model on which all philosophical enquiry should proceed. He viewed the physical world as a purely mechanical system in which every happening could be explained in terms of the preceeding events.

To quote Taylor, "When Hobbes was a student at the university, the bogus Aristotleanism of the Middle Ages was still being taught in the lecture halls. Kepler, Galileo, and Descartes had all put mechanical science on a firm foundation before he died. Harvey and Gilbert laid the groundwork for the scientific study of psychology and magnetism. For more than a decade, the Royal Society for Experimental Research into Nature had been incorporated. Descartes invented analytical geometry, Leibniz and Newton invented calculus, and Newton's

NOTES

Principia was just eight years after his death the complete exposition of the new mechanical theory of the cosmos. It is only natural that philosopher who was also a keen observer of man and affairs should have made the most daring of all attempts to lose the whole of knowledge on the principle of mechanical materialism, and should have become the creator of a purely naturalistic theory of ethics and sociology.

Hobbes regarded man as a compound of moving particles. He stressed that the study of political society must begin with the examination of man's nature.

3.2.2 Hobbes' Views on Human Nature, State of Nature and Social Contract

Thomas Hobbes of England is regarded as the first modern political thinker. His theory of social contract and sovereignty are considered to be the most important contributions to British political philosophy. Thomas Hobbes was the first among the social contractualist philosophers who advocated social contract as the basis of origin of state.

Every philosopher is a product of his environment and this is more clearly felt in case of British Philosopher Thomas Hobbes. Hobbes witnessed the decline of absolute monarchy and the rise of constitutional government in England. The British civil war also left a deep impact on his philosophy and he stood for an absolute ruler to maintain order and political stability.

Before explaining his social contract Hobbes depicts the picture of human nature and state of nature that prevailed at the pre-civil stage. No doubt modern social contract theory marked its beginning from Thomas Hobbes. The Hobbes' views on human nature, state of nature and social contract are explained below.

3.2.3 Hobbes' Concept of Sovereignty of the Leviathan

As discussed earlier, explaining his social contract and sovereignty Hobbes depicts the picture of human nature and state of nature that prevailed at the pre-civil stage. He found human nature selfish, egoistic, wicked, non-relational and quarrelsome. The picture of his state of nature was a state of constant struggle, war and strife. There was no law, no virtue, no peace or progress. State of nature was pre-social and pre-political. The life in the state of nature was a solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. Hobbes stated that in order to come out of such a bad state of affairs individuals signed a contract and instituted the civil society or sovereign. The contract among individuals led to the origin of the state and instituted sovereign power in a man or assemble of men. The end of the contract or state was to maintain peace and order and to secure individual life. Thus, Hobbes social contract created a state and an absolute sovereign authority i.e. Leviathan.

Hobbes in the second part of his book "Leviathan" has depicted the picture of sovereignty. He was created as a result of the pact and now has all of the abilities that the people renounced at the moment of the contract's conclusion. Hobbes centralised all power in the hands of the king. He is an individual in Monarchy a group of men in Aristocracy and Assembly of men in a democracy. People

NOTES

surrendered all their rights to the sovereign except the right of self preservation. All individuals are subjected to the authority of sovereign. All his actions are lawful and just and the subject have no right to resist his authority and the sovereign enjoys unlimited power and absolute authority.

Attributes of Sovereignty

The essential attributes of Hobbesian sovereignty may be discussed below:

1. As a result of the pact, the sovereign was established, and he now has all of the powers that the people gave up when the contract was signed.
2. The contract creates the sovereign, yet he is not a party to the contract and did not exist before to it.
3. Because their contract with the previous sovereign is irrevocable, the individuals cannot lawfully enter into a new contract to create a new "Leviathan."
4. The sovereign's power is absolute and unrestricted. He cannot be subjected to any implied or explicit conditions. There are no constitutional checks on the sovereign.
5. The sovereign has unrestricted legislative powers, which are not constrained by any human authority, superior or subordinate. He is not bound by the people's opinions or wishes because they have completely surrendered their sovereignty to the sovereign.
6. The sovereign is not only the chief source of all laws but also their sole interpreters. As the sole interpreter of law he can not be accused of injustice.
7. The sovereign is the ultimate source of justice and has alone authority to declare war and make peace. Hobbes endows the sovereign with a wide range of powers, including executive, legislative, and judicial, and so rejects the doctrine of separation of powers.
8. The sovereign is the source of moral and immoral distinctions, as well as right and unjust outcomes.
9. The sovereign makes laws creating property and regulates taxation. He can resort to taxation without the consent of the people.
10. Hobbes's sovereign is the indivisible, inseparable, and incommunicable powers he bestows to it. He forbids the king from delegating his authority to others.
11. The sovereign has the authority to grant or deny freedom of expression and to prohibit the spread of hazardous ideas. He is morally obligated to keep the peace both domestically and outside.
12. The sovereign is the sole source of power for public officials, as well as a source of honour.
13. The authority of the sovereign is absolute and it cannot be resisted except under self defence.

NOTES

14. Sovereign is the symbol of national unity and challenge to his authority is regarded irrational & sovereignty.

In short, Hobbes created an absolute, unlimited, indivisible and inalienable.

Criticism

Hobbes's theory of sovereignty has been criticised on the following grounds:

1. Hobbes theory is unreal and untrue to facts. No actual sovereign has wielded such absolute and unlimited powers as Hobbes ascribed to his sovereign.
2. Hobbes's concept of sovereignty is authoritarian in the sense that concentration of all powers in one hand is bound to result in frustration.
3. Vaughan rejects the theory as "pernicious" and impossible". It is pernicious in so far as it leads to despotism pure and simple, in so far as it gives. He subjects no right to defend themselves against oppressive and tyrannical rule and reduces the whole herd to slavery.
4. Hobbes concept of sovereign was more exalted than any other writer. He made the sovereign unlimited and held that there could be no conflict between law of nature and laws of the sovereign.
5. Hobbes concedes right of reference to the individual in extreme cases. According to Prof. Jones the grant of this right to the individual is inconsistent with the doctrine of absolute sovereignty. Either a subject has a right against the sovereign or he has no such right. If he has this right, Hobbes major thesis that the sovereign is and must be sovereign collapses. On the other hand if the sovereign is absolute and supreme the individuals do not have the right to resist the sovereign. There is a clear inconsistency because Hobbes cannot have it both ways.
6. Rousseau described Hobbes's theory of sovereignty as both self-contradictory and revolting. He argues that the gifts of nature like life and liberty can never be renounced for any supposed benefit. A person who renounces his freedom in fact renounces his manhood and such renunciation inconsistent with man's nature.
7. Hobbes has never said any thing about the death of the sovereign.

Despite these shortcomings of his theory of sovereignty, we have to agree with Sabine that his theory of sovereignty was the most revolutionary theory of sovereignty at the time of its inception and was one of his most important contribution to the political thought. It exercised profound influence of the development of political philosophy in the subsequent years. It provided the ground for Austin's theory of legal sovereignty which has come to be accepted all over the world. It stirred the contemporary continental thinking and found enthusiastic supporters like Spinoza. Hobbes by basing his theory of sovereignty on the self interest of the individuals anticipated the utilitarian and liberal thought of the years to come. But in an indirect way it also helped in the growth of totalitarian theories

as Germany and Italy. Thus Hobbes was an individualist under the grab of an absolutist.

3.2.4 Hobbes and Individualism

Every political philosopher is a product of his environment and this is more clearly felt in case of British Philosopher Thomas Hobbes, Mr. Hobbes was a witness to the Civil War in England between the supporters of Monarchy and Republicanism. He witnessed the decline of absolute Monarchy and rise of constitutional government in England. The British Civil War also left a deep impact on his philosophy and he stood for an absolute ruler to maintain order and political stability.

Individualism and Absolutism in Hobbes

Hobbes has been carried up and down for his political theory which has been described as pure and naked despotism by some, while the others consider him as the greatest individualist. The first view seems to be based on superfluous reading of the philosophy of Hobbes. In reality he was a great individualist and the theory of absolute sovereignty with which the name of Hobbes is so generally associated as really the necessary compliment of his individualism. Even Prof. Vaughan who is highly critical of Hobbes says "By a strange irony it was reserved for the deadliest enemy of individualism to give the first formal statement of theory upon which in the hey of its power, individualism was universally held to rest. The whole work of Hobbes breathes the bitterest hatred not only of individualism as a theory, but even of those elementary rights which none but the most backward nations now deny to the individual in practice. Yet this preposterous system is itself based, consciously or unconsciously on assumptions representing an extreme form of individualism, an individualism more uncompromising than that of Locke himself." Prof. Sabine also says "Individualism is thoroughly modern element in Hobbes and the respect in which he caught most clearly the note of coming age, Hobbes was at once the complete utilitarian and a complete individualist. It is his clear cut individualism which makes his philosophy the most revolutionary theory of his age." Prof. Wayper says "Hobbes, so frequently portrayed as the greatest absolutist is perhaps the greatest individualist in the history of political thought."

Hobbes undoubtedly developed a theory of most thoroughgoing absolutism, but the rationale for such absolutism was the peace and security of the individual's person and property, giving Hobbes' theory a touch of individualism. Hobbes does not talk of vague things like public good or general good and talks of individuals who desire to live and enjoy protection for the means of life. Hobbes places the individual in such a prominent position that he grants his individual the power to fight the sovereign if the latter attacks his life, the preservation of which the contract was concluded. In certain circumstances, an individual may refuse to serve as a soldier if doing so will jeopardise his life. He also allows the individual to withdraw allegiance from the sovereign who is incapable of securing his life. The right of resistance granted to the individual carries with it the right of the individual to judge for himself when his life is endangered. Even the contract which creates

NOTES

NOTES

the sovereign is concluded by the individuals who are willing to transfer all their power to a single representative, who is henceforth authorised to will and to act in place of each individual. Hobbes does not think in terms of collective wills or common will. As Sabine has said “A general or political good like a public will is a figment of imagination, there are merely individuals who desire to live and to enjoy protection for the means of life.”

It is evident from the above account that Hobbes philosophy is pregnant with strongest seeds of individualism. He makes the individual the centre of his thought. After raising the individual to such heights Hobbes felt that if the individual was not kept in proper check it would lead to the destruction of the civil society and give rise to anarchy. This would tantamount to return to the state of nature, a war of all against all. To check such a possibility, Hobbes felt the need of a supreme power which possesses all the power to take appropriate action to prevent such a degeneration of the individual. It is in this sense that Prof. Sabine says “The absolute power of the sovereign a theory with which Hobbes’s name is more generally associated was really the necessary complement of his individualism.” Hobbes realised that Covenants without swords are but words, and to make sure that the covenants were observed by the people, he concedes absolute authority to his sovereign.

Hobbes does not stop with the grant of absolute powers to the sovereign but also ensures that he is not able to use it for his selfish ends. He gives him the power to make laws or rules by which it may be possible to determine what is just and what is unjust; or what is good and what is evil. The civil laws enacted by the sovereign are largely based on the laws of nature and therefore his laws cannot be absolute. Again, the laws are made with the sole objective of maintenance of peace for which the individual gave up his natural liberty. The sovereign makes the laws for the benefit of the individual and are subject to the judgment of the individualism. In this way Hobbes removes the right of absolutism. Hobbes grants to the individual certain rights and imposes certain obligation on the sovereign towards his subjects. All this clearly shows that Hobbes is more interested in the individual than the sovereign.

In view of the above facts, it would be sheer mockery of Hobbes’s political philosophy to charge him of absolutism. In fact, as Prof. Wayper has said “He is perhaps the greatest individualist in the history of political thought.”

3.2.5 Contribution of Hobbes of Political Thought

Thomas Hobbes of England is regarded as the first modern political thinker. Every philosopher is a product of his environment and this is more closely felt in case of British philosopher Thomas Hobbes. Hobbes was born in an atmosphere of violence and turmoil in England during the Civil War. It was due to the influence of environment that his philosophy marked a unique one. He was the first great natural philosopher who made a break with the past and inaugurated a new era in the history of political thought. He was born in the family of an Anglican Clergyman and had to pass through many ups and downs in his life. Since his birth he was

NOTES

influenced by the violence, brutality and the appalling waste of life during the British Civil War and his political philosophy was influenced by his surroundings. He witnessed the downfall of Monarchy and the conviction of Charles-I. He was realised that only a strong and stable government can only be useful for England. He was also influenced by the impact of number political thinkers, scientists and mathematicians like Plato, Hooker, Machiavelli, Ben Jonson, Bacon, Galileo, Grotius and Bodin etc.

The main works of Hobbes include the *De Cive* (1642) the *Leviathan* (1651) the *De Corpore* (1655) and *De Homine* (1658) etc. His chief contribution lies on the fact that he universalised the problem of England through his writings. Thomas Hobbes was regarded as the first modern philosopher due to his contributions to history of political thought:

1. **Use of Scientific Methods:** One of Hobbes' most important contributions to political theory is his use of scientific method. For the first time, he applied it to social sciences, attempting to derive conclusions from axioms, assumptions, and already established truths. Although Plato and others before him used scientific methods to examine political philosophy, he was the first to declare that political theory was founded on the presence of matter and motion. This method underpins his understanding of human nature, the building of civic society, and other endeavours. His method is deductive like Plato but Plato was limited to Greek city-states but Hobbes philosophy was universal. Hobbes rejected the mediaeval idea of a soul or spirit and attempted to explain everything in materialist terms.
2. **Theory of Social Contract:** Thomas Hobbes was the first among the social contractualist philosophers to regard social contract as the basis of the origin of the state. He found origin of the state in the foresight of men, in their own preservation and the rational desire to escape from the natural condition of war. He made the sovereign a product of the contract and conferred all powers to it for the safety and security of individuals. He was the first thinker to conceive state as a human institution.
3. **Theory of Sovereignty:** The theory of sovereignty of Hobbes was his original contribution to the history of political thought. He created the sovereign out of social contract and entrusted it with unlimited authority and absolute powers. He was the first philosopher who made the sovereign absolute, indivisible and inalienable. His theory of sovereignty is the basis of all definitions given by the modern political thinkers. He was the first political philosopher stood for unlimited and absolute sovereignty. As Sabine remarks the theory of sovereignty of Hobbes was the most revolutionary and most important contribution to political thought.
4. **As a Secular Thinker:** Hobbes was a secular philosopher who separated religion and morals from politics and at the same time subordinated the Church and religion to the state. He was the first thinker of the middle

NOTES

age to take such a step. Hobbes stood for secularism of the basis for the stability of the state.

5. **As an Individualist:** Hobbes was the first individualist and emphasised that the state is merely a means for the promotion of the interests of the individual. He makes the individual as the centre of his thought. He combined individualism with absolute sovereignty and in this respect he inaugurated a new era.
6. **Utilitarianism:** The utilitarianism, which was a logical corollary of Hobbes individualism, was another important contribution of Hobbes to political thought. He justifies the powers and actions of the state only in so far as they contribute to the security of the human beings. Bentham also developed the utilitarian philosophy drew inspiration from Hobbes.
7. **Supremacy of Matter:** Hobbes for the first time empathised the supremacy of the matter in relation to mind. He asserted that matter affects the sensations as well as the whole chain of perception, memory, imagination etc. In this respect he anticipated Marx.
8. **Separation of Politics from Ethics:** Hobbes brought morals at par with politics and affected a complete reference between the two. Though generally Machiavelli is given the credit of separating ethics and politics, but it was Hobbes who provided rational basis to this separation.
9. **Theory of Fictitious Corporation:** Hobbes for the first time conceived the theory of fictitious corporation. In his contract the individuals surrender all their power to a person and authorise him to will and act on behalf of all the constituents.
10. **Other Contributions:** Some other contributions of Hobbes may be discussed below:
 - (a) Hobbes was the first thinker to conceive state as a human institution and thereby sounded the deathblow to the well known doctrine of "Divine Rights of the Kings."
 - (b) He was the first philosopher who brought human equality to the forefront.
 - (c) He repudiated the doctrine of law of nature and advocated the concept of positive law. Thus, he started a movement for scientific legislation of the world.

3.3 JOHN LOCKE

John Locke was the greatest liberal thinker of 19th century in England. With John Locke, a political creed was born. This was a one-of-a-kind achievement, as there had been no liberals prior to Locke, although there had been numerous socialists prior to Karl Marx. In 1632, he was born into a Puitan Somerset lawyer's family. He was educated at Westminster and Oxford before being employed as an Oxford tutor. He was also a Whig Party supporter. He was strongly inspired by the

NOTES

outcome of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 as a member of the Whig Party. The influence of the revolution developed in him a spirit of love, compromise and moderation. As a liberal thinker, he considered over government dangerous to individual liberty. He dedicated his philosophy for the good of the individualism and community. He was also the second contractualist after Thomas Hobbes.

John Locke wrote as many as 35 books dealing with different walks of life. The main books which provide an insight into this philosophy and political thought include *Essays Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), *His Letters on Toleration* (1689), *Two Treatise of Government* (1690) and *Fundamental Constitution Concerning California* (1706).

Locke was greatly influenced by Sydney's *Discourses* concerning Government, writing and philosophy of thinkers like Filmer, Thomas Hobbes, Hooker etc. He collected ideas from different sources, assimilated them and presented them in a plausible political philosophy.

3.3.1 The Social Contract Theory of John Locke

John Locke is known as the second social contractualist after Thomas Hobbes. He was the greatest liberal thinker of England. He possessed an extraordinary quality and commonsense which helped him in his philosophical exploration. John Locke was deeply influenced by the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and Civil War of England. In his book "The Two Treatises on Government" he has discuss clearly about human nature, state of nature and social contract.

3.3.2 Locke's Idea of Limited Government

John Locke was the true representative of British Liberal tradition. He possessed an extraordinary quality and commonsense which helped him in his philosophical exploration. He was known as the second contractualist after Thomas Hobbes. John Locke was influenced deeply by the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the Civil War of England. In his book "Two Treatises on Government" he has discussed clearly about social contract regarding origin of the state.

John Locke's views on state are quite variance with the views of Thomas Hobbes on state. Whereas Hobbes treated state as a necessity for the protection of the life of the individuals and assigned it absolute powers. Locke holds it was created only to remove certain inconveniences of the law of nature. Accordingly he assigns quite a different role to it. His views on state boil down to the following points:

1. According to John Locke, the state is made up of three powers: the executive, legislative, and judicial. Legislative, executive, and federative powers are all available.. He considers legislative powers as the most important one and designates it as "The supreme power of the commonwealth." He gives the legislature great authority but not absolute authority. Its power is limited by community acts, and the people have the ability to limit it at any time. Locke places the executive authority, which includes the judicial power, in a subordinate position to the

NOTES

legislative, despite the fact that it is critical to the government's administration. He charges it with enforcing the natural law as well as the statutes enacted by the legislative branch, and he gives it the authority to apply the necessary penalties in compliance with the laws. Locke limits the executive branch's power by making it reliant on the legislative. Locke designates the third power of the state as federative power, which includes the duty to preserve the community's and individual individuals' interests in regard to other communities and citizens. It also includes state's external affairs. Locke supports the parliamentary government and made a strong plea for constitutional or limited government as against despotic or absolute rule.

2. Locke does not devote much attention to the classification of Government. Following Aristotelian tradition Locke divided the governments into three categories viz. monarchy, aristocracy and democracy depending on the number of persons exercising legislative powers. To him if the legislative authority is exercised by one man, it is monarchy. If the legislative power is vested in few selected persons the government is called aristocracy, if the community retains the legislative power in its own hands and merely appoints a few officers to execute these laws, the government is democracy. Locke considered democracy as the best government.
3. Locke holds that the state exists for the people who constitute it. He takes a purely mechanistic view of the state.
4. The state according to Locke rests on the consent of the people. He asserts that individuals obey the state because they have given their consent to be ruled by it at the time of the original contract. This also implies the acceptance of the principle of majority rule.
5. Locke's state is a constitutional state in which government is carried on according to law. The government is not permitted to rule with the help of extemporary decrees and insists that the laws should be reduced in writing so that members of the community know these laws. If men are subjected to uncertain unknown arbitrary will of another man, there can be no civil liberty. However, in case of emergency, Locke permits the use of prerogative.
6. Locke's state is not absolute like that of Hobbes. On the other hand its authority is limited by a number of factors. Individual natural rights constrain the state's authority since these rights existed prior to the establishment of the state, and individuals established the state to protect these rights. He further says the government cannot raise taxes without the consent of the people either direct or indirect.
7. Locke's state operates on the principle of religious tolerance and is opposed to all type of religious persecution. He wants the state to be neutral in religious matters. Locke does not want any interference in any body's soul by the state. However, if the religious views of an individual

pose a threat to the peace of state he would like its suppression and even repression.

8. Locke's state is assigned purely negative functions. It is merely concerned with the prevention of violation of the right by the various members of the community and protection against external aggression. It is not concerned with the moral and material development of the individual.
9. As Wayper says Locke's state is a transformer's state. It transforms the individual's self interests into public good. To quote Wayper the state holds in check self interest and all mechanism whereby men acting as they rust are in the end brought to act as they ought to do - that is for public happiness.
10. Locke makes the state secular and the church a voluntary institution. He permits the government to interfere in religious matters only when anybody abuses religious freedom threatening the peace of the state.

Locke was an exponent of popular sovereignty. He finds the sovereign a product of social contract. As an individualist Locke gives primacy to the natural rights of the individual and cautions the sovereign not to encroach upon it. The government or the sovereign who fails to safeguard these rights now no right to rule so, people have every right to dispose the sovereign.

Thus, he subordinates the sovereign for the safety of individual. Locke realised the essence of individual freedom and he did not hesitate to restrict the powers of government for the sake of individual and community as a whole.

3.3.3 Natural Rights of John Locke

Locke contributed to the political theory the doctrine of natural rights, which according to Prof. Dunning is the most distinctive contribution. As an individualists Locke argued in favour of natural rights of the individuals. To him state emerged out of the contract to protect and preserve these inalienable rights like right to life, liberty and property. Within the bonds of natural rights, the people are free to act in the manner they like. Every individual has a right to punish those who transgress or violate the limits of natural law. In this regard every individual is his own judge to decide punishment and also to enforce that. He however, made it clear that law of nature does not give rights alone, but imposes certain duties as well. In his own words, "The state of nature a law of nature to govern it, which obliges every man, and reason which is that law teaches all mankind who will but consent it that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty and possessions."

3.3.4 Locke on Revolution

Locke as the great defender of the Glorious Revolution discussed the problem of resistance to the authority of the government in great details and the right of the people to revolt against the sovereign was justified. He claims that the government is a trust that was established to achieve particular goals, and that if it fails to

NOTES

NOTES

achieve those goals, the people have the right to revolt against it and reform it. Similarly if the government transgresses the limits prescribed for it and violates basic rights which the people retained with them at the time of the creation of the state, the people have a right to revolt. To quote Locks “The legislative being only power to act for certain ends, there remains still in the people a supreme power to remove or alter the legislative when they find the legislative end contrary to the trust reposed in them, and the community perpetually retains a supreme power of saving themselves from the attempts and designs of anybody even of their legislators whenever they shall be so foolish or so wicked as to lay and carry on designs against the liberties and properties of the subjects.” He again says “Government is dissolved when the legislature is so transformed as to bring the law making power into the hands of other than those to which it was entrusted by the community and its organisation or when either legislature or executive acts contrary to its trusts.”

A question may be raised as to who is to decide whether the legislature has betrayed the confidence of the people or not. Locke says this question is to be decided by the society as a whole and its decision was final and undisputable. It is the people who have to take a final decision whether the conditions have reached such a stage that the dissolution is warranted or not.

In view of Locke’s above views on the right of the people to revolt against the sovereign, it has often been alleged that he did not formulate a theory of government but a theory of rebellion. However, this view is not fully correct. Locke himself says that by allowing right of revolution he was not necessarily encouraging rebellion. He argues that the people on the whole are very conservative and are likely to put up with many ills for long before they embark upon the path of revolution. They will take to arms only when they are oppressed to the hilt. Locke further makes the right to revolution difficult by insisting that decision in this regard should be taken by the majority. The minority, under no circumstances, is permitted the right to revolt. The revolution is justified only when a change is effective in the legislative power or the trust which the people reposed in the sovereign is violated. In the words of Prof. Sabine “Any invasion of the life, liberty or property of subjects is ipso facto void, and a legislature which attempts these rights forfeits its power.” Locke put it thus: “When the legislature or the prince break their trust, they forfeit the power that the people had placed in their hands for quite different ends, and it devolves to the people, who have the right to reclaim their original liberty and, through the establishment of a new legislature, provide for their own safety and security, which is the purpose for which they are in society.”

3.3.5 Locke on Property

Before going into detail about Locke’s ideas on property, it’s important to realise that he uses the term “property” in two different ways. In a broad sense, he means the right to life, liberty, and property. He uses it in the restricted meaning to refer to the right to own and retain one’s property. We shall deal with both these views of property.

NOTES

In the narrow sense he says that in the state of nature people possessed property in common and no body originally had private property. As the puts it "Property is without any express compact of all the commoners. The Earth, and all that is therein, is given to men for the support and comfort of their being. And...all the fruit it naturally produces, and beasts it feeds, belong to mankind in common, they are produced by the spontaneous hand of Nature and no body has originally a private dominion." Locke says that in addition to this external property which is owned in common by all the persons, every person has his private property which cannot be taken away by anybody. The private property is the property which a person produces by his labour or sweat. This is how Locke puts it: "Every man has a property in his own person." As a result, only he has the right to do so. We might claim that his body's labour and his hands' effort are rightfully his. We may say that anything he has in his hands is really his. Whatever he removes from the state that he has provided and left it in, he has combined his labour with, and coupled to it something that is his own, making it his own. Because this labour is indisputably the property of the labourers, no one else can have a claim to what is once connected to it." In short Locke says that individuals property consists of anything with which he has mixed his labour. This labour theory of Locke ultimately became the basis of modern socialism. It may be noted that Locke does not prescribe any limit for the private property a person can own, except that insists that he should not spoil or destroy it. This concept of property is however defective in so far it can apply only to a simple and agrarian society and does not fit in well with the modern complicated economic system.

In the broader sense Locke uses the term property to include three natural rights of life, liberty and property. At a number of places Locke states that the individuals enter into contract and institute the state so preserve property. Here he is clearly using the term in the broader sense of the three rights referred to above. Thus Locke envisages that property existed in the pre-civil society and the institution of state was created to preserve this right. It is not the state which creates the right to property (life, liberty and property) but is itself created to protect this right. The state can protect the property of the individual through interpretation of law of nature, through an application of this interpretation between the members of the society and enforcement of this right through use of its authority for repelling the aggression.

Locke says that the right to private property has received the approval and sanction of the society in so far as it has existed for such a long time. According to Locke "Property is legitimate because men who must live in its midst have consented to its existence... Rousseau will insist that consent must be an active process, on renewed each day in men's lives, while Burke will claim that genuine consent is found in the established customs, which men unconsciously develop over generations and centuries, furthermore, Locke defends property through consent only part of the way; he has also said that property is sanctioned by God and earned by men."

NOTES

Locke considered the institution of private property as a guarantee for individual liberties. He asserted that only those people have suffered under tyrannies who did not possess private property. According to Maxey “Guarantee every man freedom of property and according to the Lockean theory, there would be little cause to worry about his other liberties. He would be able to take out for himself.

3.3.6 Locke and Liberalism

John Locke was the greatest liberal thinker of 19th century in England. He was known to be the second contractualist after Thomas Hobbes. He was influenced deeply by the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the influence of this revolution developed in him a spirit of love, compromise and moderation. As a liberal thinker he considered over government dangerous to individual liberty. He dedicated his philosophy for the good of the individualism and community. His entire philosophy revolve round his theory of liberation and individualism.

John Locke in his writing displays himself as a through-going individualist. According to Vaughan “Everything in Locke’s system revolves around the individual”. The main features which are a pointer to the individualist philosophy of Locke can be summed up as follows.

In the **first place** he accords a fundamental position in the inalienable and natural rights in his scheme and asserts that the natural rights of life, Liberty and property belong to the individual due to the fact of his very personality. In other words he says that the natural rights are prior to the state.

Secondly, the state was created for the protection of the natural rights and the happiness of the individual. It may be noted that Locke sought rights and freedom for all men without distinction.

Thirdly, Locke bases the Government on the consent of the individuals. He considers only that Government as the Legitimate Government which is based on the consent of the individual. Viewed in this context, he does not consider on absolute Government as a true Government because it is based on caprice rather than reason, the belief in the consent theory also implies that the people can withdraw their consent if the state commits a breach of its trust.

Fourthly, Locke assigns to the State purely negative functions. It interferes only when the rights of the individual are endangered. Otherwise the individual is left completely free to pursue his moral, Material and intellectual pursuits. As a such individualists Locke could not reconcile with the idea of assigning positive functions to the state which could lead to state intervention in the personal affairs of the individual. By assigning negative functions of the state Locke proves himself a great individualist.

Fifthly, Locke’s views on property further cement his reputation as an outspoken individualist; he claims that property that was once possessed in common becomes private property of an individual after he has combined his

NOTES

labour with it or impact a bit of his individuality to the common object. This is probably the best way to emphasise the importance and worth of the individual.

Sixthly, The law of nature is given a significant place by Locke, who believes that even state law must conform to it in all circumstances, thus he places the state completely at the mercy of the individual and authorises even the minority to challenge the normal justification of a law passed by majority.

Seventhly, Locke's faith in the pleasure and pain theory, which forms the starting point of his philosophy, is a further pointer to his individualism. He claims that an individual's activities are driven by a desire for pleasure and a desire to avoid pain.

Eighthly, Locke displays his strong individualist bias in his views on revolution. He authorises the individuals to rise in revolt against the state if it transgress its limits or fails to carry out its part of obligation. Thus in his scheme of things the state is reduced to the position of a hand-made of individual, who rules supreme.

Ninthly, Locke advocates division of power, because he was convinced that it was an essential precondition for the preservation of individual freedom.

It is evident from the above discussion that Locke was a thoroughgoing individualist. In fact some of the scholars have criticised Locke for carrying individualism to such an extreme. For example, Prof. Laski says Locke reduced the state to "a negative institution, a kind of gigantic limited liability company." By assigning purely negative functions to the state, Locke in fact ensures the domination of the strong over the weak and the rich over the poor. He does not pay any attention to the idea of ensuring social justice nor does he pay any attention to the more upliftment of the individual.

3.3.7 Contribution of John Locke to the Political Thought

John Locke was a greatest liberal philosopher of England. He was a democrat at heart and a man of common sense. Liberalism as a political creed began with him. He was a member of Whig party. As a member of Whig party, he was deeply influenced by the Revolution of 1688. The influence of the revolution developed in him a spirit of love, compromise and moderation. He was a liberal thinker, he considered over government dangerous to individual liberty. He dedicated his philosophy for the good of the individualism and community. His entire philosophy revolves round his theory of liberalism. He was a rationalist and a pragmatist whose philosophy clearly reflects the Liberal of British Liberalism or an apologist of Glorious Revolution. The contribution of John Locke towards political thought is given below:

1. **Ideas on Human Nature:** Like Thomas Hobbes, John Locke explained about human nature. But his view regarding human nature was totally different from Thomas Hobbes. John had full faith and confidence on individual. Human beings, according to Locke, are fundamentally decent and have been bestowed with a natural social impulse. They are not

NOTES

always selfish. Locke recognised goodness in human beings and said men are peace loving. All human beings are equal and they seek to substitute pleasure for pain. Locke regarded human beings decent orderly, social minded and capable of ruling themselves.

2. **State of Nature:** Locke described the state of nature as social and pre-political. He regarded state of nature as an era of peace, goodwill, mutual assistance and preservation. Nature's rule governs men's behaviour. There was no government in the state of nature, which meant there was no power to make, implement, or interpret laws.
3. **Social Contract:** Locke took a liberal view of social contract. He said in the state of nature men were leading a peaceful life, but there was no common law, none to execute and interprets the law. So men in order to escape these inconvenience entered into a contract and thus the state emerged. This was a contract between each individual and the entire community, a social compact in which each person pledged to submit to the group as a whole. Individuals only gave up the right to interpret the law of nature for themselves through the contract.
4. **Natural Rights:** Locke contributed to the political theory the doctrine of natural rights, which according to Prof. Dunning is the most distinctive contribution. As an individualists Locke argued in favour of natural rights of the individuals. To him state emerged out of the contract to protect and preserve these inalienable rights like right to life, liberty and property. Within the bonds of natural rights, the people are free to act in the manner they like. Every individual has a right to punish those who transgress or violate the limits of natural law. In this regard every individual is his own judge to decide punishment and also to enforce that. He however, made it clear that law of nature does not give rights alone, but imposes certain duties as well. In his own words, "The state of nature a law of nature to govern it, which obliges every man, and reason which is that law teaches all mankind who will but consent it that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty and possessions."
5. **Idea of Revolution:** John Locke was a great defender of the Glorious Revolution. In this context, he discussed problem of resistance to the authority of Government in great details and justified the right of the people to revolt against the sovereign. The people have every right to remove an inefficient and oppressive government. If a government has authority and if the parliament or legislature does not assemble them the people are justified in organising a revolution against the authority for the revolution of the trust. Locke's views on right to revolt exercised profound influence on the people of America and France and then tried to put these views into actual practice.
6. **State and Society:** Locke is credited as being the first to distinguish between society, state, and government and to put them in proper chronological order. He says the society existed in the state of nature and

was followed by the state and ultimately the government came into existence to execute the powers of the state as its trustee.

7. **Supremacy of the Community:** Locke emphasised the doctrine of supremacy of the community on which later on Rousseau based his theory of General Will. In the words of Laski Rousseaus philosophy is nothing more than widening the channel dug by Locke.
8. **Father of Liberalism:** Locke is known as the “Father of Liberalism” because he was the first to emphasise that the people are the source of all authority and that the state must design policies in accordance with the people’s preferences and interests. If the state goes beyond its jurisdiction, its authority must be resisted.
9. **Concept of Separation of Powers:** Locke worked on the separation of powers and his ideas provided the basis for Montesquieu to present his classical theory of separation powers.
10. **As Utilitarian:** Locke thought contains seeds of utilitarianism. He greatly emphasised the principle of general happiness of the people which was later adopted by Bentham. Bentham adopted Locke’s concept of state as a machine, but he brushed aside Locke’s theory of natural rights.
11. **Popular Sovereignty and Constitutional Government:** Locke laid the groundwork for the formation of the democratic state concept, which is founded on popular institutions and constitutional government. He also emphasised the principles of consent of the government and majority rule which form the basis of the modern democratic institutions. Thus Locke provided a systematic and rational philosophy of popular sovereignty and constitutional government.
12. **Labour Theory:** Locke laid the foundation of labour theory which not only influenced the classical economists but also greatly influenced Marx’s labour theory of value.
13. **Religious Toleration:** Locke was an advocate of religious toleration and religious freedom. He separated politics from the ugly influence of the Anglican Church and thus won the level of being a liberal thinker. He did not favour to interference of God or religion leaders in the affairs of the state.
14. **Support for Private Property:** Locke advocated in favour of private property of the individualism for the development of mankind and of the individuals. He assigned the government with responsibility to protect the property rights of the individual.
15. **Individualism:** Lockean Liberalism is based on his concept of individuals. He says the individual possesses the natural rights like right of life, liberty and property which can not be abridged of the state and government have been instituted for the more effective safeguarding there rights. Locke was out and out an individualists for which he placed individual above state and society. His government is simply a means for

NOTES

NOTES

his individual. Every thing in his philosophy revolves around the individuals.

The above discussion about Locke's contribution proves that Locke was the father of Liberalism and an apologist of the Glorious Revolution.

3.4 JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU

The greatest thinker that the French created was Jean Jacques Rousseau. He was the most interesting and intriguing figure in the history of political thought. No other political theorist could come close to him because of the charm of his style. He was a genius, a strong moralist, and a merciless critic of 18th-century French society. He was one of the most divisive thinkers, as seen by the numerous inconsistent, contradicting, and frequently diametrically opposed interpretations of his ideas' nature and significance. "His philosophy is highly personal, an expression of his own fierce insistence on independence and liberty, but at the same time, paradoxical and complex."

Rousseau was born at Geneva in 1772 in a middle class French family. He fled his home at the age of fifteen and became a vagrant. As a result, he, like Hobbes and Locke, was unable to obtain a proper education or acquire a patron. On the other side, he lived a life of deprivation and poverty. In 1749, Rousseau created a name for himself in political thinking by writing an essay for the Dijon Academy titled "Has the Progress of Sciences and the Arts helped to purify corrupt morals" "The Social Contract" published in 1762 is his important contribution. Rousseau's political perspective is influenced by his surroundings as well as the other political philosophers who came before him. He was influenced by politician philosophers like Plato, Hobbes, Locke and Montesquieu.

3.4.1 Rousseau's Idea on Social Contract

The greatest thinker that the French created was Jean Jacques Rousseau. He was the most interesting and intriguing figure in the history of political thought. No other political philosopher could come close to him because of the charm of his style. Rousseau's political perspective reflects his surroundings as well as the impact of numerous political philosophers who came before him. Plato, John Locke Montesquieu, Thomas Hobbes, and other political philosophers impacted him greatly. Further his long association with Geneva was responsible for his love for democracy and democratic institutions. Rousseau in his book "The Social Contract" explained about Human Nature, State of Nature and Social Contract.

3.4.2 Rousseau's General Will

Jean Jacques Rousseau was a greatest rationalist thinker of France who put forward his ideas on politics and society. He was the most interesting and intriguing figure in the history of political thought. No other political theorist could come close to him because of the charm of his style. He was genius and a keen moralist and rationalist. He was also great democrat. As a rational and democratic thinker he believed in popular sovereignty. He cited the social compact as the foundation of

NOTES

state formation and the “General Will” as the foundation of good governance. The concept of “General Will” and popular sovereignty” are hailed as his lasting contributions to political thought.

Rousseau on General Will. The theory of General Will advocated by Rousseau has been described as the most revolutionary, distinguishing, impressive and influential doctrine of Rousseau. According to Prof. Jones “The notion of the General Will is not only the most central concept of Rousseau’s theory, it is also the most original, the most interesting and historically the most important contribution which he has made to Political Theory.” As already noted, the chief problem which confronted Rousseau man in the state of nature was “to find a form of association which will defend and protect with the whole common force the person and goods of each associate, and in which each, while uniting with all, may still obey himself alone, and remain as free as before.” For the creation of this association each person entrusted his or her person and all of his or her power to the General Will, and was received in corporate capacity as an indivisible part of the whole. This act of forming association results in the formation of a moral, collective entity with its own identity, life, and will. This is what Rousseau refers to as General Will. In the words of Rousseau “the public person, so formed by the union of all other persons is called by its members state when passive, sovereign when active.” According to Prof. Sabine, Rousseau’s theory of General Will implies that “a community has a corporate personality the organic analogy for a social group, the doctrine that the general will of the corporate self sets the moral standards valid for its members and the implied reduction of government to a mere agent of the General Will.”

It is necessary to grasp the difference between the terms Actual Will and Real Will in order to comprehend Rousseau’s concept of General Will. The ‘real will,’ according to Rousseau, was a selfish, illogical will that was concerned only with the welfare of the individual without regard for the well of society. The Real Will, on the other hand, was higher, nobler, and supreme, impelling the individual to consider his or her own well-being as well as the well-being of society. As this was based on reason it was not momentary but permanent. Rousseau’s General Will is nothing more than the aggregate of all the individual’s ‘Real Wills,’ which were based on reason and foresight.

Rousseau distinguished his General Will from the Will of all. He says that whereas the will of the all was merely a majority will which considered about the welfare of a few only, the General Will thought in terms of the community as a whole. The differences between these two wills can be best explained in the following words of Rousseau: “There is often a considerable difference between General Will and the Will of all, the former aims at the common interest, the latter aims at private interest and is these wills only a sum of particular wills. But if we take away from the various particular interests which conflict with each other, what remains as the sum if difference is General Will.”

Attributes of General Will: The General Will of Rousseau has following attributes:

NOTES

Firstly, it is indivisible. Just like the personality of an individual cannot be divided the General Will cannot be divided. Once it is divided it shall cease to be 'General Will' and become merely sectional will.

Secondly, like the human will, the General Will cannot be represented by any body else.

Thirdly, the General will is supreme and no body can disobey it. According to Rousseau "whosoever refused to obey the General Will shall be compelled to do so by the whole body... he will be forced to be free."

Fourthly, the General Will is a single unity and cannot be alienated. To alienate it tantamounted to its death.

Fifthly, the General Will was unrepresentable. Therefore, Rousseau believed in direct democracy through General Will.

Sixthly, the General Will is never wrong. Even if we can't see it, it is always working for the greater welfare of the community. It is founded on logic, wisdom, and experience, and it is unaffected by the passage of time.

Criticism of Rousseau's Theory of General Will. The following are some of the reasons why Rousseau's notion of General Will has been criticised.

Firstly, the concept of General Will is a nebulous and perplexing idea. Even Rousseau used the term 'universal will' in many contexts throughout his writings. He associates it with the will to do what is best for everyone at times, and the will of the majority at other times. Again, he also equates it with the will of wise legislature.

Secondly, Rousseau talks of General Will as distinct from the Will of all, but in practice it is almost impossible to draw a line of distinction between the two.

Thirdly, Rousseau tries to divide the individual will into two parts-the essential and non-essential. The essential part is rational while the non-essential part is selfish. But as the individual's will is a corporate will it is impossible to divide it into parts.

Fourthly, Rousseau asserts that the General Will coincides with justice. In this way he makes the things still more complicated. It is indeed impossible to reconcile two abstract concepts like justice and general will.

Fifthly, Rousseau by assigning absolute powers to the General Will paves the way for the rise of dictatorship. It leaves sufficient scope for the person or group in power to promote his own interests or interests of a particular group under the cloak of popular good.

Sixthly, Rousseau's theory of General Will implies that the state is a super-entity distinct from its organic elements, the individuals. In fact the interests of the individual and the state are identical and it is not possible to separate the two.

Seventhly, Rousseau says that liberty for the individual is possible only if he obeys the General Will. He further says that if someone goes against the General

NOTES

Will, they will be forced to obey it for their own welfare. This force could take the form of incarceration or death. It's difficult to comprehend how liberty and coercion can coexist, or how an individual's life and liberty can be taken away in the name of his or her own good.

Eighthly, Rousseau held that the General Will is not representable. This implies the existence of democracy. In modern states the theory cannot apply because of the prevalence of system of indirect democracy or representatives democracy. Therefore the theory is possible only in small communities where personal contact among the members is possible.

Ninthly, the theory expects too much from human nature. It is well known that men are essentially selfish. It would be too much to expect from them they shall forgo their selfish ends for the collective good.

Tenthly, Rousseau just presents a theory of General Will without elaborating on how it could be put into effect.

Finally, his theory of General Will has been considered as contrary to his theory of social contract. For example Prof. Wayper says "if the General Will is Supreme, the Social Contract is unnecessary and meaningless, and if the Social Contract is necessary and significant, the General Will cannot be supreme". Citizens, according to Prof Sabine, are unique and coeval with their members; they neither create it nor have rights against it. It has a moral and collective personality; it is an association, not an aggregation.

It is true that Rousseau's theory of General Will suffers from numerous paradoxes and shortcomings, but still it has been regarded as Rousseau's most profound contribution to political theory. According to prof. Maxey, "the concept of General Will is at the heart of Rousseau's theory, and it is unquestionably his most important contribution to political thought." The value of the theory lies in the fact that it asserted the importance of human beings and the need of their cooperation for the smooth working of the state." It also emphasised the principle. "Will, not force is the basis of State." The propagation of these principles proved helpful for the growth of democracy. It also emphasised the principle that the social good must get precedence over individual interests and thus contributed to the growth of idealist theory of state. The idea of Nation State was also largely the Rousseau. Prof. Dunning says "Through these concepts a way was opened by which the unity and solidarity of a population became necessary pre-supposition of scientific politics. Rousseau thus contributed largely to promote the theory of nation state."

3.4.3 Rousseau's Views on Sovereignty

Jean Jacques Rousseau a celebrated French philosopher in his famous book "The social Contract" gave a clear idea that state is a product of social contract. Rousseau formalised the compact by vesting sovereignty in the community as a whole, rather than in any single person or group of individuals, through the instrument of General Will. Rousseau associated political sovereignty with the

NOTES

General Will or the common good of the community. It is rightly said that if Bodin and Hobbes conceived of state-sovereignty and Locke and Montesquieu fought shy of the concept of sovereignty it was Rousseau who gave a solid basis to popular sovereignty by vesting it in the General Will of the community. This provides the idea that he believed in the people's sovereignty. His sovereign is the "General Will" when combines the absolutism of Hobbes and individualism of Locke. Rousseau's popular sovereignty is unreliable, indivisible, unrepresentable, and limitless. It is unrepresentable because it is part of the Universal Will, which cannot be expressed. Rousseau's state sovereignty is absolute, similar to Hobbes', with the exception that, although Hobbes distributes sovereignty to a single or multiple heads of state, Rousseau gives it to the entire community. Again, whereas Rousseau's sovereign people cannot divert themselves from their sovereign even if they choose, Hobbes' first corporate action alienates the people from their sovereignty for all time. In fact "Rousseau unites the absolute sovereignty of Hobbes and the popular consent of Locke into the philosophic doctrine of popular sovereignty". The sovereignty of Rousseau was a compromise between constitutionalism and absolute monarchy. Rousseau took an organic conception of society and assigned sovereign powers to it. It was mainly due to the fact that people are the sovereign and the subjects at once. Sovereign power lies in the body politics which can not impose any limitations on itself. The sovereign can have no interest other than those of the people, hence he felt no need of imposing limitations on sovereignty.

Rousseau in justification of absolute sovereignty says, just as every individual possesses absolute power over himself, similarly the social contract has given absolute powers to the body politic. This power is called sovereignty and it is directed by General Will. The absolutism of General Will is not based on force but on consent. The sovereign power shall only be exercised for the advantage of all citizens. It was not only the supreme legal authority but it is sanctioned by reason. Rousseau prescribed that:

1. The sovereign must not do anything which shall go against the interest of the community.
2. It must ensure equality before law.
3. It can not impose any limitations illegally having no use for the community.

Characteristics of Sovereignty

Rousseau's theory of sovereignty possesses the following features or characteristics:

- (i) **Sovereignty is inalienable:** It is inalienable because it can not be transferred to anybody else. It will always lie with the General Will. The moment sovereign power is alienated it will be no sovereign. To Rousseau "I say that sovereignty, being merely the exercise of the general will, can never be alienated - power, certainly can be transferred but not Will."

NOTES

- (ii) **Sovereignty is indivisible:** Sovereignty is unified and indivisible. If you divide the general will, it ceases to be general will and therefore ceases to be sovereign because general will alone is sovereign. It becomes a sectional will which is not sovereign. What can be divided is only the exercise of this sovereign power.
- (iii) **Sovereignty is unrepresentable:** It is unrepresentable because it is part of a community, which is a collective body that cannot be represented, yet sovereignty is the community's will, which is unrepresentable. When a country picks representatives, it ceases to be free and ceases to exist.
- (iv) **Sovereignty is infallible:** Because it is an organisation and synthesis of the true wills of the individuals, the general will is infallible. It is a good will. It is always seen general good. Rather than emotions and impulses, it is based on logic. It integrates individuals with society and seeks individual good in social good.

Thus, Rousseau's sovereign is as absolute as Hobbes', with the exception that, whereas Hobbes vests all powers in a single person, Rousseau puts Sovereign in the community or the General Will. However, in both scenarios, the sovereign is endowed with unlimited powers, and so his or her authority cannot be challenged under any circumstances. It is in this sense that it has been said that "Rousseau's sovereign is Hobbes Leviathan with its head chopped off". Rousseau's theories, according to Prof. Vaughan, lead to collectivism right away, and he was "the determined foe of individualism, sworn hater not just of individualism, but of individuality." Rousseau projects himself as an individualist in his Discourses, he confesses. He becomes an open collectivist in his later work, Social Contract. He prefers to assess him on the basis of his later work. Prof. Wayper also holds that in Social Contract Rousseau propounds the organic theory of state and insists that just as all the organs of the body work under the control of mind, similarly all the constituents of society should function under the indispensable command of the General Will. He asserts that if we go through his social contract minutely we cannot arrive at any other conclusion except that Rousseau was a collectivist. He believes in the supremacy of the state over the individual and does not leave any scope for the individual to defy the authority of the state. It is noteworthy that even Hobbes who is considered as an out-and-out absolutist authorised the individual to disobey the state if his life was endangered by rendering obedience to the commands of the leviathan. Rousseau under no circumstances permits the individual to act contrary to the dictates of the General Will because he is convinced that the individual actions are dictated by actual will which represents the selfish interests as against the interests of the whole society as represented by the General Will.

On the other hand Prof. Alfred Cobban considers Rousseau as an individualist out-and-out. In support of his contention he argues that Rousseau aspired to promote the individual's moral life and independence. The community is only a vehicle for an individual's moral growth. Individuals create the state, and it exists for them. This is proved that Rousseau starts with the individual and not the state.

NOTES

No doubt, the ultimate solution offered by Rousseau implies the merger of individuals personality into the state's personality but it is created for the moral development of all individuals. It exists merely to promote the moral and material well-being of the individuals which compose it. Thus Rousseau was neither an individualist nor a collectivist rather both. He made a sincere effort to reconcile the interests of the individual and the state so that both could acquire fuller meaning.

3.4.4 Contribution of Rousseau to Political Thought

The political philosophy of Rousseau is found in his writings like "Discourses on the Origin and Foundation of Inequality", French Encyclopaedia, the Social Contract, La Nouvelle Heloise, the Emile, the Confessions Dialogues and Reveries, rationalist. No doubt Rousseau was the greatest thinker of France who put forward his ideas on politics and society. The contribution of Rousseau towards the history of political thought may be discussed below:

1. **Origin of the State:** Like Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, Rousseau also assumes that the people formed a social contract in order to escape the dreadful and intolerable conditions of the post-property stage of nature. However, his contract is quite different from the one envisaged by Hobbes and Locke and in a way constitutes an improvement over both. He combined the methods of Hobbes and the substance of Locke. To him the state originated due to social contract. However his contract is double-sided. As a member of the sovereign, he is obligated to other individuals, and as a member of the state, he is obligated to the sovereign.
2. **General Will:** The Theory of General Will advocated by Rousseau has been described as the most revolutionary, distinguishing, impressive and influential doctrine of Rousseau. Rousseau in his Social Contract vested the sovereign power on General Will. Rousseau's General Will is nothing more than the sum of all the "actual wills" of individuals that are based on reason. General Will represents the common interests of members of the community and it is err-less, impartial and sovereign.

General Will is neither majority will nor the will of all, rather its wills general good. The body politics is a moral being which possesses this general will. It is the source of laws and its end is to serve the people and promote this happiness and welfare. It is based on reason and none can refuse to obey this will without causing any harm to himself.

This Theory of General Will influenced many political thinkers in the direction of guaranteeing rights to the individuals and claiming obedience from them. According to Prof. Jones "Not only is Rousseau's concept of the General Will the most central concept in his theory, but it is also the most unique, intriguing, and historically significant contribution he has made to political theory."

3. **Popular Sovereignty:** Another lasting contribution of Rousseau to the history of political thinking is his thesis of popular sovereignty. Rousseau's Social Contract vested sovereign power in the community as

NOTES

a whole, through the medium of the General Will, rather than in any single person or group of persons. Rousseau believes in the people's sovereignty. People are morally bound to follow out the General Will's judgement because it serves the common good. People are also expected to obey the General Will fully on legal grounds, as they ceded all their rights to the General Will without condition at the time of the contract. The Sovereignty of Rousseau identifies the common interest of the community and it is permanent, infallible and unrepresentable in nature. The sovereign ensures equality before law and maintains justice. It cannot act against public interest. Thus his theory of popular sovereignty is another outstanding contribution. No doubt other thinkers before Rousseau gave theory of sovereignty but none of them emphasised the doctrine of popular sovereignty.

4. **Absolutism:** Rousseau emphasised the importance of the state and sovereignty in the life of the individual and asserted that the fullest development of individual's personality was possible only within the state. He regarded the state as an organism and individuals as an integral part of the state. The individual does not have any authority to act in violation of the sovereign. As a collectivist, he believed in the supremacy of the state over individuals.
5. **Individualism:** Rousseau was considered as an individualist out-and-out. To Rousseau, state is created by the individuals and exists for them. This proved by the fact that Rousseau starts with the individual and not the state. To him state exists merely to promote the moral and material well-being of the individuals which compose it. His theory of General Will also emphasises on moral development of individual.
6. **Idealism:** Rousseau left deep impact on the idealist scheme of thought. His concept of General Will greatly influenced idealist thinkers like Kant and Hegel. The latter's Spirit of Nation was nothing but a reformed form of Rousseaus concept of General Will.
7. **Utilitarianism:** Rousseau gave the concept of common good which was subsequently developed by the Utilitarian thinkers like Bentham and Mill into the concept of "greatest good of the greatest number."
8. **Nationalism:** Rousseau developed the concept of Nation-state by laying emphasis on the principles of common good, common interest, General Will as well as unity and solidarity of the people.
9. **Other Contributions:** Rousseau's concept of liberty and equality created a spirit which was responsible for the great revolution of 1789 in France. His theory of social contract was given due weightage in the declaration of independence and Bill of Rights of U.S. constitution. He also pleaded the consent theory as the basis of political obligation.

NOTES

3.4.5 Comparison of the Views of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau

Hobbes and Rousseau maintained that sovereignty was absolute but to Locke, it was limited. Hobbes was of the opinion that sovereignty may be vested in one, few or the many but once it is vested, it could not be recalled. Rousseau held that sovereignty is vested in the whole people.

To Hobbes natural man was selfish and the state of nature was a period of constant warfare. Rousseau believed that the natural man was good and there was happiness in the state of nature. Locke, on these points occupied a middle position.

On government, their views also differed. Hobbes said that a change in government meant a dissolution of state. Locke held that the people had a right to choose the government and change it if they do not like it. To Rousseau, the government was merely the agent which executed the popular will.

The following detailed comparison gives a clear picture:

- (i) **On nature of state:** Hobbes maintained that in the state of nature man was selfish and it was a period of constant warfare. Locke believed that in the state of nature man was happy. People were safe and led a peaceful life. There existed co-operation among man. Rousseau held that the natural man was good and the period was that of happiness. People were leading ideal life. Equality among men existed. Later came into being the institution of private property which led to inequality which resulted into the organisation of the state.
- (ii) **On nature of law:** In natural state, Hobbes says, there were no civil laws and the actions of men were controlled by natural laws. Locke maintains that in the state of nature, natural laws were the embodiment of the morality. These laws were based on reason. Human behaviour was controlled by them. A law, according to Rousseau, is a revolution of the whole people for the whole people, addressing a matter that affects everyone. The law must be in the public interest and must originate with the people as a whole.
- (iii) **On natural rights:** Hobbes says in the state of nature, might was the only right. Thus the rights of men were based on the power of the individual concerned. Locke draws a brighter picture. He maintains that in the state of nature everybody had a right to life, right to property and right to liberty. He maintains that rights were inborn. Rousseau holds that the rights of liberty, equality and property are rights of the citizen and are not innate. However, he maintains that in the state of nature man was free to enjoy all his natural rights.
- (iv) **On social contract:** Hobbes says in the state of nature man's was solitary, poor and brutish. There was a constant warfare. Later on man discovered that peace was more useful. As a result, he agreed that every man should strive for peace as far as he has a chance of achieving it, and that he must accept as much liberty against other men as he would allow other men

against himself. On this basis, men agreed to establish a sovereign to whom all authority was transferred.

Locke says, the state was established by a social contract. The duty of the state was to define and enforce the natural laws. The sovereign's authority was limited and man surrendered to him some of his natural rights and not all of them.

Rousseau says that political society came into being on the basis of a social contract to which each and all members assented. It was to provide its members with both the freedom of the state of nature and the advantages of civil law and order.

- (v) **On sovereignty:** Hobbes maintained that sovereignty was absolute, indivisible, inalienable, above law and source of law, justice and property. No-body had any right to revolt against the sovereign. The sovereign had complete control over the citizens. Locke conceived of popular and not legal sovereignty. His government was limited to its duties. He did not conceive of a sovereign state. Rousseau believed in popular sovereignty. To him, the people as the whole were sovereign and sovereignty resided in the General will. Unity, permanency, indivisibility, inalienability and its absolute and unrepresentable character were its attributes.

NOTES

Check Your Progress

I. Multiple Choice Questions

- According to Hobbes, life in the state of nature was:
 - Free and noble
 - Solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short
 - Better than life in his own time
 - Difficult but honest
- Who among the following advocated for the absolute sovereignty?
 - Thomas Hobbes
 - John Locke
 - J.J. Rousseau
 - None of the above
- 'Leviathan' is the book written by _____.
 - Machiavelli
 - John Locke
 - Hobbes
 - Rousseau
- _____ is written by John Locke
 - The Prince
 - The Social Contract
 - Two Treatises on Government
 - The Politics
- 'The Social Contract' is a book written by _____.
 - Thomas Hobbes
 - Machiavelli
 - John Locke
 - J.J. Rousseau
- Rousseau's Theory of Sovereignty is known as _____.
 - Absolute Sovereignty
 - Limited Sovereignty
 - Popular Sovereignty
 - Legal Sovereignty

NOTES

7. The concept of 'General Will' is associated with _____.
(a) Rousseau (b) Hobbes
(c) Locke (d) Machiavelli
8. Who said, "Man is born free and everywhere he is in chain"?
(a) Hobbes (b) Locke
(c) Rousseau (d) Aristotle

II. True or False

1. Hobbes, State of Nature was Social and Pre-Political.
2. Hobbes advocated for absolute sovereignty.
3. John Locke was a defender of the Glorious Revolution.
4. Locke's state of Nature was solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short.
5. The General Will of Rousseau is nothing but the sum total of all the real Wills.

III. Match the Following

(A)

1. Thomas Hobbes
2. John Locke
3. J.J. Rousseau

(B)

- (a) Limited Sovereignty
- (b) Popular Sovereignty
- (c) Absolute Sovereignty

3.5 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

I. Multiple Choice Questions

1. (b)
2. (a)
3. (c)
4. (c)
5. (d)
6. (c)
7. (a)
8. (c)

II. True and False

1. False
2. True
3. True
4. False
5. True

III. Match the Following

1. (c)
2. (a)
3. (b)

NOTES

3.6 SUMMARY

Thomas Hobbes was the first thinker to conceive state as a human institution. He was the first great individualist and emphasised that the state is merely a means for the promotion of the interests of the individual. He is credited to have emphasised the theory of absolute sovereignty and freed his sovereign of all the shackles. His ideas on social contract regarding origin of the state was one of the most distinctive innovations. Prof. Sabine describes Hobbes as probably the greatest writer on political philosophy that the English speaking people have produced.

John Locke was the first philosophy to draw a distinction between society, state and government and to put them in chronological order. He contributed to the political theory the doctrine of natural rights. He provided basis for the development of the idea of a democratic state. He is regarded as the father of liberalism. He also laid great emphasis on the principles of toleration and secularism.

Rousseau's famous book 'Social Contract' exercised profound influence on the French people and prepared them for the Great French Revolution. He emphasised the importance of the state in the life of the individual. His theory of popular sovereignty is another outstanding contribution to the Political Thought. He developed the concept of Nation-State. His reconciliation between liberty and authority provided a new theoretical basis to society.

3.7 KEY TERMS

- **The leviathan:** Book written by Thomas Hobbes.
- **State of Nature:** Condition before the state come into existence.
- **Sovereignty:** Supreme Power of the State.
- **The Social Contract:** Book written by Rousseau.
- **Individualism:** A political theory which puts importance on freedom of individual.
- **Absolutism:** Unlimited power enjoyed by the ruler.

3.8 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short Type Questions

1. Hobbes, Leviathan
2. Hobbes, views on Human Nature
3. Locke on Limited Government
4. Locke's views on Natural Rights
5. Rousseau's General Will
6. Popular Sovereignty

NOTES

Long Type Questions

1. Describe Thomas Hobbes views on Social Contract.
2. "Hobbes was an individualist". Examine.
3. Analyse John Locke's views on Human Nature, State of Nature and Social Contract.
4. Describe contribution of John Locke to the Political Thought
5. Examine Rousseau's theory of General Will.
6. Explain Rousseau's idea on Social Contract.

ACTIVITY

Provide two real-life examples to prove how:

1. "Thomas Hobbes was an individualist Examine."
2. "Locke was greatly influenced by the Glorious Revolution". Analyse
3. "While analysing Human Nature, Rousseau started with Locke and ended with Hobbes." Examine

CASE STUDY

"Hobbes described state of Nature as solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short".

Thomas Hobbes painted a bleak image of the state of nature in his book 'Leviathan,' which he penned against the backdrop of the English Civil War (1642-1651). It was a state of constant battles and disputes between men who were fundamentally selfish and power-hungry. It was pre-social as well as pre-political. Natural rights was a euphemism for power. The order of the day was "kill everybody you can, steal what you can." Hobbes viewed life as "solitary, poor, ugly, brutish, and short" because it was so insecure. Men forged a deal amongst themselves to get out of this dreadful condition of nature, and they established a civil society, or state.

Question:

1. Describe in detail how Natural rights was another name for might. according to Thomas Hobbes.

3.9 REFERENCES

1. Dr. J.C. Johari. (1966) Political Thought (Ancient and Medieval). Metropolitan Book Company.
2. E. Barker. (1918). "Greek Political Theory of Plato and his Predecessors". London: Methuen & Co.
3. R.G. Gettell. (1953). "History of Political Thought". London: Allen and Unwin.
4. F.W. Coker. (1938). "Readings in Political Philosophy". New York, Macmillan Co.

NOTES

Unit IV Later Modern Political Thought

Learning Objectives:

This unit devotes the discussion on political thought of Jeremy Bentham, the Father of the Utilitarian School of Thought, John Stuart Mill, a great champion of the individual liberty and Karl Marx, the father of scientific socialism or communism. After studying this unit, you should be able to understand:

- Life History and works of Jeremy Bentham
- Bentham's views on utilitarianism
- Bentham's views on State, Government and Individual Liberty
- Political and Legal reforms suggested by Bentham
- S. Mill as a Utilitarian thinker
- S. Mills ideas on Liberty
- J.S. Mill's views on Democracy or Representative Government
- Mill's views on Women's Rights
- Life history of Karl Marx
- Dialectical materialism of Karl Marx
- Marx's views on class struggle

Structure:

- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Jeremy Bentham
 - 4.2.1 Bentham's Views on Utilitarianism
 - 4.2.2 Political and Legal Reforms Suggested by Bentham
 - 4.2.3 Bentham's Contribution to Modern Political Thought
- 4.3 John Stuart Mill
 - 4.3.1 Mill's Ideas on Liberty
 - 4.3.2 Mill on Representative Government
 - 4.3.3 Mill on Women's Right
 - 4.3.4 Mill on Democracy
 - 4.3.5 Contribution of J.S. Mill to Western Political Thought
- 4.4 Karl Marx
 - 4.4.1 Dialectical Materialism of Karl Marx
 - 4.4.2 Historical Materialism of Karl Marx
 - 4.4.3 Karl Marx's Theory of State

NOTES

4.4.4 Theory of Surplus Value

4.4.5 Karl Marx's Views on Class Struggle

4.4.6 Marx's Views on Proletarian Revolution

4.4.7 Dictatorship of the Proletariat

4.4.8 Karl Marx on Religion

4.5 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

4.6 Summary

4.7 Key Terms

4.8 Self-Assessment Questions and Exercises

4.9 References

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The three renowned Political Thinkers of Later Modern Political Thought are Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, and Karl Marx. The father of the utilitarian school of thinking, Jeremy Bentham, lived and wrote at a time when the people of England had no political rights. Bentham is widely credited as being the first to emphasise the utility principle. Bentham's Principle of Utility had a huge influence on lawmakers and statesmen in the nineteenth century. He focused his efforts on reforming the current political and judicial systems.

John Stuart Mill is regarded as the last utilitarian and the most prominent individualist. He was a staunch supporter of individual liberty and advocated for limiting government intrusion into people's lives to the bare minimum. He was a proponent of representative government and democracy. As a democrat who believes in representative government, I have advocated for women's rights.

Karl Marx was a nineteenth-century German philosopher. He was known as the "Father of Communism" and worked mostly in the field of political philosophy.

4.2 JEREMY BENTHAM

Jeremy Bentham, the originator of utilitarianism, united his occupations as a philosopher, a judge, a social reformer, and an activist throughout his active life. In 1748, he was born into a wealthy English family. His father was an accomplished lawyer who wished for his son to follow in his footsteps. He earned his Bar at Law degree in accordance with his father's wishes. However, he was more concerned with issues of social welfare than with the profession of law. He gave up his profession and dedicated himself to researching the flaws in the legal system in order to bring about required reform.

Bentham lived and wrote during a time when England's citizens had no political rights. The lives of labourers, inmates, and others were dreadful. Britain's rise to prominence as a major colonial power has ushered in a new era. However, it was the American Revolutionary War and the French Revolution of 1789 that had

NOTES

the greatest impact on him and shaped his worldview and thought. He was profoundly influenced by Bentham, Hume, and Priestly. He drew on Hume's 'Treatise of Human Nature' and Priestly's 'Essays on Government' to develop the concept of usefulness. Mill had a big influence on him. This effect can be seen in Bentham's respect for democracy and democratic institutions. Bentham was a prolific writer and wrote as many as 11 (Eleven) volumes. In addition to this, he wrote an unaccounted number of letters. His best works are *Fragments of Government* (1776), *Essays on Political Tracties* (1791), *Discourses on Civil and Penal Legislation* (1802) *The Theory of Punishments and Rewards* (1811), *A Treatise on Judicial Evidence* (1813), *The Book of Fallacies* (1824), *Catechism of Parliamentary Reform* (1809) and *Principles of International Law* etc.

4.2.1 Bentham's Views on Utilitarianism

Jeremy Bentham, the father of utilitarianism, blended the occupations of a philosopher, a jurist, a social reformer, and an activist throughout his active life. As a political philosopher, he was greatly influenced by the political thinking of Hume and Priestly. J.S. Mill was also a big influence on him. This effect can be seen in Bentham's respect for democracy and democratic institutions. However, he drew on Hume's 'Treatise on Human Nature' and Priestley's 'Essays on Government' to develop the concept of utility. Bentham himself confesses that he took Priestley's concept of utility.

Between the middle of the 18th century and the middle of the 19th century, utilitarianism dominated English political thought.

Principle of Utility: Bentham is widely credited as being the first to emphasise the utility principle. It is, however, incorrect. He was not the first to advocate this theory, since it had already been discussed by Hume and Priestley in England, Helvetius in France, and Beccaria in Italy. Bentham only emphasised the importance of this idea and made it the foundation of his political philosophy. Prof. Massey emphasises the importance of Bentham's contributions in this regard, stating that Spinoza and Hume undoubtedly provided him with the leading clues; Priestley's *Essay on Government* suggested the 'pain' and 'pleasure' criterion; and Hutcheson's *Moral Philosophy* provided the phrase, the greatest happiness of the greatest number, which caught the public's attention. Bentham added the concept of utility, which he defined as a mathematical calculation of satisfaction based on balancing pains and pleasures, as well as the philosophy that allowed this to be expanded into a political system.

Bentham could not reconcile the argument that the English common law was faultless because it had an old history and was formed by distinguished jurists since he sought to fix the flaws in the English law and judicial practise. He had no regard for antiquity and insisted that the law be tailored to the requirements of the day. As Dunning says Bentham argued that "the law of today must be shaped by the legislator of today in accordance with the needs of today, and that the sole criterion of those needs must be the greatest good of the greatest number of men." To put it another way, he insisted that the previous rules be appraised on their usefulness.

NOTES

Any existing law that does not contribute to an individual's happiness should be repealed.

All of man's acts, according to Bentham, were motivated by considerations of 'pleasure' and 'pain,' and every man attempted to obtain pleasure while avoiding pain. According to him, "nature has placed people under the administration of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure; it is for them to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we should do." The standard of good and wrong, as well as the chain of cause and effect, are bound to their throne on the other hand. Every effort we make to throw off our subjections will serve only to demonstrate and reaffirm that they dominate us in all we say and think. In words, a guy may claim to be the ruler of their kingdom, but in reality, he will always be subservient to it.

Bentham attempted to categorise and establish a scale of values for various types of pleasures. He felt that pleasures and pains could be quantified using seven criteria: intensity, length, certainty, propinquity, fecundity, purity, and cost. Bentham classed these pleasures based on these principles and came up with a list of 14 simple pleasures and 12 simple pains. All other pains or pleasures, he claimed, were compounded of them. Piety, benevolence, malevolence, memory, imagination, expectation, association, and relief were among the fourteen simple pleasures listed. Bentham listed twelve simple pains: privation, sense, awkwardness, ill-name, enmity, expectation connection, and so on. These pleasures and pains were to be used to judge the goodness and badness of an act. Thus, an act was good or right if it resulted in a greater amount of pleasure than pain, and it was bad or wrong if it resulted in more suffering than joys. Bentham established this as the sole criterion for evaluating all activities. He claimed that lawmakers and moralists had a responsibility to "sum up all the values of all the pleasures on the one hand and those of all the pains on the other." If the balance is on the side of pleasure, the act will have a positive tendency on the whole while respecting the interests of that specific person; if it is on the side of pain, the act will have a bad tendency on the whole. In other words, the principle of utility was the criterion by which Bentham appraised all activities. He asserted "By the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question. I say of every action whatsoever, and therefore not only of every action of a private individual, but of every measure of Government".

Bentham's utilitarian principle had a significant impact on lawmakers and statesmen during the nineteenth century. It served as a benchmark by which they might assess the usefulness of a certain law.. In the words of Ivor Brown the principle has "an immense value because it denied the infallibility of the supreme person who endeavours to foist his own morality or his own type of happiness upon others whom he believed to be the pitiful dupes of ignorance".

Bentham's theory of utility has been severely criticised. **In the first place** it is alleged that Bentham is guilty of over-simplification. When his concept of utility is

NOTES

put to the test in the real world, it fails miserably. It is difficult to accept Bentham's proposition that one should promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number, because there is a significant distinction between an individual's greatest pleasure and the greatest happiness of the largest number. As to what will urge a man to pursue the public interest at the cost of self-interest of his own happiness, Bentham fails to provide a logical answer. He simply states that some additional pleasure encourages an individual to sacrifice his own happiness for the sake of others' pleasure.

Secondly, it is alleged that Bentham's utilitarian theory gives no weight to a person's moral or immoral conduct, instead judging them solely on materialistic grounds. According to Marry if we take away conscience as Bentham does, "there is no such thing as a moral, immoral action, though there may remain acts that are generally useful or the reverse. As there is no individual conscience, so there is no collective conscience. The culprit does not feel the censure of the Community". Bentham has a very restricted perspective of human nature, treating each person as though they were only a sensory thing. Happiness lies not in increasing and attaining the desires but in controlling and limiting them and in acquiring a status in which pleasure and pain have no meaning.

Thirdly, insofar as it puts the person as the centre of all actions and completely ignores the relevance of society, his theory of utility is based on incorrect premises. Bentham clearly overlooks the fact that humans are social animals who are reliant on society. In this regard Prof. Wayper has rightly observed. "In his study of the individual he has left out both society and history. In refusing to consider the importance of history and society he ignored the strongest forces that have made what he is". If we accept Bentham's contention that all the human actions are motivated by the considerations of pleasure, it becomes indeed difficult to explain as to why an individual should care for social happiness. It is indeed difficult to reconcile the elements of egoism and altruism.

Fourthly, Bentham does not offer us with a reliable criterion for determining whether or not pleasure has been realised, and if so, to what extent. In the absence of such a measure, his theory's entire edifice is doomed to crumble.

Fifthly, his hypothesis is regarded as impractical because achieving the greatest happiness for the largest number of people is unattainable. In actual practice the happiness is confined to a few rather than the great number of people. Both under the capitalist as well as the socialist system the power is used to further the interest of the ruling elite. It was wrong on his part to attempt the measure the soundness of a political institution on the basis of the pleasure it gives to the people. It's nearly impossible to quantify pleasure or misery just in terms of mathematics. Furthermore, the definition of pleasure varies from person to person and location to location, making it all the more difficult to put into effect.

Sixthly, Bentham was incorrect in asserting that people are constantly influenced by pleasure and suffering. Many people become addicted to undesirable

NOTES

habits and act without thinking about the pleasure or suffering they will experience as a result of their actions.

Despite these shortcomings, the importance of Bentham's theory of utility cannot be denied. Prof. Dunning sums up importance this: They claim that a political community is nothing more or less than a collection of living human beings motivated by impulses that are universally understood. Its actions are controlled, like all other human actions, by considerations of pleasure and pain, happiness and woe of living persons, not by agreements or compacts made by previous generations or thought to have been made unknowingly by the present. All institutions, traditions, rituals, and ceremonies, regardless of their age, dignity, or reputation, are worse than useless since they promote the greatest happiness of the largest number of men directly and instantly. When these clear and persuasive propositions are offered amid the idealists' and obscurantists' abstractions, fancies, and mysteries, the bearer's unavoidable reaction is approval and acceptance.

4.2.2 Political and Legal Reforms Suggested by Bentham

Jeremy Bentham, the originator of Modern Utilitarianism, was an English philosopher, jurist, and reformer. He described the notion that the greatest happiness of the greatest number is the measure of good and wrong as the "basic postulate" of his philosophy. To do this, he focused on reforming England's existing political and judicial systems, classifying them after sorting out the outmoded and deleting the worthless laws.

Bentham looked at the state as a contrivance designed by men for the promotion of their pleasure or happiness. It is not an end in itself and exists merely to promote the happiness of its members. People agreed to obey the authority of the state because of utility or probably because they were conscious of the fact he "the probable mischiefs or obedience are less than the probable mischiefs of disobedience." Thus Bentham propounded an individualistic or atomistic conception of state. As regards the functions of the state, he favours grant of only negative functions. The only functions which he would like to assign to the state include the power to make laws which enable the citizens to know about the felicity and non-felicity tendencies of the various types of action and remove all those hindrances which stand in the way of individual's pursuit of self-interest. Bentham had full faith in the goodness of the human nature and was convinced that if each person rationally sought his own happiness and observed the laws of the state, this would automatically lead to social harmony and the greatest happiness of the greatest number. People render obedience to the government as long as it promotes the general happiness and when it fails to do so the people have a right to disobey it. He, no doubt vests the state with sovereign power but its authority is restricted by the fear of possibility of resistance by the subjects. He asserts the utility of resistance is greater than the evil of resistance. However, under normal conditions he did not permit the right to disobey the sovereign.

Bentham did not concentrate much on the forms of government and considered that government as the best which promoted the greatest good of the

NOTES

greatest number of people. However, he accepted the division of the governments into Monarchies, Aristocracies and Democracies. He did not approve of the first two forms of government because he thought they did not promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number. On the other hand, he thought representative government was the finest form of government since it maximised the enjoyment of the greatest number of people. He insisted on the constitution to be drawn in such a way as to make the government an agency of good or happiness. The intensity and duration of the political power should be properly restricted in the interest of the happiness of the people and this could be possible only under democracy.

Judged by the criteria of utility he found the British Constitution as defective and suggested many constitutional reforms. Some of the reforms suggested by Bentham include introduction of Unicameral Legislature and doing away of House of Lords, annual Parliamentary elections on the basis of universal adult franchise and vote by ballot. However, he qualified the introduction of Universal Adult Franchise by the condition that the voters should be able to read and write. He held that annual Parliament would act as effective check against self interest and the introduction of ballot would secure against intimidation and bribery. He also pleaded for equal electoral districts and freedom of press. He favoured the Republican Government because it fostered the greatest good for the largest number of people by ensuring economic efficiency, efficiency, and supremacy of the people. He considered the Republican Government of USA as pure democracy as against the Aristocracy ridden Monarchy of England. Bentham, according to Davidson argued "Given a Monarchy, the King's interest alone is supreme, given a limited Monarchy the interest of a privileged class, as well as that of the sovereign comes in; it is only when democracy rules that the interests of the governors and governed become identical for the greatest number is the supreme end in view".

Thus Bentham emphasised that people render obedience to the government not due to any past contract but due to direct and immediate services rendered by the government to the citizens, In other words, he emphasised that the government must justify itself before the bar of public opinion to command their obedience. Judged by the time in which he wrote, the elevation of the public opinion to such a dominant position was indeed an act of bravery which deserves our praise.

Bentham attempted to judge laws from the perspective of people who would be affected by them. As a result, he stressed that everyone should be aware of the legislation. He chastised current laws for being overly technical and obscure, and asked that they be made plain and simple. As a result, he stressed on the need for law codification and was eager to take on the effort himself, however he did not receive sufficient encouragement in this regard.

Jeremy Bentham was totally dissatisfied with the existing legal administration of England. To him, the law at that time, was dilatory and placed insuperable difficulties in the way of the litigants. It resulted in excessive costs and delays. People could not contact courts directly at the time and had to do so through attorneys and barristers, who charged a high fee, thus criticising the existing judicial administration. Bentham said, "In this country, justice is sold, and dearly

NOTES

sold, and it is denied to him who cannot disburse the price at which it is purchased.” Further he said, “Under English law not to speak of other systems, the sort of commodity called, justice, is not only sold, but being like gun power and made of different degrees of strength, is sold at different prices, suited to the pockets of so many different classes of customers.”

Bentham was also satisfied with the attitude and role of the judges of his time. To check the despotism of judges he advocated for introduction Jury System. He was in favour of single judge system because he believed that plurality of judges led to division of responsibility. Thus, Bentham pleaded for an extensive legal reforms with a view to improve the judicial administration.

Bentham also wanted to reform the criminal administration system of England, as he was quite unhappy with the system prevailed at his time in England. He was against the system of strict punishments and held that the punishments increased rather than suppressed offences. He viewed that the purpose of punishment should be to reform the criminal and not to eliminate him. He was opposed to any punishment if there was no harm to be prevented or if the evil it caused was greater than the evil it was attempting to eliminate. He insisted that the quantum of punishment should not sufficient to prevent the people from committing crimes. According to him, the primary criterion for determining punishment should be the benefit of society. He also favoured the idea of punishing the offenders in public so that the punishment could have a deterrent effect. He wanted the punishment should not be more than necessary to teach the desired lesson. He was against capital punishment. So, he pleaded for more humane treatment of prisoners and suggested numerous prison reforms and various schemes for the rehabilitation of the criminals. He suggested a scheme known as the panopticon. Panopticon means a peculiar type of building which was to be used for housing the criminals, in which the Governor could keep a watch on all the criminals from a central place. To Bentham, the criminals were to be treated very kindly and an effort was to be made to improve them. The criminals were to be given proper training during their imprisonment so that they could lead a better life after their release. Necessary education should be given to the prisoners to improve their moral and religious attitude. He was against solitary confinement of the prisoners.

Thus, Bentham’s legal writings on judicial reforms have had a degree of practical influence upon the legislation of England and various other countries.

4.2.3 Bentham’s Contribution to Modern Political Thought

Jeremy Bentham was the real founder of the Utilitarian School of Political Philosophy. In 1748, he was born into a wealthy English family. His father was an accomplished lawyer who wished for his son to follow in his footsteps. As per his father’s desire he completed Bar at Law. But, because he was more interested in social welfare issues than in practising law, he gave up his profession and dedicated himself to researching the flaws in the legal system in order to achieve required reform.

NOTES

Bentham lived and wrote during a time when England's citizens had no political rights. The lives of labourers, inmates, and others were dreadful. The emergence of the United Kingdom as a dominant colonial power has resulted in a shift in perspective. However, it was the American Revolutionary War and the French Revolution of 1789 that had the greatest impact on him and shaped his worldview and thought. He was profoundly influenced by Bentham, Hume, and Priestly. He drew on Hume's 'Treatise of Human Nature' and Priestly's 'Essays on Government' to develop the concept of usefulness. Mill had a big influence on him. This effect can be seen in Bentham's respect for democracy and democratic instructions.

Bentham was a prolific writer and wrote as many as 11 volumes. In addition to this he wrote an unaccounted number of letters. His best works are *Fragments of Government* (1776), *Essays on Political Tracties* (1791), *Discourses on Civil and Penal Legislation* (1802) *The Theory of Punishments and Rewards* (1811), *A Treatise on Judicial Evidence* 1813, *The Book of Fallacies* (1824), *Catechism of Parliamentary Reforms* 1809 and *Principle of International Law* etc.

Jeremy Bentham's contributions can be stated below:

1. **Principle of Utility:** Bentham is generally given the credit of being the first to emphasize the principle of utility. All of man's acts, according to Bentham, were motivated by considerations of 'pleasure' and 'pain,' and everyone attempted to obtain pleasure and avoid pain. Bentham attempted to categorise and establish a scale of values for various types of pleasures. He classified 14 simple pleasures and 12 simple pains. The principle of Utility was to him the criterion by which all activities might be evaluated.

Bentham's Principle of Utility had a significant impact on legislators and public opinion in the nineteenth century. It gave them a standard to use in determining the usefulness of a given law.

2. **Natural Law and Natural Rights:** Bentham was an outspoken opponent of the social contract idea, as well as the concepts of natural law and natural rights. He saw law as a manifestation of the sovereign will in the shape of a political society whose members are compelled to obey it due to its value. As a result, he saw the law as nothing more than an expression of God's and man's will. As a result, there can only be two types of laws: divine law and human law. Similarly, he dismissed natural rights as nonsense, claiming that rights are produced by state legislation. It's impossible to see natural rights existing independent of the state.
3. **State and Government:** Bentham looked at the state as a contrivance designed by men for the promotion of their pleasure or happiness. It is not an end in itself and exists merely to promote the happiness of its members. People agreed to obey the authority of the state because of its utility. Thus Bentham propounded an individualistic or atomistic conception of state. As regards of the functions of the state, he favours

NOTES

grant of only negative functions. Under normal conditions he did not permit the right to disobey the sovereign.

Bentham did not concentrate much on the forms of government and considered that government as the best which promoted the greatest good of the greatest number of people. However, he accepted the division of the governments into monarchies, aristocracies and democracies. He did not approve of the first two forms of government because he believed they would be unable to foster the biggest chamber's satisfaction. Representative democracy, on the other hand, he believed, was the finest form of governance since it produced the greatest happiness for the largest number of people. He emphasised that people render obedience to the government not due to any past contract but due to direct and immediate services rendered by the government to the citizens.

4. **Individual Liberty:** Individual liberty was something Bentham despised. He maintained that men require security rather than liberty. Each Law was viewed by him as a restriction on individual liberty. He did not believe that liberty was essential to the happiness of the greatest number of individuals. He placed a strong emphasis on law adherence since it was the only way for legislation to have longevity and efficacy, allowing it to enhance the pleasure of the largest number of people, which was the primary goal of all laws.

5. **Reforms of Law and Judicial Administration:** Bentham was very concerned about reforming England's existing judicial system, and he classified the laws after sorting out the absolute and dismissing the superfluous ones. He attempted to assess the legislation from the perspective of people who might be affected by them. As a result, he stressed that everyone everyone be aware of the legislation.

Bentham was a harsh critic of the current court system, which he believed was excessively dilatory and included unnecessary costs and delays. Bentham was highly critical of the attitude and role of the Judges. With a view to check the despotism of judges he pleaded for the system of juries. He also favoured the system of single judge because plurality of judges led to division of responsibility.

6. **On punishments and prison Reforms:** Bentham was also not quite happy with the criminal administration in England and wanted to reform it. He was against strict. punishments. He favoured the idea of punishing the offenders in public so that the punishment could have a deterrent effect. He wanted the punishment to be frugal of pain. He was also against capital punishment.

Bentham pleaded for more humane treatment of prisoners and suggested numerous prison reforms and schemes for the rehabilitation of an effort was to be made to improve them. They were to be given proper training during their imprisonment so that they could lead a better life after their release. Attention was also to be paid to their moral and religious

improvement through necessary education. Bentham was against solitary confinement of the prisoners.

7. **On Education:** Bentham had great faith in the power of education to effect improvement in mankind and promote greatest happiness of the individual as well as the mankind. He therefore, suggested a Scheme of National Education. He asserted that it was duty of the state to look after the education of the poor children and therefore suggested a number of reform in the poor law. In course of time the views of Bentham have been accepted by most of the progressive countries of the world.

NOTES

4.3 JOHN STUART MILL

The eldest son of James Mill, John Stuart Mill, is regarded the last of the utilitarians and the first of the individualists. He was subjected to a very hard training by his father and spent most of his time as a child with his books. He studied Latin, Greek, and French, and was influenced immensely by Plato's dialogues and dialectic tactics. He also studied and felt the effect of Roman government history. But it was arguably Bentham's utilitarian worldview that had the most impact on the young teenager. At the age of 16 Mill founded Utilitarian Society. He also became member of Speculative Debating Society and the Political Economic Club. His involvement with these societies had a significant impact on his ideas. Coleridge and Wordsworth were two additional thinkers and writers who had a significant impact on Mill. Above all, his own wife, Mrs. Taylor, with whom he discussed the most of his ideas, backed him up. Mill stated that she was the source of the majority of his thoughts.

J.S. Mill published a huge number of books, pamphlets, and articles during his lifetime. Among his notable works are the following: *System of Logic* (1843); *Principles of Political Economy* (1848); *Enfranchisement of Women* (1848); *On Liberty* (1859); *Dissertations and Discussions* (1859); *Thoughts on Parliamentary Reforms* (1859); *Considerations on Representative Government* (1860); *Utilitarianism* (1863); *Women Suffrage* (1873); *Subjection of Women* (1869); *Three Essays on Religion* (1874); and so on.

J.S. Mill was a strong follower of Jeremy Bentham's ideas and radical politics when he was younger. But he modified and revised the philosophy of his master in response to the contemporary age after the death of Jeremy Bentham.

4.3.1 Mill's Ideas on Liberty

The most prominent political thinker of the nineteenth century was John Stuart Mill. In his political theory, liberalism shifted from *laissez faire* to active government, from a negative to a positive view of liberty, and from an atomistic to a more social view of personality. While Mill was a liberal, he was also a hesitant democracy, a pluralist, a cooperative socialist, an elitist, and a feminist at times.

John Stuart Mill was a great champion of individual liberty and freedom. As an individualist, he advocated for limiting government intrusion in people's lives

NOTES

and enjoyment. He claims that the individual must be left alone, and that any government intervention will only result in repetition and mediocrity, with no social growth..

Meaning of Liberty: Mill in his book “On Liberty” has given it clear explanation of individual liberty and the sphere of state activity. His view of liberty is concerned with giving adequate opportunity for self development. He discovers that every man’s ultimate goal is to secure the highest and most harmonious development of his abilities. To him liberty means, the sphere of activity of an individual where he is free from interference. Mill argues for unrestricted freedom for the individuals. He claims that as long as an individual’s acts are solely for his benefit and do not jeopardise the interests of others, he is free. He allowed the state to impose constraints on an individual’s liberty if it jeopardises the interests of others in the community.

Mill advocated his views on liberty in the following words. “The sole and for which mankind is warranted individually or collectively in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number is self-protection. The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of the community against his will is to prevent harm to others. An individuals own good, either physical or moral is not a sufficient warrant. The only part of the conduct of any one for which he is amenable to society, is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns himself, his independence is absolute. Over himself, his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign.”

Thus, Mill divides individual’s actions into:

- (a) Self regarding; and
- (b) Others-regarding actions.

He left the individual free in regard to his self regarding functions but let the state or society the scope to interfere on the activities of the individuals that concerns others.

Mill, once again, allows the state to intervene in the self-interested acts of the person. For example, the government can prevent someone from flying on a plane that has explosives on board. As a result, According to Mill, the state genuinely supports individual liberty and interests. For this type of contradictory views, Barker criticised Mill’s concept of liberty as empty.

J.S. Mill considers democracy, public opinion, and collectivism to be antithetical to individual liberty, and argues that they should be limited. He says that, there is a tendency with the society to impose its will, rules and customs and penalties on those who dissent from social norms to prevent the formation of any individuality. For him, liberty constitutes the inward domain of conscience which includes, liberty of thought and feeling, freedom of opinion and sentiment. The individual should have freedom of taste and pursuits. The society has no right to suppress the feeling or thinking of an individual even if it is wrong. As a result, he claims, if everyone save one was of one opinion and everyone else was of the

NOTES

opposite position, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that individual than he would be justified in silencing mankind if he had the means.

Mill was against all sorts of suppression of individual freedom of speech and expression. He says, if his opinion is right then by suppressing it the mankind is deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth, it wrong then it is as great a loss for it will be easier to reach truth out of its collision with error.

Mill considers the greatest threat to liberty is not the Government but a majority which is into learnt of the unconventional views and opinions.

Criticism

J.S. Mill's concept of liberty is criticised on numerous grounds:

- (i) Mill divides human activity into self-regarding and others-regarding functions which is impracticable. Every action of an individual has its social implications.
- (ii) Barker condemns Mill's conception of liberty as empty because on the one hand he gives complete freedom to the individual but on the other hand permits the state to encroach upon individual liberty for self-preservation.
- (iii) He makes no provision for checking the misuse of liberty. But such liberty may prove to be dangerous for the society.
- (iv) Mill has talked about negative liberty. He prescribes what the state shall not do, but nothing about what it should do.
- (v) Mill's concept of liberty applies only to human beings not to children and younger ones. He denies liberty to the backward community.
- (vi) Mill was the prophet of hollow liberty and abstract individual, according to Barker, who criticises Mill's definition of liberty. He lacked a defined rights theory through which his freedom might be meaningful. He had no concept of the social whole, in which the false antagonism of state and individual vanishes.

4.3.2 Mill on Representative Government

According to Mill, the finest form of government is one that fulfils the goal of a school of citizenship for the political education and training of citizens to the greatest extent possible. As a result, he claimed that one of the most significant characteristics of a healthy government is that it promotes the virtue and intelligence of its citizens. He claims that government is more than just a series of well-organized procedures for conducting public business. It also has a significant impact on the human intellect. Its worth should be determined by its actions. The first thing to be considered in this regard is "how far does the Government tend to foster the moral and intellectual qualities of the citizens." In other words, the essential criterion of a good government, according to Mill, is the degree to which it contributes to raise the total of good characteristics among the governed, both collectively and individually, rather than the administrative body's efficiency.

NOTES

The finest government, according to Mill, is a representative government. because “it was a means of bringing the general standard of intelligence and honesty existing in the community, and the individual intellect and virtue of its wisest members, more directly to bear upon the government and investing them with greater influence on it, than they would in general have under any other mode of organization.” It should be remembered, however, that Mill supported representative governance only for advanced nations and not for backward and colonial populations. Mill was also aware of the flaws in England’s representative government at the time, and proposed a variety of improvements to improve its functioning and make it genuinely representative and democratic. Some of the shortcomings noted by Mill in the existing democratic system and suggestions made for the removal of these defects are as follows.

Firstly, He was dissatisfied with the lack of representation given to minorities and the majority’s authoritarian attitude. As a result, he campaigned for the proportional representation system, which ensured that each part of society was represented proportionally to its vote strength. He argued that in a really equal democracy every section of the community must be represented proportionally. He said that only under this system “a majority of the electors would always have a majority of the representatives; but a minority of the electors would always have minority of representatives. Man for man, they would be as fully represented as the majority. Unless they are, there is not equal government but a government of inequality and privilege; one part of the people rules over the rest; there is a part whose fair and equal share of influence in the representation is withheld from them, contrary to just government, but above all, contrary to the principle of democracy, which professes equality as its very root and foundation”.

Secondly, Mill wanted to give everyone the right to vote, but he was also convinced that not everyone was capable of exercising that right correctly and rationally. As a result, he argued for more weight in voting for people with stronger qualities and capabilities. He emphasised that voters had property and educational credentials. “Intelligence, education, and greater virtue count far more than ignorance, stupidity, and indifferent character,” Davidson argued. As a result, he called for a plurality of votes for residents with a greater level of education. Emphasising the importance of the educational qualifications Mill said “I regard it as wholly inadmissible that any person should participate in the suffrage without being able to read, write, and I will add, perform the common operations of arithmetic. Justice demands, even when the suffrage does not depend on it, that the means of attaining these elementary acquirements should be within the reach of every person, either gratuitously, or at an expense not exceeding what the poorest who earn their own living can afford.” To ward against the possibility of educated classes behaving in a tyrannical manner he provided that “It be open to the poorest individual in the community to claim its privileges if he can prove that in spite of all difficulties and obstacles, he is, in point of intelligence entitled to them.”

Mill also insisted on property qualifications for the voters. Justifying his stand he asserted “It is important that the assembly which votes the taxes, either general

NOTES

or local, should be elected exclusively by those who pay something towards the taxes imposed. Those who pay no taxes, disposing by their votes other people's money, have every motive to be lavish and none to economise as far as money matters are concerned, and any power of voting possessed by them is a violation of the fundamental principle and free government, a severance of the power of control from the interest in its beneficial exercise".

Thirdly, In contrast to secret ballot voting, Mill called for open or public voting. He claimed that the value and effectiveness of voting were determined by how the right to vote was exercised and asserted "the duty of voting, like any other public duty, should be performed under the eye and criticism of the public." Secret ballots, on the other hand, he claimed, were more likely to encourage selfishness.

Fourthly, Mill advocated for women to be treated equally to men and to have the same opportunities as men. He maintained that sex should not be used as a criterion for disqualification because the variations based on sex were caused exclusively by external factors that could readily be changed. These differences were the product of long domination of men over the women and were bound to disappear once the women were given political and social freedom. Justifying right of franchise for women Mill said "I consider it entirely irrelevant to political rights, as difference in the colour of the hair, if there be any difference, women require it more than men, since, being physically weaker, they are dependent on law and society for protection".

Fifthly, Mill was an outspoken opponent of paying members of Parliament. He claimed that being a member of Parliament was an honour and a service for which members should not be compensated. This, according to him, would not only ensure efficiency and purity in administration but also lead to economy. In view of non-payment to the members, he was certain that the elections should not be viewed as a cost to the candidate. He intended the state representative to be entirely free to govern and instruct the state once he was chosen.. He should not act merely as an echo of the people and try to judge the matters according to his own intelligence. He did not want that the people of high calibre should governed by the people of low calibre. On this count he also did not favour the idea of annual elections to the Parliament. According to Doyle "He advocated an extension of local government in order to place such responsibility on an increasing number of people that they might respond to the new stimulus and develop their latent abilities. Mill had diverged fundamentally from Bentham's premises and his theory of the state".

4.3.3 Mill on Women's Right

John Stuart Mill was a strong supporter and great advocate of women suffrage. He treated men and women on equal terms. He advocated for women to have the same status as males. He claimed that a person's sexuality should not be used as a basis for disqualification. He believed that the existing subjection of a women was unjust. The inferiority of women in society was due to existing institutions which deny equal opportunity of self-development to them. Otherwise, women are as

NOTES

mentally alert and intelligent as men are. Mill believed that gender disparities were purely attributable to external factors and could be easily remedied. These differences were the product of long domination of men over the women and were bound to disappear once the women were given political and social freedom. Mill advocated the right to vote being given to women. He did not see any justification in denying the political rights to women because there is no difference between man and woman other than sex. Justifying right of franchise for woman, Mill said; "I consider it entirely irrelevant to political rights, as difference in the colour of the hair, if there be any difference, women require it more than men, since, being physically weaker, they are dependent on law and society for protection."

4.3.4 Mill on Democracy

J.S. Mill was a great patron of 'Democracy' and Representative Government. In his book, "Essays on liberty and Representative Government" he has expressed his views on democracy and representative government. He defines representative democracy as a form of Government where political power is exercised by the representatives, elected periodically and which remains accountable to the people.

Mill was a democrat but he was not satisfied with the working of democracies. He does not consider representative Government as the best form of Government for all times and all ages. The character and capacity of the people are the determinants of a democratic regime. It can't operate successfully until the people become fully civilised.

Therefore, Mill wanted to reform representative democracy so as to make it adoptable to the changing needs of time and circumstances. Mill acclaims the excellence of representative government from moral and psychological point of view. He considered it useful as it promotes a better and higher form of national character. Mill was not a blind supporter of democracy and he introduced certain reforms in it to make it more adaptable and praise worthy.

The various reforms suggested by J.S. Mill in the working of democracy can be explained below:

1. Mill was a strong supporter of democracy but he found modern democracy defective as it provides no scope for the due representation of minorities. The minorities must be represented in proportion to their population and so he introduced proportional representation instead of open ball of. He was not against majority rule but he said, while the majority would rule the minority should have scope to express their grievances.
2. J.S. Mill was a defender of women franchise. He said women franchise would open avenues for the good which men can not impact. He demanded for women participation in politics and their liberation from the dominance of male ones. The women possessing abilities can be useful for the society.

NOTES

3. He rejected secret ballot for public voting. The effectiveness of voting depends upon the manner of exercise of franchise. Secret voting encourages selfishness and harm the consciousness of moral responsibility while upon voting is proper as it is made in the face of criticism.
4. Mill was critical of equal voting right to all and so he spoke of weightage voting. He said, in the light of superior knowledge, education and intelligence weightage should be given to some over the ignorant, stupid and inefficient.
5. Mill recognised the importance of educational qualifications of giving the right vote. Those who do not have minimum knowledge should be disenfranchised. He was of the view that, those who do not think about their voting right should not be given the right at all, for it will be an abuse of the right.
6. Mill justified the imposition of property qualification for enfranchisement. Those possessing property are supposed to be more responsible than others. Those who do not pay taxes to the state should not have the right to express their views on financial matters. They are most likely to demonstrate lavishly and responsibility and thus vitiate the character of financial discussion.
7. Mill was critical of the provision of payment to the parliament members. He contends that paying to parliamentarians makes politics a gainful profession and in the hope of having a seat ambitious incompetent politicians are mostly attracted. As result, those who enrol them as representatives of the people do not regard politics as a public duty but consider successful performance a big reward.
8. Mill stressed upon the independent role of the representatives. He does not consider the electorate or the party as the master of the representative. He said; the representatives should judge things in their own view and then decide. He did not want that people of high calibre to be ruled by people of lower calibre. He desired a local government expansion in order to distribute a greater amount of responsibility to a larger number of individuals so that they could respond to the new stimulus and develop their latent potential.

Thus, Mill as a democrat has analysed the problems and prospects of democracy and representative government. He believes that democracy can contribute to the happiness of the individual. He said, democracy is a system in which men of intelligence rule for common good. He was critical of democracy of numbers. The prevailing notions of democracy was found to be defective in many respects and he suggested reforms in it to restore the value of democracy. It was due to his criticism that Weymeyer calls him a reluctant democrat. Actually, he wanted to bring more efficiency to democratic government.

NOTES

4.3.5 Contribution of J.S. Mill to Western Political Thought

John Stuart Mill's contribution to the Western Political Thought are stated below:

1. **Modification of Utilitarian Philosophy:** Mill was a strong follower of Bentham's doctrines and radical politics when he was younger. However, in his later years, he made changes to utilitarianism's ideas. In the process, he not only denounced utilitarianism, but also effectively overthrew it as a whole. In his renowned article 'Utilitarianism,' Mill laid the foundation for utilitarianism and incorporated numerous features that ran opposite to the hedonist philosophy. In this way, he tempered Bentham's severe ethics and brought utilitarianism and common sense closer together. Mill made important changes to Bentham's utilitarianism in order to save it from deterioration. Bentham's utilitarianism concerns the individual but Mill converts into collective well-being. Personal happiness was considered by Bentham to be the primary criteria for all human acts, while Mill believes that a good life is more desirable than a life devoted to pleasure. He advocated public voting in place of secret ballot and he was more concerned with the solution of socio-economic problems facing the society. Mill while trying to save Benthamism confessed its essential fallacy and in the process changed its face together. Ivor Brown has observed "Mill made utilitarianism at once more human and less consistent."
2. **Individualism:** J.S. Mill was the greatest exponent of individualism and also a great champion of individual freedom. He regarded individual liberty and freedom essential for every one. Mill fought for religious liberty, freedom of thought and expression, freedom of association, profession, religion, and morals. He pleaded for property right to individuals and socialisation of means of production. Mill was never an orthodox individualist. He allowed state intervention in individual liberty for protection of the individual.
3. **Liberty:** J.S. Mill was a staunch supporter of individual liberty and freedom, advocating for the least amount of government intervention in people's lives as possible. He believes that democracy, public opinion, and collectivism are all destructive to individual liberty and should be kept out of it. He pleaded for maximum liberty to the individual and minimum interference from state. Liberty of an individual implies a sphere of activity where man is free from interference. He allowed the state to limit individual liberty if it interfered with the interests of the rest of society. He condemned suppression of freedom of speech and expression.
4. **Democracy and Representative Government:** J.S. Mill's contributions towards democracy have been far reaching. He was a great patron of "Democracy" and "Representative Government". In his book, "Essays on Liberty and Representative Government" has expressed his view on

NOTES

democracy. To him representative democracy is a form of government where political power is exercised by the representatives, elected periodically and which remains accountable to the people. Mill was a democrat but he was not satisfied with the working of democracies. He does not consider representative government as the best form of government for all times and all ages. The character and capacity of the people are the determinants of a democratic regime. It can not operate successfully until the people become, fully civilised. However Mill was not a blind supporter of democracy and he introduced certain reforms in it to make it more adaptable and praise worthy. He rejected secret ballot for public voting and also not a supporter equal voting right to all and so he spoke of weightage of voting. He also recognised the importance of educational qualifications of giving the right to vote. He justified the imposition of property qualification for enfranchisement. He stressed upon the independent role of the representatives. Thus as a democrat he analysed the problem and prospects of democracy and representative government.

5. **State:** Mill saw the state as a product of the will of the people who make it up, rather than a tool for furthering their goals. He was an outspoken opponent of mechanical state theories because they completely ignored the human will and neglected the personality of man. Mill also does not emphasise the negative character of the state like Bentham and asserts that interference from the state is required for the development of an individual's personality. He desired that the state be managed in such a way that citizens' best intellectual and other characteristics may be developed and exploited for the benefit of society.
6. **Supporter of Women Suffrage:** J.S. Mill was strong supporter of women suffrage. He was the first utilitarians to talk about universal suffrage. He considered voting right more essential for women in view of their independence and security.

4.4 KARL MARX

Karl Marx is probably one of the most controversial political thinkers. He is revered by half of the world a God while other half condemn him as a devil. By his writings he changed the very course of history and gave it an altogether new and different outlook with a new basis and orientation. On account of his revolutionary and radical ideas he had to remain in exile, was expelled from one state to another and had to sacrifice his personal comforts and family life poverty snatched from him even his children and wife but still he continued with his efforts and with all firm mindedness tried to achieve the mission of his life. Basic principle of his philosophy were the out come of his struggle with life and based on his practical experience. However, Karl Marx put his philosophy on scientific footing and made that logical and convincing.

NOTES

Karl Marx was born in 1818 in the Rhineland of Germany. After completing his early education he joined Bonn University as a Law student and also obtained his doctorate from Jena University in 1841. Though Marx wanted to be a Professor at that University, but he could not succeed in his mission and fell to the profession of his second preference viz Journalism. In October, 1842, he took up; Job as an Editor with a liberal newspaper known as *Rheinsche Zeitung*. Marx contributed slashing articles to this newspaper and earned great reputation. However in 1843 the government banned his newspaper and Marx was thrown on the road. There after Marx decided to proceed to France. In France he came in contact with eminent scholar, like Proudhon, Potkin and Fredrich Engels. Probably the greatest outcome of his French visit was his friendship and closeness with Engles. Marx who was economically worried, found a solution of his problem in Engles who became his regular financier.

In 1845 both Marx and Engles went to England where they were introduced to the Workers, Education Union of German residents. This association provided a forum to Marx to preach his political philosophy. In 1848, Karl Marx and Engles wrote their famous book 'Communist Manifesto' which actually contains the compact statement of Marx's philosophy.

Karl Marx drew inspiration from three ideological currents of the 19th century viz. the German Classical Philosophy, the Classical School of British Economy and the French Revolutionary tradition. The German Classical Philosophy formed the basis of Marx's doctrine of historical materialism, the Classical English School provided basis of labour theory as well as the doctrine of surplus value. The French revolutionary tradition influenced his theory of state and revolution.

Marx came under the influence of Hegel as a student and learnt from him that nature was dynamic and moved in a zigzag way. He was greatly influenced by Hegel's dialectic which explained the progress through the progress of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. Marx also greatly influenced by the French socialist philosophy.

The important works of Karl Marx include 'The Poverty of Philosophy (1847). The Communist Manifesto (1848), The Critique of Political Economy (1859), Value, Price and Profit (1865) Das Capital (1867) and the Civil War in France (1870-71) etc'.

4.4.1 Dialectical Materialism of Karl Marx

Dialectical materialism is the basic foundation on which the entire political philosophy of Marx rest. It constitutes one of the important idea of Marx's political thought. However, this was not his original contribution and he borrowed it from Hegel and fitted it into his thought. Hegel held that all ideas in the world developed through the process of dialectic and tried to help the development of history through the process of thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis and ultimately reaching the highest form. Marx borrowed the idealistic philosophy of Hegel and fitted it into his own economic thought to demonstrate the necessity of the class-struggle and the inevitability of progress through revolution. Marx did not feel shy of this change

NOTES

and boasted that he turned Hegel's dialectic upside down. Highlighting the difference between Hegelian and Marxian dialectic Prof. Sabine says "In Hegel's philosophy of history the driving force was a self-developing spiritual principle that embodied itself successively in historic nations; in Marx's it was a self-developing system of productive forces that embodied itself in basic patterns of economic distribution and in the social classes consequent thereto. For Hegel the mechanism of progress was welfare between nations; for Marx it was antagonism between social classes. Both men regarded the course of history as rationally necessary, a pattern of stages unfolding according to a logical plan and advancing towards a pre-determined goal. The majestic march of human civilization invites men to co-operate and to serve. While Hegel appealed to national patriotism, Marx appealed to the fidelity of workers to their fellow workers. In both cases the appeal was addressed to the loyalty rather than to self-interest, to duties than to rights, and it offered no reward except the hopes that one's private life would gain meaning through service to cause greater than oneself." What Marx did, according to Prof. Hunt, was "to take over the essential property of the Absolute upon which, in Hegel's system both mind and nature depend, and apply it to a material world of which, he had declared mind to be simply a by-product".

The world, according to Marx, is material by nature, and the diverse manifestations of the world are distinct kinds of matter in action. Because the material world is main and the mind or idea is secondary, society's material well-being is primary and spiritual well-being is secondary. To quote Marx, "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary their social being that determines their consciousness." He says that the different social doctrines that appeared at various periods of history were simply a reflection of the material being of society. The material being of society included nature, geographical movement, population, its density etc. But the way of procuring the means of life necessary for human existence, the manner of creation of material goods such as were necessary for life and development of society, was the primary force that dictated the physiognomy of society and the character of social being at every given period. The mode of producing material values was always changing and evolving. The same thesis, antithesis, and synthesis process that Hegel used in his philosophy of the spirit was applied to the evolution of society.

Though Marx used the term 'materialism' he did not clearly explain it. By implication, however, it carried certain meaning. First, by calling it as dialectical he made materialism scientific, precise and certain. Secondly, it implied rejection of religion which supplied imaginary or fantastic satisfactions as against dialectic which was the real solvent of every supposed absolute truth. In the words of Sabine materialism to Marx meant "an anti-religious secularism regarded as the precondition of any through-going social reform". Thirdly, it suggested a kind of social revolution in which the state would be superseded.

The Dialectical Materialism of Marx was certainly an improvement on the current methods of social analysis which viewed society as a static unit. It attempted to explain the continuity of culture throughout human history by

NOTES

emphasising how men were products of their environment and education. The process of development was a continuous one. According to John Plamenatz “Dialectical materialism isn’t really a theory at all; it means and indicates very little; it’s more of a type of preparatory pattern for the mind of historical materialism, which rests no more on it than a ship rests on its own reflection in the sea.” Historical materialism is at the heart of Marxism, and it is what binds it all together (albeit the bonds aren’t necessarily rational). In fact, the Marxists were not interested in Dialectical Materialism and their chief interest lies in *Historical Materialism*, which is derived from it.

4.4.2 Historical Materialism of Karl Marx

The application of the principle of dialectical materialism to the development of society is known as historical materialism of Marx. To put it another way, it is an economic interpretation of historical events. It all starts with the simple fact that man must eat to survive, and his survival is contingent on his ability to produce what he desires. Thus, production, according to Marx, is the most important of all human activities. The society is the result of an attempt to secure the necessities of life. But the society is not able to produce all that is required by the members, which inevitably gives rise to tensions and stresses. The form and structure of the society is thus determined by the conditions of production. Accordingly Marx divides the history into four stages-primitive communism (Asiatic stage), ancient, feudal and capitalist. Throughout all of these stages, the class in charge of the production forces is in charge of everything else. This domination of one class over others naturally gave rise to tensions and strains. To quote Marx “All the social, an intellectual relations, all religious and legal system, all the theoretical outlooks which emerge in the course of history, are derived from the material conditions of life”. He further says “Upon the several forms of property, upon the social conditions of existence, a whole super structure is reared of various and peculiarly shaped feelings, illusions, habits of thought and conceptions of life. The whole class produces and shapes these out of its material foundations and out of the corresponding social conditions”.

According to Marx the progress of society from one stage to another is not the result of a chance, but the result of the law of history. In each stage each dominant class develops its opposite and as a result of clash between these two opposites (barons and serfs, freeman and slave bourgeoisie and journeymen) the new ruling class emerges. At the final stage capitalist and the proletariat stand face to face against each other. As a result of clash between the two, classless society shall emerge. However, before the emergence of the classless society there shall be a transitional stage known as dictatorship of the proletariat which shall socialise the natural resources and destroy the last remains of capitalism.

Marx offers the theory of materialistic interpretation of history thus: Men come into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will in the social production of their material life; these production relations correspond to a Definite stage in the development of their material force of production. The economic structure of society is made up of the sum total of these production

NOTES

relations, which serves as the real foundation on which a legal and political superstructure emerges, and to which particular forms of social consciousness correspond. The social, political, and intellectual life processes are all influenced by the way of production of material life. Men's consciousness does not dictate their (social) life; rather, it is their consciousness that determines their social existence. At some point in their development, society's material forces of production clash with existing production relations, or, as a legal expression of the same thing, with the property relations within which they have all worked previously. These relations transform from forms of development of the productive force into their fetters. Then a period of social revolution begins. The entire vast superstructure is more or less modified when the economic underpinning changes. Thus Marx finds a close relationship between the social relations and the productive forces.

Marx's materialistic interpretation on history is defective in so far as it ignores the part played by the non-economic factors in the shaping of history. It also does not attach any importance to human passions, sentiments, emotions, religion etc. No doubt the economic factors influence human affairs, but it is certainly wrong to say that they exclusively influence all human actions. Laski says Marx's insistence upon an economic background as the whole explanation was radically false. He says "The love of power, herd instinct, rivalry, the desire of display, all these are hardly less vital than the acquisitiveness which explains the strength of material environment". Despite the above defect in Marxian concept of materialistic interpretation of history, it cannot be denied that it greatly broadened the study of history to include within its purview things other than the stories of kings and battles. Thus Marx deserves the credit for broadening the basis of the study of history.

4.4.3 Karl Marx's Theory of State

Karl Marx argued that the state arose at a specific point in the economic evolutionary process. Initially there was no state, but it arose out of the necessity of holding class antagonism in check. Gradually, it became an instrument in the hands of economically dominant class to establish its rule.

Marx considered state as a class institution which reflected the interests and ideas of the dominant class. It is the use of organised political power by one class to elevate another. When the society was broken into, the state emerged, according to him. It was ruled by slave owners and property at first. Owners who ruthlessly exploited slaves and the impoverished. This established a significant divide between the haves and the have-nots; as a result of this class war, the state arose and became a tool of class exploitation. A single class has dominated others at every step of its evolution, and this class controls the state and uses its machinery to advance its exploitation of the lower classes. The modern bourgeoisie, according to him. Wasn't the state simply a form of organisation that the bourgeoisie had to embrace both for internal purposes and for the mutual protection of their property and interests? He argued that with the disappearance of capital the state shall also disappear and a classless and a stateless society shall emerge.

NOTES

Similarly, Marx saw government as a stumbling block to social progress rather than a driving force. He defined it as a vehicle through which the ruling class enforced its will on the subject classes while maintaining its economic privileged position.. Because of the control of government the ruling class was able to make its will into law and in force it over all. The Communist Manifesto defines the government as the modern state's executive or a committee for the management of the entire bourgeoisie's common affairs.

Marx did not regard the state a welfare agency but an agency of class-coercion. It is not a group of citizens working towards a shared goal. He disagreed with the notion that the state is a natural institution that has evolved over time to meet human needs. The state hasn't existed since the beginning of time. It arose as a result of social divisions. Slave and serf exploitation was carried out through the ancient and mediaeval states, which were instruments in the hands of the ruling elite. In mediaeval period the feudal lords and serfs were at war with each other. In the modern age the conflict between the capitalists and proletariat is on. Thus, Marx regards the state as a class organisation which uses its legal system and executive machinery to safeguard and promote the interests of the ruling class.

The Marxist state is the result of class conflict. It has a coercive element to it. It is a tool for oppressing one class by oppressing another. By regulating the collision of classes, the state legitimises and maintains oppression. The state shall retain its coercive character as long as the classless society emerges. After the final overthrow of the capitalists, a classless society will emerge and class-antagonism will end giving way to withering away of the state.

Criticism

Marx's theory of state have been severally condemned. It has been criticised on the following grounds:

1. Marx has over emphasised the coercive character of the state, but ignored the useful functions of the state. The state does not always represent the interests of the economically better classes. Quite often it works for the welfare of the weaker and deprived sections of the society. The Modern welfare states perform many welfare functions like spread of education, public health, eradication of poverty and many welfare functions.
2. Marx completely ignored the contributions of the non-economic factors which play an important role in the emergence of state.
3. Marx's theory of state based on assumptions that the interests of the working classes and capitalists are irreconcilable and they are quite antagonistic to each other. This is, however, not proved by the actual experience in modern times.
4. Though Marx condemns capitalism on the ground that is based on exploitation but he fails to suggest any alternative system free from exploitation.

5. Marx believed that changes could be brought about only through revolution and completely neglected the peaceful and constitutional methods for bringing about the change.
6. Marx's contention of withering away of state is misleading.
7. Marx has failed to explain the nature of state.

NOTES

4.4.4 Theory of Surplus Value

One of Karl Marx's contributions to Political Economy is the theory of surplus value. In his book *Das Kapital*, he discusses this theory. The labour theory of value is the foundation of the theory. According to Prof. Sabine, "The theory of surplus value was professedly an extension of the labour theory of value already stated by Ricardo and the classical economists". Sir William Penty initially proposed the labour theory of value in England, and it was later expanded by classical economists such as Adam Smith and Ricardo.

These economists distinguished between the natural value and artificial value of a thing. By natural value is meant the intrinsic value of a thing, while artificial values includes the human labour spent in producing the thing. According to these economists the value of a thing is determined by the labour spent upon it. In other words, it is labour that produces value.

Now, Marx adopted this labour theory of value and pointed out that it is labour alone that produces value. Because the value of a thing is created by labour, he believes that the entire price paid for the product should go to the labour. In practise, however, this is not the case. Only his pay are handed to the labourer, which are hardly enough to keep him alive. The capitalists simply pay the labourer a small portion of their earnings and keep the rest for themselves. In the form of profits, rents, and interests, they extract the entire value earned by labour. Surplus value, or unpaid labour, was referred to by Marx as "concealed labour." The difference between the value of the commodity and the wages received by the labourer was known as surplus value. Capitalists' capture of surplus value is straightforward and simple exploitation. The capitalist system is exploitative in nature because of this expropriation of surplus value by the capitalists. Marx employed the surplus value theory to establish his point that capitalism is inherently exploitative..

Marxian theory of surplus value may be criticized from numerous angles. It is wrong to say that labour alone creates value. Production is a co-operative effort of the entire community, i.e., labour, capital, management, science and technology, etc. All have a claim to a share in the value of the commodity. Labour cannot work without capital. Nor can it be said that the proletarian labour is the most important factor. Even Dr. Engels recognised that the advancement of technology has rendered human labour obsolete.

Technical ability, industry, entrepreneurship, and organisational capacity are just as vital as proletariat labour in the generation of value.

NOTES

Second, if surplus value is only produced by labour, an industry in which capital is invested primarily in the purchase of machinery should produce more surplus value than one in which capital is spent in the purchase of machinery. The theory of surplus value, according to Bertrand Russell, should be viewed as a translation into abstract terms of Marx's contempt for the current system rather than a contribution to pure theory.

It may, however, be noted that the purpose of Marx in writing about the theory of surplus value was not to propound a theory of value. His purpose was only to show the exploitative character of the capitalistic system and that the theory of surplus value served this purpose well can hardly be denied. The theory was to serve as a propaganda value and it so served in the times of Marx. According to Max Weber, "It is impossible to set aside the view that Marx's theory of value has rather the significance of a political and social slogan than of an economic truth." Marx in respect of his theory of surplus value is predominantly an agitator rather than economist. Sabine writes: "The theory of surplus value was in substance a dialectical refutation of the bourgeois economists' defence of capitalism, and it was in truth not an ineffective one. It really sought to accomplish two purposes: first to bring to light the ethical bias implied in the bourgeois defence of a competitive economy and to show that this bias is incompatible with the moral professions of individualist liberalism and second, to pose the question of the nature of social justice in a highly organised society where individualism has ceased to be tenable moral position. In short, Marx's social philosophy was the first realistic attack on purely 'acquisitive society' and there is little doubt that this, for more than its fine spun dialectic, was what made it acceptable to his followers".

4.4.5 Karl Marx's Views on Class Struggle

Karl Marx's ideas on class, class struggle and classless society are found in his famous writings. 'Communist Manifesto' and 'Das Capital' which can be discussed below:

Class: According to Karl Marx 'Class' means a group of people organised together on economic grounds. The forces of production viz. raw materials, natural resources and technology etc. give rise to a production relation. The forces of production in association with production relations give rise to class structure. The class which owns the means of production and property is called 'haves' and they enjoy a dominant position in society. Those who do not possess property, wealth and resources are called have nots. The state as a class institution always favours the dominant class and suppresses the have nots.

Class Struggle or Class War

Class struggle is an indispensable feature of Marx's philosophy. His thesis of class conflict follows logically from his theory of historical economic interpretation. According to Marx, the history of all previous societies is a history of class fights between freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serfs, guild master and journeyman, or oppressor and oppressed. A feeling of bitterness existing between these rival classes which could not be reconciled.

NOTES

Marx regards class struggle as the mechanism through which the theory of social change take place. He claims that all social movements in history are class movements, and that every major historical period is marked by the supremacy of one economic class, which then gives way to another competitor class in the following epoch, which was exploited in the previous era. The battle between the two classes for economic and political power has resulted in the major movements of history. In the history of the society, freemen and slaves, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guild master and journeymen, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, have always been in constant opposition to one another, engaged in an interruption, now hidden, now open fight, which has always resulted in either a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large or the common ruin of the contending classes.

In the ancient period there were class antagonisms, in the middle ages there was conflict between lords and serfs, guild master and journeymen. In the modern society, there is a class conflict between bourgeois i.e. and proletariat. There are new classes, new conditions of oppression, and new forms of struggle in place of the old. Marx in process of analysing the course to class-war has divided every society into opposing classes hostile to each other. One class which is small but privileged, owned mean of production and the other being the majority class belong to the workers and peasants. Marx says, these two classes are at war with each other. Their interests are diametrically opposed. The labour or workers are exploited by the proprietors of the means of production. For a while, this relationship remains stable, but as the means of production undergo revolutionary changes, new innovations are developed, and improved technology is introduced, the present production relations become obsolete. The exploited class is in a difficult situation. so as soon as takes place and a new social order established. During 17th and 18th century Feudalism was replaced by capitalism and in the present century in Russia capitalism is replaced by socialism. Thus Marx believes that society has split more clearly into two hostile camps. He also believes that the bitterness and hostility between the bourgeois and proletariat shall ultimately end with the victory of the workers.

Criticism

Marx's theory of class struggle or class war has met with severe criticism on numerous grounds:

- (i) This theory of Marx has only propagate value. It is evident from the fact that whereas Marx has only all along discussed "class struggle" Surprisingly enough he has nowhere defined the term 'class'. Similarly he has also nowhere defined the term 'Bourgeois class'. Thus the very basis of this theory is unsound.
- (ii) Marx wrongly assumed that society is divided, divided into two sharp classes. In fact the society is a pyramidal structure with a number of layers of classes, with each enjoying a superior position to some and inferior position to other.
- (iii) Marx failed to distinguish between the social and economic classes.

NOTES

- (iv) Marxian theory of class war is a continuous process which breeds hostility and hatred among classes in society. It ignores the forces of love, co-operation and sacrifice.
- (v) Marx idea of class struggle is harmful in so far it encourages hatred and violence.
- (vi) Marx theory is historically unsound as we find in no society such a clear cut division of classes.
- (vii) Further the history of the classes has been more synthetic than analytical.
- (viii) It is erroneous to assume that every battle is a class struggle. On the other hand, it is primarily a conflict between classes and individuals. Even if there are no classes, people would always fight society.

Classless society: Marx's conception of classless society was future oriented. To him, the victory of the proletariat after a successful revolution there will be dictatorship of proletariat. During this short and temporary period the remnants of capitalism will be destroyed and all class antagonism will disappear and finally, it will lead to the establishment of class-less society. There will be no class distinction. Every individual will work according to his needs. There will be mutual assistance and co-operation among the members.

4.4.6 Marx's Views on Proletarian Revolution

Marx considered state as a class institution which reflected the interests and ideas of the dominant class. It is an organized political power of one class for upraising another. According to him the modern bourgeoisie state was "nothing more than the form of organisation which the bourgeois necessarily adopt both for internal purposes for the mutual guarantee of their property and interest." In the words of Prof. Hunt "In Marxist theory the state per-eminently embodies that super structure which is created by the productive force of society, and reflects the productive relations as defined by the class struggle; and it thus stands guardian over the economic order, which it protects with its army, legal system, police and other organs of physical or moral compulsion. The democratic state is therefore a contradiction in terms, as democracy cannot exist in any society which is divided, as it is under Capitalism, into two antagonistic and irreconcilable groups." Marx argued that with the disappearance of capital the state shall also disappear and a classless and a stateless society shall emerge.

Similarly, Marx saw the government as a stumbling block to social progress rather than a driving force. He defined it as a vehicle through which the ruling class enforced its will on the subject classes while maintaining its economic privileged position. Because of the control of government the ruling class was able to make its will into law and enforce it over all. The Communist Manifesto defines the government as the modern state's executive or a committee for the management of the entire bourgeoisie's common affairs.

Marx held that the ruling classes always tried to perpetuate their position and used all the authority at their command to resist the changes. The major changes

NOTES

could be brought about only by the working classes by organising themselves. Marx envisaged two stages of the revolution. During the first phase the bourgeoisie would be engaged in a struggle with Feudalism as represented by absolute monarchy and its various survivals. In this struggle the proletariat must support the bourgeoisie and then look forward for an opportunity to capture power from the bourgeoisie. Marx asserted that as there existed fundamental antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat this alliance was merely a tactical move. In the second phase of revolution, the bourgeoisie which destroyed Feudalism would itself be destroyed by the proletariat in alliance with the left-wing bourgeoisie elements, which would be later on discarded by the proletariat. Thus, in the words of Prof. Hunt “the role of bourgeois democracy was to act as the foster mother of the proletariat during the stage of pre-emancipation. The reforms that it affected, such as extensions of franchise or of the workers, right to combine, not only softened the reactionary crust of society, but also provided the conditions under which the proletariat gained the experience required to enable it to fulfil its historic mission.”

4.4.7 Dictatorship of the Proletariat

According to Karl Marx, capitalism is meant to fail and communism is destined to flourish. However, once capitalism is gone, communism will not emerge overnight. Its march will be preceded by a “proletarian dictatorship,” as Marx describes it. The proletarian dictatorship is a crucial stage in the transition from a capitalist to a socialist society. Before communism can be established, the bureaucratic and military machine erected by the bourgeoisie must be completely smashed and a new order must be set up in its place. Marx thus contemplated a transitional stage between the conquest of power by the proletariat and the establishment of the new social order. As he writes: “Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. These corresponds to this also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat”.

Though the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat occupies an important place in the philosophy of Marx, yet it is unfortunate that he does not lay down the organisation of the proletarian state. Beyond laying down that the proletariat would organise itself as the ruling power after the capitalist state has been smashed, the Manifesto says nothing. However, one thing is clear. The proletarian state will be a class state. It would not be a free society and would retain the chief features of the old order. It would preserve the coercive machinery of its predecessor, but with a difference. Whereas in the old capitalist state the minority used political power to exploit and suppress the majority, in the proletarian state the majority would expropriate the minority. To quote Marx, “The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state i.e., of the proletariat organized as a ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible”. When the proletariat have succeeded in completely marking out the

NOTES

institutions set up by capitalists to satisfy their interests, then there shall be no need of the state and it would 'wither away'.

As said earlier, Marx did not fully elaborate the organisation of the proletarian state. It was Lenin who worked out it fully. The way in which proletarian state was to actually conduct itself may be seen from what has happened in Soviet Russia during the transitional stage of communism. It need not be said that in working out the Marxian programme Lenin made its his own contributions which greatly altered the spirit of Marxism.

Neither Marx and nor Lenin predicted the date at which the proletarian dictatorship would come to an end. Marx warned that "you will have to go through fifteen, twenty or even fifty years of civil and international war not only to change relations but also to change your own selves, to render yourselves fit to assume the political reins". Lenin said simply that we do not know and cannot know. However, one point is agreed that since the task of overthrowing the bourgeoisie completely is going to be a hard one, it will take a long time before complete communism can be a reality and the dictatorship of the proletariat can wither away.

Marx says that after the final destruction of capitalism state will wither away and communism shall be established. It will challenge the present socio-economic, religious, political order and establish a new social order based on different principles. There will be no class distinction. Every individual will work according to his ability and get according to his needs. There will be mutual assistance and co-operation among the members.

Karl Marx says that "all history is the history of class conflict." To him, the society is divided into two classes, the exploiting and the exploited. He has focussed on the conflict between two opposite classes i.e. bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the capitalist societies. Through revolution or class war the bourgeoisie will be eliminated and the proletariat will be victorious. The state will wither away and a classless society will be established. He also believes that "the existing conditions in any society contain the seeds of future social changes."

Marxism believes in the dynamics of social change. It is a living and progressive philosophy. It opposes various decadent forces like religion. It says that 'religion is the opium of the masses.' It advocates rapid progress for the downtrodden.

4.4.8 Karl Marx on Religion

Because Marx saw religion as the people's opium, he denied the existence of any eternal and unchanging principles upon which an ethical system could be built. He claimed that the economic structure of the social organism of which he was a member determined men's conceptions of good and wrong. Even religion was considered as a part of the superstructure formed by the conditions of production, according to him. Thus morality derived from God's commandments finds no place in his thought. He held that such a morality was a big hoax and fraud perpetuated in the interests of the landlords and capitalists. However, this should not lead us to the

NOTES

conclusion that Marx had no faith in ethics or morality. His morality was positive and he laid emphasis on practical ethics. According to Popper “He (Marx) wanted to improve society and improvement meant to him more freedom, more equality, more justice, more security, higher standards of living. It was his hatred to hypocrisy, his reluctance to speak about these ‘high ideals’ together with his amazing optimism, his trust that all this would be realized in the near future, which led him to veil his moral beliefs behind historicist formulations.” Prof. Hallowell also says. “In theory Marxism rejects religion but in practice the passion which informs it is religious in character. God Marx substitutes Historical Necessity for the Chosen people, the proletariat, and for the Messianic Kingdom, the Realm of Freedom.”

Check Your Progress

I. Multiple Choice Questions

1. Bentham claims that nature has placed Mankind under two sovereign masters.

- (a) A pain and pleasure
- (b) Good and evil
- (c) God and the evil
- (d) Duty and self interest

2. Which one of the following book is not written by Bentham?

- (a) Fragments of Government
- (b) Discourses on Civil and Penal Legislation
- (c) On Liberty
- (d) Principles of International Law

3. Which one of the following is not written by J.S. Mill?

- (a) Principles of Political Economy
- (b) Enfranchisement of Women
- (c) On Liberty
- (d) Das Capital

4. Who said “Over himself, over own body and mind the individual is sovereign”?

- | | |
|---------------|-------------|
| (a) J.S. Mill | (b) Bentham |
| (c) Karl Marx | (d) Hegel |

5. Dictatorship of Proletariat is one of the concepts of:

- | | |
|---------------|---------------|
| (a) J.S. Mill | (b) Karl Marx |
| (c) Rousseau | (d) Bentham |

6. Marxism regards state as a:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| (a) Natural Institution | (b) Social Institution |
| (c) Class Institution | (d) Welfare Institution |

NOTES

7. Marxism believes in:

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| (a) Class Struggle | (b) Classless Society |
| (c) Surplus Value | (d) All of the above |

8. Karl Marx adopted dialects from

- | | |
|-------------|---------------|
| (a) Engles | (b) Hegel |
| (c) Bentham | (d) J.S. Mill |

II. True or False

1. J.S. Mill was against Women Suffrage.
2. Bentham was the fathers of Utilitarianism.
3. Marx regarded state as a social Institution.
4. 'Communist manifesto' is written by Karl Marx.

III. Match the Following

- | (A) | (B) |
|--------------|--------------------|
| 1. J.S. Mill | (a) Communism |
| 2. Bentham | (b) On Liberty |
| 3. Karl Marx | (c) Utilitarianism |

4.5 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

I. Multiple Choice Questions

1. (a)
2. (b)
3. (a)
4. (a)
5. (b)
6. (c)
7. (d)
8. (b)

II. True and False

1. False
2. True
3. False
4. True

III. Match the Following

1. (b)
2. (c)
3. (a)

NOTES

4.6 SUMMARY

Jeremy Bentham exercised profound influence on the Western Political Thought. Mill, J.S. Bentham was regarded as one of the masters of Wisdom, great teachers, and indestructible intellectual ornaments of the human face. He is one of those who has given inexhaustible blessings to mankind. Prof. Doyle paid high complements to him and said “Jeremy Bentham stood out as the dominating philosopher of the radical group.”

Regarding J.S. Mill, no doubt, he was more analytical rather than synthetic, he was one of the foremost individualists or Liberal Thinker who emphasised the Principles of human progress as the goal of Civilization. He realised the danger to society from the tyranny of the majority over the minority and suggested necessary remedial measures. He strongly advocated of Representative government and in favour of women’s rights. He is known as the Last of the Utilitarians and the most prominent of individualists.

Karl Marx was a philosopher, economist, historian, sociologist, political scientist, journalist, and socialist revolutionary from Germany. He mostly specialised in the field of political philosophy and was a well-known communist supporter.

He is known as the “Father of Communism” or “Father of Scientific Socialism.” His political and philosophical ideas shaped later intellectual, economic, and political history enormously.

4.7 KEY TERMS

- **Utilitarianism:** A political theory of morality that advocates actions that foster happiness
- **Dialectical Materialism:** A Marxian ideology that advocates conflicts is seen as caused by material needs.
- **Class Struggle:** Class war-face between two opposite classes rich and poor.
- **Proletariat:** Working class people.
- **Bourgeoisie:** The Capitalist class that controls society’s Wealth and Production.

4.8 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short Type Questions

1. Utilitarianism
2. J.S. Mill on Women Right
3. Class Struggle
4. Dictatorship of Proletariat
5. Surplus Value

NOTES

Long Type Questions

1. “John Stuart Mill is a Utilitarianism Thinker” Examine.
2. Discuss J.S. Mill’s on Liberty.
3. Critically Examine Bentham’s views on Utilitarianism.
4. Discuss Jeremy Bentham’s views on political and Legal Reforms.
5. Examine Karl Marx’s views on Dialectical materialism and Historical materialism.
6. Discuss Karl Marx’s views on class struggle and Classless Society
7. Discuss Karl Marx’s Contribution to the Political Thought.

ACTIVITY

Provide two real-life examples to Prove how:

1. Bentham’s Judicial Reforms.
2. J.S. Mill as reluctant democrat.
3. Classless Society is the motto of Marxism

CASE STUDY

“J.S. Mill was never an orthodox Individualist” Examine.

J.S. Mill was the greatest exponent of Individualism and also a great champion of individual freedom. He regarded individual Liberty and freedom essential for every one. Mill stood for freedom of conscience, thought and expression, liberty of pursuit, freedom to form association, profession religion and morals. He pleaded for property right to individuals and socialisation, of means of production. He was never an orthodox individualist. He allowed state intervention in individual Liberty for protection of the individual.

Question:

1. “J.S. Mill was reluctant Democrat” Examine.

4.9 REFERENCES

1. R.G. Gettell. (1953). “History of Political Thought”. London: Allen and Unwin.
2. F.W. Coker. (1938). “Readings in Political Philosophy”. New York, Macmillan Co.
3. Kaushal Goyal, (2015). Karl Marx: A Biography. Pigeon Books Ltd.

Unit V Indian Political Thought

Learning Objectives:

This unit devotes discussion on political thought of Kautilya known as Chanakya on ancient Indian Political Philosopher, a great teacher, economist, jurist and royal advisor. It also explains about the political thought of Mahatma Gandhi and Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. After studying this unit, you should be able to understand:

- Arthashastra of Kautilya
- Social order stated by Kautilya
- Kautilya's Theory of Kingship
- Kautilya's ideas on statecraft
- Kautilya's Theory of Rajamandal
- Kautilya's concept of Law, Justice and Punishment (Danda)
- Relationship between ethics and politics
- Life history of M.K. Gandhi
- Gandhi's concept of Non-Violence or Ahimsa
- Gandhi's views on Satyagraha
- Gandhi's views on Swaraj and Swadeshi
- Gandhi's views on Village Democracy
- Gandhi's views on Property and Trusteeship
- Ends and means Relationship stated by M.K. Gandhi
- Life history of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan
- Sir Syed Ahmad Khan's views on Education and Social Reforms

Structure:

- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Kautilya
 - 5.2.1 Arthashastra of Kautilya
 - 5.2.2 Social Order of Kautilya
 - 5.2.3 Theory of Statecraft
 - 5.2.4 Theory of Kingship
 - 5.2.5 Concept of Law
 - 5.2.6 Concept of Justice
 - 5.2.7 Mandal Theory
 - 5.2.8 Theory of Danda (Punishment)

NOTES

- 5.2.9 Kautilya's Foreign Policy
- 5.2.10 Relationship between Ethics and Politics
- 5.3 M.K. Gandhi
 - 5.3.1 Ends and Means Relationship
 - 5.3.2 Gandhi on Ahimsa or Non-violence
 - 5.3.3 Gandhi on Satyagraha
 - 5.3.4 Gandhi on Sarvodaya
 - 5.3.5 Gandhi on Swadeshi
 - 5.3.6 Gandhi on Swaraj
 - 5.3.7 Gandhi on Village Democracy/Gram Swaraj
 - 5.3.8 Gandhi's Views on Trusteeship
 - 5.3.9 Gandhi on State (Ram Rajya)
 - 5.3.10 Ends and Means Relationship
 - 5.3.11 Gandhi on Nationalism and Internationalism
 - 5.3.12 Relevance of Gandhism
 - 5.3.13 Western Modernity of Gandhism
- 5.4 Sir Syed Ahmad Khan
 - 5.4.1 Compulsions of his Times
 - 5.4.2 Collaboration with British
 - 5.4.3 Avoidance of Imitational Politics
 - 5.4.4 Social and Educational Reforms
 - 5.4.5 Two Nation Theory
- 5.5 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 5.6 Summary
- 5.7 Key Terms
- 5.8 Self-Assessment Questions and Exercises
- 5.9 References

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In 19th century British India, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was an Indian Muslim Pragmatist, Islamic reformer, philosopher, and educator. He is most known for the Aligarh movement, a systemic effort to alter the Muslim community's social, political, and educational conditions. In 1863, he established the scientific society with the goal of translating great works of science and modern art into Hindi.

5.2 KAUTILYA

Kautilya was the first political scientist of ancient India and a great political philosopher. He was the Prime Minister of Chandragupta Maurya. Kautilya was an eminent scholar of that time. His diplomacy had no bounds. He could have overcome all sorts of administrative crisis within no time for this sharp intelligence. He was famous for his “Arthashastra”. This eminent book divided into fifteen parts for good analysis. It is simple but enigmatic in places. This book deals with the necessary parts of human life. It is significant because it is the first time that the science of politics has been freed from all kinds of constraints and has generated a systematic tool for state administration. Its discovery, writes Parmar, radically changed the outlook of the western scholars in India. His theory of state and government was popular of that time. He discovered very popular idea to make the administrative more dissatisfied. Administration is meaningful if it does welfare of the people, his interpretation of administration become the lesson for the future administrator. The character of the administrator had been stressed more during his time. However Kautilya is best known for his deeds.

5.2.1 Arthashastra of Kautilya

The views of Kautilya are contained in his monumental work “Arthashastra”. In the fields of Political Theory and Public Administration, his classic book “Arthashastra” is a work of outstanding interest. Though its name signifies a study of wealth, in fact it is more a treatise on the state-craft. According to Prof. Ghoshal ‘the Arthashastra of Kautilya is much more than a summary of the earlier literature on the subject. It involves, in the form of a closer analysis of the earlier ideas and notions a virtual reconstruction of the science.’

The Arthashastra is divided into 15 Adhikaranas with 180 Prakaranas. This work is a combination of Sutra and Bhasya. Sutra probably applied to the headings of Prakaranas and Bhasya is a commentary on it with a certain mixture of verses. The objective of the sastra is to define the methods for obtaining and maintaining control over the planet. The style of Arthashastra is simple but it is enigmatic in places. Its 15 Adhikaranas address various areas of government and administration. The first section covers topics such as princely education, princely discipline, ministerial qualification, various types of spies, kingly obligations, and so on. The second section covers land and village administration, government employee behaviour, treasury officials and superintendents, and so forth. The third section deals with different types of agreements, legal conflicts, marriage, agreements, sales and purchases, and so on. The removal of harmful elements and criminal law are discussed in the fourth section. The fifth section discusses how to get rid of state foes and replenish the king’s wealth. The sixth and seventh sections cover the seven aspects of kingship as well as six policy lines. The eighth section discusses the king’s vices as well as natural disasters such as floods and fires. The military campaigns are covered in the ninth and tenth parts. The company and guild are discussed in the eleventh section. The twelfth and thirteenth parts discuss how to win wars and gain popularity in conquered lands. The fourteenth section covers

NOTES

NOTES

how to make powders and combinations to create an illusory appearance, spread sickness, and so forth.

The Arthashastra of Kautilya is significant because, for the first time, it freed the science of politics from all kinds of constraints and provided a methodical tool for state management. According to Parmar, its discovery “radically influenced the outlook of western scholars in India.”

5.2.2 Social Order of Kautilya

The religious prescriptions were the foundation of Kautilya’s society. On the surface, Kautilya’s concept of social structure was unoriginal. It was thanks to the vedas and smritis that he was able to do so. But an in depth study of Kautilya’s social order reveals that Kautilya went one step ahead and made his social order more progressive. To put it another way, Arthashastra society was more open and progressive than Manusmriti society. Kautilya’s social order is based on the following foundations.

Varna or Caste System

Kautilya believed in the vedic conception of society based on four varnas such as Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaisya and Sudra. These four varnas were given separate responsibilities. The Brahman’s responsibilities included studying, teaching, performing, and giving and receiving gifts. A Kshatriya’s responsibilities were education, sacrifice, gift-giving, military service, and life-protection. A vaisya’s responsibilities included study, sacrifice, agriculture, cattle raising, and trade. Sudras were responsible for serving the twice-born, agriculture, livestock rearing, and trade.

Four Stages of Life

Kautilya also emphasised the need of four religious orders in maintaining the right order of the individual and society. Such four orders are Householder (Grahastha), Student (Brahmacharya), Vanaprasta (Forest recluse), Ascetic (Paribrajaka). A householder’s responsibilities include earning a living through his own profession, marriage among his peers, intercourse with his married wife, gifts to God, ancestors, guests, and servants, and so on. The student’s task, known as the Brahmacharya stage, is to learn the Vedas, which includes fire worship, begging, and complete devotion to his teacher, even at the risk of his life. Chastity, sleeping on the naked earth, wearing deer skin, and fire worship should all be observed during the vanaprastha (Forest recluse) stage. During the last stage a man has to lead an ascetic retired life from the worldly affairs. He must live the life of a parivrajaka, with perfect control over his sense organs, gaining from all sorts of work, disowning money, being isolated from society, and so on. Internal and external purity are also important.

Kautilya had great faith in such vedic prescriptions and believed that if the world was kept in line with them, it would proceed to prosperity. He appropriately suggests his king to see every individual and caste perform their duties in their own station of life.

Position of Women in the Society

Kautilya gave the women their due place in the society. The state should make law for the protection of women in the society. He was quite sympathetic to the cause of poor women and said, poor pregnant women should be provided with financial assistance. He also expected the state to protect the honour of women. Any forcible relationship with immature girls, rape of widows and orphans should be dealt with severe punishment. Even the daughters of prostitutes should be protected.

Another positive aspect of the Arthashastra was the increasing respect for women in matters of marriage, contract, and divorce. Marriage was a sacramental institution, but it also emphasised the necessity of contractual commitments. “The women enjoyed a large measure of freedom and the relations between men and women were reciprocal in character. Neither of them could practice cruelty on the other. The obligation of a wife to serve her husband for a short or long period depended on the amount of maintenance and the caste of the husband. But Kautilya prohibited women of the higher castes who were married according to religious rites (Dharm Vivahat) from enjoying the privileges that were allowed for others”. Kautilya gave the women the right to remarry under special circumstances like when the husband is outside for a long time or the husband suffers from incurable diseases or he is sterile. Widows can marry the brothers of their husband. Divorce is allowed only on the ground of mutual enmity. The husband and wife are to lead a friendly life.

Observations on Kautilya’s Concept of Social Order

No doubt Kautilya followed the footprints of the vedic social order but lower castes got better and broader privileges in his hand than under Manu. As M.V Krishna Rao in his book on “Studies in Kautilya” observes that Kautilya while allowing a superior position for the Brahmins, gave the sudras certain rights which were not contemplated before. Previously sudras were limited to their duty i.e., to serve the twice born only. But Kautilya broadened their activities by allowing them to have agriculture and cattle breeding. They can also undertake artisan activities. Kautilya accepted the Sudras as Aryas. A Sudra can be an Arya by birth and an Arya should not be subjected to slavery. Kautilya’s Arthashastra permitted the sudras to give witness in the court in the matter of taking oaths. He gave the sudras equal right of citizenship along with other castes. Kautilya also allowed the lower caste women with more freedom in marriage and divorce. The greatest contribution of Kautilya was the bestowal of Aryahood or citizenship on any freeman irrespective of this class or birth and Aryahood was understood as a privilege that was cultural and not racial. Thus Kautilya’s social order was more liberal, progressive and secular.

5.2.3 Theory of Statecraft

Saptanga Theory of State or Seven Elements of State

Since the dawn of political philosophy, many philosophers of both East and West have involved themselves in the questions with regard to origin, nature

NOTES

NOTES

elements and functions of the state. Kautilya, like his predecessors, believed in seven elements of state or 'Rajya' viz Swamin, Amatya, Janayada, Durga, Kosha, Danda, Bala, Mitra.

The Swamin or the King

The king or the Swamin is the head of the state and occupies an exalted position in his polity. But in order to be the Swamin or the king, one should be bestowed with different qualities like high descendancy, godly nature, virtues, truthfulness, gratefulness, resolute, courage and discipline. He should be devoid of vices and a role model for his subjects. As the sovereign head of state, the monarch has a variety of responsibilities, including the appointment of ministers, protection of the people, and the capacity to administer justice and punish the wicked. The king's happiness is dependent on the happiness of the people. As a result, Kautilya's head of state resembles a modern head of state who is all powerful as long as he does his duties.

Amatya

The second component of the state is Amatya. However, Kautilya uses the term Amatya in a different context. The term "amatya" refers to the council of ministers. All high offices, such as chief priests, ministers, collectors; officers, envoys, and Superintendents of various departments, are to be selected from the amatyas, according to the Arthashastra. As a result, Sharma believes that Amatya does not exclusively refer to ministers for Kautilya. The kingdom cannot be ruled solely by the king. A single wheel, according to Kautilya, cannot move. Ministers should be available to assist him. Ministers, on the other hand, must be men of wisdom, integrity, bravery, and loyalty. The size of the council of ministers should be neither too big nor too small.

Janapada (The Country)

The Arhasastra's definition of Janapada includes both territory and people. Because a state cannot survive without either its population or its land. Fertile fields, mines, timber, pasture areas, forests, and waterways, among other things, should be found on the territory. Men of good character and loyalty, as well as clever, wise masters and slaves, should be among the people. Thus, the country possessing the above type of territory and people, can be said to be a good country which is the third element of the state.

Durga (Fort)

Durga or Fort constitutes the fourth element of the state. Here Durga means the Fortress and resembles pura, the third element of Manu's state. It should be considered as a fortified capital when used as a synonym for Pura. In his Arhashastra, Kautilya mentions Durgavidhana and Durganivesa. He alludes to the construction of fortresses in Durgavidhana and the planning and layout of capitals in Durganivesa. The capital will be established in a central location, with regions set aside for members of various varnas, artisans, and gods. Many functions, such as covert war, army readiness, and enemy combat, are to be carried out from the fort.

NOTES

Kosha (The Treasury)

The treasury, or Kosha, is required for the security and upkeep of the state in general, and the army in particular. If army suffers from shortages it may desert the king or even kill him. The treasury should be stocked with diamonds, gold, jewels, and other valuables, and it should be able to withstand natural disasters for an extended period of time. Kautilya, on the other hand, believes that the Treasury should amass money through righteous and legitimate means.

Army

Kautilya's state is made up of six elements, the sixth of which being the army. Its primary responsibility is to defend the country against external assault and to safeguard its independence. According to Kautilya, this element is made up of hereditary and hired soldiers who include infantry, chariots, elephants, and cavalry. The army is primarily made up of Kshatriyas. In contrast to Manu, Kautilya allowed members of the lower castes to join the army in an emergency. However, Kautilya believes that the best army is one that is powerful, obedient, and content. It should be invincible, trained to combat many types of battles, skilled in the use of numerous weapons, and share the king's wealth. They must also ensure that their sons and wives are happy.

Mitra (Ally)

Kautilya's Mitra (ally) idea is founded on ethical principles. The true ally should be inherited rather than created. To Kautilya, everyone who is selfish, possessed with disloyal subjects, has a shaky character, is addicted to mean pleasure, is helpless and important, and so on, is an enemy..

Kautilya says, it all depends on the king how he deals with the elements of the state. Even the poor and miserable elements of his sovereignty can be made happy and prosperous by him, but a wicked king will inevitably destroy the state's most prosperous element. In reality Kautilya through his Saptanga theory of state tried to investigate and explain the nature of his polity different from tribal counterpart. As Parmar rightly observes that the Arthashastra's theory of state is essentially an examination of the ingredients required for the effective operation of a political organisation.

Functions of the State

Kautilya assigns very extensive functions to the state. He assigns his state to discharge the role of a modern welfare state. According to Kautilya state has to reform following functions.

Protection of Life and Property of the People

According to Kautilya protection of life and property of the people is the prime function of the state. Protection of the people has been a major function of the state since the beginning of the Vedic period. Kautilya also claims that the state's primary function is to safeguard individuals and their property. The state must defend its citizens from both internal and external threats. Kautilya deals in detail in his the Arthashastra (Part-IV) entitled "Removal of Thorns" The technique

NOTES

for preventing anti-social behaviours such as stealing, robbery, murder, killing, and cheating, as well as providing solutions for natural disasters such as fire, floods, and starvation. As a sincere nationalist, Kautilya proposes that the monarch use unethical tactics such as expediency, diplomacy, dishonesty, hypocrisy, and even murder and murdering to defend and strengthen the state. Another purpose of the state is to safeguard the people's Varna (caste) and Dharma (duties).

Developmental Functions

To ensure prosperity and happiness to the people is the second important function of the state. The welfare of the people is the only objective of the state. Kautilya hence says, "in the happiness of his subjects lies king's happiness; in their welfare his welfare; whatever pleases himself he shall not consider as good, but whatever pleases his subjects he shall consider as good". Hence for the welfare of the people, the state has to carry out developmental activities like construction of dams, settlement of virgin lands, providing pastures for the cattle, opening trade centres, providing irrigation facilities etc.

Economic Functions

In terms of economics, Kautilya advocates for some state ownership and regulation. The King will continue to mine and manufacture, exploit timber and elephant forests, provide facilities for cattle breeding and commerce, build land and water traffic roads, and establish market towns. Furthermore, businesses such as transportation and cotton should be owned by the government. However, because Kautilya supports private property and industry ownership, this should not be interpreted as a socialist. Even mines are to be leased out to private persons. Kautilya's economic system can be included under 'Mixed Economy System'. But the state retains the right to interfere in case of loss of production or overproduction or workers problem. The state also regulates the trade to ensure good of the consumers. The state accordingly has to regulate the prices of the commodities; import and export, weights and measures etc. If any trader cheats the people, he has to be inflicted with severe punishment. The state has to make provisions for market centres and market hours.

Social Functions

As previously said, the state is responsible for maintaining social order in accordance with the varna (caste) structure and their Dharma (duties). Education, learning, and art must all be promoted by the government. Kautilya creates particular provisions for his state's educated and erudite. According to Kautilya, those who do sacrifices, spiritual guides, priests, and those who have studied the Vedas would be given Brahmadeya lands that generate enough food and will be exempt from fines and taxes. The state is responsible for the residents' health. Physicians in the city and countryside are responsible for controlling infections and preventing epidemics from spreading. The government must also assist poor pregnant women, orphans, the elderly, and the disabled.

As a result, according to Kautilya, state actions have several dimensions. It must safeguard the dharma, justice, and people's interests. In old philosophical

NOTES

terms, the state must be Dharmadhikari, Nyayadhikari, and Mangalkari. The state has been endowed with such broad powers and functions that it is reasonable to conclude that the king's position is extremely powerful. However, this is not the case. The king's activities are restrained by Kautilya, who transforms him into a saint and servant of the people rather than a monopolistic power wielder. The opinions of Kautilya on state activities and its economic structure are similar to those of modern welfare states.

Nature and Characteristics of State and Government

The Arthashastra is a treatise by Kautilya that focuses on statecraft, or the art of governing. Kautilya establishes a stable administration that prioritises welfare. His government is organised in a hierarchical manner. The government and administration are led by the King. He is the state's chief executive officer. He is assisted by many Tirthas who help the king to administer the state. Those are Mantri (the minister), Purohit (the priest), Senapati (the commander of the army), Yuvraj (the heir-apparent), Dawarika (the door-keeper), Antavanshika (the officer-in-charge of harem), Prashastra (the magistrate), Samahartr (the collector-general), Sannidhtr (the chamberlain or the director), the commissioner, the city-constable, the officer-incharge of the city and superintendent of transactions, the superintendent of manufactories, the assembly of councillors and the heads of departments, the commissary-general, the officer incharge of fortification, the officer-incharge of boundaries, the officer-incharge of wild tracts. In Book II of the Arthashastra Kautilya talks about Adyakshaprachara and describes the duties of nearly thirty Adyakshas. An Adhyaksha has under him a lekhaka (clerk), a rupadarshaka (inspector of coins), Samkhyaka (accountant) Nivigrahaka (keeper of the balance), and an Uttardhyaksha (who watches the activity of the subordinate staff). There are Yukta, Upayukta and Tatpurusha in every department. Yukta is the head of the department, the Upayukta is a subordinate officer and Tatpurushas are servants of the lowest category.

Like Manu, Kautilya also decentralised the units of administration. The entire state was divided into a number of provinces consisting of about 800 villages put under the princes. Each province was divided into different district administration to be administered by a group of officers under the general supervision of the pradeshtras (the commissioner). Lastly comes village administration to be kept under the control of the village headman. The village headman was incharge of security, collection of revenue, president of the village council and custodian of the village records.

The main objective of the government having the administrative structure mentioned above is to guarantee security and welfare of the people through an honest, loyal and efficient administration. Besides the administrative structures, a study of Kautilya's theory of government also includes powers and position of the king, the council of Ministers, Public servants, law and justice, system of Espionage war and foreign policy.

NOTES**5.2.4 Theory of Kingship**

The King is the head of state and the most powerful figure in Kautilya's polity. The King also serves as the leader of the entire government. Nothing happens without his permission. He wields great power and holds a unique position of power. The king, on the other hand, must be honourable and benevolent. By virtue of his own actions, he must lead the people. As a result, Kautilya claims that if a king is enthusiastic, his subjects would be as well. "If he is reckless, they will not only be reckless likewise, but also eat into his works. Besides, a reckless king easily fall into the hands of his enemies. Hence the king shall ever be wakeful". In other words, Kautilya created "a people's king" who should possess some qualities. Those qualities include sincerity, gratitude, firmness, strong determination, wit and humour, courage and strength, quickness in action, freedom from passion, quality to study the situation etc. He should be well-versed in the art of rule and live a disciplined life. The king has a variety of powers and responsibilities. As mentioned earlier, the king has been vested with such power by the sacred laws and traditions not to exhibit his power over the people but to ensure the security and happiness of the people through his able administration.

Executive and Administrative Powers

The king has the authority to appoint ministers (Mantris), amatyas (Officers), spies, diplomats, and other officials, as well as to establish an administrative structure. With the help of his ministers and officers, he must preserve law and order throughout the state. With the help of his army, spies, and ambassadors, he must defend his country. To put it another way, he must ensure people's safety both internally and externally. In his kingdom, he must prevent theft, robbery, murder, and assassination. He must use his coercive authority (Danda) against those who are evil. He has to take necessary steps to prevent the natural calamities like fire, flood, famine etc. He should be the protector of the downtrodden and underprivileged, particularly poor pregnant women and orphans. He has also the power of punishing any official who turns to be corrupt and terrorise the people.

Legislative Power

The king represents law, authority, and fairness. The king, however, is not the one who makes the laws. He only needs to uphold the law as it is written in sacred texts, divine revelations, and customs and usages. He has the power of subordinate legislation, which allows him to create rules and principles for day-to-day administration, but he does not have the authority to legislate in the area of social norms. The legislative power of the king is largely in the nature of enforcing the law.

Judicial Power

Justice is dispensed by the king. The king appoints the judges and oversees the fair administration of justice. A king is not supposed to distinguish between his son and the enemy while administering justice. The king has the authority to penalise judges who fail to investigate into the essential circumstances, take excessive time in fulfilling their duties, assist witnesses by giving them hints, and so on. When a

judge administers unjust corporal punishment, the monarch will punish the judge in the same way.

Financial Power

The king has the financial authority to levy taxes and collect revenues. He always fills his coffers with gold, jewels, and gems, among other things. He has the right to ask for the statement of receipts and expenditure. Besides, he has the power to regulate trade, commerce and industries, regulate the mode of production. He should order his officers to regulate commodity market prices and punish dealers who defraud the public.

Military Power

The sovereign is the king, who has the authority to declare war and make peace. He is the commander in chief. He inspects the elephants, horses, chariots and the infantry. To win the war, the king has the right to use any means he wants.

Power of Protecting Social Order

Since the Vedic period, the king has been entrusted with preserving the divinely decreed and Vedic-prescribed social order. The king must ensure that everyone follows his Svadharma and performs the duties given to their castes. Its primary goals are to ensure the general well-being of citizens and to prevent social disruption. It aims to replace a competitive society with one in which the strong and weak work together.

As a result, the king has enormous power and authority. But as mentioned earlier, the king is to be a responsible and benevolent king. For the evil, the king can be absolute and ruthless but for good he has to be the most responsible king. As a result, Kautilya argues that when in court, he should never make his petitioner wait at the door, because a monarch who makes himself unavailable to his people may cause disarray in his affairs. Kautilya also advises his ruler to take care of gods, Brahmanas as taught in the Vedas, sacred places, children, the elderly, the sick, and vulnerable women. The king is supposed to be the saviour of the poor and destitutes.

Council of Ministers

Kautilya said King can not rule alone. However powerful or competent King may be he alone can not administer the state. The Council of Ministers constitute the second rank in the governmental hierarchy. Without a doubt, there is a concentration of power because the monarch is the only one who can make the final choice. However, as a realist, Kautilya could see the king's limitations. The king alone cannot rule. However powerful or competent a king may be he alone can not administer the state. He has to take the help of the ministers in the decision making and implementation of different plans and programmes. But Kautilya did not conceive of a personal government and hence suggested for a council of ministers. Because all administrative actions must be preceded by deliberations in a properly constituted council.

NOTES

NOTES**Composition**

Kautilya suggests that the king should appoint neither more nor less than three or four ministers. Because he argues “a single minister may be beyond control; two may quarrel and ruin the state or conspire against the king and a large number of ministers may effect the secrecy of the council”. Thus the council of ministers should consist of three or four ministers which will be an ideal consultative body. Only man of honesty and ability should be appointed as ministers. Second, the king shall appoint as ministers those who are descended from noble families and possess wisdom, sincerity of purpose, bravery, and loyal affections. But a man with high character, well educated in the Vedas and the six Angas, well versed in the science of government and has the capacity to prevent calamities shall be appointed as priests.

Functions

Council of Ministers constitute the real wheel of the government because the king's decisions are to be based on the suggestions of the council of ministers and once a decision or a policy is finalised, its implementation is also the responsibility of one ministers. In other words, council of ministers have advisory functions and individual minister has executive function. For the security and welfare of the people, the king depends upon the performance and excellence of the individual minister. The council will be a small body of three to four ministers (not all). The king will have secret consultations with the council whenever he feels the necessity. The king may take their opinion individually or jointly. But when urgent matters are to be discussed, the meeting of the council of ministers should be summoned for consultations. If the majority's recommendation is capable of leading to the attainment of the goal, the king should follow it.

The king's success is contingent on the success of the individual ministers. As a result, ministers should be in charge of ensuring the safety of people and property, identifying disaster cures, recruiting a capable army, collecting income, and improving the treasury, among other things. According to Kautilya, the king should direct his ministers to look after the poor and impoverished, placing a priority on agriculture, industry, trade, food supply, labour, transportation, morals, and health. Since Kautilya was referring to a welfare state, the ministers should work for the state's overall development.

5.2.5 Concept of Law

In Book III of his Arthashastra, Kautilya discusses the subject of law. The main goal of Kautilya law has always been to provide man intellectual and spiritual independence. Law was created in ancient India as a result of heavenly revelations. The king had no legal authority throughout the Dharmasutra period. All he had to do was guard and preserve the dharma. However, Kautilya claims that there are four sources of law: Dharma (holy law), Vyabahara (proof), Charitra (history), and Rajashasana (law) (edicts of the king). The value of rational law, often known as king's law, is emphasised by Kautilya. In the event of a contradiction between

Rajashasana and the three other texts, he claims that the former should take precedence.

Marriage and related topics, division of inheritance, property and building disputes, not-performance of agreements, debt recovery, rules concerning deposits, rules regarding slaves and labourers, co-operative undertakings, law regarding purchase and sales, resumption of gifts, sale without ownership, law concerning ownership, robbery (or forcible seizure of an object), defamation, assault, gambling and betting were among the seventeen types of laws mentioned by Kautilya.

Kautilya presents a thorough explanation of the law. He makes a distinction between civil law and criminal law. Some of the civil laws and penal laws are presented below:

Civil Law

In his Arthashastra, Kautilya outlines in detail the civil laws governing marriage, the responsibility of marriage, a woman's property, and remarriage recompense. In terms of marriage, Kautilya was fairly permissive. According to him, every type of marriage is acceptable as long as it is acceptable to all parties involved. Property of women includes means of subsistence (virtu) or jewellery (Abadhaya). Both husband and wife can make use of it during the time of necessity. Kautilya discusses the civil laws governing marriage, marriage responsibilities, a woman's property, and remarriage recompense in his Arthashastra. Kautilya was a liberal when it came to marriage. He believes that any sort of marriage is fine as long as all individuals involved are happy.

According to inheritance laws, inheritance should be divided once all inheritors have reached the age of majority. When a father divides his possessions among his sons, he must make no distinction. If the girls are single, they will be granted sufficient property to be paid to them when they marry.

Disputes concerning immovable property such as a house, a field, a garden, waterwork, a tank and reservoir of water; are generally settled on the testimony of neighbours. The disputes concerning property include disputes on the construction of houses and their ascents, tenancy, sale of property, encroachment on another property.

Regarding the recovery of debts, according to Kautilya, a debt whose payment is not restricted by time, place, or both, shall be paid by the debtor's sons, grandsons, or other heirs. However, a wife who is unaware of the debt will not be held liable for her husband's debt. However, the husband may be held liable for the debt incurred by his wife.

In the case of slaves and labourers, Kautilya proposed legislation outlawing the sale or mortgage of the lives of Sudras who are not born slaves and Aryas by birth. If his Kinsmen do the crime, they shall be penalised. If others who are not Kinsmen do the same, they will face the death penalty. The purchaser, as well as anyone who aid and abet him, will be held accountable. The Mlechhas, on the other hand, are not prohibited from selling or pledging the lives of their own children.

NOTES

NOTES

Arya, on the other hand, will never be subjugated to servitude. Wherever there will be slavery, a master and his servant must have an agreement, and the nature of the agreement must be known to the neighbours. The promised wages will be paid to the servant. If the slave's wages have already been agreed upon, the amount will be determined in proportion to the work done and the time spent doing it. A servant who neglects or puts off work for which he has been paid is fined 12 panas and is imprisoned until the work is completed.

Criminal Law

Criminal law is concerned with major crimes including the death penalty. It covers robbery, theft, slander, and assault, among other things. In terms of robbery, he claims that immediate and direct seizure of things constitutes robbery, while fraudulent or indirect seizure constitutes theft. The amount of the fine for direct seizure of articles must be equal to the seriousness of the crime.

Defamation, he claims, includes character assassination, scornful remarks, and intimidation. If a person of higher level is abused, the fines will be quadrupled; if a person of lesser rank is assaulted, the fines will be halved. The sanctions will be multiplied if you defame the wives of other people. If a member of a lower caste violates the customs of a member of a higher caste, the fines levied will rise from 3 panas to 10 panas. If a member of a higher caste abuses a member of a lower caste, the penalty imposed will be reduced from two panas to one pana. The first amercement is for defaming one's own nation and villages, the second is for defaming one's own caste, and the third is for defaming gods or temples.

Assault, he explains, is defined as touching, striking, or injuring someone. When a person touches the body of another person below the navel with his or her hand, he or she will be fined 3 panas. The penalty are twice if the offence is committed above the navel. If a person strikes someone with an instrument that causes swelling, he will receive the first amercement; if a person strikes with the intention of murdering someone, he will receive the second amercement.

If one beats a person to death without causing blood or breaks some body's hand, legs or teeth, he shall be punished with first amercement. Kautilya does not outright denounce gambling or prescribe punishment for gamblers. He proposes that gambling be regulated by the government. He wants it to be centralised in state-provided locations, with officers in charge collecting revenue from gamblers on behalf of the government.

Different types of laws as prescribed by Kautilya are presented above to provide a model for the modern legislators to follow in law making. Kautilya's codification of law is quite exhaustive, systematic and progressive.

5.2.6 Concept of Justice

If the judiciary does not execute the law, it loses its meaning. In the hands of uninformed people, the law becomes tempered and partial. As a result, Kautilya deals with law and the process of providing justice to the people in Book III of Arthashastra.

Organisation of Judiciary

To carry on the administration of justice, Kautilya proposes three members who are familiar with sacred law and three king's ministers. Judges are called as Dharmasthas because they are directed by Dharma. The judges, on the other hand, will be appointed at 400 village headquarters and the principal city, which will be surrounded by 800 villages. The goal of situating the courts in this manner is to bring the judiciary's doors considerably closer to the people. So that irrespective of social and economic justice, people can knock at the door of judiciary.

Kautilya prescribes for two types of court dharmasthiya and Kantakasodhana. Of course, Kautilya does not explain the nature and composition of these courts. Dharmasthiyas can deal with both civil and criminal cases. Kantakasodhanas deal with political and official cases. Kantakasodhana courts are chaired by (Magistrates) of amatya rank. In order to keep watch on the work of the officers and subordinates, Kantakasodhana courts are to be set up in different provincial headquarters. On the otherhand, dharmasthiya courts are presided by the three learned judges of the rank of amatya. They primarily deal with the disputes between judges. Besides these courts, each village will have its local court consisting of the headman and the elder of the village.

Judicial Procedure

The year, month, season, day, nature and place of the deed, residence, caste, gotra, name and occupation of both the plaintiff and defendant must all be registered before the trial can begin, according to Kautilya. The parties' statements will then be taken down in the sequence that the case requires. Such claims must be thoroughly investigated. Both the plaintiff and the defendant must make a financial deposit before the lawsuit may begin. The defendant is supposed to reply to the plaintiff within a period of three to seven days. In case a defendant fails to reply within the prescribed period, he is to be fined. The complainant is required to submit his counter reply on the same day on which the defendant's reply is filed, otherwise, he will lose the suit and is fined suitably. If the defendant opposes the allegation, the judges will question the parties as well as any witnesses called in. Only individuals who were there at the time of the transactions (the incident) can be considered witnesses. Secondly the witness must be trustworthy and honest and should be acceptable to both the parties. But persons who are physically and socially disabled like blind, deaf or dumb and have vested interest in one or other party to the suit can not be the witness. There may be two three witnesses in case. In case of conflicting statements by the witnesses, Kautilya says, the judge has to accept the statement by the majority. A witness who makes a false statement will be fined twenty-four panas.

Finally, Kautilya advises that the judge follow five factors in order to reach a verdict. A clearly perceived offence, a willing admission, straightforwardness in question (and answers) placed in court, reasoning, and swearing are examples of such prerequisites.

NOTES

NOTES

However, Kautilya cautions and warns the judges to be cautious and unbiased when giving the verdict. When a judge fails to inquire into the required conditions, delays in fulfilling his duties unnecessarily, evades or induces to evade statements, or assists a witness, he will be penalised severely. If he commits the same offence again, he will be fined twice as much as before and dismissed. He was the first ancient lawmaker to provide everyone the right to go to court. He proposed a system of natural justice, equity, and instant justice.

Kautilya's prescription of judicial organisation and procedure with high sense of honesty and impartiality has much relevance for the modern school of jurisprudence. If followed, it will help in the creation of a sound judicial system.

5.2.7 Mandal Theory

Kautilya offered a comprehensive theory of punishment that included a wide range of offences. Danda is the law of retribution or the science of administration, according to Kautilya. Its two main goals are to establish peace and order, as well as to provide justice to the weak. In the absence of Danda (Law of Punishment), Kautilya claims that Matsyanyaya (larger fish devouring smaller fish or might is right) will triumph. Danda will safeguard the weak against the powerful. People from various castes and orders will perform their separate responsibilities where Danda (law of retribution) would be implemented. He claims that Danda, or punishment, can be divided into four categories: fines, limb mutilation, incarceration, and death.

Fine

In his Arthashastra, Kautilya suggests that this is the most typical sort of punishment. It is intended for all types of offences. Weavers, washermen, scavengers, and other artisans must carry out their obligations in line with their agreements regarding time, place, and type of labour. Those who postpone their contracts under the pretext that no agreement has been reached on a time, place, or form of employment will not only lose 1/4 of their earnings, but will also face a fine equal to twice their salary. Those who refuse to obey the order will not only lose their wages, but will also have to pay a fee equal to twice their wages. Second, if a dealer sells or mortgages inferior commodities as superior type, sells items from another locality as the produce of a certain locality, or sells contaminated or deceptive mixtures to clients, he will not only be fined 54 panas but will also be forced to repay the loss. When it comes to theft, he says it happens when someone steals something worth 1/4 to 1/2 pana. He will either be fined 6 panas, have his head shaved, or be exiled. When a person steals items worth half to three-quarters of a pana, he will be penalised nine panas..

Mutilation of Limbs

Another sort of punishment suggested by Kautilya for various crimes such as theft, kidnapping, and murder is limb mutilation. It encompasses both the government and the general public. Kautilya starts with severe punishment for the government servants. The thumb and little fingers of government employees who commit such offences as violation of sacred institutions or pick-pocketing for the

NOTES

first time will be chopped off. Second, anyone who enters a fort without permission or takes anything important or valued from it through a hole or tunnel in the fort's wall will be decapitated. When a person takes a large animal, kidnaps a man or female slave, or sells the belongings of a deceased person, both of his legs must be severed.

Imprisonment

Despite the fact that Kautilya does not specify the terms of imprisonment for the qualities, his references to *bandhangara* and *bandhanasthana* (site of confinement) imply that both sexes are imprisoned. However, jail is a rare kind of punishment. As an alternative to the prison system, he proposes forced labour in state mines and the payment of large fines.

Death

Some offences, according to Kautilya, should be punished by death. It could include or exclude torture. In other words, some will be sentenced to death with torture while others will be sentenced to death without torture. A man shall be tortured to death if he murders another in a disagreement. However, if a person is wounded in a struggle and dies within seven nights, the person who caused the wounds will be executed immediately. Any anyone who sets fire to pasture grounds, fields, threshing yards, residences, wood forests, or elephants will be thrown into the flames. Any person who murders his or her father, mother, son, brother, teacher, or ascetic will be executed by having his or her skin and head burned.

However, the law of punishment must be administered with caution. Kautilya says, "Whoever imposes severe punishment becomes repulsive to the people, while he who awards mild punishments becomes contemptible. But whoever imposes punishments as deserved becomes respectable."

Kautilya's theory of punishment is relevant in the sense that it is uniformly applied. Whether one is an ordinary citizen or government officer or judge, law of punishment is applied to all. Judges when neglect their duty are to be fined if still neglects are to be dismissed.

5.2.8 Theory of Danda (Punishment)

Kautilya's emphasis on spying in different areas of the state constitutes an important aspect of his governmental system. It has both internal and external objectives. Its internal objectives consist of giving secret information to the king regarding ministers, officers, army generals, robbery; theft, killing, murder, conspiracy against the king etc. its external objectives consists of giving information regarding the neighbouring states and their plans of war, to create dissension and trouble in foreign states, to envisage the plan to murder the enemy and to inform the king regarding the foreign spies. The spying system is a unique contribution of Kautilya in the field of internal administration and foreign relation.

To pursue the objectives described above, the king shall give appointment to spies on the advice of ministers. In his *Arthashastra* Kautilya mentions about nine types of spies such as *Kapatikachhatra* (fraudulent disciple), *Udasthita* (recluse); a

NOTES

grihastika (householder), a Vaidehaka (a merchant), tapasa (an ascetic practising austerities), a Satri (a class mate or a colleague), a tikshna (a fire-brand) a rasada (poisoner) and Bhishmukhi a mendicant women.

Kaptika-chhatra (Fudulent Disciple)

Kapatika-chhatra is the most capable and skillful who can easily study the mind of others. They are appointed either with honour or on the basis of salary. Their main function is to inform the king and the ministers regarding the crooked and wicked nature of people.

Udasthitha (Recluse)

Udasthitha is one who is an ascetic with strong character and foresight. They will be provided with money and disciples to start agriculture, cattle-rearing and trade. Out of the disciples he will send some for spying. Their main duty will be to detect crime committed in connection with the King's wealth.

Grihapatika (a House Holder)

Grihapatika is an intelligent, honest cultivator who has left his traditional occupation. He would spend his time and energy for encouraging the farmer for cultivation in the lands allotted to him. After gaining their confidence, he will engage them for spying.

Vaidehaka (Merchant)

Like Grihapatika, Vaidehaka is a trader with foresight and character. But he has left his profession. He will be appointed as spy to carry on the manufacture of merchandise goods on the lands allotted to him for the purpose.

Tapasa (An Ascetic Practising Austerities)

Tapasa is a man with shaved head or bearded face who pretends to be an ascetic. He pretends to be vegetarian, but he takes non-vegetarian food. His disciples may carry the message to the people that he is a man with supernatural power. His blessings will remove their miseries and bring their prosperity. He may use palmistry to predict future occurrences involving his ancestors' activities in the land, such as tiny profits, fire damage, robbery dread, and sedition execution, among other things. He will ascertain the validity of his forecast through nods and signs of the people. He will also foresee not just the prizes that people with foresight, eloquence, and bravery are likely to receive from the king, but also possible changes in ministerial appointments. According to such reports of the spy, the ministers will honour or give relief to those who have been unnecessarily victimised and give punishment indirectly to those who have escaped it.

Tikshna (A Five-brand)

Those who are brave and fearless and can fight even with tigers or elephant are appointed as fiery spies (Tikshna). They espy the public character of those officers attached to the king.

NOTES

Rasada (Poisoner)

Those who are very cruel and indolent are to be appointed as Rasada Poisoner. Poisoners include sauce-maker (suda) a cook and the spreader of bed etc. and their duty will be to spy the private character of the officers.

Bhikshmukhi (A Mendicant Woman)

A poor widow of Brahman caste who is very clever but an ascetic appointed as a spy. Such spies have access to king's harem and residence of king's prime minister. She will be deployed to test the love allurements of the ministers and the officials.

Those spies who are skillful, loyal, reliable and well trained in putting on disguises shall be sent by the king to give secret information regarding the ministers, priests, magistrates, collector general, the chamberlain, the commissioner, the city constables, superintendent of transactions, heads of departments, Officer in charge of fortifications etc. The institute of espionage will have spies in motion in different departments. If any spy will be treated giving wrong information, he will be punished by the king. The modern system of administration has to borrow many from the exhaustive system of espionage created by Kautilya.

5.2.9 Kautilya's Foreign Policy

Kautilya was quite original in prescribing a foreign policy based expediency, diplomacy and war. His main objective was to create a strong state with the power of dominance over the other states. His patriotism provoked him to create a powerful state which can defend itself against the invaders and the enemies. Kautilya suggested that there should be six-fold policy of the state like peace, war, observance of neutrality, marching (Yana), alliance and the double policy of making peace with one and waging war with another. Kautilya says, "of these, agreement with pledges is peace, offensive operation is war, indifference is neutrality, making preparation is marching, seeking the protection of another is alliance and making peace with one and waging war with another is termed as double policy".

Peace

Kautilya says "If any two kings who are hostile to each other and expect to acquire equal amount of wealth and power in equal time, they shall make peace with each other". By this, many objectives can be served. The king can undertake production and development work. During the period of peace, the king can employ spies and other secret means to destroy the works of his enemy. Due to peace, there can be exploitation and augmentation of the resources and developmental work can yield result very quickly.

War

If a king is full of his natural soldiers and corporation of fighting men and if the country is surrounded by natural defensive position as mountains, forests, rivers and forts and is sure of repelling the attack of his enemy, he may go for war.

NOTES

Neutrality

Neutrality should be observed when the king thinks that neither the enemy is strong to destroy him nor he is or if becomes to fight with him like a dog with boar.

Marching

When the king is sure to destroy the works of his enemy by marching his troops and has made arrangements to safeguard his own work, he may take recourse to marching.

Alliance

When the king realises that he is neither capable to harm his enemy's works nor to defend his own against enemy's attack, he shall seek protection from a king of superior power by making an alliance.

Double Policy

If a king is situated between two powerful kings, he can make peace with one of the two kings and wage war with the other. If this is not possible, he may make friendship with traitors, enemies and wild chief who are conspirating against both the kings.

Kautilya surrendered all moral principles and suggested double standard of morality like Machiavelli to build a strong nation. Hence he suggested his king to be clever shrewed, cunning, deceitful, brave and courageous in foreign relations. By means of spies, dissension and discord should be created in foreign land. When the enemy state is suffering due to fatal disease or internal trouble it should be attacked. If the enemy king is nearer, he should be killed without losing any opportunity. The king who wants to make expansion of his own power should dwell upon the six-fold policy mentioned above.

5.2.10 Relationship between Ethics and Politics

Generally, Ethics is the science of morality, whereas politics is the art and science of state and government. Since the beginning of Political Tradition, political philosophers have differed on the relationship between ethics and politics. Those who view 'Politics' as a means to ensure the welfare of the people, establish a close relationship between the two but those who treat 'politics' as a 'pursuit of power' make a separation between ethics and politics. Kautilya belongs to the first generation of political philosophers who established a close relationship between ethics and politics in the internal administration of the state. M.V Krishna Rao writes in his book "Studies in Kautilya", "there is complete agreement between Aristotle, Plato and Kautilya regarding ethics and politics as identical and assigning a normal and spiritual significance to associated living and in believing that the happy life is virtuous life for the fulfilment of which the whole creation moves". Plato gives a picture of unattainable ideals; Aristotle of the descent of ideal to the real and Kautilya of the ascent of real through spiritual effort to the ideal. Some scholars view Kautilya as the Machiavelli of India. Because both of them have deep concerns for the preservation, acquisition and expansion of the state. Both of them suggest for the use of force and fraud to consolidate the interest of the state. But

NOTES

such comparisons are superficial and an in depth study of their respective political approaches reveal their differences. The distinctions between Kautilya and Machiavelli's political perspectives are inherent in the lengthy Indian history of culture and politics on which Kautilya built his political philosophy. Because of this tradition, Kautilya did not separate political and ethical questions as Machiavelli did. Kautilya no doubt emphasised the consolidation of political power but never viewed political power as an end in itself. In Kautilya, the separation between politics and morality is unthinkable and political power acquires legitimacy only when it promotes human happiness. But in external relationship with other states and during the time of war, Kautilya emphasised expediency and subordinated ethics to politics. But this is a temporary measure to be pursued by the king to establish supremacy of his state and bring back normally. Therefore, any analysis of Kautilya's view on the relationship between Ethics and Politics should be divided into two parts i.e., part one deals with politics and ethics in identical terms, part two make a compromise with ethics for a greater cause.

Identical Relationship between Ethics and Politics

As mentioned earlier, Kautilya's political ideas are grounded on the long Indian tradition of culture and politics. India's culture and politics have always been linked to religion and ethics or morality. So in Kautilya's political philosophy, there is no chance that his king will be indifferent to morality to pursue the political power. An immoral king will be most hated by the Indian Psyche. Hence "Kautilya's concern for moral values is obvious and his major pre-occupation is to restore and Foster the ethical values of Hindu religion". According to Kautilya, the techniques and prescriptions of the Arthashastra are understood in the concept of Rajdharma which is supposed to lead to heaven.

Kautilya had deep faith in the vedic social order and wanted to pursue the social order through his state-craft. Like Manu, he also traced the origin of the state to divinity and made the king benevolent' instead of making him an 'absolute king'. He talked of four sciences like Anvishaki, the triple vedas (Trayi), Varta (agriculture, cattle breeding and trade) and Dandaniti (Science of government). Anvikshaki, comprises the philosophy of Sankhya, Yoga and Lokayata. Righteous and unrighteous acts can be determined from the triple vedas; wealth and non-wealth, potency and impotency can be decided through the science of government. Kautilya's faith in ethics and morality propelled him to talk of four sciences which could be adopted as guidelines by all sections of the society. The triple vedas are the most useful since they determine the various obligations of the four classes and the four orders of religious life. Aside from the vedic obligations, Kautilya claims that harmlessness, truthfulness, purity, freedom from vengeance, abstinence from cruelty, and forgiveness are universal duties. The fulfilment of one's own obligations leads to heaven and eternal pleasure. When it is broken, the world will come to an end due to caste and duty confusion. Kautilya also tells his monarch not to allow people to depart from their tasks, for whoever upholds his own responsibility, always adhering to Arya customs and obeying the laws of castes and religious life divisions, would undoubtedly be happy both now and in the afterlife.

NOTES

Thus Kautilya has completely identified his politics with the preservation of a moral and religious social order. He rightly advises his king to be well educated and well versed in all the four sciences. Kautilya's moral prescription for political rule becomes vivid in his statement when he says, "the king who is well educated and disciplined in sciences, devoted to good government of his subjects and bent on doing good to all people will enjoy the earth unopposed". But the king in order to be ethical should keep his six senses under control. Such six senses are just, anger, greed, vanity, haughtiness and over joy. By doing this, the king will refrain from doing harm to anybody and keep himself away from falsehood and unrighteousness.

Kautilya's politics was never power oriented. Like Machiavelli neither he defined politics as the art of capturing power and the craft of preserving it nor made his king the absolute wielder of power. Rather Kautilya made political power of means to achieve the ethical goal. Hence Kautilya says, "in the happiness of his subject lies his happiness; in their welfare his welfare; whatever pleases himself he shall not consider as good, but whatever pleases his subjects he shall consider as good". Thus happiness and welfare of the people should be the only concern of the king. Kautilya warns the king that just as the king is powerful, his subjects are equally powerful. If the king becomes dishonest and reckless, his people will be more dishonest and reckless. The king should be the symbol of virtues and ethics.

Kautilya also talks of Danda (Punishment) to be based on law and justice. Even the king or judges are not free from such punishments. Laws are not the dictates of the king and justice is not what the king says it to be. It is rather based on religious scriptures and local usages. Second, Kautilya claims that when the law of punishment is suspended, it leads to the chaos implied in the proverb 'Matsyanyaya Mudbhavayati' (bigger fish swallowing smaller fish), because the strong will swallow the weak in the absence of a magistrate, but the weak will resist the strong under his (magistrate) protection. Thus Kautilya establishes the rule of law and justice in his polity and does not leave it to the monopoly of anybody. His laws of punishment are more the reflection of a religious and ethical social order. He also creates a system of administration in which he suggests his king to keep close watch on corrupt officers and punish them. He always prescribes for an honest and efficient administration.

Subordination of Ethics to Politics in Foreign Relation and War

Kautilya introduces double standard of morality in conducting his foreign relations and war. He suggests his king to establish a strong and powerful state. Hence he introduces the elements of expediency, diplomacy, espionage, dissension, distrust and murder if necessary in making the state powerful. He was the first Indian Political Philosopher who not only separated ethics and politics but subordinate ethical considerations to political consideration in matters of foreign relations and war. The king by hook or crook must win the war if not today, tomorrow.

But as mentioned earlier, he separates ethics and politics for a temporary period i.e., to win the war and consolidate the state. He always pays importance to a

king with virtuous character and under worse trouble is attacked, his subjects will help him; whereas if the king is vicious character, his subject will be indifferent even if he is under less trouble.

NOTES

5.3 M.K. GANDHI

Mohandas Karmachand Gandhi, popularly known as Mahatma Gandhi had a very significant past but his determination and persistent endeavour made him an encyclopaedia personality. He was born during the time the first war of independence had already taken place in 1857 and the spirit of renaissance was gradually ushering into the Indian polity. He was born on 2nd October 1869 at Porbandar in Kathiwar district of Gujarat.

Gandhiji had his early education at Porbandar. He started his journey to South Africa and after returning from this place he started his public life as a lawyer. He entered into Indian politics in the year 1915. He started a new era in new politics.

Gandhiji attempted to make politics religious. He also tried to make religion practically relevant for the society. The concept of Swaraj is not a completely new doctrine that Gandhiji conceived. The concept of Swaraj or self-rule associated with the nation of 'Swarajya' in ancient Indian political theory alluded to a certain method of ensuring self-determination for all elements of society. But in Modern India Dadabhai Naoroji and Tilak gave negative concept of Swaraj implying national independence only. Gandhiji restored the original meaning of Swaraj. His concept of Swadeshi, non-violence Satyagraha and Civil Disobedience have built a new vision for national independence. His most important views on Sarvodaya is a popular one.

5.3.1 Ends and Means Relationship

Gandhiji saw a very intimate relationship between the end and means and considered the means as more important than the end itself because the former grows out of the latter. Gandhiji introduced a new era in Indian politics. With an objective of spiritualising politics, he conceived of a strong link between religion and politics. Because he always emphasized his principle that means justify the end. He completely rejected the doctrine that end justifies the means. If the end is achieved by unfair means, it will not yield a permanent result. It will be like "ill got ill spent". Gandhiji compared "the means to a seed, the end to a tree and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree". He strongly believed that "if one takes care of the means, the end will take care of itself". Since Gandhiji believed in the moral pursuit and achievement of man, he always interlinked the means and the end.

Application of 'Means and End' Principle

Gandhiji not only talked about the moral means but also was committed to it during his life time. During the freedom movement of India he never conceived of attaining Swaraj by any means. He always emphasized that India should win its freedom by means of truth and non-violence. By means of violence and falsehood

NOTES

one man bring victory but that victory will never be permanent. Because violence begets violence and the process continues for ever. Hence Gandhiji decided to suspend the non-cooperation movement due to violent methods adopted by the Satyagrahis at Chauri-Chaura. He said “it is true we cannot rise till our political condition is reformed. But it is not true that we shall be able to progress if our political condition undergoes a change by any means and in any manner. Only a change brought about by pure means, that is, by peaceful and legitimate means, can lead us to real progress”. As a firm believer in the path of just and moral means, he never tried to take advantage of his opponents’ flaws. When the Boer War broke out in 1899, he believed that Indians who claimed citizenship were ethically obligated to assist the government. Despite their legitimate frustrations, he gave his and the Indian community’s assistance to the Natal government. So also as a part of moral duty, he advised the Indian leaders to support the British government during World War I and to fight for India’s Independence after the end of the war.

Spiritualisation of Politics

Gandhiji’s doctrine of means justifying the end was manifested not only during the period of our freedom struggle but also in its application in India’s internal politics. He was the first political leader of Modern India who made a serious attempt to spiritualise politics and establish an organic link between religion and politics. But by ‘spiritualisation’ or ‘religion’ he did not mean any religious dogmas or fundamentalism. What he implied was the ‘synthesis’ of the values in all the religions. It is the ‘rock-bottom’ of fundamental morality. For Gandhi religion did not consist in worshipping God or reading a religious book; it encompasses all human activities. Religious life means identification with mankind. He regarded religion as self-realisation, suffering and sacrifice. On the otherhand, he challenged the traditional view of politics, power and the difference between public and private morality. He never believed in the Machiavellian sense of ‘politics as an art of capturing power’. ‘Politics and power’ must aim at social reform and service to mankind. In this sense politics becomes as essential as religion. ‘Today’s politics encircles us like the coils of a snake from which we cannot escape, no matter how hard we try. The only way to wrestle with the serpent is to incorporate religion into politics,’ Gandhiji felt. If politics is separated from faith, it is a corpse that should be burned. Thus religious virtue can guide the political actions in the right direction. But Gandhiji totally discarded the idea of ‘state religion’ or ‘subordination of politics to religion’.

Value of Politics for Religious Man

Just as Gandhiji attempted to make politics religious, he also tried to make religion practically relevant for the society. He thought that the saint and the revolutionary are not incompatible. The saint must not become an escapist who refuses to act and renounces the society; the revolutionary should not be an opportunist who is ready to sacrifice principles. The true saint must be effective in society while the true revolutionary must possess the deepest integrity. According to him, just as religious values could purify politics, politics could play a positive role in spiritual perfection of an individual. Through politics, Gandhi agreed with

Buddha that one can serve the suffering humanity and purify himself. He brought into lime light the path of Karmayoga, or spiritual realisation through social action.

Thus Gandhiji, while emphasizing the importance of ‘means’ over ‘ends’ made an attempt to ‘spiritualise politics’ and establish a correlation between religion and politics. Every action of the individual is based on the single objective of achieving perfect result whether that is spiritual, economic, social or political.

NOTES

5.3.2 Gandhi on Ahimsa or Non-violence

In the history of mankind, Gandhi has been the true champion of truth and non-violence. For thousands of years, brute power has ruled the globe, and mankind has been reaping the painful harvest all along. So Gandhiji called upon the people to eschew violence. According to Gandhiji, the one universal characteristic that differentiates man from the rest of God’s creation is nonviolence. Non-violence as a concept did not belong to Gandhi originally. The only thing, that he did was to expand the idea of non-violence and apply the same in his mission of life.

Source of Influence

In spearheading the cause of non-violence, Gandhiji was influenced by his own parents who were the followers of Jainism and Buddhism. In no other part of India, the influence of Jainism on people’s lives was stronger than in Gujarat, where Gandhiji was born and raised. Gandhiji was also influenced by a British scholar Sir Henry David Thoreau’s book ‘Essays on Civil Disobedience’. He also said that reading Tolstoy’s ‘The Kingdom of God is Within You’ cured him of his scepticism and made him a staunch believer in Ahimsa at a time when he was going through a sceptical crisis.

Meaning and Implications of Non-violence

Gandhiji considered Ahimsa (Non-violence) as the supreme religious duty of every man. Anybody having kindness, within himself must believe in non-violence. Non-violence is the means of achieving the end i.e., truth. It refers to both physical and mental non-violence. Physical non-violence means one should not hurt or attack or kill any wrong doer. Nor should one mentally harbour something bad against others. This is however a negative meaning of non-violence. Positively it means one must have love, sympathy, compassion even for his opponent. Secondly Gandhiji believed that non-violence is a weapon of the strong and not of weak. Those who apply non-violence are men with indomitable courage and strength. One must face danger without causing any injury come what may. “Non-violence is not cowardice, Gandhiji said, where there is a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence. I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honour than that she should in a cowardly manner become or remain witness to her own dishonour”.

How to Practice Non-violence

But how non-violence can be applied by men. Gandhiji suggested the following methods to apply non-violence:

NOTES

- (a) **Fearless self-suffering:** Gandhiji strongly believed that a votary of non-violence must be utterly selfless, altruistic and completely fearless. Because non-violent man undergoes conscious suffering as he has to suffer physical and mental injury caused to him by the evil doer. The main objective of non-violence should be to convert the enemy into friends. Nonviolence is unquestionably preferable to violence. Physical capacity does not equal strength. It stems from an unwavering bravery. The innocent man's self-sacrifice is a million times more powerful than the sacrifice of a million men killed in the act of killing.
- (b) **Truthfulness:** Non-violence claims the practitioner to become truthful. Truth means there should not be any dishonesty of purpose. Truth is eternal. Gandhiji wanted to prove his strong faith in truth and accordingly postponed non-cooperation movement against the British when the movement became violent. Because he believed truth to be more valuable than victory. Victory without truth becomes violent and temporary.
- (c) **Persuasion:** Persuasion is another way of approaching the enemy through non-violence. Gandhiji believed that an evil doer if persuaded properly can change his mind from violence to non-violence. But one must understand and appreciate the cause of his enemy.
- (d) **Self-control and Fasting:** Gandhiji suggested that non-violence is possible only when one has self-control, patience and tolerance. For self-control Gandhiji advised fasting. Fasting makes the body and mind cool and disciplined. By way of self-control one can have patience to tolerate and understand the cause of his enemy.
- (e) **Love and Compassion:** Lastly he suggested the votaries of non-violence to develop love and sympathy for others. One should be sympathetic towards the ignorance of his enemy. One should love his enemy but denounce his action. Gandhiji said 'we never fought against the British but we were fighting against British rule in India'.

Gandhiji advocated for nonviolence not just for individuals, but also for nations and people as a whole. It is past time for nations to abandon violence and the frantic rush for weaponry, which will inevitably result in a slaughterhouse unlike any other in history. "There is no way out of the impending doom save a bold and unqualified acceptance of the nonviolent technique with all its beautiful implications," Gandhiji declared. Gandhiji's prophecy of non-violence became a guiding principle for all generations to establish the kingdom of peace and love.

5.3.3 Gandhi on Satyagraha

Satyagraha as doctrine and a weapon undoubtedly rose into prominence due to the untiring effort of Mahatma Gandhi. But it was in practice prior to Gandhi in both Asia and Europe. Satyagraha at that time was in the form of 'passive resistance'. Right to resist injustice even offered by the king was enunciated in the mythical characters of Bamadeva and Bhishma in the Mahabharata. In modern India the doctrine or passive resistance was expounded chiefly by Aurobindo Ghosh as a

NOTES

political technique rather than a spiritual therapy. However the term 'satyagraha' was coined by Gandhi in 1906 in place of 'passive resistance' which he thought was a foreign expression. Secondly the use of the word 'passive resistance' did not connote the whole idea which Gandhiji wished to connote. Accordingly he used the word 'Satyagraha' which means the combination of truth (satya) and firmness (agraha) and serves as a synonym for force. However Gandhiji has been influenced by many sources like Tolstoy, Bhagvad Gita, and David Thoreau.

Meaning and Implications of Satyagraha

The term Satyagraha has its link with a similar expression in Sanskrit literature. The word "Agraha" in Sadagraha, which Gandhi changed to Satyagraha has been derived from 'Grah' which means to seize or to grasp, to get hold of, to grapple with. Satyagraha, hence, implies, "Relentless search for truth and a determination to reach truth".

Secondly Satyagraha of Gandhi implies "truth-force or soul force". Satyagraha should not be conceived as a weapon of the weak because it excludes violence. On the contrary it is the most courageous but non-violent way of resistance to uphold the truth. The true revolution of the entire social structure is disrupted and prolonged by violence.

Satyagraha also refers to the practise of resisting all that is wicked, unjust, unclean, or untrue. It uses love, intentional suffering, and self-purification to solve all issues in human relationships. As Gandhiji said "Satyagraha is a vindication of truth by bearing witness to it through self-suffering or in other words, love"; Satyagraha bestows blessings on both those who practise it and those who oppose it.

Satyagraha is a form of resistance based on moral rather than physical power. It is nonviolent opposition that is both passive and active. Gandhiji claimed that by combining Satya (truth) and Ahimsa (nonviolence), one can bring the entire world to his feet. It is, in essence, the introduction of truth and tenderness into political, i.e., national life.

Techniques of Satyagraha

Gandhi originally used Satyagraha as a tactic for redressing social and political injustice in South Africa, with great success. It was then applied successfully in India's freedom struggle quite unique in human history. Gandhiji suggested different methods of staging Satyagraha. Devices, non-cooperation tactics, civil disobedience methods, and the constructive programme are all examples of Satyagraha methods. All these techniques may be adopted by individual, group or mass movements in the political area as well as in different spheres of social life. Such techniques are discussed below:

Purification: The purifying method in a specific context will be determined by the rightness of purpose, degree and genuineness of non-violence displayed by the Satyagrahi. While judging the purity of the action of a Satyagrahi his character must be taken into account. A Satyagrahi should always undergo self examination.

NOTES

Under purifying and penitential techniques we may include the following instruments:

- (a) **The pledge:** It is a public declaration of a Satyagrahi 'that he or they will abstain from or perform certain acts to fight untruth or injustice'. It implies their sense of determination to be a crusader for truth and justice.
- (b) **Prayer:** It is no doubt a religious act of generating 'soul force' but it may be secularised so as to mean one's determination to discover the general will or common good. Satyagrahi through prayer develops his quality of other regardingness.
- (c) **Fasting:** It may be adopted for self-purification and as a means of resisting injustice and making the evil doer to realise his mistake. In other words through fasting the Satyagrahi sends a message to the evil doer to admit his wrong and rectify himself. Gandhiji used it in the form of a science and warned that the technique should be used with extreme caution. It must be used only on rare occasion and by those who are skilled in the art of fasting. Fasting requires a high degree of purity, self-discipline, humility and faith. The man who launches fast should have spiritual fitness and a clean vision.

Non-cooperation: Non-cooperation is a non-violent technique of resisting the illegal authority or order or any person of exploiting nature. Gandhiji argued so long one co-operates he is oppressed and exploited; if people cease completely to co-operate with an unjust or tyrannical system, it will ultimately collapse. "Even the most despotic government" Gandhiji said, "cannot stand except with the consent of the governed which is procured forcibly by the despot". This is true for the government as well as to those who exploit. Through non-cooperation with the evil the Satyagrahi purifies himself and withdraws his part of co-operation from the inhuman and unrighteous evil doers. Non-cooperation emphasises the purity of means, purity of ends, purity of motives and intentions. The methods of non-cooperation include hartal, boycott, strike fast unto death and hijrat which are discussed below:

- (a) **Hartal:** It is temporary strike with advance notice as to its duration, the closing down of shop and business and sometimes the halting of the work of administration. It is a traditional form of protest in India. Hartal according to Gandhiji strikes the imagination of the people and the government.
- (b) **Boycott:** It is a means to protest against or paralyse an unjust political system. It may be applied to an institution involved in corrupt or unfairly discriminatory practices. Boycott may be economically intended to keep out foreign goods where their presence creates unemployment or destroys local industries.
- (c) **Strike:** It is a weapon of the labourers for the redress of their legitimate grievances. Gandhiji's concept of strike is different from the western concept. Unlike the west, he suggested, strike should be directed against corruption,

NOTES

injustice, inefficiency and not to eliminate the 'capitalist' or simply seize power. The Satyagrahi should adopt strike in a non-violent way. It should not be imposed and no one should be compelled to join the strike. It is a voluntary act of purification committed in order to convert the erring opponent. But the demands of the strike according to Gandhi, must be clear, feasible and justified. It should not be emotional or sporadic.

- (d) **Hijrat:** It means voluntary exile or temporary withdrawal from the place where one cannot live with self-respect. This method was advised by Gandhi to the Bardoli peasants in 1928.
- (e) **Fast unto death:** It is the last weapon to be applied by a Satyagrahi for self-purification and changing the attitude of the evil doers.

5.3.4 Gandhi on Sarvodaya

The concept of Sarvodaya is one of the main foundations of Gandhian ideology and technique. It is the most original contemporary contribution to political thought. In modern times, Mahatma Gandhi was the first to use the word 'Sarvodaya' whose literary meaning is 'the welfare of all'. But this literary meaning does not represent the view of Gandhi properly. Gandhi's Sarvodaya, on the other hand, refers to the art and science of mobilising society's physical, economic, and spiritual resources for the common good. It portrays a socialist order in which everyone's growth and advancement is guaranteed. Before developing this concept, Gandhiji was influenced by John Ruskin's book 'Unto this Last' and published in Gujarathi and adaptation of Ruskin's book which he entitled as 'Sarvodaya'. But Gandhiji has borrowed the word from a Jain scripture by Acharya Samantabhadra. Sarvodaya emerged as a true remedy for the society's social, economic, and political ills. It aspires to everyone's happiness. It outperforms the utilitarian concept of 'highest enjoyment for the greatest number' in this way. Dada Dharmadhikari emphasised the difference between Sarvodaya and westernisms, citing three stages in the evolution of humanist thought: first, Darwin's advocacy of the survival of the fittest; second, Huxley's doctrine of "live and let live," and finally, today's "sarvodaya," which asserts "Live in order to help others live."

Implications of Sarvodaya

'Sarvodaya' of Gandhiji as a doctrine of new social, political and economic order stands on different foundations and has many implications. It has rejected the existing social, economic and political order and has sought for a new. A brief analysis is made below with regard to different aspects of Sarvodaya.

Ethical Aspect

The concept of Sarvodaya has originated from 'positive' concept of human nature. Because any system can thrive or decay depending upon the human nature. Like any other anarchist, Sarvodaya discards the assumption of the 'wicked man' or 'the selfish man'. Rather according to this concept man is essentially good. But due to external evil forces, his goodness may get 'distacted'. But that goodness continues to remain the same whatever be its outward manifestation. It strongly believes that there is an innate nobility even in an apparently ignoble man. So even

NOTES

if a man gets distracted, he can be put into right path. Sarvodaya believes that human character can be improved through Tapasya (self-effort) or through pleas from others through nonviolent means like as Satyagraha, non-cooperation, and fasting.

Political Aspect

Gandhi's Sarvodaya also denounced the current political structure and advocated for the development of a "truly democratic order." The current state structure, according to Gandhiji, is a system of organised aggression. He claimed that the state is a soulless machine that can never be free of the violence that sustains it. Sarvodaya also opposes majority rule, elections, political parties, and power concentration. Parties are "conspiracies against the people". There is the monopoly of 'rich' to get the party-tickets. Elections are compared to tuberculosis and leaders to "bidders at the auction of popularity". He rejected majority rule because majority rule may not enact policies for the entire society. He claimed that being obedient to the majority, regardless of its decisions, is a form of slavery. Gandhiji, on the other hand, advocated for a "stateless democracy" in which even the most vulnerable people have the same opportunities as the most powerful. Everyone is their own ruler in such a state. He governs himself in such a way that he is never an obstruction to his neighbour. As a result, there is no political authority in the perfect state because there is no state. A federation of nonviolent satyagrahi village communities will be the ideal democracy. It can only be of communities living in villages where voluntary cooperation is the only way to live in dignity and harmony.

Economic Aspect

Gandhiji's Sarvodaya economy which aims at welfare of all, is founded on the philosophy of limited wants. Any economy worth the name must aim at promoting welfare but in the west, welfare has largely been understood with reference to availability of material goods and "bodily welfare". It is based on craze for more and more well-being. On the otherhand, Gandhiji believed "Civilization in the real sense of the term consists not in the multiplication but in the deliberate and voluntary reduction of wants. This alone promotes real happiness and contentment and increases capacity for service". Peace can never be achieved if our accumulation of wants go on increasing. Our economy should be based on 'simple living, high thinking'. An economy based on mass production provokes man to have more and more, and if this haunt, individual gets lost. Gandhiji admitted that matter is necessary for man. He said, "it is good enough to talk of God while we are sitting after a nice breakfast. But for millions of poor God can only appear as bread and butter". Hence Gandhiji also gives emphasis on developing an economy which ensures 'a balanced diet, adequate clothing for the protection of the body against heat and cold and a clean well-ventilated house to live in'. Accordingly he fought for an economy free from exploitation and corruption, limitation of human wants, equality and basic needs for all.

Criticism

Sarvodaya concept of Gandhiji has been the target of criticism from different corners. It has been branded as 'Utopia' and sometimes looked with suspicion. As Annie Besant long back wrote, "Mr. Gandhi proposes to paralyse the government, to render it powerless, unable to govern. The fact that he does not propose to kill its members does not alter the fact that he is trying to bring about a revolution, for whether you kill the government with machine-guns or paralyses, the end is the same. You overthrow the government". S. Murty writes in his work 'Studies in the Problem of Peace'. "The desire to overwhelm and coerce the minds of opponents seems to have been at work in many of the Gandhian movements and fasts. To substitute the word 'move' in place of 'Coerce' may be more polite". The Gandhian concept of "simple life and high thought" has been questioned on the grounds that the simplest of foods and austerity practises can sometimes foster all kinds of evil and wicked inclinations. In certain circles, wealth is thought to be a necessary precondition for culture and higher values.

Critics argue that large-scale production and industrialisation can enhance living standards and free up human energies for more creative endeavours. Cottage businesses may create jobs, but they may fail owing to excessive manufacturing costs and poor product quality.

However, Sarvodaya may be utopian but there is no utopia from which man cannot learn something. Sarvodaya is no exception. Sarvodaya's attack on excessive state control, centralisation, brute majority and 'pushbutton economy with excessive consumerism' can teach all generations to guard against blatant materialism and excessive centralised coercive authority. Thus Gandhi's concept of Sarvodaya aimed at establishing socialism in its own form quite different from western socialism in its own form quite different from western socialism or Marxian socialism. As described above, it not only rejected the idea of a powerful state having majority dominance to bring about socialism but also discarded the use of force and violence as the basic elements of socialism. On the contrary, Gandhian socialism recognised the inner strength and capacity of each individual and made in a base of socialism. His Sarvodaya society established a society free of exploitation and provided everyone with the opportunity to succeed and work for the common good. As a result, Gandhiji's Sarvodaya set the stage not just for participatory democracy but also for the emergence of a new form of socialism.

5.3.5 Gandhi on Swadeshi

Swadeshi literally means love for one's own country. However, Gandhi applied the concept to various spheres of viz. religious, economic and political. In the religious sphere Swadeshi meant to Gandhi following one's hereditary religion. He said "A Hindu can get more inspiration from his own religion than from Islam or Christianity. We should try that Hindus should become better Hindus, Muslims better Muslims and Christians better Christians." He attached more importance to the moral conduct than performance of worship and other rituals.

NOTES

NOTES

In the economic sphere Swadeshi meant for Gandhi the use of only those goods which were produced by one's immediate neighbours and serve those industries by making them efficient and plea for the protection of the home industries, especially those which had the potentiality of growth. Swadeshi in the economic sphere also meant boycott of the foreign foods. Emphasising the importance of boycott of foreign goods Gandhi said "India cannot be free so long as India voluntarily encourages or tolerates the economic drain which has been going on for the past century and a half, boycott of foreign goods means no more and no less than boycott of foreign cloth", Gandhi was not in favour of rejecting everything that was foreign. He certainly favoured the use of foreign goods which could not be manufactured in the country provided they did not interfere with the growth or injured the interest of immediate neighbours. He said "To reject foreign manufactures merely because they are foreign and to go on wasting national time and money in the promotion in one's own country of manufacturers for which it is not suited would be criminal folly and a negation of the Swadesh spirit." Thus he favoured the purchase of goods from different parts of the world provided they were needed for the growth of the individual and did not interfere with and injured the growth of the local industries. As such he had no objection to the purchase of useful healthy literature from different parts of the world, surgical instruments from England and watches from Switzerland. On the other hand he was not in favour of purchasing even an inch of the finest cotton fabrics from England or Japan because they would injure the indigenous industry of India. Thus Gandhi's principle of Swadeshi emphasised "contentment with local conditions and with the things that God had provided for man's sustenance, instead of ruthless exploitation had provided for man's sustenance, instead of ruthless exploitation of other countries to obtain unnecessary luxuries: thus, overthrowing their own internal economic equilibrium and introducing discord".

In the political sphere Swadeshi meant adoption of traditional Indian political institutions in preference to the western political institutions. Thus Gandhi pleaded for the establishment of village Panchayats, Ganarajya etc. In short, Gandhi pleaded for Swadeshi in the religious, economic, political and even other spheres with a view to promote a spirit of self-confidence, courage and self-reliance among the people of the country.

5.3.6 Gandhi on Swaraj

The concept of Swaraj is not a completely new doctrine that Gandhiji conceived. The concept of Swaraj, or self-rule, in conjunction with the concept of 'Swarajya,' related to a certain manner of attaining self-determination for all elements of society in ancient Indian political thinking. But in modern India, Dadabhai Naoroji and Tilak gave negative concept of Swaraj implying 'national independence' only. Gandhiji restored the original meaning of the word "Swaraj." His concept of Swaraj provides direction for converting what he refers to as "nominal" democracy, or Purna Swaraj (complete or integral democracy).

Meaning and Implications of Swaraj

Gandhiji gave a positive concept of 'Swaraj'. Swaraj means self-rule. It entails not allowing any external authority in the world to exert control over oneself or others. Swaraj is neither a submission nor an exploitation because of these two factors. As a result, Swaraj has both 'nationalist' and 'individualist' overtones, but it also entails international and social duties. For a nation Swaraj means, as mentioned above, freedom from foreign rule and in that sense Gandhiji also finally demanded the exit of the British from India. A free nation, in Gandhiji's opinion, can not be selfish and need not be an isolationist. Gandhiji was both a nationalist and internationalist. So he said Indian nationalism must organise itself for the benefit and service of humanity.

Another implication of Swaraj as mentioned above, is 'self-rule' for the individual. It is equated with 'freedom to choose' and 'freedom to decide'. Without individual freedom, national freedom becomes meaningless. He asserted that the 'Swaraj of people' refers to the sum of each individual's Swaraj (Self-rule). It means establishing true participatory democracy, in which each individual is able to govern himself (politically and economically) and participate in the operation of the political system. 'Swaraj, for me, means freedom for the poorest of my countrymen,' he remarked appropriately. I'm not concerned in simply freeing India from the tyranny of the English. I am hell-bent on rescuing India from all yokes'. In true Swaraj, the acquisition of the capacity to oppose authority when it is abused is more important than the gain of authority by a few. True democracy, he correctly contended, cannot be forged by a group of twenty men seated in the centre. Every village's residents must figure it out from the ground up. While there will be a central government, it should not be based on the Western democratic model. The state's role should be to carry out the people's wishes, not to dictate or force them to do what it wants. The conversion of democracy to mobocracy should be avoided. Democracy is impossible to achieve until all people have equal access to power. Hence he made it clear that democracy should not be identified with the rule of majority. Swaraj will be an absurdity if individuals have to surrender their judgement to majority. Therefore, Gandhiji said Swaraj should provide equal opportunity to all to express themselves and in which none suffers under forced opinion. Under it, there is no recognition of any separate race, caste or religion. As a result, he stated that Swaraj in my dream is the Swaraj of the poor. The necessities of life should be enjoyed by all in the same way as princes and wealthy people enjoy them.

Means of Achieving Swaraj

But how to achieve Swaraj and maintain it? Gandhiji very strongly believed that Swaraj can be achieved by the application of truth, non-violence and Satyagraha. Swaraj achieved by a non-violent satyagraha can bring 'permanent freedom' for a country. But after the attainment of Swaraj a country should develop a 'true democratic polity' in which every individual is capable of resisting the absolute authority and ventilate his views freely. There should be decentralisation of power and authority. As mentioned earlier, Gandhiji, no doubt recognised the

NOTES

NOTES

need for a central government but he said it should be structured not as a pyramid but as an oceanic circle. To quote him “In this structure composed of innumerable villages, there will be ever-widening never ascending circles. Life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be individual, always ready to perish for the village, the later ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance but ever humble, sharing the majority of the oceanic circle of which they are integral units.” Besides this structural suggestion, Gandhiji also suggested that Swaraj can be achieved by ‘moral autonomy’ which demands ‘self purification’. Because it enables the individual to claim individual rights on moral ground. Such claims are more effective in politics and society. Swaraj also depends upon the self-discipline of the individuals, and self-control. There should be ‘mass participation’ of the people who can bring mass movement and can educate the people politically. Gandhiji, hence, rightly said “Purna Swaraj denotes a condition of things when the dumb and lame millions will speak and walk. That Swaraj cannot be achieved by force but by organisation and unity”.

5.3.7 Gandhi on Village Democracy/Gram Swaraj

M. K. Gandhi once said, “the soul of India Lives in its villages.” Gandhi villages are the backbone of a nation. For the nation’s development, Gandhiji envisioned each village as a mini-republic, self-sufficient in its basic needs, organically and non-hierarchically linked to larger spatial bodies, and with complete autonomy over local affairs. Gandhi advocated for the distribution of political authority among India’s villages. To define what he called True democracy, he favoured the term ‘Gram Swaraj.’ This democracy is founded on liberty. Individual liberty, according to Gandhi, could only be preserved in autonomous, self-sufficient communities that provided people with chances for full engagement.

Gandhi was a strong critic of the centralised system because it curbed individual initiative and stood in the way of self realisation. He, therefore, pleaded for decentralisation of authority both in the political as well as economic sphere. In terms of politics, he advocated for the state’s jurisdiction to be limited and for the local community to be given more autonomy. He insisted on the creation of self-sufficing autonomous village communities.

Gandhiji travelled the length and breadth of the country, reinforcing his belief that India would benefit from rural panchayats. These were village republics that were self-contained, self-sufficient, and had everything that people desire. These were the places where all people might enjoy the highest possible standard of living. An individual had complete freedom and opportunity to express himself to the fullest extent possible. Panchayats, which are made up of five people who are chosen annually, are in charge of the village’s affairs. Gandhi’s focus was on the individual, who was at the heart of municipal government. People are supposed to take a personal interest in the meeting and attend in large numbers to discuss issues

of common concern, such as village industries, agriculture, production, obligation, and planning..

Gandhi made it clear that concentrating economic or political power would violate all of participatory democracy's fundamental ideals. To counteract centralization, he proposed the establishment of village republics as both rival political organisations and economic autonomous groups. A decentralised system's lowest unit is the village. In terms of politics, a village must be small enough to allow everyone to participate directly in decision-making. It is the fundamental building block of participatory democracy. As regards decentralisation in the economic field he favoured replacement of the large-scale industry by cottage industry. He asserted that through cottage industries alone the spiritual values could be properly understood and appreciated. In short, he favoured decentralisation in the political and economic spheres. According to him, villages should not only be self-sufficient, but also capable of defending themselves against the entire globe if necessary.

By involving all stakeholders in the decision-making and policy-making process, Gandhi's vision of Gram Swaraj can become vehicles for bringing about much-needed social and political transformation. Gandhi noted in his Presidential Address to the Belgaum Congress that the Panchayat was not only a good way to get cheap justice, but also a way to avoid relying on the government to handle mutual disputes. Gram Swaraj, or village democracy, represented true democracy to Gandhi. As a result, he stated, "Decentralization of political and economic authority allows democracy to function based on individual freedom and initiative in his country."

5.3.8 Gandhi's Views on Trusteeship

Mahatma Gandhi advocated a socioeconomic ideology known as Trusteeship. It establishes a mechanism for wealthy individuals to serve as trustees of trusts that care after the welfare of the general public. Gandhi emphasised the ideal of a simple life and insisted that a person should possess only what was absolutely essential for his day-to-day life and attainment of self-realisation. He was against unnecessary accumulation of wealth or goods. He conceded right to private property to the extent it was necessary for one's moral, mental and physical well-being. To him, "Everyone must have a balanced diet, a decent house to live in, facilities for education of one's children and adequate medical relief."

Though he was opposed to the accumulation of wealth in the hands of few rich people, he did not favour use of force for taking away his surplus wealth from the rich for the benefit of the poor and deserving. He said the sense of Justice of the rich should be aroused and they should be made to feel that they have no justification in keeping surplus wealth with them. They should be made to realise that they hold the surplus wealth as trustees of the society and should devote the same for benefit of the community. Once the rich people were made to feel that they were merely trustees of the surplus wealth, it would become easy to establish a class-less society without violence or force. As a result, Gandhi felt that the wealthy

NOTES

NOTES

could be convinced to give up some of their fortune in order to help the poor. He also believed in the trusteeship paradigm, in which one's riches must be returned to the Society.

According to Gandhi, trusteeship is the only basis on which an ideal marriage of economics and morals can be achieved. The following is his trusteeship formula:

- (i) Trusteeship is a tool for converting society's current capitalist structure into a more egalitarian one. It does not offer Capitalism any leeway, but it does allow the current owning class a chance to reform itself. It is based on the belief that human nature may always be redeemed.
- (ii) It does not recognise any right to private property ownership save to the extent that society permits it for its own good.
- (iii) It does not preclude legislation governing wealth ownership and use. Under state-regulated trusteeship, an individual will not be free to hold or use his or her wealth for personal gain at the expense of society's interests.
- (iv) In the same way that a fair minimum living wage is advocated, a maximum income cap for each individual in society should be established. The difference between such minimal and maximum wages should be acceptable, equitable, and changing from time to time, so that the tenancy is geared toward erasing the gap.
- (v) The character of production will be dictated by societal necessity rather than selfish greed under the Gandhian economic order.
- (vi) Gandhi's trusteeship theory differs greatly from Marx's economic philosophy. While Marxism is a product of the industrial revolution, Gandhi's trusteeship theory can be considered fundamental spiritual principles in Indian heritage. Marxist Socialism aims to overthrow the capitalist class, whereas Gandhian Socialism aims to change the institution rather than destroy it. Gandhian Socialism differs from Marxist Socialism in that it is ethical. To him, man is first and foremost an ethical being, and then a social being. Thus, Gandhi proposed this concept as a response to economic inequities in ownership and income, a nonviolent means of addressing all social and economic problems that arose from the current social order's inequalities and privileges.

5.3.9 Gandhi on State (Ram Rajya)

Gandhi was opposed to the present state because it was based on force and centralisation of authority, which led to negation of individual freedom. Gandhi attached great importance to the individual and pleaded for decentralisation of authority. He wrote in 1931 "To me political power is not an end but one of the means enabling the people to better their condition in every department of life. Political power means capacity to regulate national life through national representatives. If national life becomes so perfect as to become self-regulated, no representation is necessary. There is then a state of enlightened anarchy. In such a state every one is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a

NOTES

hindrance to his neighbour". Gandhi looked upon enormous powers of the state with suspicion and considered it as a "great threat to individual's progress. He side look upon an increase in the power of the state with great fear, because although while apparently doing good by minimising exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality which lies at the root of all progress. The state represents violence in a concentrated and organized form".

Though Gandhi was against the existing state and wanted to replace it by an ideal state, based on non-violence, in which individual would have maximum independence, He refrained from painting a picture of the ideal state. He said "When society is deliberately constructed in accordance with the law of non-violence, its structure will be different in material particulars from what it is today. But I cannot say in advance what the Government based wholly on non-violence will be like." Gandhi did give some vague idea about the ideal society in the course of his speeches and writings and by piecing them together we can form a fairly good idea of the ideal state of his concept.

A Non-Violent State. In the First place he envisaged an ideal state which would be predominantly non-violent. Gandhi admitted that in actual practice use of force was inevitable in politics on account of imperfections of human beings. As he put it "Perfect non-violence whilst you are inhabiting the body is only a theory like Euclid's point or straight line, but we have to endeavour every moment of our lives." He therefore advocated a predominantly non-violent society. Gandhi did not favour imposition of non-violence from above and insisted on voluntary non-violence. He held that this could be achieved through moral evolution of the individual. Gandhi stated that nonviolence was a positive energy, indicating love in the broadest sense, even love for the evildoer. Explaining the concept of non-violence Gandhi said "Non-violence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering. It does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil doer, but it means that putting one's wholesome against the will of the tyrant. Working under this law of our being, it is possible for a single individual to defy the whole might of an unjust empire to save his honour, his religion, his soul and lay the foundation of that empire's fall or its regeneration".

5.3.10 Ends and Means Relationship

Gandhiji saw a very intimate relationship between the end and means and considered the means as more important than the end itself because the former grows out of the latter. Gandhiji introduced a new era in Indian politics. With an objective of spiritualising politics, he conceived of a strong link between religion and politics. Because he always emphasized his principle that means justify the end. He completely rejected the doctrine that end justifies the means. If the end is achieved by unfair means, it will not yield a permanent result. It will be like "ill got ill spent". Gandhiji compared "the means to a seed, the end to a tree and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree". He strongly believed that "if one takes care of the means, the end will take care of itself". Since Gandhiji believed in the moral pursuit and achievement of man, he always interlinked the means and the end.

NOTES**Application of 'Means and End' Principle**

Gandhiji not only talked about the moral means but also was committed to it during his life time. During the freedom movement of India he never conceived of attaining Swaraj by any means. He always emphasized that India should win its freedom by means of truth and non-violence. By means of violence and falsehood one man bring victory but that victory will never be permanent. Because violence begets violence and the process continues for ever. Hence Gandhiji decided to suspend the non-cooperation movement due to violent methods adopted by the Satyagrahis at Chauri-Chaura. He said "it is true we cannot rise till our political condition is reformed. But it is not true that we shall be able to progress if our political condition undergoes a change by any means and in any manner. Only a change brought about by pure means, that is, by peaceful and legitimate means, can lead us to real progress". As a firm believer in the path of just and moral means, he never tried to take advantage of the weakness of his opponents. When the Boer War broke out in 1899, he believed that Indians who claimed citizenship were ethically obligated to assist the government. Despite their legitimate frustrations, he gave his and the Indian community's assistance to the Natal government. So also as a part of moral duty, he advised the Indian leaders to support the British government during World War I and to fight for India's Independence after the end of the war.

Spiritualisation of Politics

Gandhiji's doctrine of means justifying the end was manifested not only during the period of our freedom struggle but also in its application in India's internal politics. He was the first political leader of Modern India who made a serious attempt to spiritualise politics and establish an organic link between religion and politics. But by 'Spiritualisation' or 'religion' he did not mean any religious dogmas or fundamentalism. What he implied was the 'synthesis' of the values in all the religions. It is the 'rock-bottom' of fundamental morality. For Gandhi religion did not consist in worshipping God or reading a religious book; it encompasses all human activities. Religious life means identification with mankind. He regarded religion as self-realisation, suffering and sacrifice. On the otherhand, he challenged the traditional view of politics, power and the difference between public and private morality. He never believed in the Machiavellian sense of 'politics as an art of capturing power'. 'Politics and power' must aim at social reform and service to mankind. In this sense politics becomes as essential as religion. 'Today's politics encircles us like the coils of a snake from which we cannot escape, no matter how hard we try. The only way to wrestle with the serpent is to incorporate religion into politics,' Gandhiji felt. If politics is separated from faith, it is a corpse that should be burned. Thus religious virtue can guide the political actions in the right direction. But Gandhiji totally discarded the idea of 'state religion' or 'subordination of politics to religion'.

Value of Politics for Religious Man

Just as Gandhiji attempted to make politics religious, he also tried to make religion practically relevant for the society. He thought that the saint and the revolutionary are not incompatible. The saint must not become an escapist who

NOTES

refuses to act and renounces the society; the revolutionary should not be an opportunist who is ready to sacrifice principles. The true saint must be effective in society while the true revolutionary must possess the deepest integrity. According to him, just as religious values could purify politics, politics could play a positive role in spiritual perfection of an individual. Through politics, Gandhi agreed with Budha that one can serve the suffering humanity and purify himself. He brought into lime light the path of Karmayoga, or spiritual realisation through social action.

Thus Gandhiji, while emphasizing the importance of 'means' over 'ends' made an attempt to 'spiritualise politics' and establish a correlation between religion and politics. Every action of the individual is based on the single objective of achieving perfect result whether that is spiritual, economic, social or political.

5.3.11 Gandhi on Nationalism and Internationalism

Though Gandhi was a great nationalist in the sense that he deeply loved his country, he also had a humanist side to him, and he saw the welfare of the globe as equally vital, making him a true internationalist. Gandhi himself said "My mission is not merely the brotherhood of Indian humanity, my mission is not merely the freedom of India, through today it undoubtedly engrosses practically the whole of my life and the whole of my time. But through the realization of the freedom of India, I hope to realize and carry on the mission of the brotherhood of man".

Gandhi did not find any contradiction between the absolutely independent states and internationalism and asserted that an international league would become possible when all the nations, big or small, composing it were fully independent and learnt to live in friendship with each other. Gandhi desired for India to be free and strong so that she might willingly and completely dedicate herself for the sake of the world. To quote Gandhi "Just as the cult of patriotism teaches us today that the individual has to die for the family, the family for the village and the village for the district. The district for the province and the province for the country, even so a country has to be free in order that it may die if necessary for the benefit of the world. My idea therefore of nationalism is that our country may become free that if need be, the whole country may die so that the human race may live."

It is quite evident from the above views of Gandhi that he was a true internationalist. He placed a high value on serving his country, but he did nothing to harm the interests of other nations. He saw no conflict between nationalism and internationalism, and claimed that being an internationalist without being a nationalist was impossible. He said "It is not nationalism that is evil, it is the narrowness, selfishness, exclusiveness which is the bane of modern nations which is evil." According to a scholar who has made a special study of Gandhi, his ideal does not, make any contribution to the shaping of an institutional framework capable of keeping the peace despite national rivalries. The value of the ideal consists in the inspiration it may provide to any individual or nation willing to strive for it.

NOTES

5.3.12 Relevance of Gandhism

The relevance of Gandhian thought has always been a question in the minds of modern men. The essential postulates of Gandhism teach modern man with all his accentricity, hunger for power, knowledge, and technology of modern warfare. However, the current generation is not to fault for this. Gandhi was assassinated by Nathuram Godse, but Gandhism was assassinated by his successors for all time. Any concept of ideology that is not reinterpreted becomes obsolete in the present. In the case of Gandhism, the same thing happened. The post-independence era was dominated by the 'Nehruvian' model of political and economic growth, which marked a total departure from Gandhi's ideas. Above all the intellectual arrogance of Marxists and western liberals contribute more to the decay of Gandhism.

Gandhism, on the other hand, will never die. As we enter the twenty-first century, we are confronted with pollution, environmental degradation, and poverty as a result of industrialisation and high technology. There is also an increasing prospect of an arms race and terrorism, which is causing global discontent. In his book 'Hind Swaraj,' Gandhiji foresaw this predicament—the impending disaster—as early as 1909. Throughout his life, he warned against it and demonstrated how to avoid it by using truth and nonviolence. He referred to modern society as a "disease." He had made a prophetic statement two weeks before his death, stating that "this contemporary civilisation is such that one only needs to be patient and it will self-destruct." Considering the current global situation, from the possibility of nuclear war to environmental devastation, one must question Gandhiji's assertion. Gandhiji spoke for the establishment of internationalism and the peaceful coexistence of nations. Today, each of us is attempting to achieve Gandhi's goal.

5.3.13 Western Modernity of Gandhism

Gandhi seems to have had a thirst for modern-day ideas since he was a child. What compelled Gandhi, a 19-year-old historical figure, to travel to London to learn about? It was not a practical venture. For high-caste Hindus, travelling to foreign countries was considered prohibited, and Gandhi's caste elders proclaimed him an outcast. His intense desire to visit England, however, won out. He'd envisaged London as "the home of philosophers and poets, the very centre of civilization," he'd later say. Gandhi, when he was younger, was clearly eager to mingle with the modern world.

He considered satyagraha, a tactic of nonviolent, non-cooperation protest. However, this would only be successful if public opinion supported it, which would have been impossible without communication technology such as railways, telegraphs, and newspapers. Even the Dandi March to the Sea for the Salt Act, which would have been unthinkable without the sophisticated technology available at the time, would have been impossible.

He himself edited one newspaper with all the political struggle of his life and the movements were made against the Britishers and made it reach to the people to achieve the goal.

NOTES

Gandhi's critique of modernity and the West was largely based on the works of Westerners, as he admitted. Gandhi claimed to have "enjoyed respectfully to observe Tolstoy, Ruskin, Thoreau, Emerson, and other writers, barring the masters of Indian philosophy" when condemning modernity.

Though he had the moral and political authority to resist it if he so wished, Gandhi actively supported the appointment of unashamed modernizers and progressives like Jawaharlal Nehru and Babasaheb Ambedkar to key positions in the new Indian government after independence.

5.4 SIR SYED AHMAD KHAN

In 19th century British India, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was an Indian Muslim Pragmatist, Islamic reformer, philosopher, and educator. He was born on October 17, 1817 in Delhi. His original name was Ahamad Taqvi bin Syed Muhammad Muttaqi. He is primarily known for the Aligarh movement, which was a methodical movement led by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. The Aligarh movement intended to change the Muslim community's social, political, and educational components. In 1964, he established the scientific society with the goal of translating great works of science and modern art into Urdu.

5.4.1 Compulsions of his Times

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was born into a Mughal family with deep ties. He hailed from a well-known and well-respected family in the community. His father took great care to ensure that he had a good education. Within the court, he studied the Quran and Sciences during his infancy. In 1889, he received an honorary LLD from the University of Edinburgh.

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan's legacy was difficult because he was a Loyal Servant of the British administration prior to the Sepoy Mutiny in 1857. He even wrote a paper called *The Causes of the Indian Revolt* to explain the revolt's causes from a negative standpoint. Witnessing the near-annihilation of Muslim elites motivated him to take up the cause of Muslims, and his long career as an Islamic reformer and educator is a tribute to his commitment.

Looting of my house and loss of goods did not disappoint me during the revolt. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan expressed his dissatisfaction with the state of his 'qaum.' He considered leaving the country at first, but changed his mind afterwards. I gave up on the thought of emigrating and resolved to fight for the qaum's reconstruction.

Due to his family's close ties to the Mughal court, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan worn various hats, including civil servant, journalist, and historian. He was most well-known, though, for his pioneering role in improving Muslim educational prospects.

During the early age of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Muslims in India were socially, educationally and culturally backward. The Mughal empire came to an end with the collapse of the Revolt of 1857, and the British took over. During the Post-Sepoy Mutiny Period, Muslim society was in a condition of decline. The Muslim society, according to Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, is educationally, socially, and culturally

NOTES

backward. He attributed the deplorable situation of Muslim society to the current educational system. As a result, he founded a movement dedicated to the intellectual, educational, social, and cultural renewal of Muslim society. After Sir Syed Ahmad Khan established his school in Aligarh, which later became the movement's focal point, the movement became known as the Aligarh Movement..

As a result, the Muslims in India suffered a crushing defeat in the 1857 War of Independence. Because the British believed the Muslims were to blame for the anti-British rebellion, they subjected them to harsh punishments. The British introduced a new educational policy with dramatic modifications after deposing the Muslim kings from the throne. The programme outlawed Arabic, Persian, and religious education schools, and made English the official language as well as the medium of teaching. This engendered a negative attitude among Muslims toward all things contemporary and western, as well as a reluctance to take advantage of the new British regime's chances. If this trend had lasted for a long time, it would have been terrible for India's Muslim community. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan began his attempt to restore the spirit of progress within the Muslim community in India after observing his surroundings of hopelessness and pessimism. The conditions of Muslims at that time were:

- (a) **Economic Conditions:** Following the Revolt of 1857, the British authorities took their lands and gave them to non-Muslims. Muslims were forbidden employment in the government and civil service. Ink filling, taking water to the lavatory, dusting, and sweeping were among the chores performed by Muslims.
- (b) **Political Conditions:** In politics, Muslims were denied the right to participate in councils. In subjects pertaining to the Muslim community, they found their requests and reservations unheard. As a result, they began to despise the British for their anti-Muslim policies and adopted a resentful posture. As a result, the government failed to include the Muslim community in development programmes and initiatives.
- (c) **Educational Conditions:** Muslims were the ones that suffered the most in terms of education. They did not send their children to school because they believed English education was essentially anti-Islamic. They claimed the British were using English education to distract Muslim children's attention away from Islam. The boycott of schools resulted in the illiteracy of a whole generation within a few decades. Children from other villages, on the other hand, were educated and participated in practically every aspect of national life.

5.4.2 Collaboration with British

Prior to the Aligarh Movement, Muslims viewed any move or action taken by the government as a conspiracy against Muslims and Islam. This attitude put Muslims at odds with the British all of the time. When the British are in charge, they can do anything to damage Muslims. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan believed that the British would remain in India for a long time and that fighting them from a weak

NOTES

position would be fruitless. Any hypothetical Muslim insurrection would have resulted in retaliation far worse than the aftermath of the 1857 Indian Revolt. As a result, Muslims should eschew combative politics and instead become loyal subjects, according to Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. Muslims in India began to view Muslims as less antagonistic and friendlier as they began to cooperate with the British. As a result, Muslims have seen and experienced significantly superior treatment from the British. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was convinced that if Muslims did not want to be excluded from government positions and professions, they had no choice than to collaborate with the British. The Muslims' lives and property were safe in the British hands, and their religious freedom was unrestricted. He also saw that Muslims' wretched and awful situation stemmed from a lack of contemporary knowledge. He believed that contemporary education was the answer to all of Islam's problems. He advocated for English education for India's Muslim youth. He followed his son to England in 1869 to study English education at institutions such as Oxford and Cambridge University in order to keep a close eye on the English educational system.

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was also a critic of the Indian National Congress's policies, believing that the interests of Muslims and Hindus were diametrically opposed. He feared that once the British left, the Hindu majority would take control, which would be unfair to Muslims. Muslims, according to Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, had to have a good attitude toward the British and accept their educational system. To accomplish this, he had forged an alliance between Muslims and the British. To accomplish this, he did the following:

- (i) Wrote to India's loyal Muhammedans, demonstrating that Muslims were not traitors to the British and requesting that the British halt their enmity.
- (ii) Wrote a paper titled "Essay on the Causes of Indian Revolt," in which he outlined the causes of the 1857 uprising. This leaflet was distributed to British officials for free.
- (iii) Wrote a Tabyin-Zil-Kalam to show how Islam and Christianity are similar.
- (iv) The British Indian Association was founded.

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan argued that the Muslim community needed to acknowledge that the British were long-term rulers. Only by adopting a more friendly attitude toward the British could the Muslim position be improved. They needed to be more accepting of British ideas and to benefit from British education. As a result, he promoted English education as a means of regenerating Muslims in India. To do this, he began promoting western scientific education by establishing contemporary schools and magazines, as well as organising Muslim intellectuals. He stepped up his efforts to get Indian Muslims to cooperate with British authorities and to promote British Empire patriotism. In 1888, he founded the United Patriotic Association in Aligarh with Raja Shiv Prasad of Banaras to encourage political cooperation with the British and Muslim involvement in the British government. The Aligarh Movement was primarily concerned with

NOTES

demonstrating loyalty to the British government and providing Muslims with modern western education in order to compete with Hindus. He also attempted to promote a reinterpretation of Muslim thought in order to harmonise tradition and education in the West. In 1875, he founded Anglo-Oriental College, inspired by the functioning of British colleges. He has always believed that if Muslims wish to claim their full rights, they must be friendly with the British..

5.4.3 Avoidance of Imitational Politics

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan advised Muslims not to get involved in politics. In terms of political aspirations, he considered higher English education to be the most important factor in the upliftment of the Muslim population. He declined to endorse the National Muhammadan Association, a political organisation created by Syed Ameer Ali in 1887, and he also refused to attend the Muhammadan National Conference in Lahore, which he considered a political movement. He did not express any view about the Indian National Congress when it was created in 1885, but afterwards became an outspoken critic of the organisation and proclaimed his ardent opposition to it. He argued, however, that constitutional mechanisms such as involvement in administration should be used to express dissatisfaction with the British government. He backed Indian politicians Surendranath Banarjee and Dadabhai Naoroji in their fight for Indian representation in the government and civil service. He established the Muhammadan Civil Service Fund Association in 1883 to encourage and support Muslim graduates entering the Indian civil service. In the same year, he founded the Muhammadan Association to represent the Muslim complaints before the Imperial Legislative Council. In 1888, he and Raja Shiv Prasad founded the United Patriotic Association in Aligarh to seek political cooperation with the British and Muslim involvement in the British government.

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was an outspoken critic of the Indian National Congress's policies, believing that the interests of Muslims and Hindus were diametrically opposed. He was terrified that if the British left, the Hindu majority would take power and treat Muslims unfairly. Despite his sympathy for British injustice, he regarded Congress as a potentially dangerous organisation.

Syed Ahmad Khan's political career began after 1857, without a doubt. By uniting the people under the flag of Islam, he gave political leadership. He published a number of important works in effort to dispel the British public's mistrust about Muslims. He urged Muslims to be loyal to the government, and he begged the British to reconsider their policies, which would win the support of the country's largest minority.

He discouraged Muslims from joining the Indian National Congress. Sir Syed believed that the Congress was primarily a Hindu organisation dedicated to the defence of Hindu rights. He urged Muslims to first obtain a modern education before entering politics in order to safeguard their rights. Political involvement, he believed, would take Muslims' attention away from the productive job at hand and reignite British distrust. He offered the Muslim community an independent political voice, which aided its goal of gaining political power in India.

5.4.4 Social and Educational Reforms

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was an Islamic reformer and educator in British India during the nineteenth century. He is most recognised for his involvement in the Aligarh Movement. He spearheaded a systematic campaign in Aligarh that aimed to alter the social, political, and educational components of the Muslim community in India. The situation of Muslims in India was deteriorating after the First War of Independence ended in 1857. The Muslim society in India, according to Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, was educationally, socially, and culturally backward. He attributed the deplorable situation of Muslim society to the current educational system. As a result, he founded a movement dedicated to the educational and social regeneration of Muslim society.

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan realised that Indian Muslims' wretched and terrible situation was owing to a lack of contemporary education. He also felt that the development of modern education will solve all of Islam's problems. For the next generation of Muslims, he campaigned for English instruction. Sir Ahmad began promoting western-style scientific education by building modern schools and periodicals, believing that the rigidity of Muslims' orthodox worldview jeopardised their future. He was met with hostility by Muslims who were more orthodox. He conquered these challenges, however, with courage and insight. He advocated for women's education, the repeal of the purdah, and the development of a scientific society.

He founded Muradabad's Gulshan School in 1859, Ghazipur's Victoria School in 1863, and a Scientific Society for Muslims in 1864. The Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College, the first Muslim university in Southern Asia, was founded in 1875. Sir Syed's contemporary Madrasa was one of the first religious schools to offer scientific education. In Ghazipur, he also founded the Scientific Society to promote educational changes throughout the country.

When Sir Syed Khan arrived in Aligarh in 1864, he immediately began working as an educator. Ghazipur's Scientific Society was relocated to Aligarh. He gathered Muslim experts from all around the country, modelling Scientific Society after the Royal Society and the Royal Asiatic Society. The association organised annual conferences, donated funding to educational purposes, and published a scholarly journal in English and Urdu on a regular basis. He believed that Muslims' socioeconomic future was jeopardised by their orthodox opposition to contemporary science and technology. He wrote a number of books advocating for liberal, reasonable interpretations of Islamic scriptures.

On December 24, 1870, he began publishing the Journal *Tehzeeb-ul-Akhlaq* (Social Reformer) in order to promote reforms in Muslim society by spreading awareness and understanding about current themes. He attempted to create a reinterpretation of Muslim thought that would allow tradition and western education to coexist. His educational initiatives produced Muslim leaders in education, poetry, politics, and economics, among other fields. Aligarh College

NOTES

NOTES

graduates contributed significantly to the overall betterment of Indian Muslims' image. They also played an essential part in the evolution of society as a whole.

He saw that education was the most crucial instrument for Muslims to overcome their disadvantage and catch up to Hindus, particularly Bengali Hindus, who were at the pinnacle of political science at the time. He formed the Aligarh Literary Group, which was the first scientific society in the city. The society's principal goals were to translate western works of art and science into vernacular languages and to promote western education among Muslim populations.

He championed democratic values and freedom of speech while pushing for educational and social changes. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan is most known for founding the Aligarh Movement, a Systemic Movement aiming at improving the Muslim community's social, political, and educational dimensions. Aligarh Muslim University, the country's finest educational institution, was founded by him. He intended the college to be modelled after universities like Oxford and Cambridge. He also intended to establish a network of Muslim-run educational institutions, therefore he established the All India Muslim Educational Conference.

Without a doubt, he promoted English education as a means of regenerating Muslims in India. The orthodox Muslims were particularly outraged by his emphasis on science. He was confronted with opposition from traditional Muslims. He conquered these challenges, however, with courage and insight. He was instrumental in the Muslim community's educational advancement in India. Muslims received modern education, which they previously regarded anti-Islamic, as a result of the Aligarh Movement led by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. Poets, writers, orators, politicians, and other notables have come from Aligarh College and University.

Shan Muhammad writes in his political biography Sir Syed Ahmad Khan that Sir Syed was first and foremost an educationist and reformer, not an intellectual thinker.

5.4.5 Two Nation Theory

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan is credited as being the first to propose the idea of a separate Muslim nation on the subcontinent. In a lecture delivered in Meerut in 1866, he offered an overview of the post-colonial period, describing Muslims and Hindus as two countries. He is regarded as the founder of the two-nation doctrine. He saw that Muslims and Hindus could not coexist, thus he regarded Muslims as a separate nation and desired a separate state where Muslims could follow their Islamic way of life.

According to the 'Two Nation Theory,' Hindus and Muslims in India are two separate communities that could not coexist in a single state without oppressing and discriminating against one another, or without perpetual strife. It was the primary factor that led to India's split in 1947. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan will be remembered as the Muslim community's main pioneer in the growth of modern learning.

Sir Syed Khan was a great Muslim leader and a leading figure in India's Muslim community throughout the nineteenth century.

NOTES

Check Your Progress

I. Multiple Choice Questions

1. Which one of the following is written by Kautilya?
(a) Manusmriti (b) Arthashastra
(c) Republic (d) Politics
2. The Arthashastra of Kautilya is divided into _____ Adhikaranas.
(a) 10 (b) 12
(c) 15 (d) 18
3. According to Kautilya _____ is the head of the state.
(a) King or Swamin (b) Amatya
(c) Prime Minister (d) Philosopher King
4. Which one of the following is an element of state as stated by Kautilya in saptange
(a) The Swain (b) Amatya
(c) Durga (d) All these
5. In Arthashastra Kautilya mentions about _____ types of spies.
(a) 5 (b) 6
(c) 8 (d) 9
6. Gandhiji was born on _____ in 1869.
(a) January 15 (b) May 5
(c) October 2 (d) July 15
7. In the Year _____ Gandhiji entered into Indian Politics
(a) 1910 (b) 1915
(c) 1920 (d) 1922
8. Gandhiji does not believe in _____ of the following.
(a) Satyagraha (b) Non-violence
(c) Class struggle (d) Sarvodaya
9. Which one of the following is not led by Gandhiji?
(a) Noncooperation movement (b) Civil Disobedience movement
(c) Bhoodan Movement (d) Quit India Movement
10. Who first addressed Gandhiji as Mahatma?
(a) Tilak (b) Nehru
(c) Sarojini Naidu (d) R.N. Thakur
11. For Rural reconstruction Gandhiji recommended for organisation of _____.
(a) Block (b) District
(c) Taluk (d) Gram Panchayat
12. Who Published the magazine Tehzib-ul-Akhlaque?
(a) Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (b) Muhammad Ali Johar
(c) Muhammad Ali Shawkat (d) Shah Waliullah

NOTES

13. Who wrote an "Essay on the Life of Muhammad?"
 - (a) Syed Suleman Nadvi
 - (b) Muhammad Ali Jinnah
 - (c) Sir Syed Ahmad Khan
 - (d) Liaquat Ali Khan
14. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan used word 'Two Nations' first in
 - (a) 1866
 - (b) 1867
 - (c) 1968
 - (d) 1869

II. True or False

1. Kautilya is also known as Chanakya.
2. Arthashastra is a monumental work of Mahatma Gandhi.
3. Gandhi believes in Marxian class struggle.
4. Ramarajya is an ideal state imagine by Gandhi.
5. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan started Aligarh Movement.

III. Match the Following

- | (A) | (B) |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Kautilya | (a) Gram Swaraj |
| 2. Gandhi | (b) Aligarh Movement |
| 3. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan | (c) Arthashastra |

5.5 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

I. Multiple Choice Questions

1. (b)
2. (c)
3. (a)
4. (d)
5. (d)
6. (c)
7. (c)
8. (c)
9. (d)
10. (d)
11. (c)
12. (a)
13. (c)
14. (c)

II. True and False

1. True
2. False
3. False
4. True
5. True

III. Match the following

1. (c)
2. (a)
3. (b)

5.6 SUMMARY**Kautilya**

It is difficult to make a real estimate of Kautilya's contribution to political theory. His book the 'Arthashastra' speaks of principles of both conformism as well as changes, morality as well as immorality, spiritual power as well as political power (temporal power). So critics assail Kautilya for creating confusion in his political perception. Secondly, scholars like G.B. Bottazi and Hillebrant portray Kautilya as 'Machivelli of India'. It means Kautilya stands for 'double standard' and his concern for political power makes less bothered for morality and ethics. Deviating from the religious tradition of Dharmasastra he is criticised for "immoralising politics" for the sake of making the king powerful. Elements of rationalism and individualism are very much lacking in his political ideas. He has inherited the social order of four varnas having Brahminical supremacy. He has given so much importance to priestly system, prescription of Dharma, astrology that hardly he can be called secular.

Gandhi

Always a question lurks in the mind of the modern man with regard to the relevance of Gandhian thought. The essential postulates of Gandhism teach modern man with all his accentricity, hunger for power, knowledge, and technology of modern warfare. However, the current generation is not to fault for this. Gandhi was assassinated by Nathuram Godse, but Gandhism was assassinated by his successors for all time. Any concept of ideology that is not reinterpreted becomes obsolete in the present. In the case of Gandhism, the same thing happened. The post-independence era was dominated by the 'Nehruvian' model of political and economic growth, which marked a total departure from Gandhi's ideas. Above all the intellectual arrogance of Marxists and western liberals contribute more to the decay of Gandhism.

Gandhism, on the other hand, will never die. As we enter the twenty-first century, we are confronted with pollution, environmental degradation, and poverty as a result of industrialisation and high technology. There is also an increasing prospect of an arms race and terrorism, which is causing global discontent. In his book 'Hind Swaraj,' Gandhiji foresaw this predicament—the impending disaster—as early as 1909. Throughout his life, he warned against it and demonstrated how to avoid it by using truth and nonviolence. He referred to modern society as a "disease." He had made a prophetic statement two weeks before his death, stating that "this contemporary civilisation is such that one only needs to be patient and it will self-destruct." Considering the current global situation, from the possibility of

NOTES

nuclear war to environmental damage, one must consider Gandhij's assertion. Gandhiji spoke for the establishment of internationalism and the peaceful coexistence of nations. Today, each of us is attempting to achieve Gandhi's goal.

Nehru

Nehru was builder of modern India. His contributions to India is always memorable. In the mind 20th century, he was a prominent Indian nationalist prophet. His contribution to Indian nationalism was one-of-a-kind and groundbreaking. He laid secular foundation of Indian Nationalism. He was opposed to aggressive nationalism and he was regarded as a progressive nationalist.

His nationalism had cosmopolitan and international character. In international area he was one of the progenitors of non-alignment movement. He was the first leader in India who tried for promoting international outlook among the members of the Indian National Congress and his countryman. He justified his concept of Internationalism on the ground that without favourable international environment like peace, goodwill and mutual aid, no nation can grow or develop. He envisioned a world federation and world government, in which every nation will have free participation to resolve conflict and establish peace. His concept of Panchasheel or the five cardinal principles were to be the basis of International amity and understanding. He was also a secularist in his thought and action. He was a great individualist and attached great importance to the all-round development of the individual. His faith in individual naturally led to Nehru's faith in democracy. He was also strong supporter of democratic socialism. A careful perusal of the various ideas of Nehru shows that he adopted a liberal approach to be political and economic problems of the country and made no bid to involve new concepts of Political Science.

5.7 KEY TERMS

- **Kosha (The Treasury):** The treasury, or Kosha, is required for the security and upkeep of the state in general, and the army in particular.
- **Kautilya:** Kautilya was the first political scientist of ancient India and a great political philosopher.
- **Danda:** Danda is the law of punishment or science of government.
- **Sarvodaya:** The concept of Sarvodaya is one of the main foundations of Gandhian ideology and technique.
- **Nehruvian Model:** The Nehruvian model aspires for economic progress while maintaining social justice. Adequate output and employment must be supplied for all, and equitable growth possibilities must be offered for all.
- **Ramrajya:** An ideal State imagined by M. K. Gandhi.
- **Trusteeship:** A Socioeconomic philosophy propounded by M. K. Gandhi.
- **Hijrat:** Voluntary Exile.

5.8 SELF-ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short Type Questions

1. Arthashastra of Kautilya
2. Mandal Theory of Kautilya
3. Non-Violence of Gandhi
4. Gandhi on Sarvodaya
5. Aligarh Movement
6. 'Two Nations' Theory

Long Type Questions

1. Explain Kautilya's Theory of Kingship.
2. Discuss about organisation and functions of the State of Kautilya
3. Briefly discuss Kautilya's Arthashastra
4. Explain Gandhi's views on Ahimsa.
5. Discuss about Gandhiji's views on Satyagraha.
6. Explain Gandhi's idea on Swaraj and Sarvodaya.
7. Examine Sir Syed Ahmad Khan as Social reformer.

ACTIVITY

Provide two real-life examples to Prove how:

1. "King occupies an exalted position in Kautilya's Polity.", Comment on it.
2. "Kautilya's social order was founded on religious prescription", explain it.
3. "Ramrajya of Gandhiji", explain the term in your own words.
4. "Gandhiji believes in non-violence", explain in short.
5. "Two Nations" Theory of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan was root for Partition of India".

CASE STUDY

Always a question lurks in the mind of the modern man with regard to the relevance of Gandhian thought. The essential postulates of Gandhism teach modern man with all his accentricity, hunger for power, knowledge, and technology of modern warfare. However, the current generation is not to fault for this. Gandhi was assassinated by Nathuram Godse, but Gandhism was assassinated by his successors for all time. Any concept of ideology that is not reinterpreted becomes obsolete in the present. In the case of Gandhism, the same thing happened. The post-independence era was dominated by the 'Nehruvian' model of political and economic growth, which marked a total departure from Gandhi's ideas. Above all

NOTES

NOTES

the intellectual arrogance of Marxists and western liberals contribute more to the decay of Gandhism.

Gandhism, on the other hand, will never die. As we enter the twenty-first century, we are confronted with pollution, environmental degradation, and poverty as a result of industrialisation and high technology. There is also an increasing prospect of an arms race and terrorism, which is causing global discontent. In his book 'Hind Swaraj,' Gandhiji foresaw this predicament—the impending disaster—as early as 1909. Throughout his life, he warned against it and demonstrated how to avoid it by using truth and nonviolence. He referred to modern society as a “disease.” He had made a prophetic statement two weeks before his death, stating that “this contemporary civilisation is such that one only needs to be patient and it will self-destruct.” Considering the current global situation, from the possibility of nuclear war to environmental devastation, one must question Gandhiji’s assertion. Gandhiji spoke for the establishment of internationalism and the peaceful coexistence of nations. Today, each of us is attempting to achieve Gandhi’s goal.

Question:

1. “Two Pillars of Gandhism are truth and non-violence”. Examine.

5.9 REFERENCES

1. D. Mohanty (1997). 'Indian Political Tradition.' Anmol Publications.
2. N. B. Sen. (1965). 'Glorious Thoughts of Gandhi.' New Book Society of India.
3. J.K. Mehta. (1985). Gandhian Thought. South Asia Books.
4. Roy and Singh. (2011) Indian Political Thought: Themes and Thinkers. Pearson.
5. Chakrabarty and Pandey. (2009) Modern Indian Political Thought. SAGE Publications India.