



RKDF UNIVERSITY, BHOPAL
Bachelor of Arts (B.A.)
Second Semester

Course	Category	Subject	Subject Code
B.A.	Minor	Western Political Thinkers	BA-PS 202
Total Credit: 6		Max.Marks:100 (Internal:40+External:60)	

Course Learning outcomes (CLO):

- 1.Students will be able to understand the constitutional development in India.
- 2.They will be able to answer how constituent assembly was formed.
- 3.They will be able to describe the significance of the Preamble, Fundamental rights and Directive Principles of State Policy in the constitutional design of India.
- 4.They will be able to answer questions pertaining to the function and role of the President, Prime Minister, Governor, Chief Minister, Parliament and State legislature, and the courts in the Constitutional design of India.
- 5.They will be able to identify the power division in constitutional setup.

Units	Topic	Duration (In Hours)	Marks
1	Plato: a. Ideal state b. Philosopher King c. Theory of Justice ³ d. System of Education Aristotle: a. Citizenship b. Justice ³ c. Slavery d. Classification of Government	15	20
2	St. Augustine & St Thomas Aquinas a. Christianity & State Machiavelli: a. Religion and Politics b. Republicanism.	15	20
3	Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau: a. State of Nature, Natural Rights and Social Contract b. State and Political Obligation.	15	20
4	Bentham and J S Mill: a. Utilitarianism b. Liberty ³ , Representative Governm	24	20
5	Karl Marx, Lenin and Mao: a. Theory of AIendtion, Diaiectic Materialism and Historical Materialism b. State and Revolution c. Post- Marx Marxism-Leninism, Maoism.	18	20

Part- C Learning Resource

Text Books, Reference Books, Other Resources

Suggested Readings:

13. Basu Durgadas, "Introduction to the Constitution of India", Lexis Nexis 21st edition, 2013.
14. Bakshi, PM, "The Constitution of India", Universal Law Publishing, Delhi, 2017.
15. G. Austin, "The Indian Constitution: Corner Stone of a Nation", Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996
16. Kapur A.C. and Mishra, "Select Constitutions", S.Chand Publications, 16th Edition 2008.
17. M. Laxmikant, "Indian Polity", McGraw Hill Education, New Delhi, 6th Edition 2019.
18. Pylee, M. V., 'India's constitution', Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1962
19. Rochana, B, "Constituent Assembly Debates and Minority Rights", Economic and Political Weekly, 35(21/22), pp. 1837-1845, 2000.
20. S. Kashyap, "Our Constitution", NBT, Delhi 2007
21. S. Kashyap, "Our Parliament", NBT, Delhi 2004.
22. Sharma B.K, "Introduction to the constitution of India", PHE Publications, New Delhi, 8th Edition 2017.
23. Shankar, B. L., & Rodrigues, V. "The Indian Parliament: A democracy at work", Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2014
24. Singh, M. P., & Saxena, R., "Federalizing India in the Age of Globalization", Primus Books, New Delhi, 2013.
25. Card, C. (2003). The Cambridge Companion to Simone De Beauvoir. Cambridge University Press. • Sabine, G. H.(1973). A History of Political Theory. New Delhi: Oxford and I. B. H. Publishing. • McClelland, J. S. (1996). A History of Western Political Thought. Routledge. • Ten, C. L. Mill (1980). Liberty. Oxford: Clarendon Press. • Kelly, P. (2009). J. S. Mill on Liberty. In Political Thinkers: From Socrates to the Present. New York: Oxford University Press, pp Hobbes, T., & Macpherson, C. B. (1968). Leviathan. Baltimore: Penguin Books. • Laslett, P.(Ed.). (1960). Locke-Two Treatises of Government. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • Maters, R. D. (Ed.). (1978). On the Social Contract, with Geneva Manuscript and Political Economy. New York: St. Martin's Press. (Translated by Judith R. Masters) • Macpherson, C.(1962).The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke. Oxford University Press, Ontario, pp. 17-29 & 194-214. • Ashcraft, R.(1999). Locke's Political Philosophy. In Chappell, V. (Ed.). The Cambridge Companion

Suggested equivalent online courses:

Online course-Indian Constitution- Swayam

<https://www.classcentral.com>>course

Self-Study Material (OLD)

Western Political Thinkers

Plato (c.428-347 B.C.) is one of the most important figures of the Ancient Greek world and in the history of Western thought. Political philosophy in the West begins with the ancient Greeks and Plato. Plato was one of the most influential authors in the history of western philosophy. In his written dialogues, he expanded on the ideas and techniques of his teacher Socrates. Plato's recurring theme of writing was the distinction between ideal forms and everyday experience, and how it played out both for individuals and for societies. In the Republic, his most famous work, he envisioned a civilization governed not by lowly appetites, but by the pure wisdom of a philosopher-king.

Philosopher-King and Guardians:

At the core of Plato's ideal state lies the concept of a philosopher-king, an enlightened ruler with a deep understanding of the Forms and the ability to discern absolute truth and justice. The philosopher-king is chosen based on merit, intellectual prowess, and a lifetime of rigorous philosophical education. Alongside the philosopher-king are the guardians, a group of highly disciplined and educated individuals responsible for protecting and governing the state.

Meritocracy and Education:

Plato advocates for a meritocratic society where individuals are assigned roles and responsibilities based on their abilities, rather than inherited or acquired status. Education plays a pivotal role in shaping the citizens of the ideal state. The educational system is rigorous, focusing on philosophical training, mathematics, ethics, and physical fitness, aiming to nurture the intellect and moral character of the populace.

Tripartite Division of Society:

Plato divides the population of the ideal state into three classes: rulers (philosopher-kings and guardians), auxiliaries (warriors and defenders), and producers (farmers, artisans, and laborers). Each class has a distinct function and role in the society, contributing to the overall harmony and stability of the state.

Communism of Property and Family:

Plato proposes a communal system where property and family ties are abolished among the guardian class. This ensures that the rulers and guardians prioritize the common good over personal interests. The elimination of private property mitigates conflicts arising from wealth disparities, fostering a sense of unity and solidarity.

A Just and Harmonious Society:

The primary goal of Plato's ideal state is to achieve justice and harmony. Justice is attained when each individual fulfills their prescribed role and contributes to the greater good of society. Harmony prevails when there is a balance and order within the society, with each part performing its function efficiently.

Focus on the Greater Good:

Plato emphasizes the importance of pursuing the greater good rather than individual desires. This approach involves subordinating personal interests to the well-being of the entire society, ensuring that decisions and actions are guided by the principles of justice and virtue.

Contemplation of the Forms:

Plato's ideal state encourages individuals, particularly the philosopher-kings and guardians, to engage in contemplation and understanding of the Forms, which represent the highest and unchanging reality. This philosophical pursuit enables a deeper understanding of truth, virtue, and the ultimate purpose of life.

Plato's ideal state, as outlined in "The Republic," is a compelling and thought-provoking vision of an ideal society. While some aspects of Plato's ideal state may be seen as impractical or incompatible with contemporary society, the underlying principles of justice, meritocracy, education, and the pursuit of the greater good remain relevant. Understanding and engaging with these concepts can provide valuable insights into contemporary governance and societal development.

Definition and Nature of Justice:

In Plato's theory to perform the nature-ordained duty is justice. Each class and each individual will do their duty and none will interfere with other's activities. In The Republic, Plato has made the following observation... "in the case of citizens generally each individual should be put to the use for which nature intended him, one to one work, and then every man would do his own business and be one and not many; and the whole city would be one and

not many”. Plato wants to say that nature has made some men physically strong and other men intelligent and wise.

It has also made some men brave. Naturally, one man will be unfit for another man’s job. If we accept this natural phenomenon it is expected that man will cooperate with nature in all respects. This constitutes the central idea of justice. When this is achieved, Plato says, justice in the society will start to reside.

Plato has analyzed the concept of justice in wider perspective and for that reason he has said that justice has full relevance in the state. In *The Republic* we find “And a state was thought by us to be just when the three classes in the state severally did their own business and also thought to be temperate, valiant and wise”. Like individuals, classes will also not interfere with each other. This is justice. Plato has assertively said that in the good state this must be found. Plato’s theory of justice is another name of specialisation.

Interpreting Plato’s theory of justice from the background of specialisation Barker says—”Justice is simply the specialization ...it is simply the will to fulfil the duties of one’s station and not to meddle with the duties of another station and its habitation is therefore in the mind of every citizen who does his duty in his appointed place.”

Plato in his *The Republic* has said that justice demands that each man shall do his own business and to that business only to which he is best adapted. Meddlesomeness and interference, according to Plato, breed great injustice.

Again, he says, just actions cause justice and unjust actions cause injustice. All these observations about justice prove one thing—specialisation is the central idea of justice.

We have already noted that Plato strongly advocated justice to prevent any civil dissension and discord among the several classes and individuals. He thought that if each class were engaged in performing its own duty ordained by nature, then there should not arise any ground for dissatisfaction.

It was his belief that absence of specialisation was the prime cause of disunity among the citizens—with the advent of specialisation selfish aspiration for government office and meddling with others’ functions would disappear.

Plato's Theory of Justice

Since the tradition of Greek Philosophy considered ethics to be important, they believed that the state comes into existence for the sake of life and continues for the sake of a good life. Plato believed in the same dictum and held that the state exists to fulfil the necessities of human life. The origin of the state, therefore, owed its existence to the fulfilment of human needs, and the Greek philosophers saw society and state as the same.

Unlike other living beings, human beings do not merely seek survival but essentially want to live a good life. Justice is the essential requirement to lead a good life. One cannot lead a good life without meeting their needs, and it's possible to meet one's needs only in the presence of Justice.

The Republic discusses Justice in the form of a dialogue. This methodology is known as Dialectical Method, which Plato borrowed from his mentor, Socrates. The dialogue takes place between Socrates, Glaucon, Adeimantus, Cephalus and Thrasymachus. The dialogue concluded that if one were allowed to suppress another, there would be complete anarchy, and it would be difficult to have any state of affairs. To save oneself from any such suffering and to prevent injustice, men enter into a contract to prevent injustice upon themselves or on others. That is also how laws came into existence to codify standard human conduct and bring a sense of Justice.

Essence of Justice

Socrates clarifies that justice is a relationship. A relationship among individuals relies on the kind of social organisation they inhabit. He further explains that justice can be analysed on a large scale, that is, state and then, on the level of the individual. Therefore, Plato's idea of justice believes that just individuals and just society are interwoven. To further understand Plato's theory of justice and its essence, it is important first to solve the issue of selecting the best ruler for the state. According to his argument, statesmanship is a special function and can only be performed by qualified persons with a moral character.

Then, in order to comprehend the nature of the state, the nature of man has to be understood too. Plato believed in "Like Man, Like State", implying that the character of the state is dependent on the character of its citizens. It also meant that once the nature of human beings

is understood, it's easier to understand the functions of human society, and to arrive at the conclusion as to who is the best fit for ruling in this society.

Justice is Quality of Both Individual and State:

Plato did not use the word justice in any legal sense. Nor did he attach any legal significance to the term. Like courage, self-control, and wisdom, justice is a virtue. All these four virtues constitute the moral goodness of the ideal state. Again, this moral goodness is the virtue of both the individual and the state.

The logical form, therefore, of justice is moral goodness. Individual and the state are not separate entities. Both require justice. Individual and the state are connected by justice or moral goodness and not by any legal act. Plato's theory of justice rules out the possibility of interference of law.

Plato has further said that there are three elements of soul—reason, spirit and appetite. Goodness is identified with justice in relation to these three elements of soul. In the same way we can say that the goodness of the community is identified with the justice in relation to the members of the state.

Architectonic Nature of Justice:

“The architectonic nature of justice accounts for that element of restraint which is the first thing apparent in it. Just as the authority of the architect touches the subordinate craftsmen as a restrictive force, curbing the exuberance of their production, confining their scope and limiting their freedom in the interest of the design as a whole, so justice operates as a restraint upon a man's particular capacity, withholding him from many things which he has both the desire and the ability to do.”

In Plato's theory of ideal state there are several virtues or excellences and justice is one of them. But it plays the role of an architect.

That is, it is architectonic in relation to other excellences. Michael Foster has illustrated the point in the following way. A carpenter with a high degree of finesse manufactures a door. But the excellence of the door is not to be judged in isolation. The other parts of the building are to be duly considered while analyzing and estimating the design and beauty of the building.

The design and dimension of the door must be in harmony with other features of the building. The carpenter cannot do this job; it is the architect's job. Architect's skill has not special department, but it is present in all departments. Justice, in Plato's opinion, plays the role of an architect. It acts as a control office upon the capacities of the individual.

Justice in Political Arena:

Justice is not simply a moral goodness of human virtue, it has also political value. It is a quality that enables man to enter into relation with other fellow citizens, and this relation forms human society which is the subject-matter of political science.

Justice teaches every individual to practise self-control. It prevents many from doing those acts which are harmful to other members of the society. Self-restraint is, therefore, essential for any political society.

While analysing justice the following observation has been made by a critic. "Justice is, for Plato, at once a part of human virtue and the bond which joins men together in state. It is an identical quality which makes man good and which makes him social. This identification is the first and fundamental principle of Plato's political philosophy."

Sophists admitted the political value of justice, but they denied its human value, that is, it is a moral goodness. It was a great drawback on the part of the Sophists. Justice or morality to the Sophists was essential for the formation of political society.

Sophists' refusal to accept it as a human value has not been approved by Plato. Analysing from this angle we can say that Plato's theory of justice is a comprehensive and perfect concept.

Plato's Theory of Education

Education for Plato was one of the great things of life. Education was an attempt to touch the evil at its source, and reform the wrong ways of living as well as one's outlook towards life. According to Barker, education is an attempt to cure a mental illness by a medicine.

The object of education is to turn the soul towards light. Plato once stated that the main function of education is not to put knowledge into the soul, but to bring out the latent talents in the soul by directing it towards the right objects. This explanation of Plato on education

highlights his object of education and guides the readers in proper direction to unfold the ramifications of his theory of education.

Plato was, in fact, the first ancient political philosopher either to establish a university or introduce a higher course or to speak of education as such. This emphasis on education came to the forefront only due to the then prevailing education system in Athens. Plato was against the practice of buying knowledge, which according to him was a heinous crime than buying meat and drink. Plato strongly believed in a state control education system.

He held the view that without education, the individual would make no progress any more than a patient who believed in curing himself by his own loving remedy without giving up his luxurious mode of living. Therefore, Plato stated that education touches the evil at the grass root and changes the whole outlook on life.

It was through education that the principle of justice was properly maintained. Education was the positive measure for the operation of justice in the ideal state. Plato was convinced that the root of the vice lay chiefly in ignorance, and only by proper education can one be converted into a virtuous man.

The main purpose of Plato's theory of education was to ban individualism, abolish incompetence and immaturity, and establish the rule of the efficient. Promotion of common good was the primary objective of platonic education.

Influence on Plato's System of Education:

Plato was greatly influenced by the Spartan system of education, though not completely. The education system in Athens was privately controlled unlike in Sparta where the education was state-controlled. The Spartan youth were induced to military spirit and the educational system was geared to this end.

However, the system lacked the literacy aspect. Intriguingly, many Spartans could neither read nor write. Therefore, it can be stated that the Spartan system did not produce any kind of intellectual potentials in man, which made Plato discard the Spartan education to an extent. The platonic system of education is, in fact, a blend of Athens and the organization of Sparta. This is because Plato believed in the integrated development of human personality.

State-controlled Education:

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

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

Plato's Scheme of Education:

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

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

Elementary Education:

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

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

However, these subjects must be taught by smoothing them into verse and songs and must not be forced on children. This is because, according to Plato, knowledge acquired under compulsion has no hold on the mind. Therefore, he believed that education must not be forced, but should be made a sort of amusement as it would enable the teacher to understand the natural bent of mind of the child. Plato also emphasized on moral education.

Higher Education:

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

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

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

The education system did not end here. Candidates had to study for another 15 years for practical experience in dialectics. Finally at the age of 50, those who withstood the hard and fast process of education were introduced to the ultimate task of governing their country and the fellow beings.

These kings were expected to spend most of the time in philosophical pursuits. Thus, after accomplishing perfection, the rulers would exercise power only in the best interests of the state. The ideal state would be realized and its people would be just, honest and happy.

Aristotle's Theory of Citizenship and Slavery

Aristotle strongly believed that the middle class have a powerful role to play in the state. According to Maxey, one of the greatest values of Aristotle's theory of citizenship was the salvation of political society lies in the enthronement of rulers of that salutary middle class, which represents the happy mean between wealth and poverty.

Aristotle was a conservative or a traditional philosopher, who never felt the need to change the existing system. He, however, attempted to rationalize and channelize the existing conditions. He believed in maintaining status quo. As regards the issue of citizenship, in

ancient Greece, especially in Athens, citizenship was given to only the privileged class or, in other words, it was their monopoly of the upper class. This monopoly was hereditary in nature, and according to Aristotle, the monopoly entitles a person to be a part of political, judicial and deliberative matters.

Aristotle denied citizenship to foreigners, slaves and women and other manual and menial workers. This is because he opined that the above-mentioned sections of the people do not have moral and intellectual excellence to be able to serve as a member of popular assembly.

He further opined that nature did not favor them for enjoying the political wisdom of politics. Moreover, these classes could not afford leisure and sufficient economic or mental development, which were considered the prerequisites of citizenship.

To acquire citizenship, Aristotle prescribed certain qualities like residence, right of suing and being sued and descent from a citizen. Apart from the above qualities, a person should be competent enough to participate in judicial and deliberative functions and also the capacity to rule and be ruled. One who lacked these qualities could not be a complete and good citizen.

Good Citizen and Good Man:

According to Aristotle, a good citizen and a good man must work towards not only the welfare of the state, but also perform various other duties. According to Jewett, a good citizen may not be a good man; a good citizen is one who does good services to the state and this state may be bad in principle.

In a constitutional state, a good citizen should know how to rule as well how to obey. The good man is one who is fit to rule. But the citizen in a constitutional state learns to rule by obeying orders. Therefore, citizenship in such a state is a moral training. Aristotle strongly believed that the middle class have a powerful role to play in the state.

According to Maxey, one of the greatest values of Aristotle's theory of citizenship was the salvation of political society lies in the enthronement of rulers of that salutary middle class, which represents the happy mean between wealth and poverty.

His preference was decidedly for what might be termed 'aristocracy of the middle class'. Like the founders of the American Republic, he would severely exclude the property-less

masses a share in the government and would, with equal severity, hammer down the privileges and immunities of the rich.

CLASSIFICATION OF GOVERNMENTS

As we have seen that Aristotle places the state above individuals, we have to understand that this state was contextual for Aristotle. Aristotle realised that different contexts will lead to formation of different types of states and governments. In Aristotle's writings, he has interchangeably used the words governments and constitutions. Therefore, here we are also using the term government and constitution interchangeably. Aristotle differentiates several types of rule, based on the nature of the soul of the ruler and of the subject. He first reflects on despotic rule, which is exemplified in the master-slave relationship. Aristotle thinks that this form of rule is justified in the case of natural slaves who lack a deliberative faculty and thus need a natural master to direct them. Though a natural slave allegedly aids from having a master, despotic rule is still primarily for the sake of the master and only incidentally for the slave. Aristotle next considers paternal and marital rule, which he also views as defensible. For him, the male is by nature more capable of leadership than the female, unless he is constituted in some way contrary to nature and by nature the elder and perfect are more capable than the younger and imperfect (these points we have already discussed). This sets the stage for the central claim of Aristotle's constitutional theory that constitutions which aim at the common advantage are correct and just without qualification, whereas those which aim only at the advantage of the rulers are deviant and unjust because they involve despotic rule which is inappropriate for a community of free persons. Aristotle's constitutional theory is based on his theory of justice, which is expounded in *Nicomachean Ethics*. Aristotle distinguishes two different but related senses of "justice" (universal and particular) both of which play an important role in his constitutional theory. Firstly, in the universal sense "justice" means "lawfulness" and is concerned with the common advantage and happiness of the political community. The conception of universal justice shapes the distinction between correct (just) and deviant (unjust) constitutions. But what exactly the "common advantage" (*koinionsumpheron*) entails is a matter of scholarly controversy. Secondly, in the particular sense "justice" means "equality" or "fairness", and this includes distributive justice, according to which different individuals have just claims to shares of some common asset such as property. Aristotle analyses arguments for and against the different constitutions as different applications of the principle of distributive justice.

Introduction

In 1992, Cheryl Hopwood filed a case in the US Supreme Court claiming that she was being discriminated against because she was white. She argued that black applicants with the same test scores as hers got accepted into the University of Texas Law School. The only reason she did not was her race. Thus, she 'deserved' to get in too.

Hopwood's case stands in stark contrast to a 1950s case involving the same University. In this case, the university was sued for not allowing in any Black applicant. Instead, it had established a separate and inferior university for people of colour.

In both of these cases, it was argued that the applicants had no "right" to be accepted to their institution. Instead, their candidature was accepted based on which candidate would best fulfil their objectives. In the first case, the University opposed Hopwood's contention, arguing that 40% of Texas was made of African-Americans. The mission of its Law School was to produce future leaders across various fields- be it social, political or legal. Different perspectives are essential to obtain that end, and diversity brings these varying perspectives to the table. Thus, affirmative action benefits the entire student body.

In the second case too, the University invoked the argument of its ultimate 'mission'. It claimed that this mission was to promote professionals for the Texas bar and law firms. Since law firms at the time did not welcome black people, it was impractical for them to have people from the community.

The dichotomy between these two cases gives rise to various questions. What is the distinction between these cases? Can institutions arbitrarily decide their objective? What should their objective be? What do these institutions 'owe' applicants? And what do the applicants 'deserve'?

Aristotle's Theory

Aristotle is one of the most widely-known thinkers in the world. He is credited with being 'the father of political science'. Aristotle's theory of justice is built around a central supposition- justice means giving people what they deserve.

A person's rightful due is determined by their worth. This worth, in turn, is determined by the roles that people play in society.

The acceptable way to choose what roles one must play in society is determined by the virtues of the people. Aristotle defined virtue as a situation and a state, whether good or bad, that a person chooses against their actions and reactions. Virtue is 'a state or monarch', i.e. the reason that causes a man and his actions to be good.

Those who hold the virtues necessary for a role are best adept at the role. So, they are bound to play it. This was called teleological reasoning. This way of life is the path towards a 'good life' for individuals as well as the collective society.

Teleological reasoning

In Ancient Greece, the word 'telos' was understood to mean the aim or purpose. Teleological reasoning is based on the 'end' that the particular institution wants to achieve. Aristotle works back from this end to connect it with the people who are most likely to achieve them.

For instance, the object of a Bar exam preparation centre should be who is most likely to clear the test. Those who have the most influence or can pay the maximum amount should not be favoured over another who can get more marks in the test.

What people deserve Equals should be treated equally

Aristotelian 'Equality' does not align with the modern understanding of the term. It is instead determine/d based on what is being given. He opines that equals should be treated equally. Thus, equals should be assigned equal things.

Aristotle argues that giving people their due and thus justice, involves discrimination. The basis of discrimination must, however, be fair. According to this reasoning, promoting an activist who wants to make legal aid more accessible should not be preferred over another who simply wants to gain money. One of them might encourage the 'greater good' for the entire society. However, this greater good is not the object of the centre. The sole consideration must be the ability of candidates to clear the exam.

Thus, it looks only at the proximate object of any institution or practice. Here, this object is candidates clearing the test. Seat allocation is based on who can perform best simply because that's what the exam centre is for. Better lawyers may be a by-product, but that shouldn't be the central criterion for decision making.

Against arbitrariness

Denial of honours or rewards to a person must be based only on the object of an institution, not arbitrary factors. To illustrate, take the case of *Manjunath Gouli v. Union of India and Others* (2021). Here, the petitioner challenged the respondent's denial of a gallantry award to him. He claimed others from his team from a Naxalite encounter were considered for the award, while he wasn't. However, he had played an integral role in an encounter and thus, deserved the award. On further inquiry, it was stated that the petitioner's gallantry in the encounter was not up to the level of an award.

The Court rejected the petitioner's contention, holding that he had no 'legal right' to the award and was only entitled to be considered for it. It stated that in case of irregularity in decision making, the court could intervene. However, there was no irregularity here.

This aligns with Aristotle's conception of justice. The object of the award was to honour bravery in the field, not the result of the act, i.e., taking out high profile targets. Aristotle would disapprove of the award being denied for reasons that did not have a causal connection with the object of the award. Some of these arbitrary factors are social status, unpopularity or corruption. Denial of the award because the level of gallantry is not up to par is the only reasonable ground. Any other reason for not honouring the petitioner would violate his theory.

The 'good life' Politics to obtain the good life

The ultimate objective of politics is a good life for the people. To obtain this good life, cultivating good character and virtue is essential. So, politics form social institutions to that end. Social institutions connect people to the roles they would best perform and pave the way for a good life.

Those with the greatest contribution to political institutions should be rewarded with greater power and influence. This is because they can contribute best to the objective of politics, the reason that politics exists. If all social institutions work together with the people most adept at performing their functions, the end of ‘good life’ would be realised.

Social institutions act as intermediaries

All social institutions are simply means to obtain a good life. Institutions like religion, politics and personal relationships exist to connect people to the roles that they ‘fit’ in.

However, finding one’s role and developing virtues is not easy. Thus, we have to practice virtues by doing. This is why social systems that encourage virtues are integral to Aristotle’s setup. Once individuals find the virtues they excel at and can contribute best towards, they have found their place in society.

Social institutions then perform the role of giving due credit to selected virtues for those who perform them well. As an incentive, excelling at their chosen roles on account of virtue, merit or simply for the effort put in allows them credit, honour and influence. Those who have the best human virtues hold the highest offices. This is because of two main reasons-

- They can contribute best to the end of the institution.
- They must be honoured for their contribution.

Thus, all social institutions work together to help people obtain a ‘good life’.

Positive role of law

According to Aristotle’s view, the law shouldn’t just be something that secures the rights of people against each other. It shouldn’t just stop injustice. It should also have a positive role.

Interaction in a social and political community is the best way to the full realisation of our potential and for a good life. So, the law should take a proactive part in human life and facilitate this interaction. This view invariably supports legislation on morals for better interaction between people.

Features

Not utilitarianism

Several theorists criticise Aristotle claiming that his theory resembles utilitarianism. The theory of utilitarianism advocates maximising pleasure for the majority, at the cost of the pain of a minority. They hold the view that Aristotle argues for connecting people with their virtues and performing the best role for the collective good of the entire community. Just like utilitarianism, it focuses on the pleasure of the maximum number of people. The greatest good of the collective community takes precedence over everything else, even if the cost is the pain of a minority.

For instance, utilitarians would prefer hospitals to choose a cardiologist based on who would maximise pleasure for the maximum number. This is because it would be most beneficial for the maximum number of patients. Critiques of Aristotle claim that he would support this too. However, this critique is fallacious. It misunderstands Aristotle's ideas.

Aristotle does not argue for the best people to perform the role most suited to them for the good of the collective society. He argues that they should simply because that is what the role is for. The hospital would not choose a cardiologist who takes big risks that are usually successful; someone who saves most lives but makes others a lot worse. It would not choose one who has the best lives saved to lives lost ratio.

The hospital would instead choose the cardiologist who is best equipped at treating and providing care to patients. The hospital would choose the cardiologist who would try their best to treat people without taking big risks, in favour of trying to save as many as they can. The hospital would choose the second doctor even if their lives saved to lives lost ratio is much worse. Having good doctors and treating patients is the purpose of the hospital. So, hospitals must focus on mitigating the pain and treating all patients to the best of their ability. They should not save most and forsake others. This is the difference between Aristotle and utilitarians.

The natural world

Aristotle limits the application of teleological reasoning to social interactions and institutions. He reasoned that the natural order was a well thought out one. Everything in it was the way it is 'supposed' to be. The people were tasked with identifying and understanding the objective behind all these natural practises and finding where they fit in them.

However, modern science has given us a better understanding of nature. The 'natural' order is deeply coloured by the lens of what the powerful in an ancient society constructed. For instance, the caste system was upheld because elites in ancient times felt lower castes were 'naturally born' for manual jobs. As science and logical reasoning spread in the world, people realised that these ideals were irrational. No certain class of people, here- lower castes, had any 'hereditary disposition' towards menial jobs. This distinction wasn't made by nature, but by society.

Regardless, this has led many to criticise that Aristotle's views are not relevant today. They found favour with an ancient society that was deeply involved with nature and had simplistic ideas of the world, disregarding its real complexity. Contemporary society has a better understanding of the diversity and intricacies of the world.

Defence of slavery

Aristotle has been widely criticized for promoting slavery as necessary to society. He holds that some people are "meant to be ruled". They can't reason for themselves, only be reasoned with. So, they are meant to work as slaves and being enslaved is the right role for them. Moreover, to allow more virtuous people to be free from menial, manual work and pursue their true virtues, other people need to do that. Thus, the institution of slavery was just.

Nonetheless, Aristotle conceded that the Athenian practice of slavery was not just. In ancient Athen, those who were losers in war were forced to be slaves. Aristotle conceded that the act of forcing them to be slaves shows that those coerced were not be meant to be slaves. They simply had the misfortune of being losers in a war.

He was not against coercing people to be slaves. Forcing them was simply an indication that they were not naturally fit for that role. If they had to be coerced into the role, it wasn't their true calling. Thus, they should not be forced into it.

Criticisms Prejudices attached to the natural world

The justification of slavery brings us to a broader critique of Aristotle. In the ancient world, some people and communities were considered to be 'naturally fit' or 'born' for some roles. Those with light skins were considered rulers and those with darker ones were meant to 'be ruled'. These prejudices were based on ill-reasoned justifications like dark skin being meant for work in the sun.

Ancient and mediaeval society was rife with such practises that were justified by pseudo-scientific reasoning. For instance, women were placed under the subjugation of men. The reason attributed was that most ancient societies considered biological women as weak because of the ability to menstruate and bear children. Aristotle seems to have not only supported but laid down the groundwork for these discriminatory practices.

Whether or not these arbitrary discriminatory practices are justified by Aristotle's theory of justice though, is a matter of contentious debate. Modern supporters of Aristotle may argue that there isn't enough of a causal connection between childbirth and menstruation and treating biological women as weaker. Conversely, the ability to withstand pain may prove they're strong. This disagreement brings forth another criticism.

Differing views on the object

Aristotle argues that all institutions have a specific object or end. Yet, today's world is awash with multitudes of opinions. Take the example of affirmative action. Some hold that it is an apology for past wrongs. Others opine that it is meant for the economic upliftment of the historically marginalised. Still, others argue that it is a means of social mobility instead of economic. Agreeing about the 'intrinsic object' of any practice or institution often feels like an unwinnable battle. This highlights the practical difficulty in implementing teleological reasoning.

This disagreement isn't limited to public policy or the law, but also the social arena. People have different views of the objectives of various social institutions. For some, family is a means to understand and learn to navigate the world as a child; less involved in later stages. For another, it is a lifelong companion to guide them throughout life. Both of these views resonate in some cases and are inapplicable in others.

The intrinsic worth of individuals

A major criticism of Aristotle comes from individual rights theorists who believe in the intrinsic worth of individual people. Teleological reasoning ends up treating people based on what the collective society needs from them, instead of acknowledging their worth independent from what they can give to others.

For instance, a judge who works 10 hours a day might prefer to have more personal time for leisure activities. Yet, Aristotle's theory encourages them to perform their role as a judge over taking time off. It exploits people by seeing them primarily as means to an end, not as an end in themselves.

Liberal critique

Liberals place the highest weight on the freedom of choice and dignity of all individuals. Liberal democracy, the most popular form of government in today's world, supports this idea. It promotes the idea of intrinsic human worth and freedom to pursue one's perception of a good life.

On one hand, liberals claim that people must be given the freedom to choose their life. If someone exceptional at science enjoys art better, they must have the choice to pursue that. In contrast, Aristotle's theory of justice pushes people to do what they would do best, disregarding individual choice. Someone who has the qualities to be a great scientist must be one.

Equality of opportunity

According to equal rights theorists, awarding the result of the virtues is in itself, a fallacious idea. The question is that if people aren't given equal opportunity to prove themselves, how they will be rewarded based on what they are due? If a poor person has the virtues to be a great chess player but was never allowed to learn that, how do we give him his real due?

This critique is a misinterpretation of Aristotle's theory. The theory holds that social institutions must function towards connecting people to their true role, not inhibiting that. He advocates for allowing everyone the right to pursue the role they are best at, without arbitrary discrimination.

Social institutions must work to ensure the poor kid has the option to pursue his best virtues too. Equality of opportunity being denied because of arbitrary factors like familial wealth violates his equality since it does not let people realise their best and true virtues.

Genetic lottery

This critique works in tangent with using people as means to an end. People are chosen based on the skills society wants from them. They win honours, titles and roles due to no effort of their own. Their skills just happen to be valued by society at that particular time.

For instance, at one point in time, manual labour might be valued. Later, they might be replaced by machines. So, those with physical strength, dubbed 'virtuous' here, are just those who lucked out in a genetic lottery. By luck of chance, their skill coincided with the one valued by their society.

Supporters of Aristotle, however, argue that people put in the effort to inculcate the skills they think society needs. Therefore, they deserve credit for it. The truth lies somewhere in between. The virtuous are rewarded for both, their genetic and familial privileges as well as the effort they put in. Aristotle does not separate the two, simply focuses on the result.

Contemporary relevance

In our everyday social, political and personal life, we face questions on ‘why’ we are doing a particular thing- be it creative writing college classes, interacting at a boring dinner or even reading this article. Teleological reasoning helps us look at our self-perceived end to why we perform an act and work our way back to see if we fit in it. It can help us make causal decisions like what shirt to buy for work; or life-altering ones, like a student choosing what course to pursue at college.

On the social level too, there are discussions on the object of any law or policy. Newsroom debates are full of people arguing in support of or against various policies. Take the debate on labour laws. Some hold that they are essential to the dignity of people. Others contend they will lead to a well-rested, more productive workforce. Sceptics maintain that they would interfere with the demand and supply of labour and create unemployment.

In such cases, it is useful to identify the telos the practice serves, and then work backwards from it. Teleological reasoning can act as a useful means to avoid logical fallacies and make better-reasoned decisions.

Conclusion

Despite the spread of liberalism, freedom of choice and ideas of the enlightenment today, it would be a fallacy to deny any contemporary relevance of Aristotle’s views. After all, this article started with a discussion trying to find the ‘mission’ or end of Texas Law School. With an idea of the working of teleological reasoning, we are now better equipped to settle this debate.

According to the Aristotelian view, law schools like other social institutions connect people to the roles and virtues they excel at. Thus, the object of the Texas Law School was to take the people who would best utilise this knowledge of the law to perform their role in society.

In the 1950s, the University of Texas aimed at getting their students through the bar or into law firms. A few decades later, this shifted to promoting future leaders. The difference in the two cases lies in reasonable and arbitrary factors.

In the first case, the mission is defined as promoting future leaders in varying fields. This is a reasonable conception of the end of this institution. Various empirical studies have proven that inclusion, diversity and affirmative action better social welfare. Thus, affirmative action is a reasonable means to that end.

In the second case, the objective of law schools was defined in an unreasonably narrow manner. Law schools aren't just for producing lawyers, but also miscellaneous leaders. The law school must be open to anyone who would use their knowledge of the law in a useful manner- be it as a solicitor, social activist or president. There was prejudice attached to black people based on arbitrary factors to systematically exclude them. Intelligible differentia or a reasonable basis of the difference is absent here. Thus, it falls afoul of Aristotle's reasoning.

Moreover, the US Court observed that the law is an intensely practical profession. Law school is a ground for legal learning and practice. It cannot be effective in isolation from the people and institutions with which the law interacts. No one who has practised law would choose to study in an academic vacuum, removed from society. Flowing from this logic, the existing student body would not be able to exchange ideas with around 15% of the population of the state. Thus, the object of giving students a practical legal education would fail.

However, there is still considerable debate about these cases. This is by virtue of different conceptions of the object of a law school, what they should teach and which virtues they should inculcate.

Here, it becomes important to note that these theories are to form perfect principles for an imperfect society. What people deserve, what they get and what society needs are subjective considerations. They are shaped by a multitude of factors including personal experiences, ideas and vision of a good life. It is difficult to lay down as universal principles for people because humans are all different and diverse. Teleological reasoning and Aristotle's theory of justice can help us choose a path out for ourselves. However, we must be the ones to choose it.

St. Augustine & St Thomas Aquinas

Introduction

Elements which were added to political life at the beginning of the Middle Ages were the doctrines of Christianity and the political ideas of the Teutonic barbarians. The ideas of the Teutons did not affect political philosophy of the medieval period. But the establishment of the Christian religion and the development of the Christian church became cardinal influences on the medieval political thought. Christianity, with its Stoic doctrine of equality of man in sight of God and its emphasis on the supreme value of the individual appeared just after the Roman world. With the emergence dominance of Christianity we see pre-eminence of the political community being displaced by the religious community. The goal of the human beings was to live a life of virtue, but individual life was now linked with one's religious life instead of one's political life. In the works of Augustine transition from the classical period of hostility between the church and a pagan state to the period of unity in a Christian church state was observed. St Aquinas aimed to harmonize reason and revelation, to reconcile the doctrines of the church and the rational pagan philosophy which the classical learning had made.

History of Christianity

Politics in Christian Thought

The founder of Christianity had little interest in political doctrines. In emphasizing the principle of the Golden Rule, the morality of the individual was appealed to, and the authority of government was thereby minimized. Jesus carefully distinguished the spiritual kingdom and evaded every attempt to entangle him with the roman authorities. Passive obedience to the powers was enjoined. Government was conceived as a means of carrying out God's will on earth. Only when the state interfered with the teachings of the church was disobedience permitted.

Certain element of political theory which the early Christian writers drew from the ideas and which increased as Christianity spread to the upper classes and was more influenced by Stoic philosophy. The New Testament contains important statements concerning the doctrines of natural law, of human equality, and of the nature of government.

The Apostles adopted the cosmopolitan ideas of the later Greek philosophers concerning the equality of men. The attitude of the early Christians like the Stoic philosophers in the question of slavery was not altogether consistent. Civil government was viewed as a divine

institution, deriving its authority from God. Obedience to the state was demanded as a religious obligation as well as a political necessity. The state existed to maintain justice. State had a sacred character, its ruler was god's servant and obedience was essential. The Christian theory of the state was essentially based upon the later stoic; government is necessary to proper human development. The church fathers adopted the concept of natural law. They recognized slavery as a legal and necessary institution. The Fathers accepted the state as divine institution. They taught that ultimate authority for government must be sought in God.

As Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire, gradually it developed its semi-political organization, acquired property and power, built up its system of theology, a new attitude was seen in its political ideas. The church began to assume rights and dignities equal to the empire. The civil ruler was considered the 'vicar of God', a line of separation began to be drawn between ecclesiastical and secular authority. The church became more self-conscious and claimed independence and there was a tendency to depreciate the importance of political authority and to exalt by comparison spiritual authority of the church.

The Conciliar Movement

The Conciliar Movement was a 14th-15th century reform movement within the Catholic Church. The main tenets of conciliarism were that the final authority in spiritual matters lay with the church and represented by a general Council and not with the pope. The Catholic Church had become, by the Middle Ages, the principle carrier of Roman imperial absolutism, and by attacking pope's authority, conciliarism became an inspiration for Western constitutionalism as well. Before Luther, the Catholic Church had to face a lot of criticism. Some critiques were fundamental for instance those questioning the idea of church as a mediator between individual believer and God.

Church is a collective body. The Catholic Church claims to be a universal church open to all races, nationalities and sex. Christ refuses no one from God's grace and he sends his apostles to preach all mankind. The conciliarist claims that the ultimate religious authority lay with the church. According to the conciliarists, the only way the church could exercise its authority was through a general council consisting of its leading members. Initially, the Conciliar Movement advocated that power should be shared between the pope and bishop-in-council. Later it demanded unlimited sovereignty for the internally democratic council of bishops. The Church Council of Constance issued two degrees: the first, a general council is superior to a pope in matter of doctrine; second, council must meet at regular intervals. Within the movement the issue of how a large collective body was to act was problematized.

This collectivity was assumed to have a common interest a smaller group could act in its name.

The political leaders of Europe who wanted their own authority enthusiastically supported the conciliarists and they regularly interfered in the election of several popes in an attempt to keep the power of the popes in check. This interference in Church election was to displace the budding absolute monarchies of Europe. It gave up the idea that as the authority of the Christian church was to be seen as devolving to the community of the Christian church as a whole, and not just to the pope similarly the political community was not to be led by the person of the monarch, but was to be in the hands of a larger elective body.

St. Augustine

His thoughts and preachings

The work of St Augustine (A. D. 354 – 430) embodies the transition from the classical world, to the world of Christendom; from the period of hostility between church and a pagan state to the period of unity in a Christian church state. In his *City of God* (most influential book written in fifth century) he attacked paganism, traced Roman history to show that the old gods have not saved Rome from misfortune, and argued that Christianity if adopted by the people would save the state. This work was aggressively apologetic. He shifted his attention from earthly to the spiritual city. By this he meant not only Heaven, to which the Christians looked forward as their eternal home. Its counterpart on earth composed of the body of true believers. The church was, thus, the City of God.

Augustine imitated Plato in working out his ideal city and combined the philosophy of Plato with the doctrines of Cicero and the theology of the Christian religion. He justified slavery as the result of the fall of man. Accordingly, slavery was both a remedy and a divine punishment for sin. He criticized Cicero's conception as an embodiment of justice. Justice to him was not created by civil authority but by the ecclesiastical, which existed as a principle of authority independent of state. He broke away from the earlier Church Fathers and eliminated the elements of law and justice which Romans considered as the basis of the state. He considered state as a punitive, partly as a remedial institution. Men were compelled to form social relations. Men originally obeyed the rules of wisdom and justice. But as a consequence of sin some men had to be subjected to the authority of others. He believed in divine origin of the state. He opposed state as a diabolical institution. The fundamental

distinction in Augustine's thought, however, was not between church and state, but was between two societies. Augustine conceived the City of God as a "Christianized Church-State, from which unbelievers are excluded and claimed the supreme power in that state for the leaders of the ecclesiastical hierarchy."¹

Augustine's *City of God* dominated Christian thought for centuries. Thomas Aquinas, Dante and Grotius drew largely from the *City of God* for their writings. The work of Augustine

J.N. Figgis, *Political Aspects of St. Augustine's City of God* (1921), p 79

gave to the church at a critical period of history a crystallized body of thought, and put into definite statement the ideal which gave it distinctive existence and self conscious purpose.²

Thomas Aquinas

The nature of medieval political thought

From 5th to the 9th century the condition of Europe was such that it did not permit philosophical or theorizing activity. The two social factors that influenced medieval political thought in Europe were feudalism and Catholicism. Feudalism was the tenure of land from a feudal lord in return for military service. It was an institution ideally suited to the economic and military needs of medieval times. Contract, not dominion, was the essence of feudalism.

Catholicism, represented by the Roman Catholic Church with the Pope as its spiritual head, was dominant in the middle ages and influenced the political thought. It competes with the secular authority of the Empire for a position of supremacy.

Church competed with the secular authority for man's final allegiance; its problem was its relation with the state. Its weapons were spiritual and its strength was the belief of the people. Thus in the middle ages central theme was the relation between the Church and State. There were two universal empires- one spiritual and the other secular. Each claimed a universal dominion and the final allegiance of man.

The Medieval man was subject to dual authority of Pope and the Emperor. His prime object was to owe allegiance to the Christian Republic or the City of God as St Augustine described it.

'Doctrine of Two Swords' characterized medieval political thought. One sword symbolizes the Emperor and the other the Church.

As church was the main dominating institution, decision of church in all matters were final. Church controlled the whole thought system and there were no free play of different thoughts and ideas.

Slavery was the consequence of sin and person involved in sinful activities were penalized by god. Medieval political thought made important contributions to politics

Politics was dominated by the insistence of man's duality both as a spiritual being and as a temporal being.

Modern idea of representation developed during the medieval period saw rise of Parliaments.

St Aquinas expanded the idea of natural law and made it an integral part of Christian thought.

There was a great stress on reason in natural law.

Wanlass C. Lawrence , Gettell's History of Political Thought (1981), p 101 The Medieval communes and guilds provide the basis of a new type of self government.

So Barker rightly observes: "Middle Ages, therefore, are not dead. They live among us, and are contemporary with us, in many institutions of our life and many modes of our thought"

Aquinas's thoughts and ideas

The 13th century was marked by the culmination of papal power and by interest in speculative philosophy. Scholaristic writer of this period was St Thomas Aquinas (1227-1274). He aimed to harmonize reason and revelation. He best represented the desire of his age for an unification of knowledge based on divine revelation. He marked the beginning of the later medieval rational political thought which combined with old theocratic and scriptural arguments.

St Aquinas defined law as "an ordinance of reason for the common good, promulgated by him who has the care of a community".⁵ He introduced the idea of positive law, of rules actually formulated by a sovereign power in the state. However he viewed law as something universal, immutable and natural. Positive law was only a corruption of law if it conflicted with the fundamental principles of justice.

He also considered the various forms of law. He states four types of law. On the lowest level is human law, composed of custom and other laws which have a human origin. Then comes the divine law consists of revealed codes, by which men are expected to live. Divine

law is followed by natural law which concerns God's reason in created things. And finally there is an eternal law which stands as the ultimate reality of the universe.

St Thomas Aquinas based political authority on the Aristotelian conception of the social nature of man. Aquinas believed that the city was too small and weak for defense and preferred the larger kingdom as the proper type of state. He recognized the anarchic element in the doctrines of tyrannicide and rejected them. In spite of Aquinas' respect for reason he felt that the greatest truths were still obtainable only through faith. He held that the church should be given precedence over any secular power. It was the duty of the political ruler to administer secular affairs in a way as to further God's will, if a ruler disobeys the church he should be excommunicated ; the authority of the priest was temporal as well as spiritual. Pope is to be obeyed by all above rulers in matters of civil welfare and those relate to salvation.

The theories of Aquinas were later made the basis of the Jesuit system, and exerted an influence through political activities.

Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau on State of Nature

British philosophers Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and the French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau are known as the contractualists in the history of western political thought. Although they belonged to different periods of the western political thought, all of them believed in the social contract theory regarding the origin of the state. The notion of a state of nature was an essential element of the social-contract theories of the English philosophers Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) and John Locke (1632–1704) and the French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–78). We can say that the idea of state of nature stands common in Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. However the visions of the state of nature differed sharply between social-contract theorists, though most associated it with the absence of state sovereignty. Apart of the idea of state of nature, ideas on Human nature, natural laws, and natural rights also find significance to these contractualist thinkers in association of social-contract theory.

The state of nature in Hobbes (Leviathan, 1651)

For Hobbes, the state of nature is characterized by :-

1. Hobbes views on state of nature was an extension of his view of human nature. (all men are by nature equal in power. None of them is so strong as to be safe against the other. All are moved by same three passions- desire for safety, desire for gain and desire for glory)

2. The situation of state of nature was “war of every man against every man,”/ war of all against all and a constant violent condition of competition in which each individual has a natural right to everything, regardless of the interests of others (actually there was no right to property in Hobbes state of nature because the possession of a thing depended upon the power of a person to keep it)
3. Life of man in the state of nature is, as Hobbes famously states, “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.” (As there was no common superior which could hold all the people in check)
4. No distinction between right and wrong as there exists no common standards of conduct or a law to decide just or unjust. As a result, there exists no idea of justice.
5. The only laws that exist in the state of nature (the laws of nature) are not covenants forged between people but principles based on self-preservation (not words, but swords). What Hobbes calls the first law of nature, for instance, is That every man ought to endeavour peace, as far as he has hope of obtaining it; and when he cannot obtain it, that he may seek and use all helps and advantages of war.
6. In the absence of a higher authority to adjudicate disputes, everyone fears and mistrusts everyone else.
7. There can be no arts, industry, commerce, or culture in the state of nature, according to Hobbes.

The state of nature in Locke

Essays concerning Human understanding & Two Treatises of Government (1690)

For Locke, the state of nature is characterized by:

1. Lockean state of nature is characterized by the absence of government but not by the absence of mutual obligation.
2. Beyond self-preservation, the law of nature, or reason, also teaches “that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, liberty, or possessions.”
3. Unlike Hobbes, Locke believed individuals are naturally endowed with these rights (to life, liberty, and property) and that the state of nature could be relatively peaceful.
4. Individuals nevertheless agree to form a commonwealth (and thereby to leave the state of nature) in order to institute an impartial power capable of arbitrating their disputes and redressing injuries.

- Locke’s idea that the rights to life, liberty, and property are natural rights that precede the establishment of civil society influenced the American Revolution and modern liberalism more generally.

The state of nature in Rousseau

The idea of the state of nature was also central to the political philosophy of Rousseau. Another theory for which Rousseau was famous was Theory of General Will.

- Rousseau vehemently criticized Hobbes’s conception of a state of nature characterized by social antagonism.
- The state of nature, Rousseau argued, could only mean a primitive state preceding socialization; it is thus devoid of social traits such as pride, envy, or even fear of others.
- The state of nature, for Rousseau, is a morally neutral and peaceful condition in which (mainly) solitary individuals act according to their basic urges (for instance, hunger) as well as their natural desire for self-preservation. This latter instinct, however, is tempered by an equally natural sense of compassion.
- In Rousseau’s account, laid out in his Discourse on the Origin of Inequality (1755), individuals leave the state of nature by becoming increasingly civilized—that is to say, dependent on one another.

Comparison of the ideas of Hobbes and Locke on the state of nature

Hobbes and Locke differ over the state of nature:-

	Hobbesian State of Nature	Locke’s State of Nature
1	Hobbes talks of the state of nature which is ‘pre- social’ in nature (prior to civil society)	Locke’s State of Nature was not pre-social, but it was pre-political (prior to state)
2	In Hobbes the state of nature is a state of generalized insecurity. Each person runs the risk of losing everything, and each person has the right of taking anything—another’s life, possessions—whatever seems a help to his own self-preservation and prosperity.	In Locke, state of nature is not so unpredictable. Not all persons are violent. Not all discourage productive labour. Not all permit wholesale violations in practice of natural law. Not all exist in the absence of some sort of authority or order. Instead, there are a whole range of states of nature, unified not by a set of inconveniences, but by the fact that people stand outside a

		legitimate political order.
3	<p>The message of Hobbes's political treatises is that, unless it puts people at risk of immediate death, they act unjustly if they try to escape or resist tyranny, since they have bargained for submission. Anyway, it is imprudent to escape tyranny, since one will land back in the state of nature, with all its dangers and deprivations. Locke's message, on the other hand, is that life under tyranny is a betrayed trust, and that those who suffer it are in the state of nature already—not Hobbes's state of war, but in a state in which one is free to join another commonwealth or none.</p>	<p>Locke's message is more attractive than Hobbes's not only because his liberal state is more attractive to modern liberal readers than Hobbes's illiberal one, but because it is implausible that the state of nature must always, almost as a matter of definition, be worse than any sort of government. Locke's message is, however, unstable in a way that Hobbes's is not. This is because the capacity to judge when the government has betrayed its trust through tyranny is held by Locke to reside in the people, which may not have the right sort of unity for judgment, or the right sort of insulation from individual irrationality, to embark on a justified rebellion. In the same way as Locke's theory allows a people more scope to judge that its trust in government institutions has been betrayed, it gives people less reason than Hobbes's theory to leave the state of nature, or to form themselves into a state rather than a community.</p>
4	<p>in Hobbes, people give up the right to be judges of what it takes to observe the law of nature and see it observed. It is rather that they agree to be governed in their enforcement practice by the view of a majority of</p>	<p>People are supposed to have practical rationality in the form of a good native grasp of the law of nature, and in the state of nature many are supposed to be willing to observe the law of nature and see that it is observed. It is mainly to make its observance</p>

	a community even when it conflicts with the view they would have adopted privately. This deference to the majority view is the kernel of law-abidingness, but it is a plausible view of collective action only for the more or less like-minded. In Hobbes, the meeting of many minds is not to be expected; instead unity is achieved by the many delegating the right to judge to a few or to one.	more efficient, more widespread and more consistent that people agree to pool their individual powers of enforcement.
5	In Hobbes, public practical judgement is highly unified, or else no real departure from the state of nature.	In the Lockean one of protecting “property”, that is each person’s means of exercising freedom. Because security is less controversial, judgements for its sake are less likely to be disputed than judgements for the sake of a Lockean public good.

Conclusion: The social-contract theories of Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau were distinguished by their attempt to justify and delimit political authority on the grounds of individual self-interest and rational consent. By comparing the advantages of organized government with the supposed disadvantages of the state of nature, they showed why and under what conditions government is useful and ought therefore to be accepted by all reasonable people as a voluntary obligation. Those conclusions were then reduced to the form of a social contract, from which it was supposed that all the essential rights and duties of citizens could be logically deduced.

Social contract, in political philosophy, an actual or hypothetical compact, or agreement, between the ruled or between the ruled and their rulers, defining the rights and duties of each. In primeval times, according to the theory, individuals were born into an anarchic state of nature, which was happy or unhappy according to the particular version of the theory. They then, by exercising natural reason, formed a society (and a government) by means of a social contract.

Although similar ideas can be traced to the Greek Sophists, social-contract theories had their greatest currency in the 17th and 18th centuries and are associated with the English philosophers Thomas Hobbes and John Locke and the French philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau. What distinguished these theories of political obligation from other doctrines of the period was their attempt to justify and delimit political authority on the grounds of individual self-interest and rational consent. By comparing the advantages of organized government with the disadvantages of the state of nature, they showed why and under what conditions government is useful and ought therefore to be accepted by all reasonable people as a voluntary obligation. These conclusions were then reduced to the form of a social contract, from which it was supposed that all the essential rights and duties of citizens could be logically deduced.

Theories of the social contract differed according to their purpose: some were designed to justify the power of the sovereign, while others were intended to safeguard the individual from oppression by a sovereign who was all too powerful.

The social contract in Hobbes

According to Hobbes (*Leviathan*, 1651), the state of nature was one in which there were no enforceable criteria of right and wrong. People took for themselves all that they could, and human life was “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short.” The state of nature was therefore a state of war, which could be ended only if individuals agreed (in a social contract) to give their liberty into the hands of a sovereign, on the sole condition that their lives were safeguarded by sovereign power.

For Hobbes the authority of the sovereign is absolute, in the sense that no authority is above the sovereign, whose will is law. That, however, does not mean that the power of the sovereign is all-encompassing: subjects remain free to act as they please in cases in which the sovereign is silent (in other words, when the law does not address the action concerned). The social contract allows individuals to leave the state of nature and enter civil society, but the former remains a threat and returns as soon as governmental power collapses. Because the power of *Leviathan* (the political state) is uncontested, however, its collapse is very unlikely and occurs only when it is no longer able to protect its subjects.

The social contract in Locke

John Locke, oil on canvas by Herman Verelst, 1689; in the National Portrait Gallery, London.(more)

Locke (in the second of the *Two Treatises of Government*, 1690) differed from Hobbes insofar as he conceived of the state of nature not as a condition of complete license but rather as a state in which humans, though free, equal, and independent, are obliged under the law of nature to respect each other's rights to life, liberty, and property. Individuals nevertheless agree to form a commonwealth (and thereby to leave the state of nature) in order to institute an impartial power capable of arbitrating disputes and redressing injuries. Accordingly, Locke held that the obligation to obey civil government under the social contract was conditional upon the protection of the natural rights of each person, including the right to private property. Sovereigns who violated these terms could be justifiably overthrown.

Get a Britannica Premium subscription and gain access to exclusive content. **Subscribe Now**

Locke thus stated one of the fundamental principles of political liberalism: that there can be no subjection to power without consent—though once political society has been founded, citizens are obligated to accept the decisions of a majority of their number. Such decisions are made on behalf of the majority by the legislature, though the ultimate power of choosing the legislature rests with the people; and even the powers of the legislature are not absolute, because the law of nature remains as a permanent standard and as a principle of protection against arbitrary authority.

The social contract in Rousseau

Jean-Jacques Rousseau

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, undated aquatint.

Rousseau, in *Discours sur l'origine de l'inégalité* (1755; *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*), held that in the state of nature humans were solitary but also healthy, happy, good, and free. What Rousseau called “nascent societies” were formed when human began to live together as families and neighbours; that development, however, gave rise to negative and destructive passions such as jealousy and pride, which in turn fostered social inequality and human vice. The introduction of private property marked a further step toward inequality, since it made law and government necessary as a means of protecting it. Rousseau lamented the “fatal” concept of property and the “horrors” that resulted from the departure from a condition in which the earth belonged to no one.

Civil society, as Rousseau described it in the *Discourse*, came into being to serve two purposes: to provide peace for everyone and to ensure the right to property for anyone lucky enough to have possessions. It was thus of some advantage to everyone, but mostly to the

advantage of the rich, since it transformed their de facto ownership into rightful ownership and kept the poor dispossessed. It was, indeed, a somewhat fraudulent social contract, since the poor got so much less out of it than did the rich.

But Rousseau also believed in the possibility of a genuine social contract, one in which people would receive in exchange for their independence a better kind of freedom, namely true political, or republican, liberty. As described in *Du Contrat social* (1762; *The Social Contract*), such liberty is to be found in obedience to what Rousseau called the *volonté générale* (“general will”)—a collectively held will that aims at the common good or the common interest.

Rousseau’s conception of citizenship was much more organic and much less individualistic than Locke’s. The surrender of independence, or natural liberty, for political liberty meant that all individual rights, including property rights, are subordinate to the general will. For Rousseau the state is a moral person whose life is the union of its members, whose laws are acts of the general will, and whose end is the liberty and equality of its citizens. It follows that when any government usurps the power of the people, the social contract is broken; and not only are the citizens no longer compelled to obey, but they also have an obligation to rebel.

The more perceptive social-contract theorists, including Hobbes, invariably recognized that their concepts of the social contract and the state of nature were unhistorical and that they could be justified only as hypotheses useful for the clarification of timeless political problems. See also state of nature.

DEFINITIONS OF OBLIGATION : Sir John Salmond - “An obligation, therefore, may be defined as a proprietary right in personam or a duty which corresponds to such a right.” Obligations are all in one class of duties, namely those which are co-relatives of rights in personam.

NATURE OF POLITICAL OBLIGATION To have a political obligation is to have a moral duty to obey the laws of one's country or state. On that point there is almost complete agreement among political philosophers. But how does one acquire such an obligation, and how many people have really done what is necessary to acquire it? Or is political obligation more a matter of being than of doing that is, of simply being a member of the country or state in question? To those questions many answers have been given, and none now commands

widespread assent. Indeed, a number of contemporary political philosophers deny that a satisfactory theory of political obligation either has been or can be devised. Others, however, continue to believe that there is a solution to what is commonly called “the problem of political obligation,” and they are presently engaged in lively debate not only with the skeptics but also with one another on the question of which theory, if any, provides the solution to the problem. Whether political obligation is the central or fundamental problem of political philosophy, as some have maintained, may well be doubted. There is no doubt, however, that the history of political thought is replete with attempts to provide a satisfactory account of political obligation, from the time of Socrates to the present. These attempts have become increasingly sophisticated in recent years, but they have brought us no closer to agreement on a solution to the problem of political obligation than the efforts of, say, Thomas Hobbes and John Locke in the seventeenth century.

Utilitarianism, in normative ethics, a tradition stemming from the late 18th- and 19th-century English philosophers and economists Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill according to which an action (or type of action) is right if it tends to promote happiness or pleasure and wrong if it tends to produce unhappiness or pain—not just for the performer of the action but also for everyone else affected by it. Utilitarianism is a species of consequentialism, the general doctrine in ethics that actions (or types of action) should be evaluated on the basis of their consequences. Utilitarianism and other consequentialist theories are in opposition to egoism, the view that each person should pursue his or her own self-interest, even at the expense of others, and to any ethical theory that regards some actions (or types of action) as right or wrong independently of their consequences (see deontological ethics). Utilitarianism also differs from ethical theories that make the rightness or wrongness of an action dependent upon the motive of the agent—for, according to the utilitarian, it is possible for the right thing to be done from a bad motive. Utilitarians may, however, distinguish the aptness of praising or blaming an agent from whether the action was right.

(Read Peter Singer’s Britannica entry on ethics.)

The nature of utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is an effort to provide an answer to the practical question “What ought a person to do?” The answer is that a person ought to act so as to maximize happiness or pleasure and to minimize unhappiness or pain.

Basic concepts

In the notion of consequences the utilitarian includes all of the good and bad produced by the action, whether arising after the action has been performed or during its performance. If the difference in the consequences of alternative actions is not great, some utilitarians would not regard the choice between them as a moral issue. According to Mill, acts should be classified as morally right or wrong only if the consequences are of such significance that a person would wish to see the agent compelled, not merely persuaded and exhorted, to act in the preferred manner.

In assessing the consequences of actions, utilitarianism relies upon some theory of intrinsic value: something is held to be good in itself, apart from further consequences, and all other values are believed to derive their worth from their relation to this intrinsic good as a means to an end. Bentham and Mill were hedonists; i.e., they analyzed happiness as a balance of pleasure over pain and believed that these feelings alone are of intrinsic value and disvalue. Utilitarians also assume that it is possible to compare the intrinsic values produced by two alternative actions and to estimate which would have better consequences. Bentham believed that a hedonic calculus is theoretically possible. A moralist, he maintained, could sum up the units of pleasure and the units of pain for everyone likely to be affected, immediately and in the future, and could take the balance as a measure of the overall good or evil tendency of an action. Such precise measurement as Bentham envisioned is perhaps not essential, but it is nonetheless necessary for the utilitarian to make some interpersonal comparisons of the values of the effects of alternative courses of action.

Methodologies

As a normative system providing a standard by which an individual ought to act and by which the existing practices of society, including its moral code, ought to be evaluated and improved, utilitarianism cannot be verified or confirmed in the way in which a descriptive theory can, but it is not regarded by its exponents as simply arbitrary. Bentham believed that only in terms of a utilitarian interpretation do words such as “ought,” “right,” and “wrong” have meaning and that, whenever people attempt to combat the principle of utility, they do so with reasons drawn from the principle itself. Bentham and Mill both believed that human actions are motivated entirely by pleasure and pain, and Mill saw that motivation as a basis for the argument that, since happiness is the sole end of human action, the promotion of happiness is the test by which to judge all human conduct.

Get a Britannica Premium subscription and gain access to exclusive content. **Subscribe Now**

One of the leading utilitarians of the late 19th century, the Cambridge philosopher Henry Sidgwick, rejected such theories of motivation as well as Bentham's theory of the meaning of moral terms and sought to support utilitarianism by showing that it follows from systematic reflection on the morality of "common sense." Most of the requirements of commonsense morality, he argued, could be based upon utilitarian considerations. In addition, he reasoned that utilitarianism could solve the difficulties and perplexities that arise from the vagueness and inconsistencies of commonsense doctrines.

Most opponents of utilitarianism have held that it has implications contrary to their moral intuitions—that considerations of utility, for example, might sometimes sanction the breaking of a promise. Much of the defense of utilitarian ethics has consisted in answering these objections, either by showing that utilitarianism does not have the implications that its opponents claim it has or by arguing against the opponents' moral intuitions. Some utilitarians, however, have sought to modify the utilitarian theory to accommodate the objections.

Understanding Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is a tradition of ethical philosophy that is associated with Jeremy Bentham (1747-1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), two British philosophers, economists, and political thinkers. Utilitarianism holds that an action is right if it tends to promote happiness and wrong if it tends to produce sadness, or the reverse of happiness—not just the happiness of the actor but that of everyone affected by it.

At work, you display utilitarianism when you take actions to ensure that the office is a positive environment for your co-workers to be in, and then make it so for yourself.

Marxism, a body of doctrine developed by Karl Marx and, to a lesser extent, by Friedrich Engels in the mid-19th century. It originally consisted of three related ideas: a philosophical anthropology, a theory of history, and an economic and political program. There is also Marxism as it has been understood and practiced by the various socialist movements, particularly before 1914. Then there is Soviet Marxism as worked out by Vladimir Ilich Lenin and modified by Joseph Stalin, which under the name of Marxism-Leninism (*see* Leninism) became the doctrine of the communist parties set up after the Russian Revolution (1917). Offshoots of this included Marxism as interpreted by the anti-

Stalinist Leon Trotsky and his followers, Mao Zedong's Chinese variant of Marxism-Leninism, and various Marxisms in the developing world. There were also the post-World War II nondogmatic Marxisms that have modified Marx's thought with borrowings from modern philosophies, principally from those of Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger but also from Sigmund Freud and others.

THE THOUGHT OF KARL MARX

The written work of Marx cannot be reduced to a philosophy, much less to a philosophical system. The whole of his work is a radical critique of philosophy, especially of G.W.F. Hegel's idealist system and of the philosophies of the left and right post-Hegelians. It is not, however, a mere denial of those philosophies. Marx declared that philosophy must become reality. One could no longer be content with interpreting the world; one must be concerned with transforming it, which meant transforming both the world itself and human consciousness of it. This, in turn, required a critique of experience together with a critique of ideas. In fact, Marx believed that all knowledge involves a critique of ideas. He was not an empiricist. Rather, his work teems with concepts (appropriation, alienation, praxis, creative labour, value, and so on) that he had inherited from earlier philosophers and economists, including Hegel, Johann Fichte, Immanuel Kant, Adam Smith, David Ricardo, and John Stuart Mill. What uniquely characterizes the thought of Marx is that, instead of making abstract affirmations about a whole group of problems such as human nature, knowledge, and matter, he examines each problem in its dynamic relation to the others and, above all, tries to relate them to historical, social, political, and economic realities.

Historical materialism

In 1859, in the preface to his *Zur Kritik der politischen Ökonomie* (Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy), Marx wrote that the hypothesis that had served him as the basis for his analysis of society could be briefly formulated as follows:

Raised to the level of historical law, this hypothesis was subsequently called historical materialism. Marx applied it to capitalist society, both in *Manifest der kommunistischen Partei* (1848; *The Communist Manifesto*) and *Das Kapital* (vol. 1, 1867; "Capital") and in other writings. Although Marx reflected upon his working hypothesis for many years, he did not formulate it in a very exact manner: different expressions served him for identical realities. If one takes the text literally, social reality is structured in the following way:

1. Underlying everything as the real basis of society is the economic structure. This structure includes (a) the “material forces of production,” that is, the labour and means of production, and (b) the overall “relations of production,” or the social and political arrangements that regulate production and distribution. Although Marx stated that there is a correspondence between the “material forces” of production and the indispensable “relations” of production, he never made himself clear on the nature of the correspondence, a fact that was to be the source of differing interpretations among his later followers.

2. Above the economic structure rises the superstructure, consisting of legal and political “forms of social consciousness” that correspond to the economic structure. Marx says nothing about the nature of this correspondence between ideological forms and economic structure, except that through the ideological forms individuals become conscious of the conflict within the economic structure between the material forces of production and the existing relations of production expressed in the legal property relations. In other words, “The sum total of the forces of production accessible to men determines the condition of society” and is at the base of society. “The social structure and the state issue continually from the life processes of definite individuals . . . as they are in reality, that is acting and materially producing.” The political relations that individuals establish among themselves are dependent on material production, as are the legal relations. This foundation of the social on the economic is not an incidental point: it colours Marx’s whole analysis. It is found in *Das Kapital* as well as in *Die deutsche Ideologie* (written 1845–46; *The German Ideology*) and the *Ökonomisch-philosophische Manuskripte aus dem Jahre 1844* (*Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*).

Analysis of society

To go directly to the heart of the work of Marx, one must focus on his concrete program for humanity. This is just as important for an understanding of Marx as are *The Communist Manifesto* and *Das Kapital*. Marx’s interpretation of human nature begins with human need. “Man,” he wrote in the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*,

The point of departure of human history is therefore living human beings, who seek to satisfy certain primary needs. “The first historical fact is the production of the means to satisfy these needs.” This satisfaction, in turn, opens the way for new needs. Human activity is thus essentially a struggle with nature that must furnish the means of satisfying human needs:

drink, food, clothing, the development of human powers and then of human intellectual and artistic abilities. In this undertaking, people discover themselves as productive beings who humanize themselves through their labour. Furthermore, they humanize nature while they naturalize themselves. By their creative activity, by their labour, they realize their identity with the nature that they master, while at the same time, they achieve free consciousness. Born of nature, they become fully human by opposing it. Becoming aware in their struggle against nature of what separates them from it, they find the conditions of their fulfillment, of the realization of their true stature. The dawning of consciousness is inseparable from struggle. By appropriating all the creative energies, they discover that “all that is called history is nothing else than the process of creating man through human labour, the becoming of nature for man. Man has thus evident and irrefutable proof of his own creation by himself.” Understood in its universal dimension, human activity reveals that “for man, man is the supreme being.” It is thus vain to speak of God, creation, and metaphysical problems. Fully naturalized, humans are sufficient unto themselves: they have recaptured the fullness of humanity in its full liberty.

Living in a capitalist society, however, the individual is not truly free. He is an alienated being; he is not at home in his world. The idea of alienation, which Marx takes from Hegel and Ludwig Feuerbach, plays a fundamental role in the whole of his written work, starting with the writings of his youth and continuing through *Das Kapital*. In the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* the alienation of labour is seen to spring from the fact that the more the worker produces the less he has to consume, and the more values he creates the more he devalues himself, because his product and his labour are estranged from him. The life of the worker depends on things that he has created but that are not his, so that, instead of finding his rightful existence through his labour, he loses it in this world of things that are external to him: no work, no pay. Under these conditions, labour denies the fullness of concrete humanity. “The generic being (*Gattungswesen*) of man, nature as well as his intellectual faculties, is transformed into a being which is alien to him, into a means of his individual existence.” Nature, his body, his spiritual essence become alien to him. “Man is made alien to man.” When carried to its highest stage of development, private property becomes “the product of alienated labour...the means by which labour alienates itself (and) the realization of this alienation.” It is also at the same time “the tangible material expression of alienated human life.”

Although there is no evidence that Marx ever disclaimed this anthropological analysis of alienated labour, starting with *The German Ideology*, the historical, social, and economic causes of the alienation of labour are given increasing emphasis, especially in *Das Kapital*. Alienated labour is seen as the consequence of market production, the division of labour, and the division of society into antagonistic classes. As producers in society, workers create goods only by their labour. These goods are exchangeable. Their value is the average amount of social labour spent to produce them. The alienation of the worker takes on its full dimension in that system of market production in which part of the value of the goods produced by the worker is taken away from him and transformed into surplus value, which the capitalist privately appropriates. Market production also intensifies the alienation of labour by encouraging specialization, piecework, and the setting up of large enterprises. Thus the labour power of the worker is used along with that of others in a combination whose significance he is ignorant of, both individually and socially. In thus losing their quality as human products, the products of labour become fetishes, that is, alien and oppressive realities to which both the individual who possesses them privately and the individual who is deprived of them submit themselves. In the market economy, this submission to things is obscured by the fact that the exchange of goods is expressed in money.

This fundamental economic alienation is accompanied by secondary political and ideological alienations, which offer a distorted representation of and an illusory justification of a world in which the relations of individuals with one another are also distorted. The ideas that people form are closely bound up with their material activity and their material relations: “The act of making representations, of thinking, the spiritual intercourse of men, seem to be the direct emanation of their material relations.” This is true of all human activity: political, intellectual, or spiritual. “Men produce their representations and their ideas, but it is as living men, men acting as they are determined by a definite development of their powers of production.” Law, morality, metaphysics, and religion do not have a history of their own. “Men developing their material production modify together with their real existence their ways of thinking and the products of their ways of thinking.” In other words, “It is not consciousness which determines existence, it is existence which determines consciousness.”

In bourgeois, capitalist society the individual is divided into political citizen and economic actor. This duality represents his political alienation, which is further intensified by the functioning of the bourgeois state. From this study of society at the beginning of the 19th

century, Marx came to see the state as the instrument through which the propertied class dominated other classes.

Ideological alienation, for Marx, takes different forms, appearing in economic, philosophical, and legal theories. Marx undertook a lengthy critique of the first in *Das Kapital* and of the second in *The German Ideology*. But ideological alienation expresses itself supremely in religion. Taking up the ideas about religion that were current in left post-Hegelian circles, together with the thought of Feuerbach, Marx considered religion to be a product of human consciousness. It is a reflection of the situation of a person who “either has not conquered himself or has already lost himself again” (the individual in the world of private property). It is “an opium for the people.” Unlike Feuerbach, Marx believed that religion would disappear only with changes in society.

Analysis of the economy

Marx analyzed the market economy system in *Das Kapital*. In this work he borrows most of the categories of the classical English economists Smith and Ricardo but adapts them and introduces new concepts such as that of surplus value. One of the distinguishing marks of *Das Kapital* is that in it Marx studies the economy as a whole and not in one or another of its aspects. His analysis is based on the idea that humans are productive beings and that all economic value comes from human labour. The system he analyzes is principally that of mid-19th-century England. It is a system of private enterprise and competition that arose in the 16th century from the development of sea routes, international trade, and colonialism. Its rise had been facilitated by changes in the forces of production (the division of labour and the concentration of workshops), the adoption of mechanization, and technical progress. The wealth of the societies that brought this economy into play had been acquired through an “enormous accumulation of commodities.” Marx therefore begins with the study of this accumulation, analyzing the unequal exchanges that take place in the market.

According to Marx, if the capitalist advances funds to buy cotton yarn with which to produce fabrics and sells the product for a larger sum than he paid, he is able to invest the difference in additional production. “Not only is the value advanced kept in circulation, but it changes in its magnitude, adds a plus to itself, makes itself worth more, and it is this movement that transforms it into capital.” The transformation, to Marx, is possible only because the capitalist has appropriated the means of production, including the labour power of the worker. Now labour power produces more than it is worth. The value of labour power is determined by the

amount of labour necessary for its reproduction or, in other words, by the amount needed for the worker to subsist and beget children. But in the hands of the capitalist the labour power employed in the course of a day produces more than the value of the sustenance required by the worker and his family. The difference between the two values is appropriated by the capitalist, and it corresponds exactly to the surplus value realized by capitalists in the market. Marx is not concerned with whether in capitalist society there are sources of surplus value other than the exploitation of human labour—a fact pointed out by Joseph Schumpeter in *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy* (1942). He remains content with emphasizing this primary source:

Throughout his analysis, Marx argues that the development of capitalism is accompanied by increasing contradictions. For example, the introduction of machinery is profitable to the individual capitalist because it enables him to produce more goods at a lower cost, but new techniques are soon taken up by his competitors. The outlay for machinery grows faster than the outlay for wages. Since only labour can produce the surplus value from which profit is derived, this means that the capitalist's rate of profit on his total outlay tends to decline. Along with the declining rate of profit goes an increase in unemployment. Thus, the equilibrium of the system is precarious, subject as it is to the internal pressures resulting from its own development. Crises shake it at regular intervals, preludes to the general crisis that will sweep it away. This instability is increased by the formation of a reserve army of workers, both factory workers and peasants, whose pauperization keeps increasing. "Capitalist production develops the technique and the combination of the process of social production only by exhausting at the same time the two sources from which all wealth springs: the earth and the worker." According to the Marxist dialectic, these fundamental contradictions can only be resolved by a change from capitalism to a new system.

Class struggle

Marx inherited the ideas of class and class struggle from utopian socialism and the theories of Henri de Saint-Simon. These had been given substance by the writings of French historians such as Adolphe Thiers and François Guizot on the French Revolution of 1789. But unlike the French historians, Marx made class struggle the central fact of social evolution. "The history of all hitherto existing human society is the history of class struggles."

In Marx's view, the dialectical nature of history is expressed in class struggle. With the development of capitalism, the class struggle takes an acute form. Two basic classes, around which other less important classes are grouped, oppose each other in the capitalist system: the owners of the means of production, or bourgeoisie, and the workers, or proletariat. "The bourgeoisie produces its own grave-diggers. The fall of the bourgeoisie and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable"

When people have become aware of their loss, of their alienation, as a universal nonhuman situation, it will be possible for them to proceed to a radical transformation of their situation by a revolution. This revolution will be the prelude to the establishment of communism and the reign of liberty reconquered. "In the place of the old bourgeois society with its classes and its class antagonisms, there will be an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

But for Marx there are two views of revolution. One is that of a final conflagration, "a violent suppression of the old conditions of production," which occurs when the opposition between bourgeoisie and proletariat has been carried to its extreme point. This conception is set forth in a manner inspired by the Hegelian dialectic of the master and the slave, in *Die heilige Familie* (1845; *The Holy Family*). The other conception is that of a permanent revolution involving a provisional coalition between the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie rebelling against a capitalism that is only superficially united. Once a majority has been won to the coalition, an unofficial proletarian authority constitutes itself alongside the revolutionary bourgeois authority. Its mission is the political and revolutionary education of the proletariat, gradually assuring the transfer of legal power from the revolutionary bourgeoisie to the revolutionary proletariat.

If one reads *The Communist Manifesto* carefully one discovers inconsistencies that indicate that Marx had not reconciled the concepts of catastrophic and of permanent revolution. Moreover, Marx never analyzed classes as specific groups of people opposing other groups of people. Depending on the writings and the periods, the number of classes varies; and unfortunately the pen fell from Marx's hand at the moment when, in *Das Kapital* (vol. 3), he was about to take up the question. Reading *Das Kapital*, one is furthermore left with an ambiguous impression with regard to the destruction of capitalism: will it be the result of the "general crisis" that Marx expects, or of the action of the conscious proletariat, or of both at once?

Lenin

Vladimir Lenin, 1918.

Vladimir Ilich Ulyanov, or Lenin, was born in 1870 at Simbirsk (now Ulyanovsk). He entered the University of Kazan to study law but was expelled the same year for participating in student agitation. In 1893 he settled in St. Petersburg and became actively involved with the revolutionary workers. With his pamphlet *Chto delat?* (1902; *What Is to Be Done?*), he specified the theoretical principles and organization of a Marxist party as he thought it should be constituted. He took part in the second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party, which was held in Brussels and London (1903), and induced the majority of the Congress members to adopt his views. Two factions formed at the Congress: the Bolshevik (from the Russian word for "larger") with Lenin as the leader and the Menshevik (from the Russian word for "smaller") with L. Martov at the head. The former wanted a restricted party of militants and advocated the dictatorship of the proletariat. The latter wanted a wide-open proletarian party, collaboration with the liberals, and a democratic constitution for Russia. In his pamphlet *Shag vperyod, dva shaga nazad* (1904; *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*), Lenin compared the organizational principles of the Bolsheviks to those of the Mensheviks. After the failure of the Russian Revolution of 1905, he drew positive lessons for the future in *Dve taktiki Sotsial-Demokraty v demokraticheskoy revolyutsii* (1905; *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*). He fiercely attacked the influence of Kantian philosophy on German and Russian Marxism in *Materializm i empiriokrititsizm* (1908; *Materialism and Empirio-criticism* (1908)). In 1912 at the Prague Conference the Bolsheviks constituted themselves as an independent party. During World War I Lenin resided in Switzerland, where he studied Hegel's *Science of Logic* and the development of capitalism and carried on debates with Marxists like Luxemburg on the meaning of the war and the right of nations to self-determination. In 1915 at Zimmerwald, and in 1916 at Kiental, he organized two international socialist conferences to fight against the war. Immediately after the February 1917 revolution he returned to Russia, and in October the Bolshevik coup brought him to power.

The situation of Russia and the Russian revolutionary movement at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th led Lenin to diverge, in the course of his development and his analyses, from the positions both of "orthodox Marxism" and of "revisionism." He rediscovered the original thought of Marx by a careful study of his works, in particular *Das*

Kapital and The Holy Family. He saw Marxism as a practical affair and tried to go beyond the accepted formulas to plan political action that would come to grips with the surrounding world.

As early as 1894, in his populist study *Chto Takoye "Druzya Naroda," kak oni voyuyut protiv Sotsial-Demokratov?* (What the "Friends of the People" Are, and How They Fight the Social-Democrats), Lenin took up Marx's distinction between "material social relations" and "ideological social relations." In Lenin's eyes the importance of *Das Kapital* was that "while explaining the structure and the development of the social formation seen exclusively in terms of its relations of production, (Marx) has nevertheless everywhere and always analyzed the superstructure which corresponds to these relations of production." In *Razvitiye kapitalizma v Rossi* (1897–99; *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*) Lenin sought to apply Marx's analysis by showing the growing role of capital, in particular commercial capital, in the exploitation of the workers in the factories and the large-scale expropriation of the peasants. It was thus possible to apply to Russia the models developed by Marx for western Europe. At the same time Lenin did not lose sight of the importance of the peasant in Russian society. Although a disciple of Marx, he did not believe that he had only to repeat Marx's conclusions.

Lenin laid great stress upon the dialectical method. In his early writings he defined the dialectic as "nothing more nor less than the method of sociology, which sees society as a living organism, in perpetual development (and not as something mechanically assembled and thus allowing all sorts of arbitrary combinations of the various social elements)" (*Friends of the People*). After having studied Hegel toward the end of 1914, he took a more activist view. Dialectic is not only evolution; it is praxis, leading from activity to reflection and from reflection to action.

The dictatorship of the proletariat

Lenin also put much emphasis on the leading role of the party. As early as 1902 he was concerned with the need for a cohesive party with a correct doctrine, adapted to the exigencies of the period, which would be a motive force among the masses, helping to bring them to an awareness of their real situation. In *What Is To Be Done?* he called for a party of professional revolutionaries, disciplined and directed, capable of defeating the police; its aim should be to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. In order to do this, he

wrote in *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, it was necessary “to subject the insurrection of the proletarian and non-proletarian masses to our influence, to our direction, to use it in our best interests.” But this was not possible without a doctrine: “Without revolutionary theory, no revolutionary movement.” On the eve of the revolution of October 1917, in *Gosudarstvo i revolyutsiya* (*The State and Revolution*), he set forth the conditions for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the suppression of the capitalist state.

Lenin assigned major importance to the peasantry in formulating his program. It would be a serious error, he held, for the Russian revolutionary workers’ movement to neglect the peasants. Even though it was clear that the industrial proletariat constituted the vanguard of the revolution, the discontent of the peasantry could be oriented in a direction favourable to the revolution by placing among the goals of the party the seizure of privately owned land. As early as 1903, at the third congress of the party, he secured a resolution to this effect. Thereafter, the dictatorship of the proletariat became the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. In 1917 he encouraged the peasants to seize land long before the approval of agrarian reform by the Constituent Assembly.

Among Lenin’s legacies to Soviet Marxism was one that proved to be injurious to the party. This was the decision taken at his behest by the 10th congress of the party in the spring of 1921, while the sailors were rebelling at Kronstadt and the peasants were growing restless in the countryside, to forbid all factions, all factional activity, and all opposition political platforms within the party. This decision had grave consequences in later years when Stalin used it against his opponents.

Maoism

Mao Zedong

When the Chinese communists took power in 1948, they brought with them a new kind of Marxism that came to be called Maoism after their leader Mao Zedong. The thought of Mao must always be seen against the changing revolutionary reality of China from 1930 onward. His thought was complex, a Marxist type of analysis combined with the permanent fundamentals of Chinese thought and culture.

One of its central elements has to do with the nature and role of contradictions in socialist society. For Mao, every society, including socialist (communist) society, contained “two

different types of contradictions”: (1) antagonistic contradictions—contradictions between us (the people) and our enemies (the Chinese bourgeoisie faithful), between the imperialist camp and the socialist camp, and so forth—which are resolved by revolution, and (2) nonantagonistic contradictions—between the government and the people under a socialist regime, between two groups within the Communist Party, between one section of the people and another under a communist regime, and so forth—which are resolved by vigorous fraternal criticism and self-criticism.

The notion of contradiction is specific to Mao’s thought in that it differs from the conceptions of Marx or Lenin. For Mao, in effect, contradictions were at the same time universal and particular. In their universality, one must seek and discover what constitutes their particularity: every contradiction displays a particular character, depending on the nature of things and phenomena. Contradictions have alternating aspects—sometimes strongly marked, sometimes blurred. Some of these aspects are primary, others secondary. It is important to define them well, for if one fails to do so, the analysis of the social reality and the actions that follow from it will be mistaken. This is quite far from Stalinism and dogmatic Marxism-Leninism.

Another essential element of Mao’s thought, which must be seen in the context of revolutionary China, is the notion of permanent revolution. It is an old idea advocated in different contexts by Marx, Lenin, and Trotsky but lacking, in Mao’s formulation, the international dimension espoused by his predecessors. For Mao it followed from his ideas about the struggle of humans against nature (held from 1938, at least); the campaigns for the rectification of thought (1942, 1951, 1952); and the necessity of struggling against bureaucracy, waste, and corruption in a country then possessing 600 to 700 million inhabitants, where very old civilizations and cultures still permeated both the bourgeois classes and the peasantry, where bureaucracy was thoroughly entrenched, and where the previous society was extremely corrupt. It arose from Mao’s conviction that the rhythm of the revolution must be accelerated. This conviction appeared in 1957 in his speeches and became manifest in 1958 in the Great Leap Forward, followed in 1966 by the Cultural Revolution.

Mao’s concept of permanent revolution rests upon the existence of nonantagonistic contradictions in the China of the present and of the future. The people must be mobilized into a permanent movement in order to carry forward the revolution and to prevent the ruling

group from turning bourgeois (as he perceived it had in the Soviet Union). It is necessary to shape among the masses a new vision of the world by tearing them from their passivity and their century-old habits. This is the background of the Cultural Revolution that began in 1966, following previous campaigns but differing from them in its magnitude and, it would seem, in the mobilization of youth against the cadres of the party. In these campaigns Mao drew upon his past as a revolutionary Marxist peasant leader, from his life in the red military and peasant bases and among the Red Guards of Yen-an, seeking in his past experience ways to mobilize the whole Chinese population against the dangers—internal and external—that confronted it in the present.

The distinguishing characteristic of Maoism is that it represents a peasant type of Marxism, with a principally rural and military outlook. While basing himself on Marxism-Leninism, adapted to Chinese requirements, Mao was rooted in the peasant life from which he himself came, in the revolts against the warlords and the bureaucrats that have filled the history of China. By integrating this experience into a universal vision of history, Mao gave it a significance that flows beyond the provincial limits of China.

In his effort to remain close to the Chinese peasant masses, Mao drew upon an idea of nature and a symbolism found in popular Chinese Daoism, though transformed by his Marxism. It can be seen in his many poems, which were written in the classical Chinese style. This idea of nature is accompanied in his written political works by the Promethean idea of humanity struggling in a war against nature, a conception in his thought that goes back at least to 1938 and became more important after 1955 as the rhythm of the revolution accelerated.

Marxism in Cuba

The Marxism of Fidel Castro expressed itself as a rejection of injustice in any form—political, economic, or social. In this sense it is related to the liberal democracy and Pan-Americanism of Simón Bolívar in Latin America during the 19th century. In its liberalism, Castro's early socialism resembled the various French socialisms of the first half of the 19th century. Only gradually did Castroism come to identify itself with Marxism-Leninism, although from the very beginning of the Cuban revolution Castro revealed his attachment to certain of Marx's ideas. Castro's Marxism rejects some of the tenets and practices of official Marxism-Leninism: it is outspoken against dogmatism, bureaucracy, and sectarianism. In one sense, Castroism is a Marxist-Leninist "heresy." It exalts the ethos of guerrilla revolution

over party politics. At the same time it aims to apply a purer Marxism to the conditions of Cuba: alleged American imperialism, a single-crop economy, a low initial level of political and economic development. One may call it an attempt to realize a synthesis of Marxist ideas and the ideas of Bolívar.

Marxism in the developing world

The emergence of Marxist variants in the developing world was primarily influenced by the undeveloped industrial state and the former colonial status of the nations in question. In the traditional Marxist view, the growth of capitalism is seen as a step necessary for the breakup of precapitalist peasant society and for the rise of the revolutionary proletariat class. Some theorists believed, however, that capitalism introduced by imperialist rather than indigenous powers sustains rather than destroys the feudal structure of peasant society and promotes underdevelopment because resources and surplus are usurped by the colonial powers. Furthermore, the revolutionary socialist movement becomes subordinate to that of national liberation, which violates Marx's theory of class struggle by uniting all indigenous classes in the common cause of anti-imperialism. For these reasons, many developing countries chose to follow the Maoist model, with its emphasis on agrarian revolution against feudalism and imperialism, rather than the old Soviet one. Another alternative, one specific to the developing world, bypassed capitalism and depended upon the established strength of other communist countries for support against imperialism.

Marxism in the West

There are two main forms of Marxism in the West: that of the traditional communist parties and the more diffuse New Left form, which is also known as Western Marxism. In general, the success of western European communist parties had been hindered by their perceived allegiance to the old Soviet authority rather than their own countries; the secretive, bureaucratic form of organization they inherited from Lenin; the ease with which they became integrated into capitalist society; and their consequent fear of compromising their principles by sharing power with bourgeois parties. The Western parties basically adhered to the policies of Soviet Marxism until the 1970s, when they began to advocate Eurocommunism, a moderate version of communism that they felt would broaden their base of appeal beyond the working class and thus improve their chances for political success. As described by Enrico Berlinguer, Georges Marchais, and Santiago Carrillo, the leaders in the 1970s and '80s of the Italian, French, and Spanish communist parties,

respectively, Eurocommunism favoured a peaceful, democratic approach to achieving socialism, encouraged making alliances with other political parties, guaranteed civil liberties, and renounced the central authority of the Soviet party. By the 1980s, however, Eurocommunism had largely been abandoned as unsuccessful, and communist parties in advanced capitalist nations returned to orthodox Marxism-Leninism despite the concomitant problems.

Western Marxism, however, can be seen as a repudiation of Marxism-Leninism, although, when it was first formulated in the 1920s, its proponents believed they were loyal to the dominant Soviet Communist Party. Prominent figures in the evolution of Western Marxism included the central Europeans György Lukács, Karl Korsch, and Lucien Goldmann; Antonio Gramsci of Italy; the German theorists who constituted the Frankfurt School, especially Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, and Jürgen Habermas; and Henri Lefebvre, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty of France.

Western Marxism has been shaped primarily by the failure of the socialist revolution in the Western world. Western Marxists were concerned less with the actual political or economic practice of Marxism than with its philosophical interpretation, especially in relation to cultural and historical studies. In order to explain the inarguable success of capitalist society, they felt they needed to explore and understand non-Marxist approaches and all aspects of bourgeois culture. Eventually, they came to believe that traditional Marxism was not relevant to the reality of modern Western society.

Marx had predicted that revolution would succeed in Europe first, but, in fact, the developing world proved more responsive. Orthodox Marxism also championed the technological achievements associated with capitalism, viewing them as essential to the progress of socialism. Experience showed the Western Marxists, however, that technology did not necessarily produce the crises Marx described and did not lead inevitably to revolution. In particular they disagreed with the idea, originally emphasized by Engels, that Marxism is an integrated, scientific doctrine that can be applied universally to nature; they viewed it as a critique of human life, not an objective, general science. Disillusioned by the terrorism of the Stalin era and the bureaucracy of the communist party system, they advocated the idea of government by workers' councils, which they believed would eliminate professional politicians and would more truly represent the interests of the working class. Later, when the working class appeared to them to be too well integrated into the capitalist system, the

Western Marxists supported more anarchistic tactics. In general, their views are more in accord with those found in Marx's early, humanist writings rather than with his later, dogmatic interpretations.

Western Marxism has found support primarily among intellectuals rather than the working class, and orthodox Marxists have judged it impractical. Nevertheless, the Western Marxists' emphasis on Marx's social theory and their critical assessment of Marxist methodology and ideas have coloured the way even non-Marxists view the world.