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PLATO

Life and Times

Plato (427-347 BC), the first and foremost systemic political thinker and philosopher is known as Father of Idealism, presenting utopia in his political thought. However, he was first to write about political problems which he personally came across at a relatively young age of 20 years. It was he who first founded an Academy to teach the youth after he saw the poisoning of his teacher and mentor Socrates. Plato believed that Socrates possessed the highest Knowledge an individual could ever have, and was killed as punishment for political reason. This made Plato to believe that politics was dirty as to take the life of the noblest person he ever knew. This brought a turning point in his life. He quit participation in political discussion the way he used to do during Socrate’s life and opened the Academy to educate the youth on how to be good in search of truth through knowledge and justice.

Plato’s birth was eventful. He was born in around 427 BC in the City-State of Athens, Greece when city life was at its peak of its height comprising of Sophists and intellectuals such as Pericles, a great Athenian statesman and philosopher of Athens. Moreover, the Athens of that period was the highest form of democracy in its political system, while being surrounded by militarism and dictatorialism of neighboring city states. Moreover, Just after about 20 years of his birth there was a torturous war between Athens, his native land and Sparta, an oligarchical city-state, called the Peloponnesian War of 404 BC. The war ended with Spartan victory over Athens leaving Plato’s native land filled with humiliation and ruthlessness of a tyrannical victor who killed Socrates on political reasons. Ironically, when Plato and his friends had asked Socrates to escape from prison with their help, Socrates refused saying that he was prepared to die for the truth and drank the bowl of poison as punishment. Athenians democracy thus turned into tyranny. The youths of Athens had become completely demoralized in terms of fighting and learning the art of war and turned their interest towards acquiring knowledge in search of good. Plato was in the forefront of this emerging notion among the Athenian youth. This led him to establish the Academy to invite the youth imparting education to them for the search of truth and goodness through knowledge and justice. He wrote his famous treatise naming it The Republic Concerning Justice. He answered in this book his most demanding question: what is it that constitutes a state? Presented in dialogue form, the book deals with basically two topics of knowledge and Justice, but answers all questions of constituting a state elaborating his philosophy of Ideal State.

Plato belonged to a noble family of Athens. His early youth was spent in the company of those young men who were curious in search of knowledge and mostly spent their time in mastership of Socrates, who was an established scholar, thinker, and philosopher of that time. Plato remained under the influence of Socrates as much as his work on The Republic became intermingled with Socrates philosophy so much so that platonics thought has been called Platonic- Socrates. Plato spent a good period of time from his young age to maturity with Socrates. After execution of Socrates, he travelled outside Athens. He went to Syracuse where he was hired by the king, Dionysius I to teach his son, Dionysius II who was a young boy. Plato thought that he had got a good opportunity to prepare philosopher king of his own thought. But when he punished the young prince while teaching him discipline, the complaint reached the king who arrested him on this point. Plato having experience of Socrates execution escaped from the arrest and went back to Athens. He finally gave thought to teach the youth and opened the Academy. It was found that when Plato was in old age the young by Dionysis II who became the king of Syracuse invited a teacher from Plato’s Academy to make a constitution for his City-State. This implies the importance of Platonic education and also his philosophy of establishing a good state. Plato’s academy trained men in preparing statesmanship.
He gave knowledge with concept of bringing it into action, thereby making the teaching of philosophy an inspiration of one’s life. Plato wrote many books and among them his main philosophy is found in The Republic, The Statesmen, and The Laws. However his other two works, The Apology and The Crito were also important which dealt with The Individual and The State.

Plato was a firm believer of Ideal State which was constructed in his political thought making it ruled by the philosopher-king. He was a staunch enemy of oligarchy and democracy. To him the most poisoned element for a good state was political selfishness which was a common element in these two kinds of states. He believed in philosopher kings rule because with highest knowledge which is Virtue, the philosopher king will always remain a truthful and just ruler to bring good for the State. He also believed that if the state is good the people will become good. Therefore, an Ideal State is a perfect state having no political selfishness, either in the philosopher-king or in the guardian class who were to be associated with the philosopher-king to govern the State. He died at the old age of 80 in 347 BC leaving a legacy in his political philosophy which became the foundation of political thought in the West and ultimately for the universe. After him, there was no political philosophy which did not get influenced by Plato one way or the other.

Hence Platonic philosophy became foundation of governing the state system. Plato did not look upon the practicability of his political theories. He was interested to see what a good state should be, whether it could exist or not. That is why his philosophy is called Utopia. He remained an idealist realizing the need of his time to establish a state as an Ideal State which he could a perfect State.

Influence on Plato

In the study of Platonic philosophy there seems to be unity of influence upon him as regard to the similarities in his thought with other intellectuals. Prior to the rise of Platonic ideas the scholars and the philosophers seemed to be similar in ideas to what Plato presented in a broad sense. All are dialogues such Apology, the Crito, the Meno, the Symposium, the Republic, the Gorjas, the Laws and the Politics. We find that Plato is influenced by his time one way or the other, directly or in directly.

Plato wrote during the period of depression of Greek civilization. He looked for a formula with the application of which he could seek prevention in checking the forces of disintegration of Greek life. This led him to seek pessimistic estimate of human nature. It occurred to him that intellectual men are not trusted by the masses. Thus he believed that man is the worst animal having appetite and sensuality if he is unrestrained by philosophy reason or law. He even distrusted the philosopher king of his own making and therefore tried to ensure his efficiency and good behavior. He chained the philosopher king to a system of community of wives and husbands and deprived him with all economic power.

It is interesting to note that a man distrusted his own ideal rules in his own Ideal state; it is surprising that he condemns the ruler of majority in a democracy as Plato did. Plato like every philosopher was a child of his time and prisoner of his own experience. Throughout his writings he sought to combat the false notions and sophist propaganda. He also wanted to eradicate inefficiency in political administration by prescribing a functional categorization in which a man was to be restricted to a particular function for which he was fit by nature.

The second main influence on Plato has personal sources through Socrates which he embodied on one hand and the mathematical outlook of Pythagoras on the other which resulted in to the style of his academy. From Socrates he learnt that dialectical method of political studies and the rule of philosophy. These two proved in Plato the importance of constructive society based on virtue.

From Socrates Plato also learned that a law which enshrines reason and philosophy is a law from which none has a right to escape. Such examples Plato sought in his experience with the king of Syracuse Dionysus; similarly seeking experience with Socrates death Plato preached political obedience and saw
Athenian democracy an intellectual aristocracy based on primary source of intellectual snobbery of Socrates.

Similarly Plato owed much to Pythagoras. The Pythagoras doctrine of tripartite man formed throughout and Plato’s ideal state is nothing but an extension of Pythagoras doctrine into political and social sphere. Pythagoras division of human nature is transactional consisting of reason, courage and appetite. Plato on this tripartite origin in man added the principle of justice putting those three aspects of man for peace and harmony with each other. In other words Plato’s theory of justice was improvement and extension of Pythagorean doctrine of tripartite man. Further his association with mathematics was in perfect conformity of Pythagorean tradition. Plato’s belief in efficiency of the rule of the educated few and his faith in discipline in mathematics and education were the contribution of Pythagorean teaching.

The third influence on Plato consisting of the slave civilization was through his experience. The Spartan aristocracies and discipline became the model of the unquestionable bases of unhealthy society. Further his concept of and integrated political association made him confined to the small population and to the small territory with in the four walls of Greek city state. Moreover, like a true Greek, he refused to give ethics and politics any separated meaning. Society to him was at once political and moral that was because the Greek never conceived of an anti-thesis between individual’s morality and group morality. Hence Plato’s republic was primarily an ethical treatise and he gave its alternate title “concerning Justice” and like Greek, Plato believed that virtue is wisdom and can be imparted through education.

Plato’s concept of family life is also a personal influence of the environment where he was born and brought up. He belonged to an aristocratic family atmosphere based on primitive romanticism. He had immense respect for ancient traditions and myths based on wisdom as an instrument for the better world that is why we find that in his political writings he yearned for the past. He wanted to save the past from the degeneration of the present and his aim was to defend the idea of the city. State remained as an independent, political, economic and social unit. Hence he appears to be a radical as well as a conservative which was an influence that he derived from the family surroundings. Move over, the moderate and mixed constitution Plato advocated to Solon in his the Laws was a direct influence of his family which took pride in being connected with, an ancestor. Similarly Platonic “Apostle” reveals how the rich environment of his family life has got another influence the philosopher in making him conscious about money matters. Thus above the study of Platonic Philosophy shows it has deep roots into the different influences of his life.

Methods of Plato

In the study of political science and political theory different methods have been used by the scholars and philosophers. These are known as the methodology or style of philosophers based on their experience, understanding and analysis on the basis of the competitive method, method of agreement and differences, joint methods of agreement and differences. Deductive and Inductive methods of reasoning have been developed.

It is interesting to note that Plato altogether developed peculiar methods of his own, as he presented a peculiarity in his philosophical and political ideas. In general, certain methods to study social sciences have been used which oppose each other. For example, in history of modern political science we use methods of observation, empirical analysis through hypothesis and unification.

As suggested above in Plato there appears the following foundations of methodology. First by the use of deductive method Plato develops his theory proceeding from ideal or universal to the particular. He also used inductive method which was based upon the quality of the individual.

Second, his method was historical where in his book The Republic he presented a possible historical evolution of a state through four main stages which were:
1. Stage of speech  
2. Stage of Government  
3. Economic independence of man  
4. Stage of War.

Third, his method was analytical also where he divided the state into different classes to find out the more reasonable of them for the art of government for which he analyzed the traditional concept of man and society.

But in particular sense Plato has the method which was Platonic which followed the traditional Greek pattern of conversation and agreement in a dialogue form through the forums of supposed dramatic performance. Therefore his entire work with the exception of two is in the form of dialogue. These dialogues are a continued search of truth developed through intellectual concept and exercise. In other words these are thoughts in action where particular men in society are presented with such methods which are called the society on their own. Therefore Plato used a dialogue form like Socrates.

At the later stage the dialogue method to interpret history was used by philosophers like Hegel and Marx who were influenced by the dialogue of Plato. Like Plato Hegel and Marx implied a technique of dialectical conflict in order to arrive at the truth. Thus the dialectical method used by them was based upon the logical principles of contradiction for the principle of true and false.

Plato in this method also used another particular aspect that was analogy and myth e.g. he expressed his argument based upon myth and used them as classification. In ideal state he compared the soldiers and auxiliaries with watchdogs who loved their own people and guard them.

Plato also used teleological methods. Using this method Plato believed that ideal is real whereas actual is imperfect hence not real. The ideal state is the real state whereas the existing state is imperfect and therefore is not real stated. Thus Plato believed that the real state must resolve towards these ideas. From this ideal or this perfection Plato thinks of the purpose behind every state and everything. He believed that anything such as state, love, animal, and music is purpose to teleological.

Finally an interesting point in Plato method is that it is Utopian. Plato is not interested to describe the state as it is or it has been rather he is interested to express what a state should be. He is interested in the discovery of ideal. To him, the ideal state is the perfect idea of state. In his books, The Republic, The Statesman and The Laws, there is conversation of persons in search of the perfect idea of the state. His inquiry is for the sake of ideal, for understanding the true nature of the city state and not for showing such things which can exist in fact. Therefore, his philosophy exists in imagination and is nowhere found in actual sense.

As far as his methods of study are concerned we find two outstanding contributions of Plato. First, he advanced the Socrates method of dialogue thereby directing Hegel and Marx and their way of approach. Second, he gives his own teleological method thereby indicating Aristotle, Dante and Green in their peculiar development of philosophical advancement.

**Virtue is Knowledge**

The Republic of Plato does not fit into any of the categories either of modern social studies or modern science. Its range of subject matter is such that it said to deal with the whole of human life. It has to do with the good man and good life in a good state and what these are and how can they be attained.

The Republic is not a treatise of any sort nor does it belong to politics, economics, ethics or psychology but it includes all these and more like art, education and philosophy Plato wrote about these
sciences which he did not know that these will be assigned to the nation or the citizens. During his time in
the city state life itself was not classified and sub-divided so much as it now is. All activities of men were
connected with citizenship. According to Plato’s belief citizen’s religion was a religion of state and his art
was civic art. They could not be a sharp separation of this question which is faced today.

Plato tried to give a solution in his thought. The fundamental idea of the Republic came to Plato in
the form of his masters doctrine “Virtue is Knowledge” This came from his own unhappy political experience
and to be founded the Academy to bring a spirit of true knowledge in his fellowmen believing that man is
the foundation for a philosophical statecraft.

The implication that “Virtue is Knowledge” gives us the idea that good is known by rational or logical
investigation rather than by intuition, guess work or luck. Plato says that the good is objectively real. What
anybody thinks about it, it ought to be realized not because man wanted it but because it is good. From this
follows that the man who knows philosophers, scholars and scientist ought to have decisive powers in
government which entitles him to do this?

It appears from analysis that association of man with man in the society depends upon mutual and
reciprocal needs and the resulting exchange of goods and services consequently, philosopher’s claim to
power is only important case for what is found wherever man lives together namely any corporate enterprise
depends upon everyone attending taking a part in the work. In order to know what sort of work is essential,
Plato thinks that it could only be done by the philosopher as he possess virtue which depends in two factors.

1. Natural Aptitude
2. Training

The first one is naturally inherent and the second is the matter of experience and education. In
other words, it depends upon best human capacity and to develop it by the best education. Therefore,
Plato’s theory is divisible in to two main points.

1. The government ought to be an art depending upon exact knowledge.
2. The society is mutual satisfaction of needs by persons whose capacities are dependable upon
each other.

Justice

The word Justice has a wider expression than used in English meaning. We think of Justice and
Injustice as qualities displaced in the exercise of judicial or administrative functions.

To Plato, Justice is very near to morality. According to him, it is the disposition which makes a man
refrains from an act recommended by desire or by his apparent interest through obedience to a belief which
he ought not to perform.

Plato raises the issue of Justice over the question of what is supreme rule of right or code of morality
by which a man should regulate his life. Therefore, question arises in what way Justice is better than
injustice. The answer was tried by Socrates who wanted to discover the nature of Justice through the matter
of large letter that is the state. He tried to find out Justice and morality in the individual by discovering Justice
in the state. But Plato believes otherwise that Justice is to be found form the small letter, in the individuals.

Plato reviews different traditions on Theories of Justice for these purposes which are the following:

1. Cephalous: He believes that justice or morality means being true in word and deed and paying
one’s debt.
2. Thrasymachus: he looks at Justice by not believing it to be a moral obligation. To him right and Justice is the interest of the stronger. Since the stronger is the sovereign, his act and right is just.

3. Gloucon: in his view, morality is a good thing only because it serves the external end and therefore is just.

4. Adeimantus: to him justice is giving a man his due without moral consideration. Plato dismisses all these theories and like Socrates tries to discover the true nature and habitation of Justice because for him, Justice is the only remedy against political and social evils of the city state. He separates justice from the Ideal state because for him Justice is the soul and the ideal state is the body. Justice is the condition of every virtue of the state and justice of the state is the citizen’s sense of duty. Therefore, Plato’s concept of Justice does not embody a conception of individual's right rather it consists of individual's duties.

The justice of individual means that each of his three elements i.e. appetite, spirit and reason are kept within proper bounds. It is therefore both, public and private virtue because it preserves the highest good of the society and of the individual. Therefore, to Plato, a member of the society as an individual shows justice by performing his assigned duties perfectly.

An individual exhibits justice by keeping each of the three elements of his soul in its right place i.e. appetite, spirit and reason, where he exhibits all the virtues of wisdom, courage and self-control when occasion demands it. The individuals must be good in all things. By having virtue or excellence he should become an expert like architect. When individual becomes just and has justice then it holds all men together in a healthy social relationship by making them good and social.

Plato in his concept of Justice talks about two kinds of justice. They are as follows:

i. Legal Justice or Particular Justice
ii. Perfect Justice or Universal Justice

The legal or particular Justice is raised on law in a non-ideal state. It has no perfection which is ensured by wisdom of a true king i.e. Philosopher King. The perfect or universal justice can only be obtained in an ideal state which is based on right education, principle of communism, functional specialization and perfect wisdom of philosopher king.

In short, his concept of justice is based upon.

1- Recognition of three classes i.e.
   (i) Ruler representing reason
   (ii) Soldiers representing spirit
   (iii) Workers representing appetite

2- State regulated scheme of education
3- Organization of state in functional specialization i.e. one-man-one work.
4- Freedom of philosopher king from labor.
5- Unselfish interest of guardians through communism of property and family.
6- Emancipation of women
7- Service and devotion to the state

In this way Plato obtained his Justice as a perfect but not legal concept.

**Criticism on Justice**

It is not justice because self-control and devotion are moral principles and have no legal sanction behind them.
Plato does not visualize any safety from clash of individual will and conflict between one interest and the other. It is based upon functional specialization but it ignores its evils. For example, it does not sufficiently and properly recognize the wholeness of the human potential. He separates three elements in men and thinks that man can live only on reason, spirit and appetite which does not seems to be natural. He assigns ruling power to one class i.e. philosopher king. Such monopoly of political power in the hands of one class will is bound to demoralize that class sooner or later and thus corrupt the state.

Communism

In Plato’s philosophy, the theory of communism has been largely misunderstood as compared to any other of his ideas. Many writers on Plato believe that his concept of communism meant only a community of wives and property which was a system in which the guardians of the Ideal state were supposed to be holding their wives and property in common. Such writers including eminent scholars like Barker, Nettle and Jowett have unfortunately given inadequate description of Plato’s theory of communism leading to widespread misunderstanding.

With the concept of communism of family and property he ignores the essentials of human psychology. A man can forget the loss of his father but cannot forget the loss of his property. The communism of wives would make the society morally corrupt. It denies satisfaction to the fundamental desire of the human soul. It makes too demanding on the devotion of an individual to his state and therefore, it is unrealizable.

In fact, Plato’s theory of communism does not imply communism of wives and property rather it has four folds of implications.

1. It is not a community of wives but a community of family. It is as much communism of husbands and children as community of wives.

2. It is not community in possession but community in use. The philosopher guardians do not own anything either collectively or individually. For example the food thus used in common is not collective possession but a free gift extended to them to use not to own. It means they do not own property whether collectively or individually.

3. Community of education is wrong to suppose that it is spiritual and his theory of communism is materialistic. Both are different to each other. Rather it will be correct to say that Plato’s education was a part of communism. Both male and female guardians have to live in equal and same community life. In the republic he gave an organic theory in which his education is a part of his justice.

4. Plato’s communism is a community in function. There must be functional equality between male and female guardians and they must equally discharge their duties of governing the state.

By communism Plato never meant collective ownership. He only meant equality between men and women, who have the capacity to rule. It is an equality which has four main directions.

1. In family status.
2. In the use of property
3. In education
4. In functions.

When Plato used the word “communism” he in fact meant community which means equality, similarity, community and identity. Therefore his theory of communism is a theory of these four elements between the male and female guardians, who must exercise joint partnership in governing the state.
Platonic theory of communism is based upon his idea of achieving goodness by seeking good morality among the people. He believed that men and women by nature are selfish enough to struggle for their personal gain and comfort. Such selfishness leads to the second stage of guardians. To kill the instinct of selfishness among both male and female guardians, he altogether desired to abolish the institution of family and property because to him they were the real roots of selfishness and thus morality. Along with it, he further believes that the other means of remedies to such selfishness could be through seeking knowledge and discipline, which will lead to establishment of good society with good morality. He also believes that involvement of the people of guardian class along with the workers, in defined functions of their duties towards the state would make them continuously engaged towards the goodness of the state. Hence for seeking justice that is good act of morality, Plato advocates the formation of such a healthy state which comprised of a proper institutionalized society where justice could be maintained and good could be achieved. With this belief Plato advocates his theory of particular community to be formed for achieving justice and goodness.

His theory of communism was considered to be misleading and inaccurate considering it responsible for confusion and misunderstanding. His critiques believed it to be something of joint ownership, which was never a theme of Plato. On this ground his community was even compared to that of modern communism. Plato never advocates joint ownership rather he desired joint partnership or joint fellowship where the female guardians have everything in every way up to their power with the male guardian in the Ideal state.

Further his theory was not communistic in essence and it is a misleading belief that it was meant for entire community because it was directed exclusively for regulating the activities of the guardians of the Ideal State. In short, it could be better called a theory of philosophic fellowship.

His theory of communism has been criticized by his student, Aristotle with particular reference to abolition of family. Aristotle condemned it as a creation of immoral and corrupt state. Aristotle believes that abolition of property could lead to further deterioration of individual’s enthusiasm.

However, Plato’s theory of communism has a novel approach in search of good and seeking good act of morality for making a state a just state. He was interested in perfection of state and for that he desired perfection of citizens for which to him its means was communism.

**Education**

The main function of the state is to positively help the individual in discharging satisfactorily his duties of citizenship so that the individuals are fit mentally and physically. Plato distributes functions and offices according to man’s nature which to him was justice and can only be given through education. Thus to Plato, education was a means for attaining the ends and that is how he makes connection between Justice and education.

His education is the education of individual citizen because through education he tried to discover the individuality of man. He also believed that a healthy mind should be in a healthy body. Therefore, there must be parallel development in man that is his physique and intellect. His theory of education takes into account both mental and material conditions. It is not a process of introducing ideas and qualities into the mind rather it is like turning the mind’s eye towards the light.

Therefore, Plato gives a detail description of his theory of education considering it essential for individual and state, controlled with a uniform system for all the citizens. It does not mean that a producer must be equally educated with a philosopher king. It simply means that different stages of education must be integrated into one system under direct auspices of the state. Men and women are to be given the same
and equal education because women perform the same function as men and education is training in the art of citizenship. Women are to be educated not to be good caretakers of the family but to become good citizens of the state.

Education along with the training of mind and body also performs the tasks to uphold the basic principles of the state. Plato gives education to teach the rule of philosophy and justice. Plato’s scheme of education is exclusively meant for those who are to be ruler of the Ideal State. Therefore, art of citizenship is defined with the art of ruling through Plato’s education.

Plato divides the guardians into two main sections as follows:

1. The auxiliaries
2. Perfect guardians

The scheme of education is also divided into two main stages and they are:

1. The guardians being equally trained in the art of military training.
2. The perfect guardians are trained further.

Thus in the first stage the element of spirit is developed and in the second stage there is development of reason in mind or perfect guardians.

His scheme of education is arranged into different stages. In the first stage, music and gymnastic are the prior concern of education. In the second stage mainly meant for auxiliaries from early childhood to the age of twenty years beginning with storytelling & fables. Here training is for mature years confined to the perfect guardians alone, where, with gymnastic, the teaching science and psychology with mathematics are prescribed. Plato recommends teaching of mathematics and astronomy geometry from the age of twenty to thirty.

After the completion of training to guardians, they are further taught psychology till the age of thirty-five, where teaching is done which is self-taught for understanding the principle of being and becoming. At the age of thirty-five the guardian is made who must not only believe but think himself. He may possess pure reason for understanding reality and guardian action. The directing mind must understand the forces of process and must be capable of independent thinking for deciding actions. At the age of thirty-five the perfect guardians will dedicate themselves for fifteen years for services of the state. After that they must be allowed the status of elder statesmen.

Criticism on Education

It has been pointed out that Plato’s theory of education is unjust and artificial. As far as, the class of producers is concerned Justice and morality to no prevail. Plato does not allow education to them and deprives compulsory education for the bulk of society.

In his stages of education he creates a complication not realizing the psychological conditions of the childhood and creates a fix pattern for all. In his scheme of education between men practical reason and his speculate reason is not considered. The result is perpetual shift from one to the other.

Plato gives a uniform system of education controlled by the state. This may not develop any efficient thinking in the younger generation. They will learn what are taught and will end up as a machine. Still credit goes to Plato that he at least set a pattern for the method of education and training.
Ideal State

The Republic of Plato is interpreted as Utopia where he has portrayed on Ideal but unattainable state. The objective of Ideal state was the good life. The Republic is Utopia because he depicted in it a state which was primarily an embodiment of the idea of good. He wanted the future statesman (ruler) to know what was good and how to construct a good state. Therefore, his Ideal state was meant to be a state, as such a type or model for all places and for all times. He did not worry about practical ability rather tried to show what in principle and theory a state ought to be Plato believed that an ideal state could be constructed as an artist sketches an Ideal picture. Since ideal picture is not a reality, he did not bother whether his state is capable of ever becoming a reality.

He meant to examine conditions which influence actual life and diagnosed the disease of the city state and prescribed his own cure for them. The cures suggested were as follows:

1- The sovereignty of reason that is different from aptitude and some kind of remarkable work done by one-man is better than others.
2- The second cause is that skill is gained when men work steadily at which they are naturally fit because without natural aptitude, there is no specialization. Those then are the human forces upon which the society and with it the state has to rely. Therefore Plato creates a perfect harmony in the society, embracing three classes of people i.e. the workers, the soldiers and the rulers. These three classes perform three functions and create three kinds of men who are fit by nature according to their aptitude and training.

Constitution of ideal state

As the head of Plato’s ideal state is philosopher king (ruler) who is above passion and prejudice, he represents virtue in action and his wise and beneficial rule is above the control of law.

Plato advocates a regular or consistent supply of philosophers for which he recommended a state regulated scheme of education in his Ideal state. This scheme of education will not only train and educate guardians but also help in making of the capable from the incapable which will confine men’s interest for the state.

Plato proposed his Ideal with the following points:

1. Guardian class comprising of philosopher king, auxiliaries and soldiers with functional specialization.
2. Classification of citizens based upon vocational (professional) specialization.
3. Emancipation of women by making them equal to men.
4. Abolition of private family and property for the guardians
5. Censorship of art and literature
6. Rule of philosopher king.

Plato’s Ideal state is absolute and totalitarian. There is hardly a sphere of life, mental or spiritual which the state does not touch and regulate. Therefore, Plato is not an apostle of freedom of thought and association. Through communism he desires to seek unity of the state and through education he finds the only true way for the permanent stability of the state because education means to shape human nature in the right direction to produce a harmonious state.

Criticism on Ideal State

Plato’s ideal State is autocratic being occupied by philosopher. It was too much collectivistic to allow full freedom to all faults of human mind. Aristotle criticizes his Ideal Stat on various grounds. To him,
Plato’s communism of family is the most intolerable, corrupt immoral and unworkable theory. It is also against the very nature of human beings.

In the modern age, there is a debate that only wisdom cannot run the government. Also wisdom may not necessarily get particular power because it is not like specialized skill. Plato maintained that wisdom consists of the knowledge of good. But what is good or what is bad depends on the general interest of the people which may differ widely. If wisdom can form good constitution by a wise king then what will happen if the king is a fool as such examples are found in history because the rulers committed serious errors. Thus, Plato’s believe in wisdom defined by him for a ruler in Utopia. The use of wisdom in the present political society is taken up by the process of democratic society, which ensures the rule supported by the wishes of the masses through elections.

Philosopher King

Platonic Ideal State is an aristocratic state. Plato believed that all men did not possess an equal capacity for virtue and therefore all were not entitled to participate in the function of government on the basis of capacity. Those who possessed this capacity should rule over those who did not possess it. Therefore, government in the ideal state, according to Plato, should be entrusted to person’s possessing supreme wisdom which meant that Plato advocated the concept of government of the elite i.e. by the few highly trained experts.

Plato emphasized that until philosophers were kings with political greatness and wisdom, cities will never have rest from evils. With philosopher King the state would have a possibility of life and would hold the light of the day.

The concept of rule of philosophy or the philosopher king is the most original and profound of all Platonic concepts. As Plato emphasizes that government should necessarily be entrusted to a few highly trained experts, he gave principles that there is necessity for sufficient qualifications for the function of government which is based upon superiority or virtue. This requires abilities of peculiar kind which can be found only in a small number of men. Plato assumes that philosophic nature can be found only among the ranks of gentry and not among peasants and artisans. This is why he excludes the class of producers, which is the largest in the state, from his scheme of education.

Plato’s rule of philosophy is described as despotic or absolute rule of the philosopher king. It is absolute in the sense that it is not bound or limited by any written laws. It is not responsible or even responsive to public opinion. The masses have no share in it. They have no voice in determining the policy of the state. They only submit to the decisions taken by the ruling elite. Moreover, the citizens submit themselves to the care and guidance of the philosopher king in the same way as the patient surrenders to his doctor, after having once decided to put himself under his treatment. Plato frequently drew a comparison between the government and an art.

Plato’s rule of philosophy is also considered to be not an unqualified absolutism. For example, the Platonic given moral qualities which characterize the philosopher king are the most unlikely to make his rule oppressive and look like despotic. Plato had a clear concept of the end to be achieved and of the principle on which philosopher king has to realize it. The Philosopher king has love of truth which includes all the virtues forming part of the perfect human nature. It includes the passion for reality and the desire to know everything worth knowing. A truly philosophic nature would exhibit complete self-control and free from hatred, meanness etc. Moreover, it would more obviously be just also. In Plato’s mid the philosophic element is essentially the human element. It is what makes a man truly human. Thus Plato believed that such a philosophic nature is fit to rule which may not be despotic or tyrannical rule.
Plato excludes written law and public opinion from his Ideal state with certain reasons. He does not have which rather it is demanded by free of logic. The validity of the presumption with which Plato starts are:

1- The identity of virtue with knowledge.
2- The distinction between real and scientific knowledge and belief or opinion.
3- The superiority of scientific knowledge over belief or opinion takes for granted that the whole structure of Plato’s Republic with its philosopher king at the top does not need public opinion and written law because Plato gives specialist training to develop intelligence in his guardians. Therefore, his argument in support of the Philosopher king is interesting towards a logical conclusion.

Criticism on Philosopher King

There have been a number of criticisms on Plato’s concept of rule of philosophy. Aristotle rejected this idea completely and gave no room to philosopher king in his Ideal state. But it is also seen that Platonic theory is given universal application with the view that government is a difficult art and requires a specific education and training. To support this view, one can say that democracy of today could be a complete failure without education and training of those who take up the state administration without having trained reason to solve the problems of state and administration.

Plato realizes that unless politicians, power and reason are united together, or unless statesmanship is combined with profound wisdom and education, states will never he safe from evils. The principle with which Plato states seems to be right as reason should rule and society should be governed with real knowledge. The defect lies in the application of this principle with Plato. No group of individuals should be permanently debarred from participation in the exercise of political authority.

The rule of philosophy on the other hand, assures the union of reason and political power in the highest organ of the state. On the other hand, with it Plato puts an emphasis on class war from which states have suffered at all times. Class war results if the ruling power abuses political power and uses it for its own selfish interests. Through rule of philosophy it is bound to be eliminated from a society where the rulers are taught and trained to advocate themselves to the services of community and where people are promoted in public services to carry on their responsibility. Plato conditions his philosopher king and guardians to get away with their private pleasures and to devote themselves to the common good which is their highest and truest happiness.

He asks the philosopher king and guardians to surrender everything to the state. If they have political power it is at the sacrifice of their personal interest like the desire of wealth, bodily pleasure and family life. On the other hand, he also asks the economic class to surrender political power and to lose civil liberties. However, his concept of philosopher king is novel but impracticable for modern world.

Classification of Citizens

It is interesting to note that three classes advocated by Plato for his Ideal state are influence of Pythagoras. According to his doctrine, there are tripartite requirements of the human being divided into three classes. For example man has three requirements:

1- He must fulfill his basic physical needs
2- In satisfying them, he must be wise and must have good counsel.
3- His decision must result in action.

In other words, a man to be a man must eat, must deliberate and must act. To ensure these three functions in Plato’s concept appears that man’s soul has been endowed with three corresponding faculties:

1- Appetite
2- Spirit
3- Reason

Appetite is ingrained in man from his birth. Gradually he develops spirit and lastly reason. Therefore, by the time, he seeks reason his personality is fully developed. To Plato the best man is he whose actions and appetite are governed by his rational faculties. Reason is the best of the three aspects of soul and is destined to become the natural master of the other two. Hence, that man is natural whose passion, prejudice, appetite, desire, action and enthusiasm are controlled by his reason. If a man whose appetite and desire controls his action and take the best part of his reason, is the most un-natural person.

Plato with this concept transplanted the whole system of human soul into the life of human society since Ideal State is an extension of ideal man who is characterized by the rule of reason. He believed that if these distinctive qualities of representation of soul make man natural, the life and society in the ideal state will become natural.

According to Plato, as in the case of individual, a state has three basic needs as well:

1- Productive i.e. appetite
2- Protective i.e. spirit
3- Deliberative i.e. reason

To fulfill these needs in an efficient manner, Plato suggests three specialized classes or professionals:

1- The producing or labor class
2- The military or auxiliary guardians
3- The most reasonable class of guardians i.e. Philosopher King.

The producing class is the earliest followed by the warriors and then the philosopher. Therefore, the best state is that where the producing and fighting classes are governed by philosopher king, who has the faculty of reason. Since the state is the creation of man, it must have a logical affinity which it creates. Hence, Plato concludes that the state is at once an economic, military and rational organization of man.

1- The Philosopher Class

It consists of those persons of community of reason by virtue of which it is distinct to be the natural ruler of the ideal state. The function of reason is to know and love. The philosopher knows the citizens and their interests best and therefore, he loves them and pursues their interest for the interest of community. Hence, kings are philosophers and under them citizens will never be evil because with his reason and wisdom he will bring out the final salvation of mankind with rationalization. He has the natural right to govern and also with his education and training he has natural capacities to rule. In other words, Plato advocated the rule of reason and therefore, the divine right of the philosopher king is to rule. His ideal state thus becomes an intellectual aristocracy. He exhibits that:

1. Philosopher king is the supreme legislature
2. He is lover of wisdom
3. He rules the ideal state through his reason.
4. He is like a fort to safeguard guardians.

Plato also learned that most people are unreasonable and are governed by desire and appetite.

2- The Auxiliary Guardians and the Military Class.

The second sociological pattern of the Platonic system is that corresponds to spirit and courage, in the guardian class. It is military service of the Ideal State that consists of persons who are filled by nature to guard the city. As an ideal man possesses spirit or action, he becomes an ally of reason and carries the dictates of reason. Thus in the ideal state the military class serves the philosopher king. Hence, these two classes are similar and together constitute the guardian class. The military guardians receive an education
like philosopher guardians but do not get education on mathematics, philosophy and psychology. Philosopher guardians are chosen among military guardians and philosopher king is from amongst a very few of the philosopher guardians. Further, they are also similar in respect of being in line to a system of wives and property.

They differ are different in the way that philosopher guardians decide the policy of the state and military guardians execute it. The philosopher guardians have the supreme knowledge of the idea of good whereas, the military guardians have a vague notion of the good. The philosopher king contemplates and directs, whereas the military guardians implement and act. In short, reason pre-dominates the mind of philosopher guardians and influences, the military guardians.

3- Producer Class

It constitutes the last ingredient of the social set up in the Platonic ideal state. Historically, it is the first class to come into existence as it is an association of men united on the basis of economic necessity by comprising all productive forces such as land, labor and capital.

The state is primarily an economic organization; it finds its fulfillment in being simultaneously a military and rational one. It is laboring class in the ideal state consisting of farmers, builders, cobblers, weavers, instrument makers, physicians and traders, who fulfill the economic needs of the community under the principle of specialization. These groups of labor class maintain a division of labor. It means every individual sticks to a specific aspect of production for which his nature best fits him for seeking full satisfaction.

In Plato’s Ideal state, economic class represents the element of appetite. It is incapable of higher function of guarding the state but it is the main material springing from physical wants. The productive class constitutes the greatest bulk of population and must be prosperous economically. Family and property are not denied to this class by Plato.

Since Plato believed that ideal is a weapon for understanding the actual, he in his ideal state maintains these three classes based on deliberative, protective and productive categories for the principle of justice.

Oligarchy and Democracy

Plato’s theory of government is an attempt of the realist, in Plato, where he desired to free himself from idealism. His theory of government is in his book The Republic and not in The Laws which indicates that he has proceeded from idealism to realism earlier than where he wrote the Laws. He realized that idealist points the ideals but the realist hesitates to believe upon its universal validity. Similarly, reason point towards an ideal indeed but at the same time the experience points to another direction.

Plato tried to reconcile the idealist and the realist is as to compromise between reason and experience. Consequently, the realist gained ground and the idealist was pushed into the background. This conflict with in Plato came out with different forms of government and among them were Oligarchy and Democracy.

1- Oligarchy

Plato’s idea on Oligarchy changed from time to time. In the republic, it is described as a government based upon the appetite of a few rich persons and is a perversion of autocracy. In the politics, oligarchy is believed to be aristocracy gone wrong and is based neither on consent nor on law but on the ruling oligarchs. In The Laws it is sometimes declared worst form of government incapable of any improvement.
However, Plato’s idea in the Republic may be regarded as repetitive. In this sense, Oligarchy is a form of government represented by the wealthy and for the wealthy. It is a commercial government based upon the explicit action of the poor and the rich. In such form of government rights and offices become things to be bought and sold. The poor are debarred from every right of participation in the affairs of the state and it is based upon the condition of property.

Such form of government by nature is inefficient because offices and responsibilities are restricted to on any one, having sufficient sum of money and property, but not on those who have the capacity to fill those offices on merit.

The basic principle of Oligarchy is wealth. Such government can seldom achieve external harmony of the state because it creates a division between have and haves not. In an oligarchy, therefore every state becomes two in one i.e. the state of rich and the state of poor. Such state is militarily weak because the ruling oligarchy cannot muster sufficient confidence from the general body of the state population.

Ruling oligarchs are neither rulers nor servants of the state. They are only group of commercially minded capitalists holding and utilizing political power for profit and riches. All oligarchies are full of crimes because in it almost all persons are beggars and paupers, except the ruling circles. The oligarchs themselves are money minded capitalists, who regard wealth above virtue and they dig their own graves by policy of exploitation. In short, oligarchy perverts the state into a class state and its laws into class laws and is ultimately destroyed by a democratic revolution.

2- **Democracy**

Plato’s idea on Democracy is interesting because both democrats and un- democrats alike profess their belief in democratic principles. Plato was not sympathetic towards democracy. He identified democracy with anarchy and condemned its two cardinal principles of liberty and equality. He condemned it by simple Pythagorean formula as equality among un-equals. He attacked democracy with application of democratic principles.

Plato’s idea on democracy originated from the experience of Greek democracy in action. Socrates imprisonment and growth of individualism under solicit influence convinced Plato that a rule cannot be accepted under the regime of demagogues because they mislead many, and exploit popular ignorance. Plato believed that popular support can easily be achieved by passionate oration than by rational plea.

Democracy was identified with group conflict. The general assembly of entire citizens gave Plato an idea that democracy in action is hardly different from mob rule. The democratic youth declared his absolute equality with every citizen and put forward his claim to every office and every function. By this Plato believed that in democracy everyone was jack of all trades.

Democracy in Greek life was a reaction against extreme oligarchy. In Plato’s time there was a combination of democracy and oligarchy. But Plato did not find anything to choose between oligarchy and democracy. To him both were ultimately based upon the principle of appetite. Oligarchy on the appetite and the rich whereas democracy on the appetite of the many and the poor. Both are insufficient forms of government because both did not believe in capacity and training as office becomes the reward of the money for few in oligarchy and for many in democracy. Laws and state are equally perverted by both into class weapons for class benefits.
PLATO AND ARISTOTLE’S COMPARISON

Plato was Idealist and Aristotle was Realist

This distinction between Plato and Aristotle has been so profound much that it is said that all thinking men must be either Platonists or Aristotelians. This implies that these two philosophers represent opposite and contrasted poles of political thought. But looking at their philosophies minutely dimension; it may not be seen as correct. Although, Aristotle has criticized his master, he is also influenced by him. For example, both Plato and Aristotle looked towards the instability of the Greek political life and believed that its main cause was moral anarchy. Both believed that the instability can be eradicated through education, bringing better way of life. To both good life can only be lived in a state of moderate size. Both believed that good life could not be attained by all men, but only by those who had sufficient means and sufficient education to do so. Both believed in limited citizenship to make sufficient living and both thought it right that all manual labor should be done by slaves or by the non-citizens.

Both commonly inherited the legacy from Homer to Socrates. Therefore, both wished to limit citizenship. Both of them were conservative thinkers confining themselves to the city state as the ideal size of the state. Both stressed upon the population control and believed that ethics and politics constitute a single and indivisible science therefore, the only life which is worthy of man was a life of virtue.

Both believed that the greatest need of time was proper education of the rulers. For example to Plato, education was the instrument through which the ideal state could be realized and to Aristotle education is not the medium but occupies a prominent place in his best state.

Similarly in constructing his ideal state Aristotle considerably depended on the laws of Plato. Plato had said in his book The Laws that man without laws are not different from savage beast. Similarly Aristotle said that man is the best of all animals when he is perfected, but when he is separated from laws and justice, he is the worst of all. And therefore, both of them made laws sovereign in their states.

But having being influenced by Plato, Aristotle took a different line in his study of political philosophy. He did not remain a blind follower of Plato’s teaching. He rather developed them along the line determined by his earlier biological studies and scientific temperament.

Major platonic thought was based in the notion of philosopher king with the conviction that the only life which is worth of man is a life of virtue which was possible for an individual in the ideal state. Aristotle believed that state comes in to being for the sake of life and continues for the sake of good life.

Both of them were committed to the state as a moral and spiritual entity and held that ethics and politics constitute a single and indivisible science. Thus both of them approached the problem of the city state from moral point of view and their political thought was ethical in character.

From here the major difference between Plato and Aristotle began taking them apart from each other, Plato being an idealist or theorist and Aristotle a realist and pragmatist. Plato was a mathematician and learnt the use of numbers and figures which remained static, fixed and unchanging. This made him to conceive the real world as consisting of eternal, immutable and fixed essence of things. His universe is a static universe with no place for growth and development. Thus Plato believed that sense and experience are the source and basis of knowledge and reality.

Aristotle on the other hand, studied biology which deals with the fact of growth and development. His universe is dynamic which is growing and developing. He regarded fully developed form of a thing as its true nature. Hence, both Plato and Aristotle differ from each other.
Political philosophy of Aristotle is empirical and descriptive in comparison with radical and abstract nature of Plato’s philosophy. The central theme of Aristotle’s Politics is moderation or balance. Hence, Aristotle is called apostle of common sense and golden means.

Aristotle’s theories are based on historical knowledge. He condemned Plato for paying insufficient attention to history and for imagining scheme of government without due reference to the nature of human being.

Aristotle gave due importance to facts with his biological training and scientific studies. This made him a careful and systematic observer. Hence politics became empirical and inductive in his hands. This is the reason, he is considered as the father of the study of comparative government. Moreover, he collected facts and also stressed the value and importance of the fact in terms of the end or purpose of the state because politics was to him the culmination of ethics. Unlike his idealist teacher Plato, he was the first realist in the political thought. Hence, while Plato argued in the imaginary world of dreams or of idealism, Aristotle dealt with reforming of the actual thus Aristotle’s love of facts checked him from becoming too radical. He remained confined to reformation as he believed that the ideal must conform to actual facts. He followed the middle path and separated ethics from politics.

Their style was greatly different from each other. Plato was a master artist in the use of words. Aristotle cared nothing for the beauty of style. He intended upon the meaning of the words he employed. Thus he did not allow his philosophy to be governed by poetry as Plato did.

We fundamentally draw distinction therefore between Plato and Aristotle saying that Plato was theoretical and Aristotle was practical. Aristotle makes a threefold division of science into theoretical, practical and productive. According to him, physics and chemistry are theoretical sciences. Social sciences like ethics and politics are practical science. While building sculptures and painting maybe ranked as productive sciences. Aristotle believed that man makes use of his rational ability which leads to different types of knowledge and results in different kinds of sciences.

Plato being a mathematician gives importance to myths and poetry in the development of his thought as he could not allow a rational explanatory approach. Whereas, Aristotle wanted definite and scientific knowledge and his love for facts and scientific Spirit led him to get away from ideal and look for the real. Ultimately Plato’s thinking was based on the pattern of abstract ideas while Aristotle built up his system of thought on observation and analysis.

Aristotle was a middle class professional man, a husband and father and practical administrator. Plato was an aristocrat, mystic, ascetic and Puritan. Therefore for Aristotle value of family life, importance and value of property, respect for public opinion, test and preference of man and sense of possible have been very significant in the city life for the sake of good life. This made Aristotle a realist and pragmatic philosopher on the other hand. Plato was an aristocrat and so he comprehended the world of nature and the working of mind. Hence, by it he desired to direct and control the conduct of other persons.

The first approach may be termed theoretical and the second practical. Plato uses the first one and Aristotle, the second. Aristotle believed in scientific knowledge being used for the task of governing man. To him from politics to state craft is a practical science and requires a faculty of mind different from that by which knowledge of absolute is reached. He believed that the prime qualification of statesmen is not knowledge but a practical wisdom, which is acquired by along acquaintance in the work of handling men and their affairs.

Hence, it is widely accepted that Plato remained an idealist political thinker, whereas, Aristotle was considered a realist.
ARISTOTLE

Life and Times

Aristotle (384-322 BC), a Pragmatic political Philosopher is known as the first modern political thinker in the history of political thought. He spent a long time with Plato in his Academy for over 20 years. His association with Plato was a unique combination of three great philosophers of history namely Socrates, Plato and Aristotle himself but there was a marked distinction between him and his master, Plato; though he spent a long time in search of knowledge in Plato's Academy. Plato was an idealist whereas Aristotle was pragmatic. Plato was a mathematician who concentrated on mathematical calculations in his philosophical approach. Aristotle was a biologist and so he explained humanity in terms of a good life by understanding man and analyzing his psycho-biological growth. He believed that biologically a man has birth, growth and finally decay (death). Similarly a state is born, grows and then it reaches the stage of decay so, a state has to be studied and analyzed through biological means. It meant that a state is needed to be examined through finding every aspect of its parts which it consist of. Thus he began analyzing the state and how it continues to develop. Plato taught that if the state is good the people are good but Aristotle taught that if man is good then the state becomes good. Therefore, the distinction between the two is clear. Plato looked towards making a good state from above, whereas Aristotle did it from below.

Unlike Plato, Aristotle was not an Athenian. He was born in Stagira in 384 BC. His father was a physician in the royal court of King Philip, father of Alexander the Great. Aristotle had palatial life. His house was surrounded with properties, living and non-living that is slaves and wealth. This made him to the determine that a happy and good life needs a house with property enough to enjoy, the leisure of life. Further, Aristotle got married at the age of around 40 to a girl of 16 who was very beautiful and daughter of his very good friend. He loved his wife very much and never wanted to see her in the arms of another man. This background of his life made him to condemn the concept of Communism of Plato who declined the ownership of property and emancipation of women believing to be immoral and unethical.

Aristotle wrote more than 400 books on the subject of all those topics which relate to the elements of human life such as logic, metaphysics, ethics, politics, rhetoric, psychology and natural sciences. This indicates that Aristotle was a biologist a in real sense. Consequently, his philosophy of politics became both, descriptive and empirical. This made him the first modern political thinker in the world of political philosophy. He was first to bring reconciliation between ideal and actual. In search of such reconciliation he lost influence of Plato on him looking with the actualities of the modern states. He lived in a small city state and believed that an Ideal State should be comprised of a small territory with a small population to be controlled by the king easily. His political thought made him a realist in approach mainly because he emphasized upon judgments and values. For judgments, knowing fact was necessary and similarly values were important to understand ethics. Thus Aristotle's major task remained with finding and reforming the actual. This made him to be known as the father of political science. Aristotle, on the one hand, was modernist with his approach to study state; but at the same time, on the other hand, he was a conservative as well. He believed in the strong family life and moral obligation for the traditional values of parental dignity and sacrifice for the state.

However, Aristotle was Platonist in a sense that he firmly believed that education for the rulers were the greatest need of time. Plato used education as an instrument for making an Ideal State as a perfect state. Aristotle, on the other hand, realized that education had a prominent place even for the average state not only for the Ideal State. Plato dealt with education to a great extent in his book The Republic. However, Aristotle failed to do so because of his early death. Though he gave education an important place to make
a state practicable, he unfortunately did not get opportunity to present its logical conclusion because of his
death. Unfortunately the world could not learn more about method of education from Aristotle because
throughout history till the nineteenth century no thinker could better develop the concept of education after
Plato.

Aristotle died in 322 BC at the age of 62 but his broaden vision made him to combine science and
mathematics with ethics and politics which Plato had not done. This developed his philosophy into both,
theoretical and practical framework. He was a political philosopher who seems to be a philosopher of today.
If one reads his book The Politics he would immediately notice that Aristotle is living in the present world
and has written this book looking at today’s socio-political and economic conditions of the contemporary
society. It implies that Aristotle was a visionary alive even today in the courtyard of the contemporary world.

Methods

Aristotle was the first thinker who used the method of science in the study of politics. Through this
method he desired to arrive at generalization and conclusion. In other words, his method was to examine
and observe the particular. To him particular was real and the knowledge of universe is sought only from
an examination of the particular.

Plato’s method was essentially deductive and Aristotle’s was fundamentally inductive. Plato
proceeded from universal to particular and Aristotle from particular to universal. For such a study,
investigations were necessary with the collection and observation of available data so that conclusion can
be derived through observation and analysis. Therefore, Aristotle’s method was scientific, inductive,
analytical and observatory.

Aristotle’s method was also teleological i.e. to understand the real nature of things and examine it
in the stage of fullest development. This method is based upon the fundamental principle that the nature of
the thing can only be found in its ends and purpose for which it is distinct and created.

Aristotle’s method was empirical. He is regarded as a father of historical method. It implies a
process of enquiry in which conclusions are drawn by a dispassionate study of history. It is a comparative
study of society, politics and anthropology. These are utilized as techniques not only to interpret history but
also to predict its future movement.

Historical method views the present as the product of the past and its suggested changes in the
present to mould the conditions of the future.

His method was also comparative by which he meant to study different theories of government, in
constitutions of states by comparison to come to a final conclusion in finding the best available state.

Finally, his method was evolutionary. He believed that the evolution of the state takes into account
the different stages of human development like that of the family and the village. He regarded the state as
the product of series of natural development of man-kind. He believed that man is a social animal and
therefore lived with other men and also made a family. A man is also a political animal and lives with the
process of exchange of services and affairs of the society. And in search of a good life, the man as a political
animal makes a state. This is a natural and evolutionary process.

Thus Aristotle’s method of study depicts a scientific approach to the study of politics based on
pragmatism and practicality which makes him differ from Plato, who used theoretical approach to the study
of politics.
Forms of Government

According to Aristotle, constitution is the essence of political association. It embodies the principles and set goals for the common purpose of associating. Constitution of the state determines both, the forms and the substance of the state, arranging the citizens and establishing the form of government. It determines the way of life for all citizens.

Constitution is not merely a scheme for the arrangement of officers and citizens but it is by itself a norm of good life. A way of life prescribed for all the citizens to attain or realize.

His concept of constitution has several implications such as political, administrative, social, psychological, ethical, economic and legal.

Politically, a constitution is necessary ingredient of political association. It determines the political form of the state as monarchy, oligarchy and democracy and it determines the nature of political rule by explaining the Centre political power.

Administratively, a constitution implies an arrangement of the executive, legislative and judicial offices of the state. It embodies the principles of distribution in which offices are distributed among citizens based on agreed principle of capacity.

Socially, it implies the pre-dominance of a single class in society.

Psychologically, it requires a particular type in its citizens.

Ethically, it represents a particular notion of justice and injustice, balance between virtue and vice.

Economically, it represents principle of distribution.

Legally, it is a code of fundamental knowledge.

Thus Aristotle’s concept of constitution is broader than that of modern times.

Forms of Constitution

The constitution determines the form of government and state. Aristotle follows certain principles classifying state constitution or government, such as:

1. State’s constitution or government can be classified in reference to their aim and end, and for the respect of common interest. A state can be a monarchy, aristocracy and polity, which aims at the betterment of the community as a whole with respect of law and attainment of good life. There may be perverted or abnormal constitution which is class of state based on despotism and where there is no common good. Such states are tyranny, oligarchy and democracy.

2. According to the principle of number, constitution can be divided into three main classes.
   i. Government by one i.e. by birth which is pure loyalty and when prevented, it is despotism or tyranny.
   ii. Government by few i.e. by money which is aristocracy, when perverted it is oligarchy.
   iii. Government by many i.e. by number is polity and when perverted it is democracy.
   iv. State’s constitution or government can be classified with reference to the principle of class representation. Having the ends of political power, material acquisition and economic
exploration. A state may be broadly divided into two comprising two groups of people, the few rich and the many poor.

v. Constitution can be classified on the grounds of psychological requirements e.g. monarchy is based on virtue or honor, democracy is based on spirit of liberty, oligarchy is based on the virtue of wealth and tyranny is based on slavery.

Aristotle’s concept of forms of government is of six types:

1- Monarchy: it is a government, when one wise or virtuous man or family rules for the best interest of the society. He is a capable man with political wisdom and understands the social necessities. It is a strong government with an efficient administration. It may be hereditary or elected. In both cases it has the origin of the popular choice. It survives as long as it fulfills the requirements of the common good and has capacity of achievements and integrity of the monarch.

2- Aristocracy: it is a government of few based on political privilege. It rules the state till its members are alive. It exists for the good life of the citizens based on the principle of virtue, culture and wisdom.

3- Polity: is government of mixed constitution. It is a moderate democracy in which the governments of different forms are combined. Here political power is under military virtue, where the poor may also be allowed to participate in judicial functions. It is a government by many for the wellbeing of the community as a whole.

4- Democracy: it is the government by the many poor for the exploitation of the other class. It is a perverted form of polity. Its motive is freedom or liberty. It arises as a revolt against tyranny and despotism. Its psychological function is passion for freedom and equality.

5- Oligarchy: it is a form in which a rich minority enjoys the monopoly of political and economic power therefore; it is the government of the wealthy by the wealthy and for the wealthy. It is a perverted state of Aristocracy and is the worst form of class state and also the least stable.

6- Tyranny: it is the government of the despot or a dictator. It is the worst and most oppressive form of government. It is a corrupt form of monarchy, which is open for personal and open ends. In it the ruler maintains a reign of terror. It is based on force and fraud on the part of the ruler and fear and slavery of the subjects.

In short, Aristotle believed that all these forms of government follow the process of change from one form to another i.e. kingship to tyranny to aristocracy to oligarchy to polity to democracy and again to kingship. To Aristotle, the best form of government is kingship, which results in the most stable state.

Ideal State

Unlike Plato, Aristotle believed in practical reality of the Ideal State. To him it did not exist in heaven rather existed in the nature of man and therefore, Aristotle’s Ideal State was possible.

Aristotle in his ideal state made a study of different categories on which it was based like

1. Teleological
2. Ethical and psychological
3. Functional
4. Geographical
5. Social and Economic
6. Educational
1. **Teleological**

By teleological he meant the determination of purpose of political institutions. A state is an institution of man and has been created to fulfill certain basic requirements of his nature. A state is natural and exists for the sake of good life. The good citizen in such a state is also a good man. The good man makes life good. A good life can only be built with material self-sufficiency. Ideal state must have a physical good of the physical fitness of the citizens. It would also assume intellectual and spiritual good for the good life.

2. **Ethical and Psychological**

The ethical and psychological base means that fraternal bond unite citizens of the state in a single organic unity. It is a fellowship and a partnership which makes the citizens equal and ensures their mutual dependence. Because no one is self-sufficient there must be mutual contribution to the social hold. Thus the Ideal state is an organic unity where everyone is performing his own appointed function.

3. **Functional Specialization**

The ideal state of Aristotle has functional basis in which there is a functional partnership that is based upon mutual dependence and division of labor. According to Aristotle there must be a specialization in some sphere but a specialization should not be rigidly followed because extreme specialization could be evil or have evil consequences. For this reason Aristotle created six classes in his ideal State which were:

i. Priest
ii. Legislature
iii. Military
iv. Capitalist
v. Producer and laborer
vi. Artisan

The producers and laborers and artisans though constitute necessary part of the ideal state are not with leisure and culture enough to bear the responsibility of citizenship. The first four classes constitute the body of citizenship and the enjoyment of political power is confined to them alone.

4. **Geographical**

The geographical basis of Aristotle’s Ideal state is essentially an application of the principles of mean to the territory. A state is territorial association and because geography determines to some extent, the nature of citizens, attention must be paid to climatic conditions. The ideal state must be territorially limited. The lands must be sufficient to enable the state to live in self-sufficiency. The territory of the Ideal State must be big enough that all the material necessities should be provided and also it must be small enough to be easily defended.

5. **Social and Economic**

In its social and economic basis Aristotle’s Ideal State is flexible. He emphasized a private family and property which were not the cause of evil. If there is evil in man, it exists not in the external or material, but in man’s own mind and character. Private properties and other material goods must be allowed in the ideal state along with private family.

Women’s place is only in their families and they must be commanded by men. Marriage must be state controlled and on the grounds of health. The state must prescribe a minimum and maximum age limit for the men and women. It must limit the undue growth and the decay of the population. Property must be equitably distributed among them all.

6. **Education**

The educational basis of the ideal State consists of a system of state controlled education. The state must teach the art of fellowship and must give training in the art of citizenship. Education must
inculcate in the citizen obedience and respect of law. It must develop the mind and character of the people because without it individual can neither be a good man nor a good citizen. Therefore, education was to give harmony. It was to develop the intellectual excellence in citizens for active participation in the affairs of the state. With a calculated system of education the Ideal State must bring out the real man and surpass the beast.

Aristotle’s ideal state seems to be aristocratic. He not only dislodged producers and artisans classes, which are one third of the state population, he also ignored the natural slaves. The enjoyment of political power is with the small section of the entire population. His state is not an aristocracy of psychology, or reason, which Plato had described. It is an aristocracy of leisure and culture. Aristotle’s Ideal state also seems to have some democratic elements. The citizens are bound by fellowship, equality and justice and together they participate in all functions of the state. But it is a limited democracy which is operating with in the aristocratic class. In short, Aristotle’s Ideal state is a democracy with a favored few in virtue, culture and wealth, who are given political rights.

**Family**

Aristotle believes that private family is a part of the house hold. One cannot survive without the other. Family consists essentially of two parts which are:

1- The associates
2- The instruments

The associates are the free persons united together for self-preservation. They consist of a husband, wife and children.

The instruments constitute the property of the household for the fulfillment of wants and moral and psychological needs. The instrument may be either productive or consumptive. A family is incomplete without property and also without some living possessions like slave, cattle and so on.

Family is the earliest institution of man and first arose out of the double relationship of man and woman, master and slave. For the purpose of self-preservation, man and woman united together and for the necessity of psychological and economic security slaves came under the master.

According to Aristotle, every family is ruled or directed by the oldest male, who is the natural ruler of the household. His rule varies between his wife and children on one hand and the slave on the other. The rule over his wife is a constitutional rule, which assures the assumption that there is some sort of equality between husband and wife, though by nature wife is inferior to the husband. The rule over the slave is despotic, which is beneficial to the master and slave alike. The rule over the children is royal or monarchy.

He holds that the nature of the family can best be understood from the functions and the ends, for which it has been instituted. It is an association established by nature for the supply of every day wants. It does not represent merely an economic union or a biological contract. It is friendship for a life time when the master rules the wife, the children and the slave with kindness and friendship the family is more a unity and less plurality than is a case with political association. Also the basis of family is not reciprocal obligation but an unconditional friendship.

Aristotle’s concept of family is particular as he assigns the natural right of rule and command to the eldest male. Because by nature it is only the male and eldest male who is capable of taking actions and delivering good.

He vehemently rejects Plato’s concept of community of wives calling it unholy and immoral. He also does not allow women to have political participation as Plato did.
Aristotle believes that private family must exist to promote the individuality of man. The state has certain responsibility in this regard such as:

1. State must control the marriage by fixing minimum and maximum age for boys and girls, men and women.
2. The state must control the population. Without a scientific population policy in the state the result will be poverty, quarrels and disharmony. Therefore, there must be a law relating to the birth of children. More population means, poverty, more crimes and more acquisition. The state must restrict by law the sexual responsibilities of family life.
3. The state must see that the family members especially women and children are adequately educated with the requirements of the state.
4. The family members must follow the right art of house hold management for example the master of the family must know how to command the wife, children and slaves. Therefore, he must distinguish between the legitimate and illegitimate art of money making and must follow the former and reject the latter.
5. It is the responsibility of the State to save the male citizens from the clutches of their wives. The females abuse their freedom and indulge in animal passion and excessive pleasure. They take advantage of the love of their male partners which the males sincerely bestow upon them.

Aristotle gives a detailed explanation of families for seeking a good life and disagrees with Plato at almost all points who desired to seek emancipation of women and equal rights for them.

**Property**

Aristotle made property an essential instrument for man, so property is necessary part of family life and its basic foundation. Property consists of a number of possessions, living and non-living, productive and consumptive, all being instrumental to man's liberal living.

Earning livelihood or acquiring property is an act which every family must know and exercise. It may either be by natural or unnatural means such as food and clothing and trade or physical labor.

Private property must be allowed to constitute in the state as it sustains private family life. It must be limited by social morality and public law. Therefore, to Aristotle, an unlimited private property is not property but theft. Criticizing Plato, Aristotle rejects the notion of collective ownership and criticizes his theory of community of property because.

1. There may be disproportionate gain among different labors.
2. There is always a difficulty in men living together and having things in common particularly property, because it creates suspicion and quarrels.
3. Complete abolition of private property is against man's nature.

Aristotle’s theory of private property emphasizes upon holding private property as a necessity but it must not be unlimited. It must be controlled with a view to a social purpose. Unlimited private property is a greater evil than ban on its complete abolition because it leads to inequality i.e. riches in some hands and poverty in others. In other words, economic distribution between man and man must not be very wide nor it should be identical.

Mere equalization of property does not help in solving the problem. Equality in wealth is as disastrous as equality in poverty. Aristotle warns that an equalization of property will not solve the problem of unity and equality and suggests that:
Equalization of property must avoid extreme levels and must remain in moderate level so that the evil of both richness and poor are avoided.

Mere equalization of material goods may not solve the problems without equalizing the desire of acquisition and wants in man.

Equalization of property must not be confined to landed property. It must be universal to be effective e.g. houses, slaves, servants, movables and immovable, all must be equalized.

Equalization of property does not mean that every source of material wealth should equally be divided among private citizens and not left for public use. Half of the land must be owned and cultivated in common. There must be enough source of wealth at the disposal of government to meet both, the internal wants of the state and its external wants like wars and defense.

It must be remembered that population is a source of property and property is a source of disunity. Therefore, it is more necessary to limit population than property. Property becomes the parent of revolution.

In sum, Aristotle gives a comprehensive study of ownership making it an essential part of family life and limits it for the use of citizens. He also emphasizes the concept of common property for the use of public good only then the state will be a healthy state and will succeed in enhancing good life for the whole society.

**Slavery**

One of the most important contributions of Aristotle’s philosophy is on the study of slavery. He has justified slavery as a necessity; being a theoretical and practical defense. He made slavery a practical need. He opposed the doctrine of Sophist on natural inequality and desired to institutionalize slavery. He justified slavery because he believed that a state is:

1. A moral community where the citizens are actively participating in its affairs. For their happiness and leisure in life, citizens must be assisted by slaves.
2. Citizens need material goods, food, clothing and shelter, which should be provided to them by slaves.
3. Productive functions and manual work are below the citizen’s dignity and these were done by slaves.

**1 Nature of Slavery**

According to Aristotle, slavery is natural. But there are some unnatural slaves too. The doctrine is based on three foundations:

i. There existed natural inequality among things as well as among men.
ii. There is natural rule of the superior over the inferior.
iii. The function must be based upon natural aptitude.

Therefore, Aristotle’s Theory is threefold as follows:

a) Theory of natural inequality
b) Theory of Aristocratic government
c) Theory of specific function

To justify the first one, Aristotle believes that as the family, the village and the state are natural; it is based upon the natural inequality of men.
The justification of second one, Aristotle explains that there is a natural inequality and there is also a natural principle of rule and subordination which is a universal principle. It is the superior intelligence which rules the inferior.

To justify the third one, Aristotle believes that the specific functions are also natural e.g. the functions of the eyes to see, ear to hear, mind to direct and the body to obey. The function of the intellect is to order and the body to obey. In actual life people who are all body with little mind must be controlled and directed by persons having good intelligence.

Therefore, these three principles justify that there are some natural slaves and some natural masters.

2 Justification of Slavery

Aristotle had justified Slavery by moral and ethical considerations and also as a right of the slave.

Slavery is important for making master’s life leisure free from manual duties. The master gives protection to the slave because he has no intelligence and needs protection in life.

Slavery is morally just and right justice implies the rule of superior over the inferior. The soul must rule the body, if harmony is to be attained. The superior intelligence is the natural master over the natural slave for providing justice.

As an instrument is necessary for playing music, property is necessary to run the house. The slave is the part of the family life and therefore it is necessary for running of household. Thus slavery is morally justified.

To Aristotle, slavery is not only natural but also legal. To justify the legality of slavery, he says that some slaves are natural but some are not natural, but are by law. The difference between the two is that natural slavery is based upon intellect and a spiritual quality and legal slavery is based upon superior in war and conquest.

Aristotle calls natural slave as internal slave and legal slave as external slave. To him, the legal slave may be intellectually superior to their masters’ so if they are captured as prisoners of war and made slaves, they can be set free.

1 Criticism on Slavery

Aristotle should have regarded slavery as unnatural rather than natural because man is born for a purpose to realize some end. He has been endowed by nature with a capacity to attain good life. The intellectual deficiency makes him slave in the eyes of Aristotle and so incapable of attaining the good life.

With natural inequality of men, the natural inferiority and superiority for rule and subordination prevails under such conditions, and there is hierarchy in political administration because nowhere two persons can be regarded as equal. Therefore, there must be various grades of rule; such theory will lead to absoluteness.

It is also possible that a sharp mind with weak physique is superior. Aristotle emphasizes both mind and physique makes superiority which is not by birth a fixed capacity. Development of mind and physical growth bring development of capacity in man. Therefore, nature does not determine that a man with a strong mind and weak physique will remain weak or strong. Hence his justification of capacity is unnatural.

Citizenship

According to Aristotle the State is composed of several citizens and without them no state is possible. From practical point of view Aristotle’s concept of citizenship differs from state to state e.g.
democracy lays down different categories of qualification on citizenship than oligarchy. In oligarchy qualification is property and in democracy it is free birth.

The fundamentals of citizenship to Aristotle are not residence or birth or through court of law. Because the residents may be aliens (foreigners), minors or the old are not allowed to participate in discharging the duties of citizenship by possessing power. By birth a person may not be a citizen because he may not hold state power. Similarly the law does not make a person citizen unless he is guaranteed authority in the state. Therefore, citizenship is not a legal privilege. It is rather essential function. It is the power to take part in declarative, legislative, judicial and administrative functions of the state. A citizen is an active participant in the affairs and offices of the state.

Aristotle’s citizenship implies legislative, judicial and administrative functions, through which very few persons can acquire right of citizenship but broadly speaking citizenship may be constructive to mean actual participation in the affairs of the state. Therefore, a legislator or a judge or an administrator may not be a citizen, if he neglects his function.

A good citizen is he, who renders an unconditional obedience to the laws of his state. But such man may not be a good man because law in a state may not be a good law. It means that if in a state, the laws are good and individuals obey them, then they are good men and good citizens. Good citizens are only in the Ideal State, where the good man is the good citizen.

To Aristotle, good citizen has several virtues. He is an active participant in the affairs of the state. He is a member of community and concerns himself with all the common aims for a greater moral life. His virtue is relative to the constitution but in ideal polity he must learn both, to rule and to obey because a man who never learns to obey cannot be a good commander.

To be a worthy master, a citizen must have enough leisure and culture with true opinion or practical wisdom. He must learn the requirements of the constitution because it is not only a code of law but also a code of conduct. Therefore, to be a good citizen, he must be educated.

Aristotle’s concept of citizenship is very novel. He was a political thinker, who visualized this concept with reference to preference of a state function. Though Plato distinguished the ruler and the producer, but he did not speak of the citizenship. Thought Aristotle spoke of preference of state functions by rulers and the ruled and citizenship, he made it very narrow. Aristotle not only discarded aliens from citizenship but also denied it to the newly born, the minors the invalid, the old and all these who did not hold responsibility of the legislative, judicial or administrative functions. He gives responsibility to producing class for doing all other things for the good of state except these three responsibilities of legislation, judiciary and administration but does not give them the status of importance in the state as citizens.

Further in Aristotle’s concept, citizenship is completely different to that of modern times, where an individual has a birth right to become a citizen in the state he was born or cannot get citizenship to a son of citizen unless he holds the state’s responsibilities. Thus, Aristotle’s concept of citizenship gives inconsistent meaning which value from state to state depending upon the form of government.

**Revolution**

Aristotle’s concept of revolution is a discussion on sedition. It means revolution has deep meaning including the study of great rebellion not a reform bill.

Revolution comes due to the decline in political life in the city state. Aristotle discusses revolution in three heads:

1- Nature  
2- Causes  
3- Prevention and Remedies.
Nature:

To him nature of revolution is defined as:

(i) Change of constitution in the state.
(ii) Maker of the constitution takes political power in his hands.
(iii) No change in the forms of government but change in constitution.

Aristotle considers the sources of revolution as:

(a) Temper
(b) Motive
(c) Causes and occasions

To him the different interpretations of justice and equality lead to the making of different claims by different parties and conflict on these claims cause political struggle and changes which turn into revolution. Thus according to him one cause of revolution is a sense of injustice. However, he believed that the presence of injustice brings three other main causes:

1- Inequality
2- Expectations of future advantages
3- Seizing of some occasions

**Causes of Revolution**

Aristotle in his comprehensive study of revolution presents two separate causes of revolution. They are:

1. General causes
2. Particular causes.

**1- General causes**

The general causes of revolution are basically three and they are:

i. The state of mind which lead to sedition i.e. when in-equal wants to become equal and equal wants to become superior.

ii. The objects which are at stake i.e. desire for profit and honor and of loss or disgrace.

iii. The occasions which are sure to start political disturbances and military interference. Generally, there may be many occasions like gains, superiority, insult, fear, honor, undue prominence, election intrigues, and preference of the disloyal, free immigration to foreigners, private friendships or feuds, death ofnobles or introduction of new settlers.

To Aristotle, there are small occasions which also may bring about a revolution such as:

(a) Growth of power or office
(b) Uneven balance of parties
(c) Force or fraud
(d) Quarrel on love affairs

**2- Particular causes**

While giving the particular cause of revolution, Aristotle gives separate causes of revolution in separate forms of government.

(i) In a Democracy: Revolution occurs because of the policy of demagogues
(ii) In an Oligarchy: Revolution occurs where there is unjust treatment of masses, wealthy men are excluded from offices, feuds between oligarchs, the loss of war with other states or if oligarchy is too oppressive.

(iii) In an Aristocracy: Revolutions are due to:

a) Narrowing the circle of government.

b) When the masses consider themselves as good as their masters.

c) Removal of important persons from office

d) Deviation from justice

(iv) In Monarchy and Tyranny: The revolution emerges because of their undignified behavior and conflicting nature.

Thus to Aristotle, there is no economic cause of revolution in a particular sense.

He does not give emphasis to the outbreak of revolution because of economic reasons.

**Prevention and Remedies of Revolution**

The fundamental method of preventing revolution is the sense of injustice to be avoided by:

a) Consent for constitution making

b) Formation of moderate form of government

c) Spirit of obedience

d) Not to deceive people

e) The democrats should spare the rich and oligarch should help the poor.

Other ways to prevent revolution are as follows:

1- Too much political power should not be allowed in one hand or to one class.

2- Various classes should be treated with consideration.

3- Honor and awards should be distributed extensively.

4- Strangers should not be given offices.

5- Holders of political power should not be allowed to make money.

6- The citizens should be properly educated.

7- Aristotle put security of a state above everything and therefore, emphasizes that the government should maintain protection from the danger of foreign attack.

8- Aristotle is more concerned about revolution in a tyranny and give ways of preventing revolution in this form of government such as:

i) Policy of repression

ii) Changing tyranny to kingship

iii) Isolation from neighbors

iv) Good will of the subjects

v) Not to use offices as a source of gain

vi) Not to take the side of stronger in arbitration

vii) Should have large number of ministers

viii) Reward good citizens personally

ix) Punish bad citizens by agents

x) Show himself as a guardian of people

xi) Do not show self interest

xii) Should speak of the crown rather than the king and the state rather than the government.
Aristotle as a Conservative Political Thinker

Conservatism may be defined as the continuation of old or traditional way of life. It may also said to be an element in which society functions regarding development and progress based upon traditional values.

It is interesting to note that in case of Aristotle as a philosopher, he developed his political philosophy based on social value system of contemporary Hellenic world. He being conservative is also an off shoot of his own personal life and family environment in which he was brought up and educated. Aristotle was so much influenced by the surrounding environment that he ended up with strong sense of traditionalism and conservatism.

In fact, one can find out conservatism in Aristotle while going through two approaches:

1) His bringing up in peculiar Hellenic Society and the personal family life in the court of King Phillip, where his father was physician to the king.

2) The different aspect of his political philosophy which shows a deep sense of conservatism if analyzed separately.

In some Aristotle was influenced in a philosophy with his traditional and conservative approach what he experienced in his life. His concept of formation of state, citizenship, family, property, slavery, form of government, ethical and moral behavior education and class all combine together influenced him towards conservatism in his political thought he became a prey of localism supporting small population and a comfortable life to live as aristocratic style.
CHAPTER III

NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI

Life and Times

Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527 AD) is known as the first modern political thinker. His philosophy roots into the two most enlightened events of modern history of Reformation and the Renaissance. These two events influenced him or changed the world so much that it entered into modernity leaving behind the ideological influence of the medieval era. Moreover the concept of a small city state had already been largely wiped away with the rise of Alexander the great and later by the Romans. With the Christian era began the ideological growth of Christian religion which clouded the entire Europe. Thus the medieval thinkers remained under the umbrella of more or less religious thought under the influence of Christian doctrine.

Reformation brought a unique settlement within the minds of newer generation about the concept of Christianity being not only spiritual but also worldly. In other words Christianity was divided into two major camps; one which believed in Christian’s traditionalism, and the other which protected it with the view of different values of spiritual and worldly life. Thus Christianity got broadly divided into Catholicism and Protestantism. This led to a turning point in philosophical thought as well and also this developed thinking in people’s socio-cultural, political and religious value-system. This led Machiavelli to believe that the church was custodian of the next world whereas the state was the custodian of this world. Hence, to him church was neither behind the state nor above the state, rather it was within the state. His philosophy of state superiority over the church opened a new era in the history of political philosophy, and he became a pioneer of creating superior authority of the kings over the church in their political decision making.

Renaissance in the West also opened a new era in human history. The 15th and 16th centuries opened new age of awakening of mind and thought with development of science and urbanization. New inventions brought people from rural to urban areas which led to the development of education and hence awakening of human the mind. Many writers and lawyers emerged in Italy particularly in Florence, where Machiavelli was born.

When Machiavelli grew with good education he entered into a government job at the famous Medici Court. He remained with government administrative activities including diplomacy for a long period of time. This made him more of a political mechanic then a political thinker. He believed that it was easy to acquire power but difficult to maintain it. Therefore what he taught was not much to do with making of a state as Plato and Aristotle had done rather he was more concerned with maintaining the state. Thus his he taught Prince how to maintain his power and last longer and the real of power.
The political society of the 15th and 16th centuries of Europe in which Machiavelli lived was like that of ancient Greece comprising independent city states with different forms of government such as republic and despotic. The city states had rivalries among themselves with their own ambition and continued conflict with each other. There were then five major city states in Italy namely Naples, Rome, Milan, Venice and Florence. Machiavelli was born and lived in Florence. He saw that these five city states made Italy weak in front of Spain, Germany and France because of their conflicts of power-politics. Machiavelli believed that until these city states were not united with each other creating a strong central government, they would remain weak and would be destroyed by these strong powers of Europe. He wanted see Italy strong enough to defend itself against foreign aggression.

As a true patriot Machiavelli wanted to find out means to unite Italy and make it strong enough to maintain peace and order and resist external aggression. For this purpose he wrote his famous books *The Art of War*, *The Discourses* and *The Prince*. His books were on the art of government rather than theory of state. He showed himself as a statesman with pragmatism giving a mechanism of government for creating a strong centre and maintaining its power. He wanted to see the end justify the means which made him a modern thinker. He wanted to solve the problems of statecraft which made him a realist rather than a theorist. In his pragmatism he believed that the prince should not see what is right or religious while seeking his goal rather he should be shrewd and diplomatic being good or bad whatever the circumstances demanded and he should use force without considering any moral values. It is his actions which will judge through his success in obtaining, maintaining and increasing his power. Therefore for Machiavelli politics was an end itself for which means are sacrificed for attaining the goal.

**General Political Philosophy**

In a broad sense, one can say that Machiavelli was not a political theorist. He was a practical man with long experience and opportunity of being close to the government as a senior official with active life by conducting official correspondence diplomatic mission, and organizing the military of Florence. Thus he developed his interest in practical politics and wrote more about the theory of the state. He enjoyed an important place in the history of political philosophy because he was known as the father of modern political thought.

He made modern theory possible by bringing a decisive break with the middle ages with the concept of church power over the state because to him the supernatural end of human being was worldly and therefore the church could not be its custodian.

Machiavelli also divorced from morality on the same ground that moral values were not supernatural end. He maintained the significance of moral values with two standards where he allowed use of immoral acts for political end, for the rulers and the moral end to achieve for the subjects as ends of state.

He believed in democracy as a better state being a free state than kingship or princedom, which was not a free state but he recommended kingship as better a form of government for the stability and the
success of the state. To him, the most important requirement of the state’s stability was the presence of virtue in the ruler. Virtue to him was the capacity of the attainment of power, fame and success. He believed with determination that it was not possible for the large majority of the people to possess such qualities where as it was possible for one individual. Thus believing democracy as a free state in law and institution and a spontaneous acceptance of these by the citizen’s, Machiavelli regretted and preferred princedom as a better state on the ground of virtue. He knew that in princedom, the citizen obey law and institutions by compulsion.

Machiavelli in his philosophy gave two theories:

1. Of founding a state
2. And of preserving it after it is founded. He recommended despotism practically in two special cases:

   1. The making of the state
   2. The reforming of a corrupt state for such reason, he advocated double-standard of morality, recommending use of immoral means for rulers, for political ends and denying the same to the subjects.

   Machiavelli gave supreme importance to the law giver in the state. He believed that successful state must be founded by a single man with law and government. The man single will create and will determine the national character of his people. The law giver, that is the prince, could restore the moral and civic virtue of the people which grows out of laws. And where the law was absolute and not obeyed by the people, the society becomes corrupt. Thus, the law giver was the master of not only the state but of the society as well.

   Machiavelli believed that human nature is selfish. Man is ungrateful and has lust of power vanity and self-interest. He is more prone to evil than to good but desired security for life and property. Such conditions brought anarchy in the society for which Machiavelli suggested that to bring stability the state and law must possess power. He sanctioned the use of cruelty, murder or any other means to the prince to reach his ends.

   Machiavelli also laid the foundation of modern political thought. He gave the concept of modern nation state. Though he did not speak in terms of sovereignty; he advocated state with the strongest power and force of law.

   He rejected the medieval feudal concept of hierarchical organization and nobility, which destroyed the concept of nationalism for its own ends. He expressed hatred for mercenary soldiers because they were selfish, unreliable, untrusted worthy and fought for money, which was a serious cause of lawlessness in Italy. He recommended a regular army of state for national interest with training and discipline particularly for unification of the state. He also desired to expand the limit of ethical homogeneity for the purpose of the
nation state. He was aware of the forces which made the state united against other traditions, common language and common systems of law.

In Machiavelli’s philosophy, there is no reference sign of economic aspect of the state. He spoke of security of life and property but he did not deal with economics as an independent subject matter. His main concern was the stability of state based on human egoistic nature being bad, fearful, wicked and therefore corrupt. Thus, he involved himself in the mechanism of government and power of the law giver.

Machiavelli is marked as one of the most important thinkers in the history of political philosophy and has been called the first modern political thinker for bringing out a new approach to the study of politics and its mechanism. Though he looked restricted to his locality and time as George Sabine puts it that “he was a political thinker of 10th century Italy”. Undoubtedly, he was influenced by his local environment but his thought appeared all over the world after his death. He is used in history by many rulers and followed by many governments. That is why is said about him that “He was highly abused and mostly used”. People hated him and rejected him for his mechanics for a successful government but at the same time his mechanism was put in use in search of a successful government. No political thinker in the history of political theory has such recognition and usage as that of Machiavelli and probably for this reason he is called as the father of modern political thought.

Egoism

The most important and fundamental assumption in Machiavelli’s political doctrine is his view on nature of man and his motive to act in the society. Machiavelli developed his motive to act in the society by promoting a theory on the nature of the state and also to preserve the end of the state.

Machiavelli believed that men are born bad and there is no inherent goodness or virtue in them. He also believed that men are a compound of weakness and folly. They are by nature cunning and therefore, they become a prey of despotism. He describes that man is ungrateful, fickle, deceitful and cowardly like an animal with motives of fear and lust, power, vanity and self-interest. They are bad, so much so that none of them does any good unless obliged and gets something in return. Such nature of man has made him to do what he likes and therefore, there is continuous confusion and disorder in him. They are more vulnerable to evil than to good and they follow the wickedness of their own hearts, whenever they have an opportunity to do so.

What makes man bad is their selfishness (innate) and aggressiveness. Every man wants to have the best thing for himself and to have as much as possible. He has no limits to the desire of either for power or possession. Thus men themselves are in perpetual strive and competition, which ultimately leads to complete anarchy unless they are retained by the force of law.

Such ego of man has made him had and for that he is mainly interested in security and safeguard. Therefore, he agrees to the restraints imposed upon him by law only which can secure him and his property.
One of these basic needs of human ego is satisfaction with security of life and property but once man gets it he begin to desire other things particularly wealth and power. An individual seeks these additional things such as wealth and power only for himself and his family. He co-operates with other members of the state in their pressure because he realizes that without such co-operation there would be war of everyone against everyone and attainment of security would be impossible.

Machiavelli believes that origin of society is based upon the assumption that there is need of the force of law and cooperation among men for security and defense. There is need of government because of the weakness and inefficiency of the individual who cannot protect himself without state authority. Thus a successful ruler must provide man with maximum security of life and property. That is why Machiavelli considers virtue as the attainment of maximum power. Unless the ruler is strong and powerful enough to provide security to his people, he cannot be a successful ruler.

To Machiavelli, men have no social qualities except self-interest. To seek self-interest they wish to live under the force of law or strong power. This makes him to believe in the government by force.

Further, to maintain the stability in the society and the state in good health, Machiavelli recommends the use of immoral means by the ruler for achievement of political ends. He is aware of man’s nature being bad, cruel and extremely selfish. Thus, his concept of double standards of morality is given, one for the ruler and other for subjects, which is an outcome of his views on human nature being egoistic.

**Morality and Religion**

One of the most important ideas of Machiavelli which makes him break away from the Middle Ages was his determined thought of denying Divine law. Through this he separated politics from religion and morality, and developed the supremacy of the state over the church.

Before Machiavelli in the ancient and the medieval world, there was no political thinker who had kept politics separate from religion and morality, as Machiavelli did. Though Aristotle separated politics from ethics, but it did not become an essential feature of political thought. Machiavelli separated politics from religion and morality deliberately. He believed that the nature of man and government is the power as an end in itself. Before his the central point for political philosophers had been happiness which was achieved by state power as a means of moral terms. Machiavelli did not consider state power existing to serve of ethical purpose rather he believed it to be expansion of power through acquisition of the end or purpose which was an end in itself.

He did not believe in the cardinal tenets of Christian doctrine that man differs in pursuing a supernatural end. He recognized the material well-being of man, earthly or heavenly. These material values are greatness (success), fame and power, which are the qualities of virtue to seek well-being in the world. If a man has a supernatural end, there is no function to be performed by a Divine Law. Further, because the church was the custodian of Divine Law, Machiavelli denied any claim of church not merely for the superiority but also in the independence of the state. For this he sanctioned the use of immoral means such
as fraud, forgery, breach of faith, trickery and violence for the prince to gain his objectives. Through such philosophy, one could conclude that Machiavelli despised religion and morality, but this is not true. In fact the only thing in which he was interested was whether they were effective for the end regardless of consideration of being moral or immoral for the prince. It is also true that he did not despise religion, because in the opening passage of his book, *The Discourse*, he expressed the importance of religion in a state citing example of Italy and how it was ruined, when it started losing respect for the Church of Rome.

He further said that the prince and republic should make themselves free from corruption for their own existence but preserve purity of all religious observances. He said that there is no greater indicator for the ruin of a country than to see religion condemned. Thus, he was not hostile to religion rather he believed that it was necessary for health and prosperity of the state. He believed that Prince should have qualities, in which men can be counted being good. Hence, the behavior of prince should be embodiment of mercy, good faith, integrity and kindness.

Machiavelli knew that a state would not flourish without fear of punishment by the ruler so the citizens were to be made to day and to keep citizens faithful when they disobey, by the use of force and coercion. This is to attribute religion an important place within the state, because men are concerned for religious values and they obey them blindly. Thus, Machiavelli gave place to religion within a state, not above it or beside it.

He valued religion for instrumental purpose, which the ruler could imply to influence people, for the purpose of achieving the ends. He had a similar view for morality. To him moral and religious consideration could not bind the prince, because he was above and outside them but he could use both of them to realize his own ends. Thus, religion and morality was to be used as an important instrument of state policy. Machiavelli maintained double standards of morality. He condemned Christian morality, which was for another world and he advocated the use of immoral means by the ruler to gain his goals. The other hand, he never had any doubt that moral corruption in people made it impossible to have a good government. About the morality of subject therefore, he wanted a wise ruler to see that guns are of good qualities but this does not mean that the ruler must believe in the religion of his subjects and practice their virtue, because for Machiavelli virtue for the ruler was the attainment of power, fame and success. His moral standards were different for the ruler than that of the subjects. Thus Machiavelli became the pioneer (champion) of modern political thought by taking away the state from the clutches of the church and putting the state above religion and morality.

**Princedom and Democracy**

Machiavelli had adopted Aristotle’s classification of government in monarchy, aristocracy and polity, and their perverted forms tyranny, oligarchy and democracy. He also agreed with Polybius and Cicero in considering the mixed type of government as the most suitable for the state. On the whole, he dealt with two of them at great length, Princedom and Democracy.
He spoke of monarchy or princedom and its problems in his book The Prince, and of a republican form of government in his book The Discourses In the Prince, he seems to be a great supporter of monarchy and worst enemy of a republic. But on the other hand in Discourses, he speaks of democracy with a positive voice, calling it a free and health state.

To Machiavelli, the preservation of the state depends upon the excellence of its law, because law is the source of civic virtue, which makes a man, a good man and sets quality in him to achieve the goal. Thus, to Machiavelli, virtue is most important for the betterment of the state because corruption in the society could only be removed, when virtue is acquired, virtue being the attainment of power, fame and success making a man, good man processing good qualities.

Corruption can only be removed by law and the law giver. He dislikes republican form of government reflecting it is difficult to find virtue in a large number of people in a society and a republic is formed by a large number. A society has to have a man of religious virtue who will bring remedies for corruption and that one man of high virtue can be the prince or monarch.

The preservation of the state depends upon law and civic virtue. Princedom has to be regulated by law for a stable government. Legal remedies are required against illegal violence. These remedies Machiavelli wished to acquire through the double standard of morality of the ruler and morality of the subjects.

According to Machiavelli government is more stable when:

1. Shared by many
2. Through Election than heredity to choose the ruler
3. When a decision is reached through freedom by the public.
4. People are to be independent, strong and warlike.

Machiavelli has a high opinion of virtue and judgment of an uncorrupted people, when compared to those of the prince. However, he believed that the republican form of government is unfit to make a policy because it is difficult to serve virtue in a large number.

Still a republic is more sound and better than a monarchy in matters that fall within its jurisdiction hence a republic form of government can only be possible if the society is made of uncorrupted people so, they must be governed by a prince or tyrant, because they are not capable of governing themselves.

Comparing princedom and Democracy, Machiavelli concludes that princedom is not a -free state, wherein citizens obey laws by compulsion. To be free it needs virtue and in its absence people become corrupt and then princes are needed, who makes the state a- free state.

The Democracy is a Free State, where the citizens obey laws spontaneously. As long as it is a state of uncorrupt people, it maintains virtue but when it acquires corruption it requires a virtuous person for its betterment and becomes an un-free state under the prince.
Machiavelli recommended a monarchy because of the absence of virtue in a large number of people. To him monarchy seems more feasible and stable with virtue of the ruler for the attainment the goal of removing evils in the state.

**First Modern Thinker**

Machiavelli’s political thought has a practical force in state affairs. He belongs to the age of Renaissance and Reformation, which started in Italy. He was born in Florence in 1469. It was the period, which saw the outbreak of Renaissance followed by the reformation ending the middle ages and beginning the modern era.

Prior and during these two movements i.e. Renaissance and reformation, absolutism of monarchy and Papacy was on the peak. With the outbreak of Renaissance the growth of economic expansion in Europe led the merchants to play important role in state affairs which gave rise to:

1. Friendship between merchants and rulers
2. Concepts of nationalism
3. Conflict between church and state.
4. Development of national power with exploitation of nation’s resources and encouragement of trade.
5. Hatred towards nobility by new economic classes.
6. Military power and the administration of justice.

Thus, by the opening of 16the century absolute monarchy had either become or was becoming the prevailing type of government in Western Europe.

At that time, Machiavelli’s homeland Italy was in the state of institutional decay. Though it was a society of intellectually brilliant and artistic creative people, but it had the worst political corruption and moral degradation. For example:

1- The old civic institutions were dead.
2- Medieval idea of church and Empire were no longer in practice.
3- Cruelty and murder had become normal agencies of government
4- There was no good faith, and truthfulness while force and fraud had become keys to success.
5- Selfishness was the only way of progress.

Machiavelli saw all of these factors very closely and became theorist of a society in which the individual exists having no motive and no interest except that of by his own egoism.

He was not apolitical theorist rather his interest was practical to find the mechanics of government rather than a theory of state. He is considered to be the father of modern political theory mainly because he broke through the concepts of the Middle Ages.

In his modernity, he was the first to express that the realization of man’s need was not through the supernatural end in the state, subordinate to the natural and divine law of the church. He denied that man had a supernatural end and his life was regulated by divine and natural laws. This was the foundation of his theory of the state which can only be understandable by examining the mechanism of the state.
It was Machiavelli, who for the first time centered political thought round on a national state. Just like the medieval thought was the theory of society and ancient thought was the theory of city state. Machiavelli in his theory of nation state developed the concept of rulers and their mechanics of government which later became the foundation of concept of sovereignty particularly elaborated by Bodin and Hobbes. He rejected the feudal concept of hierarchical organization and in its place put all powers in a central authority supreme over citizens and associations.

It was he, who for the first time realized the necessity of a national army and rejected mercenary soldiers because national army will bring and maintain the unification of the state as a nation.

Although, he did not use the term nationality in the modern sense, he was aware of the forces which make a state on language and system of law. He warned that to maintain the unity of the state, ethnic homogeneity must be maintained because a state never attacks a state, where this homogeneity is maintained. With this newly developed thought, leading to formation of the state and preserving it after it is found Machiavelli developed theory of revolution and of government. He recommended making of state based on the modern concept of nationalism and also reforming the corrupt state by the use of a political mechanism, which made him the first modern political thinker.
THOMAS HOBBES

Life and Times

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679 AD) was born in England. His political philosophy has been highly intense both by his family life as well as British history of the period he lived in. He named his famous book the *Leviathan* which means the monster. He meant that man by nature is like a monster that is essentially by nature selfish, brutal, nasty and bad therefore his life is short. Moreover his mother always told him that he was born because she got highly scared of the news of Spanish Armada arriving in England gave him birth prematurely. Since he was born due to fear Hobbes used to say that “my mother gave birth to twins, myself and fear” and since then believed that man is born with fear and needs protection at all times for survival. He was also from a broken home. When he was around four years old his father left his mother and her children and disappeared. His mother since believed that men are selfish and bad. Although educated at Oxford University he was not satisfied with his education which to him did not give bring any positivity in his life.

He was very young when Queen Elisabeth I died in 1603 and was succeeded King James I, of Stuart dynasty who was king of Scotland. Since King James VI was a catholic and wanted to bring back Catholicism in England which remained till the time of Queen Marry, the predecessor of Queen Elisabeth I. Almost sixty years of Queen Elizabeth I reign Protestant environment was common and people had become used to it for three generations. This led to a conflict between King James I and the British people on the question of power of parliament. James I fought for his authority till he died in 1625. He was successful by his son Charles I who was a more staunch Catholic and wanted to rule with monarchical despotism. The civil war became so serious that it ended with the killing of King Charles II and establishment of military regime lead by Oliver Cromwell. The wife of King Charles I had fled to France with his young son Charles II. Hobbes was tutoring the young Prince Charles II and he also went to France with them. Oliver Cromwell died in 1660 after eleven years of his rule. He was succeeded by his son Richard Cromwell who was a weak person and unpopular among the people. Upon the death of Oliver Cromwell, Charles II returned to Scotland, his original home and asked his people to help him in restoring the British throne. They agreed to do it if Charles II made a promise to rule with the consent of the people represented in parliament which he accepted. This restored the Stuart dynasty in England under Charles II who ruled for a long period until he died in 1688. Hobbes saw the events very closely. He returned back to England with Restoration. Now he was an old man and desired to have some assignment from the King which he was refused and was only given a small pension with the condition that he will go back to his village and will not write anything concerning politics. Thus in his last days of life he remained lonely and under bondage keeping him unhappy and frustrated.

His experiences of family life and British politics of his time made him to believe that man by nature is selfish and nasty. This became the fundamental foundation of his political philosophy. Basically Hobbes
was a mathematician and was closely associated with Galileo who was his close friend. Under his influence Hobbes used geometry applying mathematics in his philosophy which made him to assimilate psychology and politics in his political thought therefore Hobbes was the first political thinker who used the approach of mathematics and Physics studying motion and passion combining the two sciences with psychology and politics. This had led him to write his famous book *The Leviathan* while he was in France which was published in 1651.

Political philosophy of Hobbes is unique in its nature. It is generally known as scientific materialism which he developed from the theory of motion of Galileo and Newton. Hobbes learned from them that knowledge gets pattern from mechanics. He related this mechanism for analyzing human nature. Through that he studied human behavior and found that Psychological element such as sensation, feeling, imagination, memory, and reason all play a dominant role in shaping and reshaping human behavior. The mechanical system of motion thus develops human behavior which is based upon the above mentioned psychological factors. In politics human behavior is exhibited through social behavior which has basis of psychology. Thus Hobbes in his philosophy looked towards analyzing the state system through scientific materialism using the human machine assimilating physics and psychology on the basis of motion and passion.

**State of Nature**

Hobbesian concept of nature of state is based upon the concept of human nature. He recognized that in natural state there was some sense of natural law. Its essences were self-preservation or “liberty each man has to preserve his own life”.

Man in society is governed by the fundamental principle of desire that is:

1. To seek pleasure and avoid pain
2. The analysis of human behavior should be that pleasure – pain mechanics explain action on all levels. Men have ego and desire to preserve themselves though the acquisition of more and more power.

From human psychology, he viewed man as living originally in a state of nature without the benefit of the government. Individual egoism and goal of self-preservation controlled all actions of man. Thus, it was a period where man was solitary and his life was poor, nasty, brutish and short.

The trouble arose from every man being the equal of every other man, because lack of physical strength was compensated by intellect and ability and vice versa.

From this equality of ability, there arose equality of hope in the attainment of ends but by nature, the weakest did not have enough strength to kill the strongest. Above all men were beset by the sins of competition diffidence and glory. This resulted in a perpetual war of every man against every man. During this period, nothing was just and right because there was no law or any notion of right and wrong there was only force and fraud.
Here Hobbes used his scientific materialism and proved that because of the nature of man, the state of nature was bad and life was short. His scientific materialism explained that human behavior including sensation, feelings and thought was made of motion.

As social behavior upon which art of government rested was merely that special care of human behavior which arose, when man acted with reference to one another. The sense of diffidence also made man to look for security.

The above condition could have continued indefinitely except for two factors which are inherent in man:

1. Reason which discovered that peace had more utility than war.
2. Fear of violent death which brought man’s passion into lines with his reason.

Thus, Hobbes recommended the formation of civil society i.e. common wealth to come out of the state of nature. He believed that it was not to see in fact what government was, but what government must be, in order to control it successfully. This was possible through such motivation which was taken with the view that human being is like a machine.

Hence, Hobbes concluded that a civil society is needed for creating a peaceful living for man and such a society was only possible for Hobbes under his plan of social contract.

**Natural Law**

Generally speaking, Natural law is discovered by human reason. It is assumed that Natural Law governs human relation in the absence of positive law. It exists as supplementary to positive law and a standard by which the conduct of government may be judged.

Natural Law is of two kinds:

1. Physical Natural law which deals with science for example:
   - Planetary law movement, Structure of atoms, Boiling point of water, Human body relating to growth and decline of man,
2. Moral Natural Law which deals with humans for example: Self-preservation, Desire for food, love or hate, Passion (like fear and death)

Hobbes realized natural Law from the moral point of view for the purpose of studying human behavior and its need to form the civil society. He studied Natural Laws through human passion and reason.

He saw in the state of nature that there was a war of every man against everyone, so nothing could be unjust. There was no common power and no Law. Because there was no law, there was no justice. Thus, force and fraud in the war were virtue to Hobbes, Justice and injustice were not faculties of body or of mind. There was no property except property of man, if he could get it he could keep it. This natural
condition stayed on, which was natural. To Hobbes the only possibility to come out of this ill condition consisted of passion and reason.

Passion made man to come out of the evil conditions because:

1- It inclines man to peace
2- It is fear of death
3- It creates desire for things necessary for life.

Reason suggests articles of peace, by which agreements are drawn. To Hobbes, these articles of peace are natural Laws thus the agreement in the form of contract is the embodiment of Natural Law.

Hobbes gave a number of different points defining these embodiments of Natural Law such as:

1- **Liberty:**
   It means each man has to use his own power by himself for the preservation of his own nature that is his life. This is in the absence of external hindrances.

2- **Contract:**
   It is an agreement between men and among the group of men to lead an agreed life style based on common desire. Thus contract is the mutual transferring of right.

3- **Covenants:**
   Form the transfer of right the contract follows another Natural Law i.e. covenants. When the rights of all men to all things are granted the remaining men are still in the condition of war. So a new covenant is made. Under which men do not only mutually transfer right but they also surrender their rights. To come out of the condition of war they try to become just by following the performance of covenant.

4- **Gratitude:**
   A man receives benefit of grace from other man endeavor. It means when gives benefits, he has no reasonable beneficiary of his good will. Thus there is an acknowledgement of obligation.

5- **Complaisance:**
   Every man strives to accommodate himself with the rest. Man is striving for superfluous things, and is guilty of war and war is contrary to Natural Law, which seeks peace.

6- **Pardon:**
   To forgive the past offense, there is nothing but granting of peace and ensuring better relations in future. If there is no pardon, state of war can occur anytime.

7- **Revenge:**
   The object of revenge is not to look at the past evils but the greatness of good. It means that punishment will be inflicted with a view to correcting the offender, in case; punishment is inflicted to hurt the
offender or to humiliate him, will glorify no end, because this will start a war. Attitude of hatred and contempt even for punishment leads to bitter relations.

8- **Contumely:**

The breach of Natural Law that is revenge is called contumely. No man should declare hatred or contempt towards other man.

9- **Equality:**

All men by nature are equal and breach of this is pride. In case of dispute between men, they will mediate equally between themselves. On the absence of a mediator or a judge who are partial, it will lead to war.

10- **Common Enjoyment:**

From equality follows another Natural Law i.e. that a thing which cannot be divided must be enjoyed in common. If the quantity of things permits it should be divided proportionally otherwise the division is unequal and contrary to equality.

11. **Lot (by many):**

Entire right is to be determined by lot. There are things which neither be divided nor enjoyed in common. Therefore, Natural Law prescribes the entire right to be determined by lot.

12. **Arbitration:**

All men mediate peace to be allowed safe conduct. Therefore, it is the law of nature that in case of controversy, case be submitted to the judgment of an arbitrator. This judge will bear in mind that there is always a possibility that in other cases in which he is involved partial judgment may be extended to him. And partial judgment can lead to condition of war.

In conclusion we see that Article of Peace which Hobbes called Natural Laws for the conservation of men in multitude is doctrine on which a civil society is based. This is only possible for making a civil society.

**Social Contract Theory**

Contract is an agreement made on mutual basis between two or a group of persons. The social contract is an agreement made on mutual basis by the pressure of society.

The social contract theory is a theory of state by which a political society is establishment with a contract between the ruler and the ruled by which the ruled agrees to submit before the ruler’s law and order and the ruler promises to give protection of life and property to the ruled.
The theory of social contract was developed by three medieval thinkers, Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau, who advocated that the state of nature need to be politically organized, which could only be done by social contract.

Hobbes was an English political thinker. He was influenced by the historical events of his time and the political environment which he witnessed. He saw the rulers of the Stuarts under King James I, King Charles I and King Charles II. He saw the conflict between the kings and the people during the first two Stuarts and witnessed the execution of Charles I with the outbreak of the civil war of 1649. He also witnessed the dictatorship of the militant ruler Oliver Cromwell and later the restoration of Charles II as the king of England in 1660. These all historical events and violent political environment made Hobbes to believe that “man by nature is selfish, brutal, nasty and bad, and he is living in a state of nature which is under the period of constant warfare of all against all”.

Similarly, the empirical studies showed Hobbes the same concept of man’s nature. He was born premature birth, when his mother delivered him getting frightened by the news of the arrival of Spanish Armada, to warship bombard London. This story, she used to tell Hobbes that he was born because of her fear. Hence, Hobbes held that “his mother gave birth to twins, himself and fear”. It meant that man is born with fear. Hobbes came from deserted and broken home. His father had left his mother and children while Hobbes was very young, on which his mother used to complaint that how man by nature is crude and nasty being selfish. At the later stage, Hobbes was not a happy man, as he was always forced by the circumstances on selfish reasons of people and government for their benefit and pleasure. Thus, Hobbes recommended a contract between the ruler and the ruled to live in an organized political society, establishing a civil society to come out of the state of nature, which was under the condition of war against all. His social contract prescribed the following.

1. **Nature of man:**
   Man by nature are selfish and brutal, therefore they should be kept under a strong hold of ruler in the civil society.

2. **State of nature:**
   State of nature is period of constant warfare of all against all. Therefore, for the establishment of common will, a contract between the ruler and the ruled is necessary for the protection of life and property.

3. **Sovereignty:**
   The contract will create a sovereign in the common-wealth, who will be all absolute to maintain peace and security by holding all powers to control the warfare nature of man and secure peace.

4. **Government:**
   For that under the contract de facto and dejure governments are legal and same, and when the government is made de facto and dejure, sovereign is created thus to be obeyed.
5. **Location of Sovereignty:**

   The location of sovereignty is under one or few hands. But once given it cannot be challenge or recalled. Hobbes recommended a single sovereign i.e. King.

6. **Law Making Authority:**

   There was no right of people to participate in law making after the contract is made. It was the sovereign, who would make the laws and once the law is made it is to be obeyed.

7. **Right of Revolution:**

   Hobbes does not give right of revolution in his contract. To change the ruler means to him men's own choice.

**Sovereignty**

Hobbes is one of the champions of the concept of sovereignty in a civil society which is to him the most important and essential aspect of the state having a strong power and authority. According to Hobbes, the agreement with the multitude of men, a covenant is made and common wealth is constituted. These men make assembly of their representatives and every man who votes for it or does not vote for it authorizes all actions and judgment of that man or assembly of men in the same manner as they were his own for the purpose of living peacefully among themselves and to be protected against other men. Thus from this institution of common wealth the sovereignty is made. Sovereign received all rights and faculties from men with the consent of the people.

   Hobbes gives a number of points suggesting the power of Sovereign for a civil society that are following:

1. Sovereign is not obliged by the former convent. A new covenant can be lawfully made by him without the permission of the former rule. The men are subject of new Sovereign.

2. None of the men can be freed from the covenant.

3. Sovereign will not get consent of every man for his action rather he will be consented of all action of men.

4. Because every subject is the author of all actions and all judgment of the Sovereign whatever the Sovereign does, it cannot be injurious to any of its subject or any of them can accuse the Sovereign of injustice.
5. Because the Sovereign cannot be accused of injustice, he cannot be justly put to death or cannot be punished by his subjects. If his subjects punish him they would punish themselves as they are the authors of the covenant.

6. For the maintenance of peace, the Sovereign will check all the books which have doctrine. In other words, there cannot be any doctrine other than the Sovereign’s own.

7. Sovereign has whole power of prescribing the rule so that everyman knows what food he may enjoy and what action he may do. Before the Sovereign was constituted, it has been shown that all men had right to all things which created war of all against all. Therefore, Sovereign has whole power of making rule to maintain peace for that the subjects have to depend upon Sovereign (Page # 155 Done)

8. Sovereign has right of dedication i.e. of hearing and deciding all controversies which may arise concerning law.

9. Sovereign has right of making war and peace with other nations and common wealth. It is for sovereign to judge for the public good that how great forces are to be assembled and armies are to be paid for the end by levying money upon the subject for expanses.

10. Sovereign has power of choosing all councilor ministers, Magistrates, officers both in peace and war.

11. Sovereign is committed to power of rewards with riches, honor and of punishment.

12. Whole of militia is commanded by sovereignty. Because there is to be force in the hands of sovereign for in execution of law.

These powers mentioned above are to be with sovereign of Hobbes. It is not necessary that these be rested in one man rather may be in few or many. But Hobbes believed that monarchy is the most desirable form of government since it is least subject to passion to dissolution of whole society. Hobbes insisted that sovereignty is absolute and could not be denoted. He holds that sovereign is supreme in spiritual and temporal affairs.

No philosopher has taken more extreme view than Hobbes, regarding the absolute nature of sovereignty. Machiavelli separated politics from religion and morality in his philosophic theory. Bodin limits sovereignty by Divine Law, Natural Law and the law of nations. Hobbes makes sovereignty all powerful and unlimited while Grotius teaches that law of nature and of nations are binding upon all states, Hobbes teaches that law of nations or nature or even of God is binding upon man only through the will of his sovereign.

In short, we see that Hobbes theory of sovereignty is resulting in absolutism. It was based upon the doctrine that all men are naturally equal having the desire of large degree of individual freedom.
CHAPTER V

JOHN LOCKE

Life and Times

John Locke (1632-1704 A.D) was an eminent political philosopher of Great Britain like Thomas Hobbes. Locke was also influenced by his times as Hobbes. The difference between the two was the circumstances which brought diversion in their political philosophies. Hobbes passed through circumstances which led him to determine that human nature was essentially bad, nasty, and brutal hence life is short because there is a war of all against all. Locke on the other hand had a different experience in life. He was born in an aristocratic and sophisticated family. He was highly educated and became a professor of philosophy at Oxford. Wherever he went he made good friends who remained sincere to him all his life. He believed in intimacy with people he knew. He experienced toleration in the people with reason to dissent. He found absence of viciousness and wickedness in men which made him to believe that human
beings are good. All these experiences led to his assessment of human nature different to that of Thomas Hobbes.

Locke passed through a different phase of British history than Hobbesian era. The English history passed through a period of political instability and religious conflict leading to civil war and be heading of King Charles I. England also experienced a military regime for decay. When the restoration took place Hobbes was sent to his village on the condition not to write anything on politics. The period covering life of Locke was a peaceful phase in the history of England. He was a relatively a young man when England was under Oliver Cromwell who established a very conservative environment in British society. During his rule England remained socially and politically peaceful and calm. After restoration in 1660 under King Charles II the English political system witnessed a remarkable change compared to the period of James I and Charles I. King Charles II ruled the country throughout his state with the consent of the Parliament. He died in 1688 and was succeeded by his brother James II. The long period of rule of Cromwell (1649 – 1660 AD) and reign of Charles II (1660 -1688 AD) made English people used to a stable political society and social peace. There was no conflict of Catholic-Protestant matters. Charles II reign made people comfortable as he was ruling the country with the consent of parliament which did not bring any political conflict between the King and Parliament thereby resulting in socio-political peace in the country. Charles II was succeeded by his brother James II. King James II was unlike Charles II in his thought and acts as a monarch. He desired to rule the country like his father and grandfather with the supremacy of Catholicism. He had two daughters, Mary and Anne both were Protestants. Mary was married to the King of Netherland, William of Orange. The mother of the two daughters had died. King James II had married a young girl when he was 71 years old. His new wife was a staunch Catholic. She gave birth to a son and the British people believed that he will become King after James II. He will be brought up and trained in a Catholic environment by his mother together with his father’s palatial environment therefore the people believed that the political environment will return to the days of James I and Charles I. There was a bloodless revolution to remove James I and bring Queen Mary and King William to the British Throne. King James II abdicated the throne and the Parliament put Queen Mary and William the Orange as William III King and queen of England in 1689 by passing the Act of Accession. The 1688 revolution is known in British history as the Glorious Revolution because it was bloodless and brought glory for British people as well as the country. John Locke saw this change in the history of England very closely and came to believe that the people can change a rule with peaceful means.

Locke’s life experience British history made him to believe that by nature man is decent, peaceful and orderly and quite capable to rule himself. This became the foundation stone of his political philosophy. He diverted from Hobbes in his political thinking and gave significant importance to knowledge and experience. He believed that knowledge is derived from experience and therefore experience is important for an understanding. Realizing this he wrote his famous essay on Treatises on Civil Government in which he described his major political philosophy.
John Locke is known as apostle of the glorious revolution which was moderate and successful. His philosophy became so widely accepted, based on Theory of Consent that the American constitution of 1789 was drawn on Locke’s political doctrine. The British constitution followed it continuously and so did France in its constitution of 1871. He thus became the champion of liberal movements establishing himself as a first modern liberal thinker

General Philosophy

England of 17th century produced two important Thinkers, Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. Both presented the nature of political philosophy differently. Both have contradictory views based upon their concepts of nature of man and the state of nature.

Locke became the champion of constitutional monarchy because his philosophy was based on the theory of consent. He was the son of a small landlord and favorite of his father, with a high academic background from Oxford, where he also taught philosophy. He had a kind disposition, which made people love him and had a wide circle of friends which led him to have sympathetic view of human nature. Everywhere he went, he made friends and surrounded by a circle of devoted associates. He had ample opportunity to see different aspects of human nature.

His concept of "What men were" was based on the events of the year 1688, which was the period of the Glorious Revolution which ultimately led him to believe that human nature as decent, peaceful, orderly and social.

In his writings, Locke was counter part of Hobbes. Hobbes was the prisoner of the Stuarts and Locke was the prisoner of William III Locke was the philosopher of constitutional monarchy as opposed to the theory of Filmer, who was a believer of absolutism of the King. Hobbes believed that state of nature was a realm of reasonable freedom and equality because individual should enjoy liberty in social life in the state of nature.

Locke was also philosopher to develop the theory of division of power, executive and legislature. He also dealt with international relations which to him was the responsibility of legislature. His theory of division of power was concluded by Montesquieu, who gave the third power, judiciary in his theory of separation of powers.

Locke developed his theory with the right of resistance against tyrannical rule, which he called an appeal of heaven. To him, it was individual not the state, who is the local person in the social drama. Locke was also a pioneer of economic thought believing that labor is almost exclusively a producer of wealth.

To him, in a state of nature, men are free and equal. No one should impair the life, property, health and freedom of another. Natural law is the command of reason which is the preservation and the freedom of all men. Reason determines the degree of punishment. It is not blind revenge. These are natural laws for those who have reason. Treaties and alliances between the states do not break up the state of nature as long as they do not bind state into a united society.
In a state of nature, it is the duty of men to keep trust & cooperate with other men in living together according to reason without any magistrate, who has exclusive authority to direct them. An injured has the right to deal with the offenders because those who threaten liberty threaten everything.

Speaking of the family, Locke claimed that father as the head of the family who controls the children and also acts as a ruler of the family. People found prosperity, peace, protection and liberty in the rule of their fathers. The natural relation between parents and children are not political because family is not a political unit society and also marriage is not a political relationship. The right of decision belongs to the husband because he is stronger and better suited for it.

While discussing Law, Locke held that since men were by nature equal, free and independent, they could be legally subjective to the political power of others with their consent. Majority of the members were to decide that their will should be regarded as the decision of the entire community. Men save their natural liberty because the state of nature was filled with danger and fear. Therefore, laws were necessary to know the just and the unjust. A judge must have the necessary powers to give validity to law. A state is established through the arrangement of persons, who united themselves in common against others and who for this purpose subject themselves to the will of the majority. That was the beginning of the legally constituted government.

Hence, people should elect the ruler. The government should be based upon their consent. Through the creation of legislative power foundation of a state is laid and the state of nature ends. The legislature was established to put an end to the uncertainty of state of nature. No government should diminish the property without the agreement of the majority of the people or of their elected representatives. The law giver cannot impose taxes on his personal pleasure. He has no right to deliberate legislative power to others. His sole power is to create laws. The people should alone decide who should make their laws. Assembly should be dissolved from time to time for new elections.

The holders of the executive power may also act without law or depart from a given law if the welfare of the state urgently demands it as the legislature would cause too much delay. But it will be asked, who is judge, whether the prince or legislature, who has violated his or its duty.

The entire right for such questions to be asked is the right of the people. On the other hand, the prince should remove the unfaithful, who do not work for the welfare of the state because might do not become right even if un-resisted. The powers of the conquerors or victors over vanquished were continuation of war, not a political rule. Political power has its origin in the consent of the people.

There is complexity in Locke’s theory resulting in difficulties. He tried to combine multitude issues involved, which he never examined thoroughly. His political philosophy was an effort to combine past and present and also to find out a compromise for a responsible men of all parties. But it does not synthesize all that he combined with the diverse elements of the past. So, his political philosophy emerged the diverse
theories in the centuries followed. He never made up his mind what exactly was fundamentally original and what was not original.

Social Contract

Locke’s theory of social contract when explained depended on his concept of human nature. The nature of the society he lived in the nature of the contract he entered into and the rind of civil society resulting thereby. Locke was influence by his life time and history and believed that man by nature is good and his living in state of nature which is also good. Thus he advocated social contract to establish a civil society where man could be given opportunity to live happily and decently. His social contract describes the following:

1- **Nature of Man:**

Nature of man is decent, orderly and peaceful and men are quite capable of ruling themselves. A man will do the job in the civil society, if he is asked to do it. Thus, under the contract, the civil society is established with the consent of man.

2- **State of Nature:**

The state of Nature is the period of peace. Men in it are quite capable of ruling and they are free from constant warfare. Thus, civil society is created with the consent of man to rule them.

3- **Sovereign:**

Sovereign is not absolute. He has to follow the wishes of the people through their representation in the parliament.

4- **Government:**

The de facto and dejure governments are not same. De facto government does not have the consent of people and therefore, is not legal and not acceptable.

5- **Location of Sovereignty:**

Sovereign is vested in people and is under the government hold only in extreme case which makes revolution necessary. Thus, all acts of government are legal unless they violate the right of the people.

6- **Law making authority:**

The people have the right to make laws through their representation in Parliament. Hence, the parliament has the authority of law making. Once the law is made it is to be obeyed. The parliament also
has the right to change the law any time through the consent of the people if it is unsatisfactory. Therefore, people have direct participation in Law making through representation.

7- Revolution:

People have the right to change the government through revolution by election if they find the government unsatisfactory. Therefore, according to Locke people have right of revolution.

Theory of Consent

John Locke as a theorist of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 presented a philosophic defense of parliament. He opposed the ecclesiastical and political methods enforced during the later Stuart period (King James II). This attaching both Divine Rights theory and the theory of absolutism. He disapproved the doctrine of Royal prerogative based upon Divine Rights.

His theory of consent had its origin in his concept of social contract through which he desired to create his civil society or government. To him, the original state of nature was one in which peace and reason prevailed. It was pre-political but not pre-social. It was not lawless as man lived under the law of nature. Where all men were equal and possessed equal natural rights i.e. right of life, liberty and property. Locke defined liberty as freedom from all rulers except the ruler of nature.

The difficulty was as to constitute the law of nature, the absence of judge to settle the disputes and the inability of individuals to maintain their natural right against injustice – all these lead to uncertainties, which became intolerable. Accordingly individuals by means of a social contract formed a body politic, giving up their personal rights to interpret and administer the law of nature. In return, they were given a guarantee that their natural rights of life, liberty and property would be preserved. The power given up by the individual was not vested in a single man or an organ but in the community as a whole. They sovereignty of the political community or state was not absolute. It only had the power to protect natural law.

Such a contract based upon consent, involved the necessity of majority rule. Each individual surrenders his right to the executive and the law of state. The minority is bound by the will of the majority who might use force if necessary. The consent of individual of the political community may be expressed which may be given through process of election.

Locke recognized the distinction between the state and the government. According to him, government was created after the establishment of civil society. For this, a social contract among the people was to be made, by which a state was to be formed. Locke followed Aristotelian tradition in dividing government into monarchies, aristocracies and democracies, considering the location of legislative authority as a fundamental test of the executive and judiciary being clearly dependent upon the law making
body. Though Locke did not develop the theory of separation of powers, he considered democracy as the best form of government.

Locke viewed legislature as the supreme organ of the government as it came into existence through the consent of the people. However, he did not allow the legislature to enjoy absolute powers, because behind the legislature stood community which retained its natural right and which might dissolve the government, if it acted contrary to its trust because when injustice becomes the majority of the people might to civil authority. Thus, government must be based upon consent. His theory of revolution became one of the most influential doctrines of his philosophy.

Locke’s theory contained little that had not been worked out by previous thinkers but he added definiteness to the idea of natural rights, popular control and the right of resistance. He emphasized the importance of consent. He also emphasized upon human rationalization and the artificial nature of human society. His theory was purely political as he was not concerned, like earlier anti-monarchists, who opposed religious tyrants. He separated the church and state not to secure ecclesiastical independence of the state. He aimed to establish government channels popular through consent that could make it affective so that individual liberty could be safeguarded. He left a strong influence on constitution making of the future. Events like French Revolution, American declaration of Independence, British Constitutional development all have been deep-rooted in Locke’s theory of consent. It can be said that no philosopher was able to leave such an important in on the minds of men and their institutions.

Property

As an apostle of the Glorious Revolution of 1688, which left a tremendous mark on socio-political and economic history of England, Locke was influenced by the contemporary environment while presenting his theory of property. He said, “I will put down in the order in which they (property) occur.” He advocated that everyone should have private property as a product of his labor. He said that “private proprietorship is the best system” and stated that “a man may own as much land as he can till, but no more.”

Man has the natural right self-presentation so he eats drinks and utilizes him and so to eat, drink and has things which are natural to him. God has given the earth to mankind in common. But it was difficult to have property as God gave the world to Adam and his children in common but it was impossible that there could be one universal property. Though God has given the world to man in common he has also given reason to make use of it to the best advantage. The earth and all that is there has been given to man for his welfare and comfort therefore, all that earth produces belongs to mankind in common used by man. Yet every man has property in his own person. It is made by his labor and effort, whatever nature has provided him. He puts his labor and with it gets more property. Therefore, all of it is his own property because it is the result of his labor and the common right of other men on his property is excluded.
It is the law of reason, which determines the fact that property is allowed to the man, who has put his labor in it. Earlier ownership was a common right of every-one but, once it is removed from the state of nature it becomes property to be privately owned.

As much as a man make use of property, God has given to him and takes an advantage before it spoils so by his labor he makes the property. Whatever more beyond that his property he makes with his labor they belong to others. Therefore, nothing is made by God for man to spoil or destroy. By reason man keeps it and saves it. There cannot be any room for quarrel for property a man establishes. Thus, the chief matter of property is not only the fruit of earth but the earth itself. For example man improves plantations and cultivation with his labor, and he uses the product and so he makes his property. Other men have other lands to improve or cultivate. No man therefore has right to complain about a man’s property which he has acquired by his own labor. God has given land in common for the advantage and benefit of men but by reason, if a person gets more of it by his labor it is his alone. The limit property is determined by the extent of man’s labor which determines value. Thus, it can be said that labor give the right of property in the beginning.

Later, in some parts of the world use of money and stock were made, which made the lands of some value. At those places, some communities settled the boundaries of their district territories and by laws within themselves. That regulated the property of private man of that society. This way contract and agreement were made. Men settled for the property and with labor industry began.

Realizing that grains and fruits would perish or decay if they were left without use and were not consumed men also learned that gold and silver and diamonds were things that fancy. The agreement or contract had put their values in their i.e. eating and necessary support of land. Thus man exchanged his produce for piece of other article like metal, clothes or diamonds which he could keep for all his life. This way he did not invade the rights of others.

The use of money was then introduced which was a lasting thing that a man could keep without spoiling and also it was with mutual consent. As the possession of man increased with the increase of industry, it gave men the opportunity to continue and enlarge their industry or property.

Since Government regulates law men by consent agreed how a man rightfully and without injury losses more than he himself could make use of, by receiving gold and silver. It is easy to conceive how labor began in property of common things of nature and how this led to our consumption and use. Reason gave man the right and conviction that a man had right to all that he could apply his labor on but not to that which he was unable to use. He had no temptation to labor for more than he could use thus, there was no room left either for controversy about the property or for encroachment on the rights of others.
CHAPTER VI

JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU

Life and Times

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778 AD) lived an exciting and adventurous life. As a supporter of Social Contract Theory the names of three thinkers Hobbes, Lock and are Rousseau are associated in the study of modern political thought. These three thinkers had divergent views mainly based upon their life and times. They explained the concept of nature of man and state of nature based on their experiences therefore their concept of Social Contract differed from each other. Unlike Hobbes and Locke, Rousseau passed through different life experiences. To him life was very precious. He was born a caesarean birth in which his mother had died therefore he used to say that life is precious because my life cost my mother’s life. He was born in Geneva to a middle class family. His father was a watch maker who also played music in the night hours in a local restaurant. His father irresponsible and had an unstable character. Due to his wife’s death he had to bring him up but he could not give him a systematic training with proper education. His rather took him to another direction of reading him erotic romantic material which developed an unhealthy effect on Rousseau’s emotions and passion. Ultimately his father left him and went to France when Rousseau was still a child of about ten. He then lived with his uncle and took up ordinary jobs which made him to steal and lie. In other words Rousseau grew in an unhealthy social environment. He lived in Geneva and then went to France at the age of fourteen where he took up job of playing music in restaurant like his father, living a life of a vagabond. One day he saw an advertisement in the newspaper about an essay competition in which he participated and got the first price and overnight he became known to the aristocratic French society.

The period in which Rousseau lived was the period of the despotic and aristocratic regime of Bourbons of France. The reign of Louis XIV was at its peak which was later followed by his successor Louis XV and Louis XVI who were greater despots. He became part of the aristocracy and lived an adventurous life in the contemporary social environment.

Rousseau continued his vagabond life with the thought of living in the present without any regret for the past and anxieties for the future. In the society he was treated with kindness but because of his egoism, vanity and bad manners he failed to maintain permanent friendship with anyone. It was his famous
book ‘The Social Contract’ which brought him fame and status of a political genius. His experience and life made him to believe that man by nature is excellent but he vehemently believed that “Men is born free but everywhere he is in chains”, this led him to develop his concept of General Will as sovereign of the state. It was a vision which had not been realized in practice since Plato. The General Will became the foundation of his political philosophy which ultimately led to the idea of democracy. It may be right to say that Rousseau’s political philosophy became the foundation of two famous revolutions, The American Revolution of 1774 and the French Revolution of 1789. It is also said that he influenced the development of political philosophy by many factors such as economic inequality, his personal family life, philosophies of Hobbes and Locke, concept of human nature enunciated by Plato, democratic concept of constitutionalism of Montesquieu, and his love for democratic institutions.

Social Contract

The Absolutism of King Louis XIV, of France and the Suppression of the people by the government made him to believe that men wanted freedom and liberty which they were not given. Thus, to establish a civil society, he advocated a social contract with the following description:

1- **Nature of Man:**

   By nature man is excellent and lives in a happy environment. He should be given all happiness and liberty to live free.

2- **State of Nature:**

   The state of nature is a period of happiness and provides all good for the people and is like a paradise, hence the civil society should maintain these conditions.

3- **Sovereign:**

   Sovereign is to be absolute. It is to be the General Will and once made, it is all powerful.

4- **Government:**

   De facto and demure governments are the same and are legal.

5- **Location of Sovereignty:**

   Sovereignty is located with everyone. It means that the General Will is sovereign which can be challenged anytime by the people.

6- **Law Making authority:**

   People have all right to participate in law making, and without them laws could not be made. The government is an agent of the people to execute popular will.

7- **Right for evolution;**
Revolution can over throw the government anytime whenever people feel it necessary. Thus, right of revolution for people is legal at all places and at any time, whenever The General Will demands.

Influence of Rousseau’s philosophy led to the French Revolution of 1789, and the American democracy declaration of Independence. Thus he is considered the champion of modern democratic theory. As a Social Contractualist Hobbesian concept cannot be ignored because he too influenced many countries. In political turmoil, the rulers are inclined to follow his policy of absolutism and examples of such conditions can be drawn from European history after Hobbes. In the contemporary age, particularly in developing areas, political turmoil only ended when absolute rulers restored peace and security and welfare of the society. Contribution of these three thinkers, Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau, together with their support of the social contract theory in political philosophy has significant value.

General Will

Rousseau’s theory of General Will is intimately connected with his concept of popular Sovereignty. The distinctive demand in Rousseau social contract is that the community which comes into existence as a result of social contract is itself the sovereign. Rousseau said that the act of association creates a moral and collective utility, having its own identity, life and will. This will is he describes as the General Will and it is under the supreme direction of the General Will that each member puts his person and his total power. What man loses by the social contract is his natural liberty and unlimited right to everything. He succeeds in getting liberty which is limited by General Will. By the social contract man exchanges his natural independence to do and get what he can in return for civil liberty which is limited and secured by the General Will. Man continuously participates as individuals in the General Will in which sovereignty resides. Rousseau’s sovereignty is something more than the supreme coercive authority. General Will always aimed at the common good and is conceived only with those things which are of common concern and not with those which are purely personal. To Rousseau, The General Will must be general not only in its purpose but also in its composition. This means that it must take into consideration the will of each member of the community.

The General Will cannot be taken to mean the sum total of the wills of all the members of community. Rousseau distinguishes between the General Will and the Will of All. He says that the sum-total of the wills of individuals can never constitute the General Will because the sum-total of the wills of all takes note of personal and private interests while the General Will deals with matters of common concern only. It is a unity which the will of all can never be. The General Will expresses the will of the community as a whole and not as a mere aggregate of persons. It is not a compromise between the conflicting will of members and a single unitary will. It is unitary because the sovereign body which expresses it is a moral and collective person having a life, will and purpose of its own. Rousseau’s General Will is nothing more and nothing less than the will of the people functioning as a whole. It has a corporate existence which can belong only to a body having a common life of its own. It cannot be discovered by the process of counting heads and is something general towards the creation of which every member of the community contributes.
The nature of General Will proceeds on the functional assumption that every individual aims at something which he takes to be good. If there were no such things as the will for good in the life of an individual, there would be no General Will. Therefore, the General Will and the will for good in the life of an individual are to a great extent identical.

Rousseau is well aware of the fact that an individual as a particular man may have a particular will, contrary to the General Will that he may have as a citizen. His particular and personal interest may demand of him a course of action different from or opposes to that required by the general will. When such a conflict arises it becomes the right and duty of the community to convince the individual to obey the General Will. For Rousseau, freedom is something towards which individuals respond. It is the condition of being own self but in order to be oneself, we must be always attain for something more than we have become in order to assert the control of what we recognized as our real self over the actual self of desire and inclination. Thus, in being compelled to obey the General Will, the individual is realizing his highest freedom which consists of mastery over his self and law of reason. Obedience to the laws of totalitarian state does not lead an individual to the highest freedom because these laws are not always commands issued by a master.

The General Will according to Rousseau is always right and infallible, because it has virtue and cannot seek anything but the general good. The general will cannot be persuaded towards uncommon interests or for the good of an individual or a section of people or an individual rule or a government of oligarchy. General will thus remain truly general and it must always by nature be right. General will is sovereign and it has all the features of sovereignty. It is absolute, indivisible and inalienable, and it must reside in the community as a whole. If it is divided it will be destroyed. Inalienable means, the people cannot surrender or delegate their sovereign power to individual or to a group of individuals. In his concept of general will Rousseau had in mind the city state; direct democracy could exist and function. His doctrine of inalienable general will cannot be applied to modern nation states, which are large in size and population and where representative institutions are unavoidable. He was opposed to representative principles because he was afraid that the elected representatives, who were under no obligation to voice the feelings of their constituents, will be brought over by a corrupt king or aristocracy.

The General Will cannot be the executive will. Its function is to make laws but not to execute them. The law must be executed by different agencies like government or the magistrate. It cannot itself execute the laws because it is universal, while decrees of government are particular and non-universal. Thus, Rousseau drew a distinction between the people who were sovereign and the government which is subordinate and therefore, responsible to the people.

CHAPTER VII
BARON DE-MONTESQUIEU

Life and Times

Baron De-Montesquieu (1689-1755 A.D) was born in France and belonged to an aristocratic family. His original name was Charles Louis Secondat and he inherited the title of Baron De-Montesquieu from his uncle who gave his fortune to Charles Louis on the condition that he inherits his title of Baron De-Montesquieu. Since then Charles became known as Baron De-Montesquieu or simply as Montesquieu. He acquired more fortune after his marriage from his wife and thus became a very rich man. He studied law and was man of a kind heart ready to help the needy and destitute. At the age forty he toured Europe and visited many countries including England where he spent two years. He studied the English political system closely and learned about it through leading statesman of the country. He was highly impressed with it especially by its concept of liberty. On return from his European tour he was engaged in writings because in his early days he had already written his famous treatise *The Persian Letters* which was published in 1721 bringing him fame. At a later age he wrote several books such as *Reflections on the causes of the Greatness and Decline of Romans* and *The Spirit of Laws* which became his master piece as a contribution to political philosophy.

Montesquieu was influenced by history which led him to believe that a monarch maintains or loses power because of moral or physical causes and this he learned from Roman history. His book *The Persian Letters* expressed his criticism on church and state in relation to social, political and religious life with reference to France. He learned the concept of liberty from the British political system which became the central point of his political philosophy. Although he was himself from an aristocratic family, he became a critique of the Tudor Dynasty of England and the Bourbon Dynasty of France. His philosophy is therefore based upon history as well as empirical and inductive methods. He was under the influence of Aristotle and did not agree with Plato, Hobbes or Rousseau. He also used scientific methods like Aristotle. He believed that human customs and patterns result in diverse attitudes therefore there is a need to form a universal principle to have a common pattern in human behavior. He looked for uniformity as against diversity. Unlike Plato, he did not advocate an ideal state. He remained a champion of pragmatism and the use of law of reason for governing the political society believing that there are two sets of influence upon human beings, one conducted by man’s nature which is God gifted, and the other is worldly like environment, soil, climate, social and religious values of the people along with the government of the state in which they lived. To him, in such a condition it was the function of the legislature to create such laws which could keep the people in uniformity despite the existence of diverse natural and environmental factors.

Montesquieu’s political philosophy became unique in the sense that it differed from all his predecessors except Aristotle. He became a champion of theory of Separation of Powers. This concept was essentially given by Aristotle who had defined his citizenship saying citizens are those who perform the legislative, executive and judicial functions of the state. Montesquieu’s concept of theory of Separation
of Powers is an influence of Aristotle except that he elaborated this theory to a great extent on universal bases. It is also significant to note he combined sociology and politics for the study of the state believing that study of government could not be complete unless human behavior is examined as it influences human action in all socio-political activities. He believed that there is nothing in the world which is completely isolated; hence man is related to both God and environment. And these two relate man to other men; and it is the law which can properly govern all men. God has given natural law which is related to the universe, God being the Creator and Preserver. Similarly the laws made by the people will govern the people covering external nature that is under the influence of environment which relates to human social and political behavior. Thus to govern the state the law is called political law or constitutional law. His philosophy of Separation of Powers highly influenced the modern state system and became a basis in the development of a democratic society.

**Theory of Separation of Powers**

The concept of liberty by Montesquieu occupies an important and vital place in his book, *The Spirit of Laws*. Here he discusses classification of states, fundamentals of the three forms of the government, cause of transformation of a state and the concept that the size of the state has a decisive influence on the principles of government.

He held that the drawing up of a bill of right and making it a part of formal constitution of the state does not ensure the attainment of liberty by the citizens. To him, proper declaration had little value and what matters, was not the letter of the day but the spirit in which it was applied. Rights recognized by the constitution were valueless unless the laws were put into action.

Montesquieu believed that in a broad sense liberty meant that individual was acting according to his will. The political concept of liberty fails to draw a clear distinction between law and natural freedom and independence. Freedom to do as one’s will is liable to conflict with the power to do as one pleases. Political liberty cannot be conceived as unrestricted freedom. Therefore, liberty is only the power of doing what one ought to will and not being constraint to do what one ought to will. Liberty is the right of doing what the laws permit and if a citizen could do what laws forbid, he would no longer possess liberty because all his fellow citizens would have the same power.

In a good state, the laws would satisfy the requirements of the people. But the difficulty arises when the laws of the state clash with the moral conviction of an individual. Montesquieu was aware of the difficulty. He also realized that different governments make different laws at different times. However, he is concerned that every government should be self-consistent and should not leave the citizens uncertain about the laws, they have to obey. What is required is that citizens should know that there is a law and that they would be punished, only when they violate it. The problem is how to ensure that there should be no undue interference in the affairs of the citizens by irresponsible government officials. To Montesquieu, the solution of the problem lay in the theory of separation of powers which he believed was realized in the British constitution. He was greatly impressed by the freedom enjoyed by the British people under constitutional
barriers against the use of arbitrary powers by the monarchy. Thus, he suggested that the three functions of the government which are legislative, executive and judicial should be separated from each other and entrusted to different persons. This is his theory of separation of powers which he describes in the following words:

“In every government there are three sorts of powers, the executive, the legislative to things which are dependent on the laws of nation and the judiciary in regards to matters that depend on civil laws.”

Hence in Montesquieu’s theory, the political liberty of the subject arises from the opinion each person has of his safety. His liberty requires that the government be constituted because one man is afraid of another. When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same persons or in the same body of the magistrate, there can be no liberty because the same monarch or the legislature can enact tyrannical laws and execute them in a tyrannical manner.

There is no liberty if the judicial power is not separated from the legislature and executive. If judiciary is combined with legislature, the life and liberty of the people can be exposed to arbitrary control because the judge would be the legislature. If judiciary is combined with the executive, the judge might use violence and oppression. Therefore, there would an end for everything, if the same man or the same body whether of the nobles or of the people exercise these three powers that is of enacting laws, executing the public resolutions and trying the cases of the citizens as well.

His theory of separation of power given by Montesquieu is nothing more than a technique of organizing the government with a view to prevent the abuse of power which is inevitable when power is concentrated in one individual or a group of individuals.

Montesquieu was not the originator of the theory of separation of powers. It is found in the writings of Aristotle, Polybius and even Locke. Montesquieu himself agreed that England derived it from the practices of ancient Germans but he expanded this theory in a precise manner. He believed that though it would secure political liberty of individuals, it would not achieve its full purpose unless reform of criminal law and procedure is not made simultaneously. Montesquieu however failed to distinguish between political and civil liberty. Moreover, he could not find rational justification to practically achieve liberty.

In short, the concept of the theory of separation of power left a significant mark on constitution making of the future on an unlimited number of constitutions adopted the theory of separation of powers in their systems of government.

Environment

Montesquieu believed that physical environment of a country exercises a decisive influence on its laws and social and political institutions. His work, The Spirit of Laws, traces the effect of soil and climate on laws, liberty, social, moral and religious ideas of the people. He is in fact the first philosopher a present and environment theory. Although it’s beginning in modern institution was made by Bodin, the effect of importance physical conditions on Montesquieu work profound.
Montesquieu established the relation of cause and effect between Soil and climate, fertility, natural resources and topography of a country, even the habits and the character of the people living in it including their social and economic ideas, laws and manners, moral and religious beliefs. The general principle in his environment theory was different wants in a different climate had given rise to different ways and of living which have resulted in different kinds of laws. Montesquieu showed the effect of heat and cold, dryness and moisture on the human body as well as the intellect and passion of man. These in turn determined the character of the people through which the social and political institutions emerge. He concluded that cold climate make people active and energetic and warm climate induces lethargy in them. The cold climate is conducive to liberty and the warm climate to slavery and despotic rule. Comparing Europe and Asia he believed that European countries have had more or less free governments compared to countries in Asia, where generally despotic governments prevail.

To him, vast geographical divisions whose continuity is not broken by deep rivers and high mountains develop despotic rule. On the other hand, regions, where nature has divided the land into small compact units are congenial to the growth of free political life. However, this argument is contested because countries like U.S.A and Australia having vast regions unbroken by rivers and mountains have establishment democratic forms of government.

Besides this social environment also exercises equal influence on laws and political institutions of a country. These are the socio-economic and religious ideas of the people, their customs and manners, moral standards and religious beliefs and practices. In totality, these constitute the spirit of the people in the form of folk ways and cultural values. The spirit of the people is a potent factor because no law can be respected and obeyed which runs contrary to it. Therefore, the legislators should know the spirit of the people and should see that laws made conform to it. It will be disastrous to make laws which made it in consistent with. If national folk ways are changed by regulations, it would lead to tyranny. The best way to change these is to make them better.

Montesquieu also discussed the relation of law to religious conditions. He praised Christianity and regarded it as the truest of all religious. He believed that is was not suited to all types of people. Discussing the relation between the state and the church, Montesquieu maintained that neither should invade the sphere of action of the other, whether, it is weak or inefficient. The state should extend toleration to all existing religious and also motivate each one of them to tolerate the rest in the interest of public order.

Montesquieu’s theory on environment is based on the belief that men are governed by different kinds of laws such as divine law, ecclesiastical law, civil law, political law and the law of nations. He carefully distinguishes these laws and says that one should not regulate the other law, otherwise injustice and disorder will prevail.
CHAPTER VIII

JERMY BENTHAM

Life and Times

Bentham was born in an aristocratic lawyer family of England in 1748. From the childhood he showed his intelligent learning Latin at the age of three and studying Voltaire at the age of 6. He studied law and instead of becoming a lawyer he choose writing on political philosophy. He wrote many books such as *Fragments of Government*, *Introduction to the Principle of Morals and Legal*, *The theory of Punishment and Reward* and *The Book of Fallacies*. He followed the politics of Tory Party but later turned towards practical politics. He lived a long life and died in 1832. As a pioneer of utilitarianism he has credit of bringing many reforms in the British socio-political and economic life.

Bentham stands out as a distinguished philosopher who pro-founded theory of utilitarianism. He belongs to a period which witnessed significant events in the development of man which influenced his mind and thought. The beginning of the Industrial Revolution in 18th century and entering its height in the 19th century was a time when Bentham was born. The later half of the 18th century witnessed two revolutions, French and American which had opened the human mind towards freedom with the slogan of Equality, Liberty and Fraternity.
The Industrial revolution brought a social revolution with a rapid change in socio-economic development and rural to urban migration leading to urbanization and modernization thus affecting the existing political thinking and value-systems. The increase in wealth and a new emerging middle class developed consciousness among the people of use of their power for their political ends. At the same time the rise in urban population strengthened the urban power in political life with demand of greater freedom and participation in seeking their rights for good living.

Both the Revolutions brought a turning point in the political thinking of the contemporary intellectuals. Among them Bentham was included who saw a rapid change in English political society which was his homeland. In England the industrial life developed workers’ association and intimacy among themselves creating pressure for better working conditions with high wages. This led to the conflicting environment between the newly established industrialists and workers of their industries and factories. This conflict spread further when they joined the workers in the cause of economic need. This developed the frustration among the masses which included Bentham as well, thereby leading him to develop his famous theory of ‘utilitarianism’. Wherein, he emphases rights of man, on happiness and welfare. Thereby pressurizing the government to reform and regulates the socio-economic life of the common people.

Bentham’s major contribution to modern political thought of utilitarianism is considered remarkable. His utilitarianism philosophy gave a systematic form to political society. He was responsible for the end of social contract theory which to him meant that, state was not a result of social contract but because of social advancement in political society. He rejected the states supremacy saying that the state had no right to punish the subjects on committing crimes as to him laws passed by the legislature were defective. Bentham stood for individual freedom and asked for people participation in governing and administering themselves. This made him the pioneer of democracy and democratic institutions. He believed that an institution should be judge from the purpose which it served. He applied empirical and critical method of investigation to look into the problems of government and administration. Bentham will be remembered as a champion of middle class uplift. He was not a revolutionary against the British conservative society of his times rather he suggested reforms in the whole legal system of the country. He wanted reforms even in prison management. He looked for reforms and not replacement by other institutions emphasizing on the representative character of the political society to make laws and achieve greatest happiness for the greatest number.

**Utilitarianism**

The Industrial Revolution and French Revolution 1789 constituted the background for the development of British Political thought in early and middle part in the 19th century leading to democratic feelings in British society wherein the people wanted to enjoy their rights and participate in the affairs of the state particularly the emerging middle class. This major outcome was the theory of Utilitarianism based on:

“The greatest happiness of the greatest number is the sole end of the public utility”.
Bentham was the follower of Hume, whose concept of utility was the basis of the state and political obligation. He introduced the experimental method of measuring into a moral subject.

Bentham disagreed with Hume on the point that English laws and judicial procedure be removed being of ancient origin. He argued that laws of today must be shaped by the legislator of today in accordance with the needs of his time and that the sole criterion of these needs must be greatest good of the greatest number of men. To him, the principle of utility demanded that the contribution to the good of society should be the only rational ground on which the old laws should be judged and evaluated and new ones introduced. Whatever is not conducive to the happiness of the individual should have no place in society. Bentham rejected out rightly the theory of natural rights as it was metaphysical. He held that all rights that a man has, should come to him by law which itself is based on utility. Bentham employed empirical or scientific method of reasoning that everything in social phenomena should be calculated tabulated and reduced to measureable propositions in the same way in which physical phenomena are calculated and measured in physics.

Though he rejected the theory of natural rights as vague and abstract, he believed that every man had a right to pursue happiness. He desired to discover the laws which governed human action in the pursuit of happiness and make them as precise as a mathematical formula. Therefore, theory of utility of Bentham led to a qualitative determination or moral and political phenomena.

Bentham interpreted utility in hedonists (pleasure-pain) way. The interpretation was based upon the view that men are subject to two sovereign masters, pleasure and pain. The utility of a thing is determined by the extent to which it seeks pleasure and diminishes pain. From this it is clear that the utility held pleasure to be the only thing desirable in and for itself for example, wealth, position, power or even virtue desired merely as a means to the ultimate end of seeking pleasure.

He developed his doctrine of hedonistic calculus as an integral part of his utility theory. According to the principle of utility, every man whether in private or public life should choose the course of action which will produce the greatest happiness to the whole. The legislator should make the happiness of the people, the aim and the end of his enactment and policies through hedonistic calculation. Bentham desired for correct and accurate limits of pleasure and pain.

To him, pleasure and pain admit measurements and comparisons in respect of their intensity, duration, certainty, time, extent and purity.

Since the act of every individual is to have the greatest amount of happiness, he should choose those courses of action which are calculated to yield certain pure, fruitful, lasting and intense pleasure.

There is great difference between the greatest happiness of the individual and happiness of the greatest number; the two may pull the individual in different directions. Therefore, there must be a sufficiently strong motive inducing an individual to pursue the greatest happiness of the greatest number even when such a course is against his own interest. On the basis of hedonism there needs not be natural
identity between self-interest and public interest. But Bentham differentiated between the two. He required
the individual to sacrifice his own pleasure for the sake of pleasure of others which he called the sanctions
on morality and classified them as physical, political, popular or religious. He believed that men are made
to prefer that greatest number to their own greatest happiness by the fear of punishment.

For his theory of utility, for seeking of the greatest happiness of the greatest number, Bentham
suggested the following:

1- Universal Suffrage for the determination of majority opinion.
2- Annual election to parliament by which the governors could keep themselves in touch with the
governed which would prevent governors from abusing their absolute power and authority.
3- Vote by secret ballot for the selection of the representatives chosen by the people.

Bentham was also opposed to the House of Lords because it was hereditary institution and it did
not represent the public. Further he also rejected monarchy and aristocracy and stood for democracy as
the best form of government.

The pragmatic attitude led Bentham to exalt the individual and subordinate social and political
institutions. He judged them by the touchstone of utility. He laid great impetus to the reform of inefficient
institutions saying there was no use for ethical absolutes or for the law of nature. He completed the bridge
between politics and ethics which was built by Machiavelli and Hobbes before him thus establishing a close
connection between politics and ethics by asserting that the individual needs help of the state in his pursuit
of happiness.

**Government**

In the principle of utility, Bentham had little or no interest in the form of government. He views the state
as a machine devised by men to impose whatever seems rational and good. Thus, he is naturally indifferent
to its forms or basis. Nevertheless, he accepts the division of government into monarchies, aristocracies
and democracies. He considered first two (monarchies and aristocracies) to be bad. Aristocracy is worse
than monarchy but in both of them, the general interest of the people and community is liable to be sacrificed
for similar interest of the governing bodies or classes. They (monarchy and aristocracy) are not in a position
to promote greater good of the greatest number.

To him, representative democracy is more likely to secure the greatest happiness of the greatest
number by adopting constitutional devices such as:

1- Universal suffrage
2- Annual parliament
3- Vote by ballot
4- The election of Prime Minister by parliament
5- Appointment of civil servants on the basis of competitive exams
Bentham favors democracy for another reason also. He realized that there are greater chances of a comprehensive code of law based on the principle of utility accepted by a democratic government than by a monarchy or aristocracy. He is particularly opposed to the British system which to him was an aristocracy-ridden monarchy and suffers from evils of both the systems.

Bentham is eager to see that justice is administered deeply and expeditious to the deserving and oppressed. He puts emphasis on the most urgent and vital need of those days to reform laws in all its forms. He urges the need of codification of British law holding that law must be expressed in a simple understandable language. He is vehemently opposed to the use of unnecessarily technical and obscure language of laws because the delay and expenses involved protected legislation pressing heavily on the poor. Bentham advocates the system of having only one judge to try a case because plurality of judges trying a case meant slackening and transferring of responsibility on each other. For a check on judge, he recommends the reform of punishment and prisons and judgment should be inflicted not with view to avenging the worst done but for preventing crime and securing public welfare. He was opposed to the infliction of death sentence for crimes other than murder. He was not opposed to women’s franchise proposing political reforms for securing effective representation of the people. He does not recommend second chamber in the legislature and greatly disliked the hereditary character of the British House of Lords.

**State and Government**

Bentham was a legal reformer and not a philosopher hence in his political writings he seemed to possess a passionate desire for legal and parliamentary reforms centered on his principles of utility. The most significant political idea of Bentham is that he conceives of the state as a group of persons organized for promoting the pleasures and happiness of the people. To him the state and society are nothing but a group of persons bound together by obedience to common authority. Bentham believed that the individual is the ultimate reality and society and the community are factitious bodies hence the state exists for the individual and not individual for the state.

Bentham, in his theory of state, explains the meaning of political obligation. To him, contract, consent and agreement furnish no basis for the duty of obedience rather the state is obeyed not because of obligation of the contract but because it is found to be useful to do so.

As the probable mischief of disobedience is less than the probable mischief of disobedience. The government continued to exist and command the obedience of citizens as long as they promote general happiness of the community. Thus, people have right to disobey when government fails in the performance of its main task.

He also distinguishes between natural liberty and civil liberty. Natural liberty consists in doing what one likes and it cannot be enjoyed in a civil and political community. Civil liberty is to do what one wishes provided it does not conflict with the similar freedom of others and civil liberty is promoted by law in a utilitarian State. According to Bentham, law is a command. It is the expression of will of the authority that
people habitually obey. It does not have its sources in nature or reason. The only source of law governing human conduct can be the will of God or the will of man. The purpose of Law is to regulate the motive of self-interest that it should operate towards the production of general happiness.

From the concept of the command of authority it follows that according to Bentham, the state must be sovereign. Sovereignty being absolute and unlimited cannot be illegal. The only conceivable limit to sovereign authority is imposed by and effective resistance of the subjects.

Men are moved to act solely by the desire of pleasure and the desire to avoid pain and each individual is the best judge of his own interest. Thus Bentham concludes that the main function of the state is legislation and the chief aim of legislation is to remove all institutional restrictions on the free action of individuals. The functions of the state are to restrain men from indulging in activities which effect general happiness adversely by attaching penalty to such performance. Government is best when it governs the least for which Bentham wishes for noninterference in the affairs of man as far as possible.

Bentham does not disregard the right of private property and defends it on the ground of general utility. He holds that the happiness of an individual consists of four things:

1- Substance
2- Abundance
3- Equality
4- Security

He maintains that the government should not take away the property of the citizens without adequate compensation defining even property on the basis of utility.

**Social Development**

The concept of social development in Bentham has also been taken from his theory of utilitarianism. He defined the ‘principle of utility’ which was greatest happiness of the greatest number, as the sole end of public utility. He presents his concept of social development with reference to this principle. To him, when pleasure is measured, one must take into account its utility, duration, certainty, purity and extent. For this purpose, Bentham requires from a man to promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number differentiating between the greatest happiness of the individual and social contract of the greatest number. Bentham believes that a man can pursue different directions therefore, the greatest happiness of the greatest number, must be sufficiently strong to pull him towards it even against other interests. Hence, on the basis of his hedonism, he projects the need for a natural identity between self-interest and public interest. He was aware that there are some super added pleasures and pains, specially the pain which induces the individual to sacrifice his own pleasure for the sake of pleasure for others. Bentham calls these sanction of morality and classifies them as physical, political, popular and religious. He relies mostly upon the political sanctions which were the reward and the punishment given by the state in view of social development. Punishments to him, were more potent than rewards. An individual is led to regard general happiness as distinct from his personal happiness as the criterion of right and wrong which is the penal law.
Men are made to prefer the greatest happiness of the greatest number instead of their own greatest happiness by the fear of punishment. Punishment in itself is evil as it causes pain therefore, Bentham desires that it should not be inflicted when there is no evil to be presented or when the evil it produces is greater than the evil meant to remove it. It can be justified only if it prevents a greater pain. Thus, Bentham rejects the theory of punishment which maintains that it is the penalty for sins that the criminal is made to suffer because he has violated the social order. Bentham advocates the determination of the extent of punishment in a rational manner saying that the quantity of punishment should be measured. It should be just sufficient to deter people from committing crime and should be such so as to meet the requirements of each individual case with a view to prevent crime and lead to correction of the culprit, suggesting reform and not mere punishment.

Bentham’s concept of utility has been criticized on the ground that there is no surety that the legislators and statesmen would make the greatest happiness of the society or of the greatest number their primary concern. Besides how can one secure that the natural self-interest of the rulers would not deter them from promoting the happiness of the masses. Bentham thus presented his scheme for a model prison as he did not have faith in the oligarchic government of his day. He proposed changes could transform it from an oligarchy to a partial democracy.

He suggested introducing universal manhood franchise wherein every adult man should be able to record his vote and thereby contribute to the formulation of majority opinion. He also suggested annual elections to the parliament. To him, that was the only way in which the governors could keep themselves in touch with the governed which can prevent them from abusing their power and authority. He holds that members elected to the parliament should be regarded as delegates and not representatives because a representative could more easily cast off the control of the constituents who elected him. When parliament is to be a body of delegates chosen by the people, there is no room for King, the House of Lords and an established Church in the reformed constitution of England.

Bentham opposed the House of Lords not only because of its hereditary character but also on the ground that in an annually elected parliament a second chamber is not at all necessary. Similarly he stood for the abolition of monarchy on several grounds and also because he had little liking for King George III.

Thus Bentham is assessed as a legal and political reformer with his basic doctrine of utility with criticism on his pleasure-pain doctrine. But many measures were taken in Great Britain during the 19th century as an influence of his thought. He had a pragmatic approach to exalt the individual in his social and political life. He regarded the government as an instrument for the betterment of existing conditions and desired to reform inefficient institutions rejecting ethical absolutes or law of nature.
CHAPTER IX

John Stuart Mill

Life and Times

John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), an outstanding political thinker was son of an established political philosopher James Mill (1773-1836), who was a friend of Jermy Bentham. J.S. Mill was influenced by both his father and Bentham. However, the socio-political conditions of nineteenth century changed to a considerable event in which J.S. Mill lived. He was born in England and remained a close associate of his father. James Mill was so much influenced by Bentham that he desired J.S Mill to be a legitimate heir of Bentham philosophical tradition. He forced targeted instructions upon his son, J.S Mill with rigidity to instill in him a perfect utilitarian mind. Hence Mill initial education was provided by his parents. At an early age of three he started learning Greek and at the age of eight he began the study of history. Still young, at the age of fourteen he was sent to France for further education. Upon his return to London, he studied law and spent considerable time in company of John Austin, who was a close associate of his father and Bentham. In the company of his friends, James Mill fed his son’s mind with Benthmite tradition of utilitarianism.

J.S. Mill served the East India Company as its senior administrator till the company was dissolved with the passage of Parliament Act of 1858 and he then went into retirement. He was elected member of House of Commons and served Parliament as a legislator for one term. His later years were spent on his writings where he achieved a remarkable scholarship in political philosophy. His famous works On Liberty and Representative Government gave a systematic expression of his political theory, published in 1859 and 1861 respectively. He was recognized as a distinguished scholar with his renowned work, Political Economy published in 1844. He wrote many other books contributing to political philosophy.

J.S. Mill’s political theory was based on the principle of logic which he developed in his book System of Logic, published in 1843. He emphasized upon logical procedure to be applied in relation to society and government. He used empirical approach in his theory like Bentham. Saying that men differ from age to age, experience and time. The circumstances of the particular time determine the character of a society hence these two are interrelated as well as dependent upon each other for the purpose of goal achievement. The study of history gives us the record of ups and downs of humanity. Experience is value which we learn
from history. In short, history gives us knowledge of laws of human progress. However, history generalizes the law of progress and its need to be verified accordingly.

Mill agreed that pleasure is the ultimate test of moral value but he asked for strengthening the utilitarian position considering the difference between different kinds of pleasure. He spoke as a non-utilitarian saying some pleasures are of higher quality than others. Bentham believed pleasures differ only in quantity whereas Mill held that there is a distinction between quantity and quality of pleasure. He emphasized on the quality of pleasure which was neglected by Bentham making him differ with Bentham on the principle of utility. Mill took non-utilitarian position believing that it is not the principle of utility but the dignity of man which is the final goal of life. He held that on pleasure is better than the other, if it promotes the dignity in man. To him moral obligation for a man cannot be interpreted by the principle of utility as Bentham believed. Thus Mill’s theory developed into a complete systematic philosophy of individualism in relation to social, political and economic life of the individuals.

Mill’s Criticism of Bentham

J.S. Mill found a creed, a doctrine, a philosophy and a religion in Bentham’s principle of utility. He desired to defend utilitarianism and introduced many non-hedonistic elements in his version of utilitarianism with the result that little of the original creed was left.

To Mill, the only thing desirable in and for itself was pleasure and freedom from pain. Other things were desired only as means to this supreme end of life. Thus, source and quality of the pleasure were irrelevant to the determination of the rightness and wrongness of an act. Mill believed that pleasure differed in quality as some pleasures were higher than and superior to others, even if pleasures were not equal.

Thus, Mill rejected Bentham’s concept of quality of pleasures being equal meaning Mill’s utilitarianism was not materialistic. He rejected Bentham’s concept that pleasure must be conceded in complete.

Mill’s Concept of Utility as Different from Bentham

Mill debated on Bentham’s thought saying that Bentham is intends pleasure in the absence of pain and the unhappiness means pain and the privation of pleasure. He says that to give a clear view of the moral standard, set up by theory much more requires to be said particularly what things the theory includes in the ideas of pain and pleasure and to which extent these questions are unanswered by Bentham.

Mill indicated that the only thing desirable for man is pleasure and freedom from pain, other things are desired only as means of this supreme end of life. Therefore it is necessary to follow that source of quality of pleasure and it is irrelevant to determine the rightness and wrongness of an act. Bentham realized it fully and held that quantity of pleasure being equal all good are equal. But Mill admitted that pleasure differs in quality because some pleasures are higher and superior to others even if as pleasures, they are equal.
He thus rejects the notion that all goods are same. Mill holds that as a source of pleasure, a good depends upon results e.g. those who have experience of both higher and lower pleasure agreeing in higher pleasure.

Mill gives importance to the source of pleasure and not the pleasure itself. He virtually abandoned Bentham’s theory that man can never escape by the subjection of sovereign motives of pleasure and pain. He disagrees with Bentham that pleasure must be conceded in complete abstraction from the objects which produce it and from the men who feel it.

He also rejects Bentham’s fundamental thesis that men are moved to action solely by the desire to obtain pleasure and avoid pain saying that the best way to obtain happiness is to fix the mind on some objects other than one’s own happiness e.g. on the happiness of others such as on the improvement of mankind. He holds that the best way of attaining is to aim at something other than self-motives. To Mill, Bentham’s thesis is wrong and he gives a new meaning to the principle of utility admitting quantitative distinction among pleasure and insisting that high pleasure must be preferred to a low one. Utility no longer means the hedonic value of things. To Mill, utility means all the good things for which men aspire such as liberty, culture, education and the higher values of life. A happy life for Mill is moral and intellectual and not a life filled with moments of pleasure. He further disagrees with Bentham’s views of the greatest happiness theory as a political rather than as an ethical principle. Bentham’s was more interested in legislating or administrating for the determination of social development.

**On Liberty**

Mill deviated from the fundamentals of Bentham’s utilitarianism in his famous essay On Liberty, which was published in 1859.

In England in the middle of 19th century, Bentham’s followers of utilitarianism resulted in the extension of control over government by increased number of citizens.

As a result several Acts passed by the parliament were specific to social good such as regulation of child labor, factory act and improving conditions of daily life of the people. Government also improved health and sanitary conditions. Consequently, the government to promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number, extended its machinery. There was a movement to extend franchise and expand the facilities for education so that the citizen can understand their responsibilities. The revival of local self-government had allowed the citizens to play their part in governmental affairs. The problem of the individual liberty and the relation between the society and individual was brought to the forefront by the theory of social institutions. The question was being asked, whether the social institutions were product for the general development or they could be controlled or moulded by individual efforts. The consequences of application of Bentham’s utilitarianism to practical life drove men towards the necessity of a fresh relation between society and the individual.

Under such circumstances, it was natural for J.S. Mill being passionately devoted to the cause of liberty, to go for its defense. The result was his famous essay on liberty. His essay was a powerful plea for
the liberty of thought, expression and action, not only against legislative interference but also against the pressure of public opinion and conventions. The way in which the British government was interfering with the freedom of individual in its efforts to promote general happiness by social legislation made it clear to Mill that popular majority could be as tyrannical as despotic rulers or tyrants were in the past. Therefore, desired that limits must be set to the power of popular government. He held that it is not only against the tyranny of the magistrate that an individual needs protection. The individual requires it equally against the tyranny of the society. Thus, liberty which Mill seeks to defend is wide and comprehensive liberty to develop, enrich and expand his individual personality.

Mill defined freedom of thought and expression because he was convinced that it was socially valuable is securing and cultivating mental and moral character in the individual. In short, Mill defended liberty because he realized that there would be no self-development in its absence.

According to him, to understand liberty one should know that:

1. The individual is sovereign over his mind and body. He must be left free in all spheres that concern him. The society has no right to impose restraint because it obstructs the development of human personality.

2. Activities of any individual are either self-regarding or other regarding. The society has no right to use force or compulsion in regard to matters which effect the agents only and are of no concern to others e.g. drinking, gambling. If an individual does something wrong in this sphere, all that society can do is to disagree with him and try to persuade him. It has no right to use force against him.

3. Mill's agreement rests upon a regular notion of liberty. He objects to private social control over the self-regarding activities of an individual. Because Mill regards restraint as evil he is convinced that human personality can develop only in an atmosphere of freedom. Therefore, absence of liberty consists in the essence of external restraints.

4. Mill's individualistic concept of liberty does not make an individual responsible to society because it concerns the interest of no person but himself.

To Mill, the only ground on which society is justified in interfering in the liberty of action of its members is to prevent harm to others. The good of the individual whether physical or moral, is not sufficient reason to interfere.

He also defended absolute freedom in thought and expression because he was convinced that it was only man’s mind that changes society. All wise and Nobel things come from individual's mind and only free discussion can nourish fruitful ideas.

**On Democracy and Representative Government**

In his book, *Representative Government* Mill advocated constitutional reforms by which the goal of good government could be achieved or could be best realized and the evils inherent in respect to government could be avoided.

He believed that the most important pain which any form of government could possess was to promote virtues and intelligence of the people themselves. A good and wise government should do the utmost to bring upon the affairs of the society the individual, his intellect and virtues.
To this end, Mill advocated far reaching electoral reforms which should be designed so as not to leave the choice of the government into the hands of ignorant masses and marginalized in the government a of collective mediocre. He suggested proportional representation and plural voting. By means of proportional representation he hoped to give proper weight to the right qualities needed in a candidate and to eliminate to some extent at least the evil effects of the numerical superiority of the ignorant masses. He recommended that the right of vote should be given only to those who passed a certain amount of intellectual capacity irrespective of gender. Thus, he stood for women franchise.

In plural voting he excluded those from electoral list, who could not read and write and did not know arithmetic. He included those to have right to vote, who paid limited tax imposed by the assembly arguing that those who pay no taxes may be without intellect. Therefore, Mill proposed plural voting as a counter poise to the numerical weight of the least educated class.

Regarding the function of the representative assembly, he pointed out that it should be:
1. An organ to watch and control the government.
2. To reveal its acts by transparency.
3. To compel exposition and justification for all it does.
4. To censure if found condemnable.
5. If the men who composed the government abuse the trust of the people they are to be expelled them from office and successors be appointed.

The business of legislature or the parliament was not to govern. To Mill, parliament can function as a committee of grievance and a congress of opinion. The proper function of parliament was discussions, deliberation and making the government aware of the impact of public opinion. Parliament should exercise supervision and control over those who actually govern and administer the affairs of the nation. He suggested that the work of administration should be left to the permanent civil servants whose members should be appointed after a most careful scrutiny of their intelligence and capabilities and their work should be controlled by Ministers in various departments. He combined the necessity for skill and intelligence in the making of law and actual direction of government affairs with the principle of popular sovereignty. He attempted to combine the principle of aristocracy with democracy through the formal civil servants and representative government.

Mill rejected Bentham’s proposal for direct control of administration by an elected parliament he believing that the representatives of the people were unfit in pursuit of the goal of the greatest happiness. He advocated efficiency of parliament at civil servants.

Mill also rejected Bentham’s idea of annual elections to the Parliament and the notion of delegation. He believed that men of higher intelligence should not be made subject of the control of men of lower capacity. He urged the development of hidden capacity of individual advocating an extension of local government in order to highlight the responsibility.

In sum, Mill was distrustful of democracy. He described the dangers and evils of representative government under two heads, positive and negative. In negative, crises occurred if and when sufficient power was not concentrated in the hands of authority to fulfill necessary offices of the government. Its positive ends as identified were:
1 General ignorance and incapacity i.e. insufficient mental qualification in the controlling body.

2 The danger of it being under the influence of those interests which were not identical to welfare of the community.

However, Mill was not altogether an anti-democratic. As writer on democracy he insisted that like liberty, democracy was not suitable for all people, but it was the best form of government whenever it was possible.

Mill was a democrat because he believed that a government was ideally the best in which sovereignty or supreme controlling power was vested in the aggregate of the community. He believed that democracy made man happier and better.

He also distinguished between false and true democracy. A democracy which gave due weight to all the different elements of society was true democracy. Therefore, a true democracy was to have proportional representation, plural voting, record chamber and above all it should not ignore the vital distinction between controlling the business of government and authority and should leave the individual to do things which he can do better than the state. It should not be blind to the danger of a powerful bureaucracy and also should be alive to the dangers of tyranny of the majority.

Mill maintained that democracy was superior to a monarchy and aristocracy because it influenced human character while other forms of government (aristocracy, monarchy) tended to produce passive character through which nothing original or inventive could be deduced. Democracy made people realized that they are to stand up for their rights making. People learn to rely upon themselves rather than what others could do for them.
CHAPTER X

KARL MARX

Life and Times

Karl Marx (1818-1883), one of the most influential philosophers of the modern era was born in Germany in 1818 in a well-established Jewish family. He was sent for higher education at the age of 17 and received his doctorate when he was 23 from one of the universities in Germany. In 1843 he went to France and as a journalist met many known radical figures of the time such as Cabet, Provdhon, Heine, Bakunim and Mazzini. He came in close contact with Friedrich Engels who became his life time companion. Engels was the son of a rich industrialist but had similar economic ideas to Marx, who was a socialist and strong supporter of workers’ share in the production profits. Marx became a leftist under influence of Engles. Marx observed capitalist development in England which led him to develop his philosophy of Scientific Socialism along with Engles. Both together came out with the most famous book, Das Capital wherein they developed their ideas on socialist theory. Marx wrote many books among which the Communist Manifesto brought him everlasting fame.

The period Marx lived in was full of socio-economic changes emerging by the impact of the Industrial Revolution which was in full swing in the 19th century. It resulted in the formation of two distinct classes, mill owners on the one hand who had wealth and the workers on the other hand, who were poor. The feudal lords of England had moved to urban areas of London with their interest in the new industrial setup. The development of a new life in emerging urbanization led to the increase of new socio-economic needs of the middle and lower classes in the British society. The influence of Industrial Revolution expanded towards other areas of Europe, particularly in France. Both England and France at that time were under strong political conservatism of the capitalist society. France had been continuously facing political upheavals, one after the other competing among democracy, monarchy, autocracy, and despotism. In a nutshell, the whole of the 19th century was engulfed with new socio-economic crises creating demands of the fulfillment of the essential needs of the middle and lower classes. Marx closely observed the whole
situation in Europe, particularly England and France. He concluded his thought in his philosophy of historical materialism on basis of what he called scientific materialism.

Marx was highly influenced by Hegel who was a university professor but had already died before Marx entered as a student. But Hegel's influence had been so high that a Hegelian club of younger students was established of which Marx also became a member. Hegel was a liberal and believed in rule of law rather than rule of men. He was an idealist and Marx was under his influence following his philosophy but became a philosopher of materialism which transformed Hegelian approach of idealism. The central idea of Hegel was dialectical method saying every statement of truth or thesis has an opposite called anti-thesis which is also truth. This thesis and anti-thesis to Hegel, ultimately meet together and create a synthesis which is common to both. In passage of time this becomes a thesis and the dialectical process continues. Marx used dialectical idealism of Hegel through history and combined it with materialism. Thus where Hegel was a theorist of idealism, Marx was a philosopher of materialism. He called his philosophy as Historical Materialism or economic interpretation of history. Through history he believed civilization pass through four stages master and slave to feudal and serfs to industrialist and laborers to capitalist and workers. These four stages finally come to the stage of bourgeoisie and proletariat. This historical combination of the Haves and Have Not are those among whom the class struggle continues and history is evidence of it. It is inevitable that this struggle will end and as a result will form a classless society.

The philosophy before Marx was a kind of struggle between idealism and materialism. The revolutionary thought of Marx developed the human mind on the emphasis of change rather than thought which was in the defense of proletariat interest. He gave a revolutionary philosophy through his books Das Capital and Communist Manifesto which brought such a change that it became an ideology of the Russians and the Chinese in the 20th century. He believed that political power is organized power which should not stay with one class to oppress the other. The supremacy of class will come to an end when proletariat comes in power after the class struggle. There will be such an association with free development that each one in this social life will get benefit for all. Hence Marx favored classless society in which everyone will receive the benefit according to his work and his needs and the state will no longer be needed hence it will wither away.

**Dialectical Materialism**

Dialectical Materialism constitutes the foundation on which the entire structure of Marxian thought rests which is based on Hegelian Dialectics. Hegel realized that since reality was dynamic and evolutionary in nature, it could be understood by means of static concept of formal logic which was applicable only to a static world of abstract ideas. The logic which can help to understand the constantly changing and developing world must be different from old tradition and formal logic. Thus, Hegel formulated a new logic for the purpose which could explain change and development through contrast and contradiction which he called Dialectics.
The Dialectical Materialism of Hegel was explained with the theory that the law of evaluation was the law of negation. It asserted that thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis were stages of development. The thesis broke down because of the internal contradiction it contained and gave rise to its anti-thesis. We may say that it was negated by the anti-thesis. But the anti-thesis, which attempts to remove the contradiction of the thesis, also broke down for the same reason and was replaced by the synthesis, which contained the vital elements of both thesis and anti-thesis. The synthesis could thus be described as the negation of the negation. The synthesis in turn became a thesis and gave rise to anti-thesis or its negation and the process went on.

Marx was impressed by Hegelian thought but he did not agree with Hegel that idea was the principal cause of the historical process and absolute idea was the goal of the evolutionary process. Main purpose of Dialectical Materialism was to show that socialism can never be born except out of the ashes of the capitalist society. To him, out of struggle between the capitalist class and its enemy the proletarian class, the perfect social or communist society in which there shall be no classes and no coercive repressive state would emerge. On the basis of Hegel’s idea that there could be no progress without conflict or contraction, Marx built his own Dialectics what was very different from that of Hegel’s. The difference between the two was that for Hegel the evolving reality was spirit and for Marx it was matter in motion. Hegel believed that the historical development took place under stress of conflict between nations and its moving forces and ideas. Marx believed that the events in which the humanity becomes organized in the course of historical development were economic classes not nations. Thus, to him, the thesis, antithesis and synthesis of Dialectical Materialism were economic classes and not categories or ideas. He further believed that the formation of class less society could not give rise to its antithesis and with the establishment of classless society the Dialectical process of class conflict would stop.

There is a strong criticism on Marx’s concept of Dialectical Materialism. It is said that the phenomenon does not exist in isolation but is highly dependent and therefore must be studied in a relationship. It must also be studied as changing and developing. One cannot set a true prospect of capitalism unless it is viewed as a transitional stage in the process of historical development, from feudalism to socialism. Since Dialectic method regards conflict as the moving force behind all development it was taken for contradiction in the process of nature and society.

If the social institutions and phases of human civilization like feudalism and capitalism can be treated as developing through contradiction, it is because they reflect embody ideas. Feudalism can be regarded as incomplete and regarding its opposite capitalism, it is an inadequate embodiment of absolute reason. The notion of self-development through inner conflict is applicable only to the spiritual principle like mind or reason and it cannot be applied to a non-ideal and non-spiritual entity like matter as was suggested by Marx.

However, it should always be remembered that Marx was not interested in Dialectical Materialism as a philosophical notion. He was interested in Dialectical Materialism as providing him with a basis for a programme in action. He adopted from Hegel but dropped it because he disliked idealism.
Marx on Historical Materialism

Marx's Materialistic interpretation of history is generally known, as Historical Materialism, contains a greater amount of truth than his Dialectical Materialism or his theories of class struggle and surplus value.

His Historical Materialism has exercised a profound influence on Social Studies. Moreover, it represents a very valuable advance in the field of social sciences. It is also called economicism but is not possible to explain all historical movements exclusively in economic terms.

Human life is full of complexities and cannot be explained in terms of a single factor like economic, religious, philosophy, climate etc. there may be other factors like greed, lust for power, love and sex which have played their part in determining the course of human history. A reading of history would show that factors, other than desire for profit and economic power had determined the course of events.

Marx adopted Dialectical Materialism as the basis of his system because he found in it a great weapon by which he could free socialism from its sentimental, moralist and visionary background and could make it scientific which was to be supported by the central position occupied by the Materialist interpretation of history.

Marx's interest in social science and social philosophy was fundamentally practical. He wanted to discover the law and method of social and historical change to formulate the tactics suited to the revolutionary proletarian theory. Thus, Marx adopted Hegel's Dialectic and applied it to history and social development in his famous theory of Historical Materialism.

The material things to Marx are the active determinants of historical development which are power of production. The power of production includes three things:

1. Natural resources including land, climate fertility of soil and mineral resources like coal, iron, water and power.
2. Machinery, tools and techniques inherited from the past.
3. The mental and moral qualities of men of the time.

As civilization advances, machinery tools and techniques which are the production of human intelligence play a greater role in extending man's control over nature. These cannot be designated as material things and they do not convey the impression that intelligence and reason are the course of history. Marx believed that human history is shaped and molded by the physical environment alone. Hence, Hegel's interpretation was idealist and Marx was materialist.

To Marx believed that men are not what they are in virtue of ideal influence. These characters are made by the manners, in which they earned their daily bread. Therefore, the determinants of social and political changes should be sought in the material conditions of life and not in the abstract consumption of eternal truth and justice.

As mentioned above the material things of life are the factors which influence production of wealth. Marx maintained that the forces which determined human and social history are economic and not cultural or political leading to the transformation from one form of social organization to the other, and are not affected by the emergence of new conception of truth and justice or new rational principle. It is the result of new inventions which radically change the relation of production i.e. the relation between man and his
environment. Thus, to Marx, the mode of production of natural means of existence conditions the whole process of social, political and intellectual life. Therefore, it is not consciousness of man that determines their social existence it is the forces of production which determine the relation and the relation of production in turn is the foundation on which all institutional and ideological superstructure of society is built. In sum, the substance of the material and economic interpretation of history according to Marx is that the ultimate determinant of social change is the transformation in the mode of production and distribution. History changes particularly where change in the system of production and distribution occur due to corresponding changes in social, political and religious institutions. For example, when feudalism declined and commerce and industry developed towards the close of middle ages, all the feudal institutions which were suited to their special economic needs were replaced by new social and political institutions, new principle of morals and legislation and new economic theories were adapted to the requirements of the new nation state. The new nation states were emerging and their spirit and institutions had to undergo change as the emphasis shifted from industrial to finance.

Thus, Marx was convinced that when the social, legal and political institutions of a society fail to adjust themselves into the rapid and radical transformation the system of production and distribution of wealth, crises grips the society. The only way out of this difficulty is revolution and thus Marx declared that class struggle is the only way of change in the social structure. His theory of class struggle therefore is connected with the materialistic interpretation of history.

In conclusion, the materialist interpretation or Historical Materialism rests upon the assumption that ownership of the means of production is the means of power in society. This is true to a large degree. In the present days, in capitalist society, political power is the hand-maid of economic power. However, it does not follow that economic power is the only type of power that leads to political power as Marx assumed. Even in history, there are several examples, where power was gained and retained for a long time by non-economic means such as papacy of middle ages, the foundation of Islamic society and the state in history and the extended empire of the caliphs.

**Class Struggle**

With his Historical Materialism or economic Materialism, Marx places his doctrine of class struggle. The Historical Materialism contained his theory of social change and in the theory of class struggle Marx described its mechanism i.e. the manner in which society progresses from one stage to another in the course of its development.

Marx found in class struggle the key to the understanding of human history. According to him, “The history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggle” this meant that every major historical event in history was characterized by the determinacy of an economic class. It yielded to another event in which the rival economic class which was exploited in the preceding era triumphed over its erstwhile exploiters after a hard struggle. Thus, according to Marx, the social movements which made history were
class movements. To Marx, at all times and in every country, society tended to divide itself into two main hostile classes differentiated by their economic conditions. One was the small privileged class of the owners of the means of production and other class was the large class of toilers, who worked on the raw material and changed it into usable commodities. There was struggle between these two classes for economic and political power and the great movements of history were consequences of this struggle. History has recorded events from ancient Rome of Roman nobles and slaves, in the Middle Ages the feudal lords and serfs and in the modern society, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. We can understand fundamentals of Marxian theory concerning the class struggle with the view that in every system of production society tends to split up into two hostile camps with conflicting interests, Wage earners want to secure the highest possible prices for their labor but are at a great disadvantage because they have to find a quick purchaser of their labor otherwise they would starve as their labor cannot be stored or preserved. Whereas, the capitalists can store or preserve their capital consequently, the wage earners have to accept the terms of the capitalist which turns the employer’s interest into a great weapon of oppression and exploitation which the wage earners have to bear. Therefore, whenever the workers become conscious of their exploitation they rise up in revolt against the oppressors thereby permanently establishing hostility between the capitalist employer and the exploited working class in every system of production which ultimately makes the class war inevitable leading to Surplus Value and concentration of capital.

Surplus value means the difference between the exchange value of the product created by labor and the value of labor power. Marx claims that the wage paid to the workers in the factory are not equivalent to the value they produce and is only equal to about half of this value or less. The rest of this value produced by the workers day is taken by his employer. This excess value taken by his employer constitutes the surplus value and it is constant effort of the employer to increase his profit.

Marx believed that the struggle of the present period of history is going on between the capitalist employer and the proletariat which has become keenly class conscious and revolutionary. It was undermining the capitalist structure and was bound to revolt in its overthrow with its final triumph of the proletariat.

Marx believed that the bourgeoisie system of production has outlived its usefulness. It was no longer able to control the powers of a revolt. It was too narrow to contain the wealth it had created and therefore was decaying. The recurrent crisis of over production which were sought to be met by deliberate mass destruction of the wealth it had created, revealed its inner instability. The Bourgeoisie had thus forged the weapons that would bring death to itself by the modern working class of the proletariat.

Marx also believed that the Bourgeoisie system of production had tendency towards centralization. As business grew, fewer individuals were in a position to secure the capital necessary to enter it. As factories grew larger and number of workers increased large industrial centers came into existence with large population. Thus the Bourgeoisie system of production led to the concentration of population in large urban areas creating centralization in industry and concentration of property in fewer hands. On the other
hand, the workers begin to form their groups or unions against the Bourgeoisie. They unite themselves together in order to keep up the rate of wages and to establish permanent association with a view to make provisions beforehand for occasional revolts. They become more unified for a class struggle and formed ever wider and bigger trade unions. These concentrations gave them power to purchase the whole fabric of society through mass strikes. Thus, it become obvious that the division of society into two conflicting classes creates class consciousness among the people leading to a class struggle on the economic basis of Haves and Have Not in all periods of history whether traditional, transitional, modern or recent.

**CHAPTER XI**

**VLADIMIR ILYICH LENIN**

*Life and Times*

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin (1870-1924) was the first modern Russian philosopher. He was pioneer of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. The widest territorial state of Europe, Russia was clouded under the despotic monarchical system of Czar’s traditional rule in the 19th century. The political conflicts among European states led to a continued struggle amongst each other in the 18th and 19th century leading to the monarchs’ desire for greater wealth and a strong defense against other states. This had led to the development of autocratic and despotic monarchical setup mostly in European states particularly Russia, France, Prussia and Austria. Although England was losing the monarchical political strength with particular reference to the two century influence of Thomas Hobbes and Rousseau but the rise of Industrial Revolution and growth of urbanization in England had changed the socio-economic orders of British society. England remained under the umbrella of conservatism supporting capitalist socio-economic system. In case of Russia, Czar Nicholas I remained a strong hold of autocratic regime. His son Czar Nicholas II was much more despotic in all aspects compared to his father. His life was extremely luxurious creating of revolutionary ideas among his populace. This was a period of the conflicting environment between the feudals and serfs on the one hand and the emerging industrial class and workers on the other. Marxian philosophy during this period had already expanded its clout over Europe widely affecting Western Europe and now it had entered into the eastern part of the continent which included the territory of Russia. The Russian as a nation was highly frustrated with autocratic and despotic regime of Czar Nicolas II and the rising demand of fulfillment of their economic need.

Lenin was a brilliant student but while he was young his father suddenly died in 1886 when he was only sixteen. He had an elder brother who had dedicated his life to the revolutionary struggle against the Czar’s autocracy. He introduced Marxian ideas to Lenin who learnt about socialist and communist philosophy from a young age by the literature of Karl Marx. His brother was arrested and executed with the charge of assassinating the Czar. The execution of his brother brought a change and revolutionary ideas in Lenin. He believed that to bring the revolution the first task for him was to make himself strong enough. He also believed that for a successful revolution the overthrow of government or even the assassination
of the Czar was not enough. Lenin thus sought to liberate the working people who could support his mission of revolutionary ideas. For this he decided to establish a well-organized political party with a strong leadership which could overthrow the autocratic despotic regime of the monarch. He established the Communist Party of the Soviet Union under his leadership and started propagating socialism in the country. He had already passed through the first stage of the revolution in 1905 when he was not in the country and this revolution was brutally suppressed by the government of the Czar. Lenin returned to Russia after spending 17 years in Europe from (1900-1917). He quickly took up the command of the Bolshevik group of political party to overthrow the government of the Czar. Disagreeing with the minor group of the party who were called the Menshevik faction, Lenin asked for peace, liberty, bread and land for the workers and peasants. Thus there appeared a second revolt on October 24, 1970 lead by the Bolshevik’s which overthrew the government of Czar by assassinating the whole family of Monarch of the Czar.

Lenin was a true disciple of Karl Marx bringing proletarian revolution transmitting capitalism to socialism and building of a communist society. He came so close to Marxian thought that the two could not be separated and since then the term Marxism and Leninism was set in the history of political thought. Lenin Developed the Marxian philosophy, political economy and scientific communism practically with the founding of communist Russia. He was not only a true believer of Karl Marx theory of historical materialism, he also believed in the Hegelian theory of dialectical materialism as very close to truth by the cycle of thesis, anti-thesis, synthesis and again will continue in the search of good and truth.

Leninism-Marxism

The concept of Leninism- Marxism or Leninist- Marxism has been identified by three definitions.

1. Leninism is something described as the application of Marxism to the condition peculiar in and to Russia. Lenin not only applied Marxism doctrine to Russia he also altered them to suit the situation. He was essentially a practical revolutionary aiming to bring a proletariat revolution in Russia and not to advance any philosophy of revolution. He modified Marxian revolutionary thought coherent to necessary conditions of Russia and presented practical policy and not the policy of ideas. The Leninism is nothing but Marxism as applied to Russian conditions and environment.

2. Leninism is said to be the revival of revolutionary element of Marxism that brought the growth of moderate revolutionary socialism. Marx did not speak of national patriotism believing that workers have no country. Lenin revived this idea of Marx. Though he fixed his attention on the evolutionary side of Marxism and completely ignored its revolutionary aspect, he stepped forward in the development of Marxian thought under the new conditions of monopoly of capitalism or known as imperialism. Thus, Lenin brought Marxism up to date in existing European conditions restating his Marxian doctrine under condition of imperialism and proletarian revolution.

3. Leninism-Marxism took a further step ahead after Lenin’s death by his successor Joseph Stalin. He elaborated Leninism-Marxism as an adequate term based on imperialism with proletarian revolt.
in the background. Stalin held that Leninism was the theory and practice of the proletarian revolt in general and dictatorship of the proletariat in particular.

Stalin observed that the condition under which Lenin applied the teachings of Marx to those prevalent in Russia necessarily led him to lay great emphasis on the strategy of practice of revolution putting the doctrine of dictatorship of the proletariat in the center. To assess the role played by Lenin in the development of Marxism, it is necessary to bear in mind that the teachings of father of the scientific socialism were presented with a double interpretation. Lenin refused the revolutionary aspect of Marx and was considered as the defender of Marxist faith in his early life, he acquired extraordinary knowledge of Marxian theory but his own life experience made him to mold Marxian thought. He continued his activities till the end of his life by teaching the insight of the interpretation of Marxism the mentality of the Russian masses, which he had very carefully noted and chose Russia to become revolutionary under the conditions of those days by bringing a Bourgeoisie revolution and setting up of a democratic government with capitalist economy in place of Czarist regime. The socialist leaders believed that the Russian peasantry was not prepared for a socialist revolution and so socialist revolution could only be engineered by the industrial proletariat. Lenin was opposed to all these thoughts. He held that it was not necessary for Russia to pass through a revolution based on the industrial proletariat. It was feasible in Russia to mold liberal Bourgeoisie rules towards a revolution. Lenin insisted upon the creation of a suitable and effective party organization of preferred revolutionaries who could work in extra-legal ways. This point of view of Lenin led to the success of the 1917 revolution in Russia which was certainly different from the main line Marxian tradition. Thus the Russian revolution was considered the Russian charter carrying Lenin’s Marxism.
CHAPTER XII

Al-Farabi

Life and Times

Abu Nasar Muhammad Al- Farabi (870-950 A.D) was born in Wazij, a village near Farab, Turkey. He became fluent in Arabic being educated in Baghdad. He was associated with Christian teachers where he learnt about Aristotle and Politics. He was called "second Aristotle" being influenced by Aristotle’s philosophy thereby developed Muslim theology, jurisprudence and constitutional theory. Farabi was the first Muslim thinker who combined Platonic, Aristotelian and Sufi theories in his own philosophical writing. He also integrated Hellenistic philosophy with Islamic thought. Al-Farabi lived in an age of turmoil in the Islamic empire due to different causes such as religious, racial, philosophic and cultural differences. New dynasties were threatening the reign of Abbassid caliphs who were getting weaker and Caliph had become a puppet in the hands of the strong surrounded ruling dynasties which were Persian and Turks and different to Abbassids in racial and religious values.

Al-Farabi has left five known works on politics:

1) Summary of Plato’s Laws
2) Siyasatul-Madaniyah
3) Ara u ahli Madinahtu’l- Fadilah
4) Jawami us-Siyasat and
5) Ijtima atu’l – Madaniyah

Among these five two of them are well known: Siyasat and Ara. Siyasat has his philosophy as a whole whereas Ara deals with only a 'Model State'.

Human Intellect and Power and Human Groupings

His treatise Siyasat consists of practically whole of the political theory of Farabi. It begins with differentiating men and animals, then the it deals with the needs of man and its impact. It deals with the need for the existence of the Model city or state and the ideal Head of State. Comparing the ancient and in the tyrannies, autocracies and republics.
His other work *Ara* concentrates on the Model State dealing with aspects like sovereignty and the theory of the state.

To study the human intellect and powers in philosophy of Farabi, we need to seek help from both of his above works. Studying his political philosophy, it underlines the principles of all bodies’ internal, mental strength as well as physical capacity. On this basis he differentiates between man and animals. This difference, he calls the agent intellect which is the first cause to raise man to the highest stature. It is this agent intellect which inspires man's intelligence to activity which Farabi calls *Gained Intellect*. He explains agent Intellect compared it to sun which gives light to the eyes and without which the power of sight is only latent. When the sun rays help the eyes, the sight becomes clear.

The powers in men can be analyzed into power of Reason, power of thinking, power of feeling and power of contention. It is the power of reason through which man acquires knowledge and differentiates between good and bad, in morality and in actions and between profit and loss. Power of contention makes him want something or get away from something and it is the basis of love and hate, truth and untruth, anger and mental rest. The power of thinking necessitates another power to retain traces of feeling after the thing felt has passed away Farabi says that the power of reasoning is a peculiarity of the human species. Certain animals possess power of thinking, contention and feeling but not reasoning whereas, most animals have only two powers that is contention and feeling but not thinking.

**Human Grouping**

Farabi says that it is in the nature of men to gather himself in large groups because of on the one hand their natural needs and on the other for the sake of attaining amenities of life for the highest possible degree of progress. Such grouping is not peculiar to any particularly set of men but it is the case of all men alike. There are many kinds of human groupings. However, Farabi divides it into two main types, perfect and imperfect. The perfect grouping is which performs service of the city which is the largest of all the groupings which may be considered the most perfect. The Imperfect Grouping is those of the village, the wards of the city, roadside congregations and gathering at resting places. The middle grouping is based on nationality or residence and this is the largest human grouping. All these perfect and imperfect groupings are to Farabi connected with one another because the halting place is part of the road, the road is part of the city, the city is part of the nationality and the nationality is the part of the mankind.

**Natural and Artificial Barriers to Human Unity**

Farabi demonstrates in a remarkable manner the essential unity of man. However, he carefully describes the reason why one nation differs from or unites with another naturally. He also tries to find out what kinds of artificial barriers has been setup between them. The natural difference between nations arise in their relations to the geographical factors from the relations of particular part of the earth to heavenly bodies which Farabi relates to heat, cold, vapor in other words change in climate conditions of the places. This affects the habit and customs of the people causing a barrier between one nation and the other.
artificial barriers consists mainly indifferences in language which makes mutual communication difficult between one nation and the other.

Thus, inspired by natural needs of co-operation mankind is divided into numerous groups and its culmination is attained in the unit of perfect assemblages which is city state and therefore, Farabi gives importance to the study of state.

**Theory of State**

Farabi describes the individualistic state or what he calls state formation based upon its motives. In other words, he gives us the causes which lead men to form a political society.

To him, the first cause for co-operation of man in forming a society is force. When one person, who has resources, physical or moral at his disposal, he makes a whole body of the people subservient to him and a state is formed.

The second possible motive given by Farabi comes very near to what is called the patriarchal theory, e.g. some people consider that the very incident of birth entails co-operation between father and children against all others so that those descending from the same father are more likely to co-operate with one another than others not belonging to the group.

Another cause of co-operation between man and man is based on material relationship. Such relationship may be established between one group and the other for material needs. Such materialism is related to the worldly life of the human group where one group becomes essentially dependent upon the other and vice versa.

Farabi believed that one of the significant motives for the formation of the state is the proper organization of the people by the supreme head whom he calls Raisul Awwal. He then presents a theory of mutual agreement of rights. Saying that to some, this is the basis of political co-operation which results from oaths and promises ensuing from the fact that no one would harm or hate his fellowmen and all would be like members of the same body the need of defending the political society from a common enemy.

Lastly, the cause of formation of a state is on the basis of language and customs which form a strong bond for union of men. Farabi also includes geographical factor for the formation of a state saying that people living in the same city are bound together as a group.

After giving different causes for the formation of the state, Farabi also gives the conception of different kinds of the states. He divides states into number of categories such as state of necessity, state of case, and state of desire. In the state of necessity the prime object of the head is to arrange for necessities of the citizens. In the state of Ease the citizens would be contented if they are assured a life of comfort and their life will not be beyond moderate limits. In the state of desires, it is to make life of the people luxurious with plenty of resources in order that they might eat, drink and live happily. Apart from the above classification which has an idealistic content, Farabi places specific importance on the political character under which one nation wants to have hegemony. He gives reason for such domination which comes in people because of their desire for safety, ease or luxury. A powerful state which is integrated may get such a desire fulfilled. As by nature the strong overpowers the weak similarly a strong nation control the
weak one Farabi says that it is justice for both, strong to control the weak and weak to be controlled by the stronger and therefore, a subdued nation should do all it can for the good of its masters.

Farabi further says that the people of an imperialistic state (Madina tool- Taghhallub) have excelled in having mastery over others, physically or spiritually in such a way that the subdued state should be at the service of their master in body and mind. He also favors the principles of colonization but he clearly suggests that the colonies should be left free for self-government of a Republican kind which in modern terms is known as the government of participation and representation of the local people.

**Concept of Head of State (Sovereign)**

Al-Farabi gives a comprehensive picture of head of a state, or a ruler, or a sovereign unlike Plato, who was idealist in his approach of making a philosopher king, Farabi presents his sovereign having a practical approach. He begins with examining the nature of the working of leadership and realizes that the sovereign needs power which should be proper and undiluted with unwanted deduction. It meant to him that there are some who had the intellect to draw conclusions better than others, while there are some who can convey their decisions with greater ability.

This power of deductions is at the bottom of all leadership. Those who can draw conclusions from given facts lead those who cannot. Because such people do not have the capacity to convey to others, what they have themselves learned they do not have the true marks of leadership. It is not necessary that a leader should lead the whole people in every branch of life. A person who has a lesser capacity to convey his message in the branch in which he excels them should not lead. Thus, according to Farabi, every man cannot be the sovereign because people differ in their intellectual capacity, physical strength, performing virtuous deals and acquiring excellent habits such as thinking, feelings, willing and doing. The sovereign who is first in rank is not subservient to any one and he is in the second rank dominating some and being dominated by others. To Farabi, the foremost leader is the Raisul-Awwal. Rais is the one who by his very nature and brought up He does not want to be instructed by others and also has the inherent capacity for observations and of conveying this to others. With such view, Farabi explains the doctrine of sovereignty which was for first time propounded given in detail by Bodin in 17th century, 600-years after Farabi. Moreover, Farabi’s sovereign or Rais is more logical and autocratic than given by Bodin, he seems to be closer to the concept of sovereignty given by John Austin. Farabi says that there is no human superior alone the Rais as Austin had said, to Farabi if there is was one, above than it would be the sovereign and this would be the position of the second leader.

If the foremost leader or the Rais is able to control all actions in the state he should possess both, latent intellect as well as gained intellect. The combination of the two by the agent intellect makes the ideal sovereign he says that the Greeks put the ideal so high that no ordinary human being could attain it, and the honor would be reserved for those who were the chosen of God, the Al Mighty.
Farabi gives twelve attributes of an ideal sovereign and says that if this ideal is ever attained its possessor could become the proud ruler of the world.

Following are the twelve attributes of his Raisul –Awwal.

1. Perfect physique.
2. Great undertaking.
3. Visionary in thought.
4. Strong memory.
5. Power to go into the roots of the matter with least argument.
6. Power to convey with love and make others understand.
7. Devotion to education and learning.
8. Control over desire such as eating, drinking and sex.
9. Love of truth and hatred for lies.
10. Love of justice and hatred for force and tyranny.
11. Distribution of justice with fearlessness.
12. Possession of sufficient amount of wealth.

Farabi knows that these fine qualities cannot be found in one single human being so he says that anyone with just five or six of these qualities would make a fairly good leader. He goes to the extent saying that in case if such a person is not available it is preferable to have a council of two or even five members possessing an aggregate of these qualities provided one of them is a Hakim. This means that one who is able to know the needs of the people and can visualize the needs of the state as a whole. Farabi believes that this Hakim is fit for every kind of government and if such Hakim is not available then the state is bound to disintegrate.

Considering the difficulties of Farabi in search of such an ideal sovereign, we have to say that Farabi was an idealist. But he must be credited for realizing difficulty to have all attributes in one person and so he suggest a council of efficient men for the purpose of smooth functioning of the state. He desires minimum requirements for the sovereign for a successful functioning of the state which include the right amount of knowledge, feeling for the welfare of the people and respect for the basic laws and traditions of the state.
CHAPTER XIII

Al- Mawardi

Life and Times

Abul Hasan Ali Al-Mawardi (974-1058 A.D) was born in Iraq. He was educated in a traditional school, but wrote on different topics such as law, ethics and commentary on the Holy Quran. He was an orthodox Shafite, but remained rational in his philosophical approach. He is regarded as versatile thinker and great scholar of jurisprudence of his time. His main concentration was on government and administration. He was Professor of law and jurisprudence in Baghdad and Basra, spent his whole life in teaching and writing. He died at an old age in 1058. He has contributed many scholarly works among which the following four are well known:

1) Al-Akram al – Sultaniyah or Ordinance of Government. Containing his main philosophy.
2) Nasihatul-Mulk or Advice to Kings.
3) Qawaninul – Wizarat or the laws of the Minister, also known as Adabul-Wazir.
4) Tahsilun – Nazar fi Tahsilz – Zafar or the Control of Sight for Facilitating Victory.

Position in Political Science and Administration

Al-Mawardi is given a position of a high esteem in Islamic political thought. He was an established jurist of his time in Baghdad of the 10th century, and witness to a remarkable change in Europe. The ancient political setup was destroyed and the Christian orthodoxy was at its height under the papacy and while Christianity spread not only in Europe but at other places as well. Such political changes were appearing in the Muslim empire as well, where the Abbasids were being influenced by the Turks and Iranians in the East. Mawardi being well educated was a strong believer of Islam and saw the change with curiosity and that resulting into two significant contributions in the study of political science:

1) The Imamat
2) The administrative organization of the state.

Mawardi gave a comprehensive description of administrative organization of the state describing all the important organs separately. His first and foremost discussion is on the *Imamat*. He says that God laid down laws in order that issues might be satisfactorily settled and the principle of right, truth and goodness may be widely known. God has also entrusted the control of his creation to various governments so that the administration of the world might be properly carried out. Mawardi holds that the *Imamat* or Presidentship is the foundation on which the rules and regulations of community depends. The real purpose of the state is the rule of Justice and Truth, and it is the state machinery which sifts well from the bad, virtue from, vice and the sanctioned from the prohibited.

The second organ of Mawardi’s state machinery is the ministry or *Wizarat*. He says that the appointment of a *Wazir* does not mean that *Imam* and Caliph give up all connections with administration of
the state but the real significance of the office of Wazir consists in the fact that it is better to have a co-jointer in political organizations rather than one person, the Imam to carry out the affairs of the state.

To Mawardi Wizarat is also of two kinds:

1) The Wizarat of delegation
2) The Wizarat of execution

The Wazir of Delegation is the person in whom the Imam has fullest confidence and whom the whole administration of the state is delegated. The difference between Wizarat and Imamat is that the Wazir of delegation cannot appoint anyone as his successor and the Imam can dismiss the officers appointed by the Wazir. The appointment of Wazir of delegation with his power and function indicates that Mawardi was well aware of the nature of constitutional government.

The Wazir of Execution was like an officer similar to a secretary of the government in the modern state system, who looks after the administrative functions. The Wazir of Execution is to execute the decree of the Imam. He is also the main official channel of information for the Imam. Mawardi puts seven qualities as requirement for the person of this office such as honesty, confidence, absence of greed, and good relationship with people, intelligence to grasp the truth, and the absence of luxuries having diplomacy and experience. Interestingly, Mawardi does not find it necessary that the Wazir of execution should be followers of Islam. Further, it is also interesting to note that if the Wazir of delegation is dismissed all the Wazirs of execution are automatically dismissed. Such practice is found in modern England under the title of collective responsibility and also in the American constitution that when the president goes all his secretaries go with him.

Mawardi also speaks of organized administration where the government should be divided into various departments dealing with the business of government such as revenue collection and other high offices of the state. His administrative setup was called Diwan.

The other organ of the state administration was justice. Here also Mawardi required seven conditions Judge such as he should be a male, clever and intelligent a freeman, Muslim, honest, pious and above suspicion, well versed in law and should not have defect in seeing and hearing. He regarded the officers of Justice as sacred and when a man is appointed as a Judge, he should neither be dismissed nor he should resign. In short, there is hardly a single topic in the field of administration, legislation, execution of laws and judiciary on which Mawardi has not expressed his opinion. He has discussed even taxation, provincial government, local administration, censorship and crime also.

On Imamat

Mawardi gives a comprehensive meaning of the Imamat and says that the real motive of the institution of Imam is the following of the straight path (Sirat-ul-Mustaqeem) and the strengthening of the political bonds. Therefore, it was very important that Imam should be chosen by the consensus of the community (Ijma Alama). He says that Imamat is not only an institution which is sanctioned by tradition and history but it can be proved to be necessary according to pure reason because wise men entrust their affairs
to a leader who is able to keep them from being molested and adjudged between them in case of mutual quarrels.

Mawardi gives a detail description about the election and appointment of the Imam and also discusses the qualifications of voters and candidates instead of dealing with purely artificial factors such as age, property and residence. Mawardi considers only those qualified who can distinguish between good and evil, right and wrong, deserving and undeserving.

According to him, there are two ways in which the Imam can be elected.

1. By the vote of qualified voters.
2. By the nomination of outgoing Imam.

He bases his argument by precedent of choice of Hazrat Abu- Bakar by election and that of Hazrat Omer by nomination. Once the new Imam has taken his place, he finds himself by an Ahd or undertaking promising that he would loyally perform the duties allotted to him. This is followed by the Bait or pledge the people will give their promises to be loyal to the new Imam.

The Imam pledges that he would protect the Faith, adjudicate between man and man against tyranny of each other, defend the liberty of the state, punish those who disobey the law, make the payment of salaries regularly, appoint honest and reliable men as his representatives, and should never give himself up either to a life of luxury or be forced to handover the management to others.

Hence, Mawardi has given a comprehensive description of Imamat recommending an elected head of the state with constitutional authority working with his two categories of Wazir, the Wazir of Delegation and the Wazir of Execution. His description is so powerful and impressive that in the modern state system whether Western or Eastern, such kind of the state functionary has been adopted together with constitutional government and collective responsibility.
CHAPTER XIV

Nizamul Mulk Tusi

Life and Times

Khawja Abu Ali Hasan (1017-1091 A.D) is known as Nizam ul Mulk Tusi. He was born in Tus in 1017 AD. Nizam ul Mulk was a title which he received by the ruler of Saljuk Dynasty. He came from a landed family and his father worked as a government officer in the court of Khurasan. Tusi was educated in law. He extensively traveled for the sole purpose of knowledge and finally he was employed in Ghaznah as a government official under the Ghaznahwids. He witnessed the political instability and turmoil in the kingdom which led him to leave Ghaznah. In other words, Tusi lived in an environment of political warfare and continued conflict within of the Caliphate. His famous works are Siyasat Namah or Siyarul Mulk, Dastural Wuzara and Safer Namah.

Kingship

Nizam- ul- MulkTusi was influenced by Islamic principles particularly using the influence of Perso-Turkish thought on his political philosophy and practice in politics. This made him at times self-contradictory. Perhaps this was the reason that when he speaks of kindship or office of the head of the state he looks similar to the concept of Imamat given by Mawardi. It seems contradictory that while he tries to justify the hereditary king, he uses arguments which he advances in favour of an elected president. Seemingly the result of a conflict found in him because of the combination of Arabic and Persian systems. However, Tusi holds that God the Almighty selects someone from among men and give him the charge of the well-being of the world and the comfort and tranquility of the human race after duly furnishing him with sets of government. God also makes him responsible for the peace and security of the land. To him, that it is the duty of the ruler or king to remain in constant consultation with the wisest, the most experienced, and most competent of his people. The ruler should repose confidence in those of his subjects who deserve it and delegate to them a part of his duties according to their merit and worth. He advises the ruler to issue instructions to all his officers of the state, telling them to treat the people well and extract only the dues allowed by the law of the land. The legal and constitutional aspect has been very important for Tusi because he warns that only such kings have been successful in their administrations who have not given up the principles. The king should remember that God Almighty is pleased only when he treats his people with kindness and Justice. Therefore, Tusi insists on the integrity and impartiality of Judiciary. The ruler should appoint only such persons as judges who should be well versed in law and should be absolutely above suspicion. He says that judges should be paid high salaries so that they should be prone to corruption of
all kinds. The ruler should make his officials treat those in their immediate charge with Justice and kindness. They should extract the legal dues from them and should always be careful for the good of the state.

The king should appoint judges and magistrates from only those people who have no personal stake in the work allotted to them. He should also see that they perform duties with diligence, honesty and care. A ruler should never appoint member of his entourage to high posts in the state. He should not force high officers to be his private companions. He should not allow any plurality of offices and should appoint persons to different offices according to their ability.

The ruler should remember that capable officers are a great assert for the state and “he should also remember what a wise man has said that a worthy servant and an able slave rank superior even to one’s own sons” while dishonest officials lead a country to utter ruin. On the one hand, the ruler should be well-informed and sympathetic towards his officials, but on the other hand, he should see that these officials are honest and perform their duty well. He says that women are by nature inferior to men so they should not be in politics and administration.

Tusi was keenly interested in foreign policy so to him and ambassador was important. He advises the king that the real objective of foreign envoys is not only to convey a message but also seek secret information about communication positions including condition of roads, paths, valleys, canals and tanks and whether they are fit for the passage of troops. The ruler should also find out through ambassadors other rulers, their armies, people, wealth and local administration. Thus, Tusi gives importance to foreign policy saying that the ruler should appoint persons unknown to officials who will sit on important positions in government keep an eye on high official and their movement. He also advises that a spy should dress as a merchant, traveler, Sufis or chemist so that they might come into direct contact with the people.

His concept of the head of the state is very comprehensive and elaborate but he does not give the details of the power the king enjoys in his state. It seems that Tusi was more interested in moral values in administrative functions rather than political power.
CHAPTER XV

Al- Ghazzali

Life and Times

Abu Hamid Muhammad (1058-1111 A.D) was born at Ghazzalah near the town of Tus. Because of his birth place he is known as Al-Ghazzali. He is regarded as a distinguish scholar of Muslims philosophy and history of political thought. He was attached as a student to the famous college founded by Nizam ul Mulk Tusi. Later he became a Professor in Baghdad where he taught philosophy. He contributed significant work on philosophy and politics which influenced the modern age. He travelled extensively and enriched his experience. He travelled to Damascus, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Macca and Madina. He witnessed a civil war, conflict and instability in his state which led him to study the root cause of human suffering.

Al- Gazzali left several distinguished works such as Munqidh Min ad Dalat, Ibyaul Ulam, Tibrut-Masbuk, Sirrul- Alamain, Fatihatul-Ulum, Kimiya-i-Sa’ada, Iqtsad Fil-I’tiqad, Kilabul-Wajiz.

State Law and Constitution

Ghazzali enunciated the necessity of a state with his view that man is created in such a manner that he cannot live alone and is always in need company and also for making a family. Once a state is formed it requires a sovereign or an Amir to take care of his subjects. This leads Ghazzali to speak of state, law and the constitution.

Ghazzali says that there are two aspects of human conduct.

1 Individual
When a man is regarded as a social being then the need of law and politics arises. Law deals with the relation among the people for the settlement of their disputes and also between the ruler and the ruled for a rule of justice. He argued that if men are to exercise justice among themselves then there would be no need for law because men will be led by their desires without regards to the right of property and life of others. Therefore, it is necessary to have law. Hence, Faqih who is well versed in law should know how to act when there is a quarrel between two persons.

To Ghazzali there is a relation between the state and religion and these two are like twin sisters. Religion is the foundation of the society and the ruler of the state is the preserver of human society. If the foundation is weak the whole structure will fall and if the ruler is absent there would be no one to preserve the foundation. By a constitution he gives great importance to the ruler or the king, whom he calls the Amir. To explain Amir’s position, Ghazzali gives a biological rezoning. He says that as the heart is the main organ of human body so is the Amir in the state, if a state is compared to a human being. Similarly, the professionals in the state are like limbs and magistrates are desires, police officers are anger and the ministers are common sense. The Amir requires the assistance of all other organs to carry on the work of the state, but desires the ministers sometimes indulge in false hood and work against the dictates of common sense. The desire wants to enact all there is in the state in the shape of revenue. The police officer or anger as it is perceived, is very sharp and is in the habit of wishing to kill or at least inflict injury. The Amir is in the habit of consulting his ministers and keeping the magistrate under his control. Ghazzali explains that it is only when the Amir or the heart takes counsel from the minister or the common sense and controls the desires and anger, making both subservient to common sense, only then the state will be managed well and if anger and desire succeed in controlling common sense then the whole body politics will be destroyed and the Amir or the heart will have to see a state decay. Herbert Spencer, a British philosopher after Ghazzali gave the same kind of description but Ghazzali is much superior in his thought regarding the constitution and its distributive agencies.

Ghazzali also gives a comprehensive explanation of justice in his constitutional frame work. He says that in order to acquire the quality of being the shadow of God as sovereign on the earth, it is necessary that the ruler or the Amir be careful that a person wronged always wants to be redressed. He quotes the Prophet’s (PBUH) tradition that the ruler is the vice regent of God himself and one day of justice is equal to 70 years of continuous prayer.

Ghazzali also describes the duties and functions of the Amir as the central executive arm of the government in his book, The Tibrul-Masbuk. Here he gives the necessary qualities of an ideal ruler and says that he should have intellect, knowledge, perception, correct preposition of things, love for his subjects, diplomacy, foresight, strong will power and should be well-versed in the need of the day and the history of the Amirs who have passed away. Moreover, he wants limited income at the disposal of the Amir for public work so that he does not live a life in luxury and remains simple as the Prophet (PBUUM) and the four Pious Caliphs.
Khulf-e-Rashadin.

Ghazzali believes in Islamic fundamental that all men are equal before law so they should be treated equally. The master should feed and clothe his slaves in exactly the same manner as himself and should immediately sell them off when they are of no use for him and should not keep God’s creature in perpetual agony. In a state it is necessary for an ideal Amir to have a secret service to keep a watchful eye on inner most affairs of the state. Without secret service the command of the Amir and without the news of the country coming to him, the state is like a body without a soul. Ghazzali puts the ideology of Islam and presence of law combining the two together and explaining how the ruler can adopt the Islamic ideal of equality before God and limited by the dictates of law. He brings down the ruler to the level of democratic emirate by hedging it with the ideal setup of the Prophet (PBUH) of Islam and his successors. He concludes that it is law which is upper most, may it be human or divine.

Ghazzali also gives significant position in his state and constitution to provincial administration explaining the duties and functions of provincial governors for which he cites the example of Khalifa Hazrat Omar (R.A) when Hazrat Omer (R.A) says to one of his governors that the best governor is he who does good to his subject and the worst is he who treats them harshly. No governor should issue orders while he is over powered with anger or lust.

Finally, Ghazzali gives the organizational set up of state, government and administration stressing on the need of an honest minister about which he deals comprehensively in his work Tibr. The minister should be faithful to the ruler and the ruler ought to respect his ministers.

Amir

Ghazzali foresees the necessity of the state in a remarkable manner justifying its development on the basis of human natural need. Once a state is formed arbitration and government become necessary to deal with quarrels and feuds. He also realizes the need of Fiqh or canon law in order to organize people and keep them with in proper bounds. He suggests warfare and arms in order to save the city internally and externally. To him for financial arrangement, a collector of revenue was required giving utmost importance to the king or Amir at helm of affairs being able to make appointments to all these offices to see that Justice is done and state is secured regarding financial matters and internal and external disorders.

Ghazzali holds that there are number of dutiful functions to be held in the state for which appointments of clerks, writers, magistrates and army men were to be made. He divides the population of the state into three parts.

1. Farmers and craftsmen.
2. Men of the swords.
3. Those who take money from the first grade in order to distribute among the second whom Ghazzali calls the men of pen.
Ghazzali gives special position to kingship or Amir saying that it is impossible to have a perfect organization of worldly affairs without ruler or Sultan. He believes that without such an organization it would be impossible act according to the Divine commandment for peace and order as such a political organization has the sanction of the law of Islam. Without a ruler or Amir to whom the people should habitually be obedient, there would be continuous turmoil and never ending of crossing of swords. He holds that it is natural that man should be divided into different ranges grades with different mental cadres and diversities in individual opinion and it is of utmost necessity that a strong ruler should be on the helm of affairs and keep the body politic properly organized and under his control.

Unlike Hobbes, Locke & Rousseau, who dealt with an imaginary man, Ghazzali spoke of a man as a ruler and also a subject who is a living entity, honest and working. It is in his (rule) nature that he is interdependent through which machinery of state functions while he remains at the center of authority.

Ghazzali provides guidance of daily routine of his ruler or Amir to be successful in his administration which includes minor details of his food, drink, privacy, desk work etc. After Morning Prayer, the Amir should go out for riding in order to investigate any wrong done to his subjects. He should sit in the court and allow everyone direct access to him so that he may have firsthand knowledge of any complaint. He should make appointment to talking counsel from those who can add to his knowledge, intelligence and experience and also he himself interacts with foreign envoys. The Amir should be well-versed in diplomacy and politics and should not be inclined to peace simply because of fear of his enemies. Ghazzali warns the Amir against excessive indulgence in drinking, chess, or hunting and says that the best system of life is “work while you work and play while you play.” He tells his Amir that the good king should divide his time as a routine has follows:

1. Prayer timings
2. State affairs
3. Justice and counsel of the learned.
4. Food and rest.
5. Recreation and hunting.

He is very particular that the ruler should not heed to the advice offered by his women favorites and quotes the instance of Hazrat Omar (R.A) who divorced his favorite wife when he was elected Caliph for fear of being influenced by her in state affairs. He warns the ruler against the curse of favoritism.

Ghazzali emphasizes limited public resources to be placed at the disposal of the Amir promoting simplicity in habit as possible giving example of Prophet (PBUH) in this regard where he (PBUH) had said that “God would be kind to those who are kind to their subjects”. Ghazzali also gives the example of Umayyad ruler, Omer bin Abdul Aziz as a model of Justice, equality and simplicity, who asked for his monthly salary in advance to buy the Eid clothes for his daughter but desisted from drawing it from the state treasury because he was reminded by his finance minister that there was no certainty of his life for the month for which he wished to draw his pay.

To Ghazzali the ideal Amir was one who kept a watchful eye on the inner most affairs of the state. Therefore, he should keep a secret service at his command as without news of the state constantly coming
to him his position would be a body without a soul. He also suggested that the *Amir* should not interfere into the affairs of the other states. Founded on these fundamentals Ghazzali gives a comprehensive study of the office of the *Amir* in the state system concerning his private and public life and responsibility as a state functionary.

**Concept of Justice**

Ghazzali wants the sovereign to clearly realize that all worldly blessings will come to an end at the time of death referring to the transitory condition of life in a world which is temporary. He advises the sovereign to keep the commandments of Almighty Allah and the saying of the Prophet (PBUH) upper most in his mind always remembering that is unjust acts will be against Divine orders. Further, the king should also visualize himself as a subject and not *Amir* to know how he would feel if unjust treatment was meted out to him in a sub ordinate capacity.

In general, the doctrine of Justice had profound significant in the works of Muslim political theorists and Ghazzali’s thought was no exception. He says that in order to acquire the quality of being the shadow of God on earth with all its implications, it is necessary that the ruler should be careful that the person wronged should always be able to have his wrong righted. He quotes the Prophet’s (PBUH) tradition that on the Day of Judgment one of the seven sets of persons who would be allowed to enjoy the shadow of the Divine Throne would be the set of kings who had done justice. Ghazzali says that ruler is the vice regent of God only if he is just otherwise he is the vice regent of the devil himself. He elaborates further that one days of justice is equal to seventy years of continuous prayer citing the Prophet’s tradition.

Ghazzali enumerated ten rules of the conduct of government in matters of justice which the ruler should bear in mind:

1. In every case, the ruler should mentally put himself in the position of the offender.
2. He should fulfill desire of those who have come to him for justice.
3. Justice is possible only when ruler does not indulge in luxurious life style.
4. He should practice leniency, not harshness in his official dealings.
5. He should try that the subject should be content with the rule of law.
6. He should not attempt any reconciliation at the expense of law.
7. He should supervise the affairs of the people in the same way as if he were to supervise his own affairs dealing with the powerful.
8. He should try to meet the learned as often as he can and should encourage them to have their say.
9. He should see that his servants, magistrates and other officers perform their duties diligently and well.
10. He should not be over powered by any false sense of pride.

Describes Justice he says that real justice is dealing with the inferior like a father with a son and with a superior like a brother and award punishment according to limit of is forbearance. Ghazzali quotes Hazrat Ali (R.A) that the best Judge is he who is not prejudiced in his decision from personal desires or by any leaning towards his relations or fear or hope but adopts a natural attitude towards all that come before him.
Thus, to Ghazzali perfect Justice is absolute neutrality of the *Amir* in all his acts or words. Paying equal regard to everything great or small, to everybody high or low, noble or downtrodden and should put down lawlessness with a stern hand.

CHAPTER XVI

Ibn Khaldun

*Life and Times*

Abu Zaid, Abd-al-Rahman Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406 A.D) was born in Tunis, North Africa. He is considered to be the first philosopher who introduced scientific method in the study of politics and history. To him history is a science which must be studied for the narration of facts. He lived in a period of crises between the Muslims and Christians when Spain was on the height of Christian power and expelled the
Muslims from the country. Ibn Khaldun became the scientific historian with deep knowledge of historiography and sociology. He was also a scholar, historian, philosopher, economist and a pedagogue. He is known as father of Science of History and founder of Sociology. He died in 1404 in Cairo. His famous works are Kitab al Ibar, al-Taaris, and History of the Berbers. He has also authored a book on sociology which is known as Prolegomena or Muqaddamah.

**Historical and Social Method**

Khaldun’s work *Prolegomena* was fundamentally neo- Aristotelian. He says that history is firmly rooted in philosophy as its branch saying that to write history we need a reliable method of verification. It means something which distinguishes things to find out what was possible from what was impossible under various circumstances.

Aristotle had developed the analytical empirical method of classifying things according to their common characteristics proceeding to examine it in minute detail. Through study of facts, Aristotle desired to produce a full understanding of time and things in it.

Khaldun was interested in setting out to writing world history. He found difficulty at the core of Islamic learning namely, how to distinguish the true from the false about past events. He thus applied the method of studying state on the basis of studying facts to produce full understanding of things. Khaldun knew that such method existed which was given by Aristotle, but he had not discovered Aristotle’s book, *The Politics.* Khaldun gave a method to study of human civilization in a much wider sense than Aristotle or anyone else did.

While Aristotle had confined his study to the city state, Khaldun made world civilization the subject of his study. According to Khaldun, history is nothing less than a narrative of human aggregation (*Ijtima*) which is organized habitation called *Umran* which mean civilization of the world. His views were a continuation and large scale extension to humanity as a whole, whereas for Aristotle, it was a study of humans as social and political beings.

Khaldun gives generalization of collective human behavior by making case studies on his own and other people's experiences. He goes further ahead from Aristotle in the study of history by saying that: “One should not reject data for which one finds no observable parallels in one’s own time because conditions in the world in civilizations are not always same.” He further states that we should assemble data of past and present events, compare these, identify and define human culture, and then determine its basic characteristics because this is what the science of civilization or *Ilm-ul-Umran.* From here Khaldun enters into the fundamental facts of politics which to him is the nature of civilization. Thus, he uses Aristotelian method by understanding the past. He reveals history’s inner workings and believes that this will give Islam a new pace for self-analysis and it would be extremely useful for a statesman.

To Khaldun, this method gives possible verification and casual explanation and method also enables one to know not only what happened but also why it happened.
Ibn Khaldun as a social investigator went further. He identified variations between people’s (nations) and temporal changes in social organization which he called “essential accidents” of human culture. Thus, the historian must understand the character of things, the differences which exist between nations and regions regarding their behavior, manners, habits, sects and doctrine. He believes that nation’s characteristics and historical changes are not universal or permanent. Temporal changes do not occur over and over again. Public offices look the same and have same names but vary fundamentally overtime. It is a mistake to think that a teacher, judge or a military commander has the same social role to play as in the past. Such recognition of history in Khaldun’s philosophy is not found in Aristotle.

Moral and Immoral Forms of Authority

Khaldun discusses moral and immoral forms of authority shifting from his analysis of royal dynastic decline. He realizes the need for a divinely inspired law giver or Prophet, who will lay down those religious laws which alone will guide humans to their true good in this world and in the next world.

Khaldun believes that Prophets are succeeded by deputies whose function is to ensure religious observance and good government. At this point, especially Islamic institution of the Caliph, described by Khaldun. He insists that here he is not responding to Islamic jurisprudence as such rather he is introducing the religious functions of the deputy only in order to distinguish these from royal government which arises in the course of nature Khaldun’s view of the relationship between Islamic and natural political authorities and their function is fairly complex. It takes us into the dialectics between

1. The science of culture and religion of revelation.
2. Between the natural forces of state emerging from Asabiyya and divine justice.

There are three possible regimes according to Khuldun.

1. **Natural Muluk : It emerges out of an Asabiyya.** Here the people get rid of private ambition and uncontrolled desires of the ruler. This is rationally organizing polity which aims primarily to secure the advantage of the ruler and also the general welfare of the society. A regime is liable to be tyrannical, unjust and unsustainable because the people will be disloyal, disobedient and rebellious.

2. **One may have government according to law devised by men of intelligence and insight.** They are imposed on and accepted by people and they are aimed primarily at their general welfare. **This is a polity based on reason.** But if that is all, it will aim solely (only) at apparent and worldly interest and will therefore be blame worthy.

3. **Finally, one may have a government according to laws which are laid down by God and promulgated by an inspired law giver.** This will be for the true good of the people both in this world and the next world. The legislator (law giver) will ensure that this world is arranged so as to
be a vehicle for the world to come, and law giver at the same time will peruse the common good of human culture. This is the rule of Prophets and their successors, the Caliphs. Hence, Khaldun's theme is that the laws of Islam are among other things intended by God, if not consciously by Prophet Mohammad (PBUH) to sustain human culture. Khaldun says that even general human welfare in this world is better provided by the Shariah than by human philosophy. This dual rule of Prophets and deputies poses problem for Ibn Khaldun. First, he has already described political social theory out of a philosophy. Khaldun decided to knock down the philosophy because he says that it will be more perfect if natural **Dawla** will be with the commands of Islamic law since it knows best, what the common good is. Thus, kingship (**Dawla**) is below the Caliphate and becomes one of its subordinate, if the regime is Islamic, but it may be separate if it is in another community.

The second problem arose out of the view that the deputyship disappeared after the first four rightly guided Caliphs. At first righteous Caliphate government was combined with group feeling (**Asabiyya**) and kindship (**Dawla**) Prophet Mohammad (PBUH) censured group feeling and kingship but only in their harmful aspects.

Once the **Asabiyya** gets into luxury and city life, the ruler begins to lose political control and eventually falls down to another group who has a strong **Asabiyya**. Khaldun here gives example of Arabs losing power to the Turks. This is what khalidun says that **Dawla** (**Mulk**) and **Asabiyya** (**group feeling**) are interdependent but **Asabiyya** is more powerful. Such situation is not found in functioning of the Caliphate which carries the religious values with itself.

**Evolutionary Theory of Society and State**

One of the main concerns of Ibn Khaldun’s philosophy was to study different stages of development of society and state. This may also be considered as his Evolutionary Theory. He discusses it as an important topic in his **Prolegomena**.

To Ibn Khaldun there are three stages of state which cover one hundred and twenty years. The first stage begins with group idea which emerges from nomadic people when man led healthy open air lives. They respected women, kept their neighbor in their control and over powered their enemies and began to rule. In this stage the solidarity was based upon familiarities and religion. This way the state was established and solidarity is essential for the preservation of state. The ruler forced the ruled to build the institution for a civilized culture. So a new political relation was created but the state was still in the period of transition because the primitive (nomadic) people who established it continued to preserve some of their primitive attitudes including authority. These attitudes hurdled the development of civilization and the concentration of authority which was necessary for development of state.

Second stage in the development was the period of consolidating the power of the ruler which was creating absolute kingship. Here, natural solidarity and religion were checked for the purpose of sharing
power and was used on the discretion of the absolute ruler. Solidarity was replaced by the paid army and organized by administrative bureaucracy who carried out the wishes of the ruler. Here, natural solidarity became increasingly artificial. The people generally acquired habit of obeying their new ruler. The army and bureaucracy protected the state and development of various institutions of civilized culture. Group minds now began to disappear and people submitted to the command of the ruler who was tolerated. Hence, full concentration of authority came in the hands of the ruler.

The third stage began with the luxury and leisure of the ruler. He concentrated on the organization of finances for state and went on increasing his own. He spent lavishly and beautified the city for becoming famous considering civilized lives as outcome of luxury. Economies progressed and prosperity increased with new era of development which satisfied the increasing desires of rulers. Crafts, Fine Arts and Sciences were greatly patronized and were flourishing which satisfied the new ruling class. The state finally reached the stage where people lived in luxury and pride. This period is identified with full enjoyment, comfort and pleasure.

The above three stages were powerful, independent and creative. The authority was consolidated and the subjects were satisfied. Economic prosperity was achieved which increased the power of the ruler and position of the ruled.

The fourth stage brought the state at its zenith. This stage was the period of containment for both the ruler and the ruled who were totally satisfied. They made their lives habitual to luxury, comfort and gratification. The next generation became completely dependent upon the continuation of what their predecessors had achieved. The length of this period depended upon the power and extent of the achievement of the founder of the state.

The last stage was the fifth stage where the state was declining and disintegrating. It had reached old age and moved slow nearing death. The process of its establishment was destroyed which was vital force of solidarity and religion which were responsible for its existence. The ruler had destroyed the communal pride and loyalty of their predecessors and became weak to lose and be conquered. Bureaucracy which was dependent on generous remuneration lost loyalty. Taxes were increased which brought economic stagnation. The fifth phase had been of extravagance and waste. In this phase the ruler destroyed what his ancestors brought together for the sake of lust and pleasure but he was still generous to his followers who were unable to undertake the task. This way he spoiled himself and nobles and he was filled with hatred. He lost his troops because he spent their pay on his own pleasure. His habits of comfort and luxury generated physical weakness and moral vices. The elite and aristocrats forgot the courage primitive life. They were powerless to protect a foreign invasion of a strong civilized state or by united primitive people. Excessive taxation and fear of invasion weakened the hope of the ruled. Dependency became common in all economic activities were frozen. The entire population became physically subject to diseases. All these brought the decline of the state which was now divided and sub-divided into
principalities. The army and bureaucracy began intriguing and actual power of ruler fell down. Finally, an external invasion put an end to type of state.

Theory of Social Change

Ibn Khaldun gives a study of social change generalizing human association (Al-ijtama-al-Insani) or civilization (Umran). Human association is necessary because man is political by nature. He cannot live without Dawla, a city or a state. Although, he demonstrates this concept similar to previous Islamic philosophers, he has his own ideas. He says humans as individuals depend on each other for their livelihood. Therefore, they live in community (Subha). This community results in (Ijtama-ul-Umrān), association of culture which requires influence of a headship that is a king because co-operation requires the use of force. Hence, kinship (Mulk) is a natural quality of man which absolutely necessary to mankind.

To Khuldun, this influence is important and religion can also act as an influence which he calls Wazi meaning internalized constraint of religion, as Ṭawāriq is more conducive than kingship to a courageous attitude. Ibn Khaldun uses the same argument to explain ranks in society. Ranks mean power to direct other people for one’s own advantage. It affects people in whatever way they make their living.

Khaldun’s social theory sprang directly out of this Islamicised version of Anatole’s theory of the origins of political society. Khaldun proceeds next to discuss the inhabitable parts of the earth including the influence of food, climate and environment on human beings. Then, he focuses upon the means of production. The differences in living style of people results into the difference emerging from their means of living like agriculture or animal husbandry. Marx calls this, economic basis and Khaldun called it social categories divided into two:

1. Badwa (Primitive Society)
2. Hadara (Civilized Society)

To Khaldun these are natural and necessary to succeed from a primitive or tribal society which possesses Group Feeling (Asabiyya). This Group Feeling or Asabiyya is a crucial quality which is defined by Khaldun as:

“The affection a man feels for a brother or a neighbor, when one of them is treated unjust or killed. It derives from kingship or its equivalent and nothing can take it away.”

Khaldun distinguishes Asabiyya as a driving force in history of Group Feeling producing the ability to defend one-self and press one’s claims. It is the natural force of Asabiyya which gives rise to the community which develops into a “house” (Bayt) which tends to be characterized by nobility and prestige. From these elements, Khaldun develops his theory of progress, change and decline. He says, the goal of Asabiyya is kingship in any group with Group Feeling. One person will inevitably emerge as a Wazir, he will be able to force others to accept his ruling and with the assistance of the collective Group Feeling such a person will proceed from citizenship (Riasa) to Kinship (Mulk) which is a final desire of the people. In other words, this Wazir will create or take over the state. But according to Khaldun, in the deserts or wilderness people are rude, proud, ambitious and eager to be the leaders. They will not take royal government unless
through religion because they can have Wazir themselves. In that case, a complete transformation creates circumstances to have a Wazir on them. This is what had happened in the case of Arabs. To Khaldun, religious sentiments can bring about a change only by popular revolution or by moral legal reforms, if the movement is based upon Asabiyya. People who fail to see this are insane, criminal or stupid Khaldun concludes that royal authority and large scale dynastic power are attained only by Group Feeling an thus concept of royal authority has its origin in Islam.

With Mulk comes the factor which leads to its own decline. Once kinship is introduced the group undergoes profound sociological change because such power needs to be concentrated in one man and he will inevitably become proud and egoistic and will claim all glory for himself. The regime indulges in luxury paving for the way decline of Mulk because luxury and other forces limit the life span of a dynasty to approximately three generations.

Concept of State (Dawla and Asabiyya)

Khaldun presents a clear concept of state. He calls it Dawla and identifies it with the dynastic clan although for Khaldun the primary object of study is Asabiyya in his book, The Muqadma the state is a fulfillment of Asabiyya. He emphasizes the compelling force within a group (Wazir) with Asabiyya to become Dawla having political power over others. It is Asabiyya which makes Dawla possible with the group (Wazir) and the first leading clan dependable wholly on Asabiyya for a successful political power. Once that Asabiyya begins to drain away through luxury and other phenomena related to the life of state, the rulers began to lose political control and eventually succumb to another group with a stronger Asabiyya as the Arabs lost power to Turks so Dawla and Asabiyya are inter-dependent. As a casual factor, Asabiyya is perhaps more powerful because Dawla is not presented as an independent variable.

Dawla in the sense of political society is the focus of Khaldun’s empirical and historical interest. Dawla in turn is valued because it sustains life. Certain conduct such as kindness with subject and ethics of the power holders are recommended because they promote Dawla. Khaldun does not conceive of the state as separate from the society in which it arises because state has no power apart from its Asabiyya. He does not see political authority as capable of being legitimimized and becoming something other than brutal force, rather, he conceives of political order as the necessary outcome of the natural forces of human existence. He also conceives of political order as a pre-requisite for human civilization but he does not seem to have regarded political authority as a rational legitimization of state authority as was regarded by European political thinkers. Khaldun does not recommended political authority as a reason why people should give their allegiance to a Dawla rather he thinks the state is legitimate even if its ruler held power by sheer force plus Asabiyya or by force alone.

Ibn Khaldun separates the concept of state from individual power holders. He says that ruler ship is a general category applicable to a variety of a particular government. To him wazi that human society needs can be a person or social force such as religion. He even speaks of ruler ship as a relationship saying that the interest subjects have in their ruler is not interest in his person or body or in his appearance or
active mind. The interest of subjects lies in his relationship to them. The state or the *Asabiyya* is something relative--a relationship between ruler and subjects.

**On Political Economy**

Khaldun strongly debates that one of the difference between man and animal is that man strives for life. This concept brought Khaldun into realizing the importance of economics. He studied pure economic problems connected with trade and commerce, taxation price, profit or loss, monopolies, supply and demand referring that corn is needed by everyone and therefore people devoted their time to its maximum production so that it becomes cheap in price. On the other hand, vegetable is not largely needed by people like corn and so it is costly than wheat, hence Khaldun looks for advancement in economic theories. He believes that along with the legal and administrative function of the public offices the important function of the state is related to the economic condition of the people in general. Hence, he gives prime significance to, caring for the poor, people suffering, widows and destitute. Hence, Khaldun emphasizes that in general every Muslim ruler must perform the standard function of benevolent public authority. He must protect the community from its enemies, he foresees restoring laws, he must protect people against violence in person and property and he must improve the safety of the roads. Since one of the most important functions of the government is to regulate and develop the economy, he dealt with an explanation of a continued system of profit in economic life. This meant to him the means of livelihood through agriculture, commerce and handicrafts which must be developed. He also believed that the ruler must guarantee his subject livelihood and fairness in transactions like weights, measures and coinage. It was both a moral right and it also sustains the civilization on which government of the state depends.

His views on political economy were based on the circle of power. He believed that the world is a guardian bordering on dynasty. Dynasty is an authority through which life is given to good conduct. Good conduct is a polity which is directed by the ruler. This ruler is an institution supported by soldiers helpers maintained by money. Money is sustenance which is brought together by the subjects. Subjects are servants who are protected by justice with which the world is familiar. Therefore, a flourishing economy and civilization depend upon secured property rights. These depend upon the enforcement of justice in economic transaction. There must not be arbitrary confiscation or forced labor.

Khaldun developed his economic thought in the direction of modern market belief. To him, the equitable treatment of people with property will give them incentive to build the state making their capital bear fruit and grow resulting in turn in generation of increase a profit in the ruler's revenue. Revenue will be maximized by keeping taxes as low as possible building confidence in making profit as an incentive for economic activities. Khaldun says that profit is the value realized from labor which suggests that both the labor theory of value and surplus value was depicted in Khaldun's economic thought which makes him known as Father of political economy.

Khaldun draws a contract between primitive (*Badawa*), under develop and cities (*Hadava*), developed economic society. He says tribal culture (*Badawa*) goes with law taxation and therefore promotes economic growth. In culture of cities (*Hadava*) the demands of ruling class increase which lead to a rise in
taxation and therefore to economic decline. To Khaldun, economic taxation is both, good morality and good policy. He professes that a ruling dynasty has the ability to stimulate economic growth by paying generous stipends meaning money must flow between the ruler and subjects meaning from him to them and from them to him. If the ruler holds money back, his subjects suffer a loss. State expenditure on public works promotes economy and brings happiness among the people in general.

Ibn Khaldun’s comprehensive study of economic thought referred as political economy lays emphases upon the welfare of the people giving prominence to economics of the society.

CHAPTER XVII

Allama Muhammad Iqbal

Life and Times

Allama Muhammad Iqbal (1877-1938 A.D) was born in Sialkot. He was highly educated scholar and poet philosopher. He completed his Ph.D. in Germany on The Development of Metaphysics in Persia. He had also received Bar-at-Law from Lincoln’s Inn. He was Professor of Philosophy in Government College Lahore and also practiced law in Lahore High Court. He entered politics by joining all India Muslim League and was elected member of Punjab Legislative Council. He was also one time President of All India Muslim League. As a champion of two-nation theory during the Pakistan Movement he believed that Muslims should have a separate homeland to profess and practice their religion and culture. His famous address of 1930 in the city of Allahabad made him famous demanding a separate homeland for the Indian Muslims. Allama Iqbal is remembered with highest prestige in Pakistan and in the Muslim world as a poet and philosopher. He has authored many works which include Development of Metaphysics in Persia, Asrar-e-Khudi (Secret of Self), Ramooz-e-Bay-Khudi (Mysteries of Selflessness), Payam-e-Mashriq (Message of the Orient), Bang-e-Dara, Zaboor-e-Ajam, Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam (a collection of lecturers), Javed–Namah, Bai-e-Jibraeel, Pas Che Bayad Kard Ay Aqwam-e-Sharq, Zarb-e-Kaleem, Armughan-e-Hijaz, Ilmul-Iqatisad.

On Khudi (Self)

Allama Iqbal has based his philosophy of life on his philosophy of self (Khudi). To him, the real cause of Muslim deterioration is Nafi-i-Khudi, meaning the lack of self-cognizance. He suggests Isbat-i-Khudi, meaning self-recognition as the remedy of Nafi-i-Khudi.

Allama Iqbal has used Khudi in a philosophical sense which he means recognition of one’s self. Man has a unique capacity of his self and purpose of his creation. This capacity in man makes him supreme over the other creatures therefore; the life of man should begin with the study of his self and culminate in
perfection of his self. Khudi is the name of several attributes in an ideal character which are self-realization, self-assertion, boldness, and spirit of independence, sense of respect, noble idealism and action. The objects of these attributes are the spiritual elevation of man.

Allama Iqbal did not believe in universal life. To him, all life is individual in character God himself is one single entity and individual, the most unique one. The universe as an organized association of individuals is in a state of organic growth. Man plays an important part in this process of evolution. Allama Iqbal says that the ethical and religious idea of Islam is not self-negation but self-affirmation. The individual attains to this ideal by becoming more and more individual or unique Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) had said “create in yourself the attributes of God”. The highest form of life is Khudi or Ego, in which the individual becomes self-contained exclusive center. He draws closes to God. The success of a complete person lies in the struggle against all material forces which hinders the progress of man. Allama Iqbal says, “The life of the Ego is a kind of tension caused by the Ego invading the Ego”. Thus, the true person relates to the environment and consequently absorbs God into his Ego for which Allama Iqbal had said,

*Khudi ko kar buland itna k har takeeer se pehly*

*Khuda banday se khud poochy bata teri raza kia hai*

The Ego attains to freedom by removing all obstruction in its way by assimilating them because this life is a forward assimilative movement. When man is most free, the Ego reaches the fullest freedom. Life is an endeavor to be free. The Holy Quran says, “And verily toward the God is the limit”.

According to Iqbal, the Ego or person is the center of life in man. Personality is a “state of tension” and the moment it ceases, relaxation follows. The development of Ego is not possible without an Ideal. Ideal is a perpetual desire and therefore in its absence life is a ceaseless activity. Man is a restless being and with ceaseless pursuit fresh scope for his self-expression and realization. The idea of personality sets forth a standard of value in a man, good or evil. The value which strengthens the personality is good and which weakens human personality is bad.

According to Allama Iqbal, Ego is fortified by love which means the desire in man to assimilate or to absorb its highest form is the creation of values and ideal and endeavor to realize them. Love individualizes the lover as well as the beloved. The Ego passes through three stages in its onward movement toward uniqueness.

1. Obedience of the law
2. Self-control which is the highest form of self-conscious or Ego-hood
3. Divine vice regency

The vice regency of God is the complex test of Ego. Since the goal of humanity is a combination of the highest power and highest knowledge, therefore, the vice regent is the real ruler of mankind and his kingdom is the kingdom of God on the earth. To Allama Iqbal, the kingdom of God on the earth means a democracy of more or less unique individuals which is presided over by the most unique individual possible on the earth. Thus, aspiration and passionate idealism serve as dynamic forces which strengthen the self of man.
Allama Iqbal says that if Khudi is properly disciplined by obedience and self-control and rightly cultivated, it develops a personality worthy of representing God on earth. The philosophy of Khudi has its corollary in the conception of Be-khudi which is the negation of self. It means losing of one’s self in the community to save a common end. Iqbal believes that individuals develop their Khudi to such an extent that they submit to the Millat but remain intimated with an intense love of action and freedom. Such individuals are a source of strength to the Millat and through this the Millat exalts their position.

**Islamic State**

To Allama Iqbal in Islam the creator and the universe, spirit and matter, church and state are all organic to each other. A Muslim is not required to renounce the temporal world in the interest of the world of the spirit. He accepts the world of both, matter and spirit. With Islam, the ideal and real are not two opposite forces which cannot be reconciled. The ideal consists not with the breach of real but to endeavor the ideal to appropriate the real and absorb it and convert it into itself and illuminate its whole being. Islam rejects the old static view of universe and reaches a dynamic expansion and progress of humanity. A Muslim is therefore directed to secure the highest well-being both materially and morally. Islam sets forth standard of conduct such as “enjoin right and forbid wrong”. Hence, rightness or wrongness of conduct may be considered with reference to good or evil. A conduct is right when it is according to rule or when it is valuable or serviceable for some end. Islam is a creed of service and leads to seek the welfare and perfection of humanity. Conduct of a Muslim being good or bad consists in its service and ability for this end. A Muslim alone knows when it is according to the law of Quran. The Shariat tells him what is right that is to be enjoyed and what is wrong is to be forbidden. From this ethical ideal of Islam, the people finally are transformed into a well-knit group called the Millat possessing a moral consciousness of their own. To Allama Iqbal, “Islam recognizes the worth of the individual as such, and rejects blood relationship as a basis of human unity”.

Every organized life is marked by the existence of certain laws and institutions and Islam also provides for the same. Islamic life is to live according to Islamic laws and Islamic institutions. These are based on ethical ideal and are essentially creative of social order and moral development. This is the culture of Islam. Islam is not a name of a type of a society. It transforms the life of individual professing the faith into a well order and well organized community of moral and material wellbeing. Thus, the life of Islam has a peculiar cultural force as a complete organization with a unity of will and purpose in the Millat. Allah Iqbal says that the Islamic Society has inner unity.

He believes in a universal polity or a politico-religious system or a social policy which is based on fundamentals that were revealed to the Prophet (PBUH). In an Islamic political system to Allama Iqbal, Allah is the real owner of sovereignty. Not only that, his sovereignty extends to the entire universe, to the whole humanity and all organizations. Allah is the real source of religion, philosophy and law and has power, strength and authority.

The sublime position and existence of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) has established various loyalties and characteristics for the fundamental polity of Islam where the Prophet (PBUH) is the guide and unifier of the Muslim Millat. The object of Prophet Hood of Muhammad (PBUH) is to establish the
fundamental unity of mankind on the basis of equality, liberty and fraternity. All Muslims have equal social and legal rights. The Prophet (PBUH) preached not to recognize anyone as your Lord except Almighty Allah.

Islamic *Millat* is not confined to territorial limits. There is no concept of nationalism in Muslim polity because to a Muslim, the entire world is his abode and place of worship because it lies within the sovereignty of his Allah. Hence nationalism to Allama Iqbal is *Millat* which has a basis of unity with moral consciousness. The universal spirit of Islam is to submit to the will of God. As a world system is a uniting force which frees the outlook of man from racial, geographical and materialistic boundaries. The Islamic polity has a basis of republican form of government as an absolute necessity with the spirit of Islam. Muslim legislative assembly is the only possible and legal form which has a basis of *ijma*.
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