

STUDY MATERIAL

WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT

For

MA POLITICAL SCIENCE

PAPER VI

II YEAR

(2013 Admission onwards)



UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

Calicut University, P.O. Malappuram, Kerala, India-673 635

496 A

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIAL

MA POLITICAL SCIENCE

Paper: VI

WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT

Prepared and scrutinized by :-

Dr.G.Sadanandan
Associate Professor and Head.
P.G Department of Political Science
Sree Kerala Varma,College Thrissur

Layout & Settings: Computer Section, SDE

© Reserved

CONTENTS	PAGES
Module - I	05-22
Module - II	23-29
Module - III	30-43
Module – IV	44-54
Module – V	55-67
Module – VI	68-80
Module – VII	81-93
Module – VIII	94-104
Module – IX	105-110

MODULE I

- a) Plato – Justice , Education, Theory Of State, Communism, Classification of Government
- b) Aristotle- Theory of State, Slavery, Citizenship, Distributive Justice, Education, Classification of Government, Revolution, Democracy

MODULE II

Machiavelli - Church v/s State Controversy: Modern Secular Nation State: Political Realism.

MODULE III

- a) Hobbes-Political Absolutism, Human Nature And Contract
- b) Locke-Limited Government; Private Property and Civil Society
- c) Rousseau- Critique of Civilization General Will and Social Contract

MODULE IV

- a) Bentham-Quantitative Utility
- b) J.S. Mill-Quantitative Utility Liberty

MODULE V

- a) Edmund Burke- Conservative Reforms, Critique of French Revolution
- b) Hegel- Idealism, Dialectics State and Freedom

MODULE VI

- a) Marx - Marx's Method; Materialistic Dialectics; Historical Materialism; Base – Superstructure Relations; Theory of Classes ; Class Struggle; Theory of Alienation and Critique of Capitalism

MODULE VII

- a) Lenin- Theory of State and Revolution; Democratic Centralism and Dictatorship of the Proletariat; Theory of Imperialism
- b) Mao- On Contradiction; Views on the Role of Peasantry In Revolution; New Democracy and Cultural Revolution;

MODULE VIII

Bakunin and Kropotkin- Theory of Anarchism.

MODULE IX

Harold J. Laski - Political Pluralism.

MODULE I

A - PLATO (427-347 BC)

The imperishable contribution of the Greeks to western civilization lies in the taming of man and nature through reason. The Greeks were not the first to think about recurrent regularities of inanimate events, but they were the first to develop the scientific attitude, a new approach to the world that constitutes to this day one of the distinctive elements of western life. In the field of human relations, too, Greek inventiveness and originality lay, not in this or that political theory, but in the discovery of the scientific study of politics. The Greek school has produced eminent thinkers like Socrates, Plato and Aristotle.

In the entire history of political thought no thinker evoked the admiration, reverence and criticism that Plato did- Plato has left behind many important works out of which three the Republic, (380-370 BC) the States man (360 BC) and the Laws (350BC), were of perennial interest to all those interested in the history of political ideas. Plato has been generally regarded as the founder of philosophical idealism by virtues of his conviction that there is a universal idea in the world of eternal reality beyond the world of the senses. He was the first to formulate and define political ideas within a larger framework of a philosophical idea of Good. He was concerned about human life and human soul or human nature, and the real question in it is how to live best in the state within the European intellectual traditions. He conceptualized the disorders and crises of the actual world and presented to his readers a vision of a desirable political order, which till today has fascinated his admirers and detractors. He has been described as a poet of ideas, a philosopher of beauty and the true founder of the cult of harmonious living. He has been praised for his denunciation of materialism and brutish selfishness. Both Voltaire (1694-1778) and Nietzsche (1844-1900) characterized Platonism as the intellectual side of Christianity. Many like John Ruskin (1819-1900) and William Morris (1834-1896) were attracted by Plato's concern for human perfection and excellence. Plato, along with his disciple Aristotle has been credited for laying the foundations of Greek political theory on which the western political tradition rests. These two thinkers between themselves have explored, stated, analyzed and covered a wide range of philosophical perspectives and issues.

Plato was born in May-June 428/27 BC in Athens in an aristocratic though not affluent, family. His father, Ariston, traced his ancestry to the early kings of Athens. His mother, Perictione, was a descendant of Solon, the famous law giver of Athens. Plato's original name was Aristocles, which meant the "best and renowned". He was given the nick name 'Plato', derived from platys, because of his broad and strong shoulders. He was known for his good looks and charming disposition. He excelled in the study of music, mathematics and poetry. He excelled in the study of music, mathematics and poetry. He fought in three wars and won an award for bravery. He met Socrates in 407 BC at the age of 20 and since then was under his hypnotic spell. The trial and execution of Socrates in 399 BC proved to be a turning point in Plato's life. In 386 BC on returning to Athens, Plato's friends gifted him a recreation spot named after its local hero Academns. It was here that Plato established his Academy which became a seat of higher learning and intellectual pursuits in Greece for the next one hundred years. The academy was initially a religious group

dedicated to the worship of Muses and its leader Apollo. The academy concretised the possibility of a science of knowledge with which one could reform the world. Plato saw in the academy a training school for future philosophic rulers'. As Taylor has beautifully commented the founding of Academy is a turning point in Plato's life and in some ways the most memorable event in the history of European science. It was a permanent institution for the pursuit of science by original research.

Plato spent the last years of his life at the academy, teaching and instructing. He died in 347 BC while attending the wedding feast of one of his students. Plato's works include the Apology of Socrates, 22 genuine and 11 disputed dialogues, and 13 letters. Apology was an imaginative and satirical version of Socrates' defence trail.

The Republic, the Statesman and the Laws were Plato's major works in political philosophy. The Republic was collection of Plato's ideas in the field of ethics, metaphysics, philosophy and politics. The Republic, concerning justice, the greatest and most well-known work of Plato, was written in the form of a dialogue, a method of great importance in clarifying questions and establishing truth. It was one of the finest examples of the dialectical method as stated and first developed by Socrates. Though Socrates did not provide a theoretical exposition of the method, he established a clear-cut pattern of dialectical reasoning for others to follow. He placed dialectics in the service of ethics, defining virtue as a basis for traditional and moral transformation. The discussion in the Republic was conducted in a single room among Socrates. The Republic in Greek means justice, and should not be used or understood in this Latin sense meaning the states or the polity' As has been rightly pointed out by William Ebenstein, after twenty three hundred years the Republic "is still match less as an introduction to the basic issues that confront human being as citizens". No other writer on politics has equaled Plato in combining penetrating and dialectical reasoning with poetic imagery and symbolism. One of the main assumptions of the Republic is that the right kind of government and politics can be the legitimate object of rigorous scientific thinking rather than the inevitable product of muddling through fear and faith, indolence and improvisation.

THEORY OF JUSTICE

The concept of justice is the most important principle of Plato's political philosophy. The sub-title of the Republic, 'Concerning Justice' shows the extra ordinary importance which Plato attached to justice. Plato saw in justice the only practical remedy of saving his beloved Athens from decay and ruin. The main argument in the republic is a sustained search after the location and nature of justice. He discovers and locates the principle of justice with the help of his ideal state.

An ideal state for Plato possessed the four cardinal virtues of wisdom, courage, discipline and justice. It would have wisdom because its rulers were persons of knowledge, courage because its warriors were brave, self discipline because of the harmony that pervaded the societal matrix due to a common agreement as to who ought to rule, and finally, justice of doing one's job for which one was naturally filled without interfering with others. For Plato, the state was ideal, of which justice was the reality. Justice was the principle on which the state had to be founded and a contribution made towards the excellence of the city.

According to Plato, justice does not consist in mere adherence to the laws, for it is based on the inner nature of human spirit, it is also to the triumph of the stronger over the weaker, for it protects

the weaker against the stronger. A just state, Plato argues, is achieved with an eye to the good of the whole. In a just state or society, the rulers and military, the producers all do what they ought to do. In such a society the rulers are wise, the soldiers are brave, and the producers exercise self-control or temperance.

For Plato, justice is a moral concept. As Prof: Ernest Barker has rightly pointed out; justice for Plato is at once a part of human virtue and the bond which joins men together in the states. It makes man good and make him social" A similar view has been expressed by a Prof. Sabine when he wrote that for Plato' "Justice is a bound which holds the society together".

DIFFERENT MEANINGS AND THEORIES OF JUSTICE

Plato in his masterpiece, the Republic, reviews the then prevailing theories of justice representing various stages in the development of conceptions of justice and morality and finally gives own interpretations and meaning. The text opens with a discussion between Socrates and Cephalous on the subject of old age and wealth. Cephalous, old and prosperous, pointed out that wealth by itself did not make one happy but provided comforts that made life easy. It is enabled one to lead a good life and to do what was morally wrong. Cephalous defined justice as telling the truth, being honest in word and deed and paying one's debts. Socrates dismissed the argument effortlessly by pointing out that in some cases it might be harmful to speak the truth or return one's belongings, through examples like returning weapons to a mad person, or telling the truth when it was better to conceal it. He did not show that honesty in word and deed was not justice but rather that such honesty could be harmful.

By altering the definition provided by Cephalous, Polemarchus pointed out that justice means giving each man his due' or what was fitting', In short justice was doing the right thing which he qualified to mean doing good to friends might also involve acts like stealing and telling a lie. Second the idea of being good to friends and bad to enemies was difficult to apply, because a person could make mistakes about one's friends and enemies. A friend might not actually be a friend in reality. Moreover, a person who could do the maximum help could also do the maximum harm. Third, a person should not harm anyone because those who get injured become more unjust. Justice was human excellence; a just person could not harm anybody, including the self.

Through a series of analogies, Socrates showed the justice was not the advantage of the stronger, for the ruler's duty was to serve the interests of the people. A ruler's position was similar to that of a doctor, teacher or shepherd. By defining justice as the interest of the stronger, Thrasymachus earned a place in the history of political theory.

There is another theory of justice advocated by two brothers - Glaucon and Adeimantus. Glaucon held the view that justice is in the interest of the weaker and that it is artificial in so far as it is the product of customs and conventions. Plato saw limitations in Glaucon's theory by describing justice as natural and universal as against Glaucon's notion of it as artificial and product of conventions and customs.

Platonic justice has two aspects - individual and social. According to Plato, every individual was a functional unit, assigned a particular task with clear cut obligations and privileges, which one was expected to perform diligently and meticulously. William Bernstein wrote in the discussion of justice,

all elements of Plato's political philosophy are contained, In his theory of justice the relations of man to nature, to the polis, and to his fellow men form an architectonic whole.

Plato explained his arguments for differing individual capabilities with the help of the theory of three classes and three souls, an idea borrowed from Pythagoras. He pointed out that every human soul had three qualities: rational, spirit and appetite with justice as the fourth virtue balancing and harmonizing the other three qualities. In each soul one of these qualities would be the predominant faculty. Individuals in whom the rational faculty was predominant would constitute the ruling class and the virtue of such a soul was wisdom. This soul, a lover of learning had the power to comprehend the idea of good. Those in whom spirit was the predominant quality were the auxiliaries or warriors and the virtue of such souls was courage, implying the ability to hold on to one's convictions and beliefs in adverse times. Together the rulers and soldiers would constitute the guardian class.

Individuals whose souls were appetitive exhibited a fondness for material things. They were lovers of gain and money. They were the artisans, the producing class. The quality of such an appetitive soul was temperance, though Plato did not see temperance as an exclusive quality of the artisan class. Though Plato took into account the role of spirit and appetite in human behavior, he was convinced that reason must ultimately control and direct emotions and passions.

Thus justice in the state meant that the three social classes (rulers, warriors and producers) performed the deliberative and governing, defense and production without interfering with the functions of others. Justice was "one class, one duty; every man, one work. Prof. Ernest Barker has defined the Platonic theory of justice when he wrote that justice means 'will to concentrate on one's own sphere of duty and not to meddle with the sphere of others'".

According to Plato, the justice of the state is the citizen's sense of duty. This conception of justice goes against individualism because a man must not think of himself as an isolated unit with personal desire. Plato's justice does not embody a conception of rights but of duties though it is identical with true liberty. It is the true condition the individual and of the state and the ideal state is the embodiment of justice. The state is the reality of which justice is the idea. According to Prof. Sabine, Plato visualized society as a system of services in which each member both gives and receives. What the state takes cognizance of is this mutual exchange and what it tries to arrange is the most adequate satisfaction of needs and the most harmonious interchange of services

Platonic justice leads to functional specialization. From the point of view of society justice means self control on the part of various classes of society which makes each class mind its own function and not interfere with the functions of others. It also makes various members of each class stick to their own allotted functions and responsibilities within the class and not interfere with the function of other individuals in the same class.

CRITICISMS

Several criticisms have been leveled against Platonic theory of justice. Platonic doctrine of justice is based on self - control and self abnegation of the individual in the interest of society. It leads to functional specialization. It ignores the evils of functional specialization which does not sufficiently

realize and properly provide for the whole of human personality. It stunts the growth of the individual and there - by impoverished the society.

Platonic theory of justice divides the state into three separate classes and is not applicable to modern states with large population and numerous interests and sections of society. His division of society into separate classes would lead to a class state with class consciousness and privileges. Further, concentration of political power in the hands of philosophers is likely to lead to totalitarianism.

EDUCATION

Plato's republic is not merely an essay on Justice. It is one of the greatest treatises on education to be ever written. The main objective of Plato's philosophy was to bring about reforms in the Greek city – states. The object of the Republic was to locate and thereafter establish justice in the ideal state and his scheme of education is the spiritual remedy for the realization of justice. According to Plato, social education is a means to social justice. It is; therefore, correct to say that education for Plato has been a solution to all the important questions during his period.

The ideal state ruled by the philosopher king was made possible through an elaborate and rigorous scheme of education. The state was wholly constructed around the scheme of education, in the belief that if the state performed its task of conducting and supervising education properly, Plato looked to education as an instrument of moral reform, for it would mould and transform human souls. Education inculcated the right values of selfless duty towards all, and was therefore positive. It helped in the performance of one's functions in society and in attaining fulfillment. Thus, education was the key to the realisation of the new social order. As Prof.: Ernest Barker has rightly pointed out; Plato's scheme of education brings the soul into that environment which in each stage of its growth is best suited for its development.

Plato attached more importance to education than either Aristotle or other Greek thinkers did. He clearly saw that education was more than acquiring of basic facts and ideas in one's childhood and adolescence but he was the first to propose an elaborate system of adult training and education. Following his teacher Socrates, Plato had a belief in the dictum that virtue is knowledge and for making people virtuous, he made education a very powerful instrument. Plato believed that education builds man's character and it is therefore a necessary condition for extracting man's natural faculties in order to develop his personalities. According to Plato, education promotes justice and enables a man to fulfill his duties. Education has the twin aim of enabling the individual to realize himself and of adjusting him harmoniously and usefully to society.

In his masterpiece, The Republic, Plato has recommended a state controlled compulsory and comprehensive scheme of education meant for both men and women. He wants that deduction must itself provide the needed means, must see that citizens must actually get the training they require and must be sure that the education supplied is consonant with the harmony and well being of the state. As Prof.: Sabine has rightly pointed out Plato's plan is, therefore, for a state controlled system of compulsory education. His educational scheme falls naturally into two parts, the elementary education, which includes the training of the young person's up to the age of 20 and culminating in

the beginning of military services and the higher education intended for those selected persons of both sexes who are to be members of the two ruling classes and extending from the age of 20 to 35.

Plato considered the state as an educational institution capable of providing the benefits of education to each and every student in his ideal state. Plato's scheme of education had both the Athenian and the Spartan influence. Impressed by the result of state - controlled education in Sparta, Plato duplicated the same for Athens. An important draw back in the Athenian curriculum was the lack of training in martial arts that would prepare the individual from childhood to the service of the interests of the state. Plato attempted to balance the two contrasting models. The education system drew from Athens values of creativity, excellence and individual achievement, which it tried to integrate with that of Sparta, namely civic training. Its content was typically Athenian and its purpose was dominated by the end of moral and intellectual cultivation. The curriculum of the elementary education was divided into two parts, gymnastics for training the body and music for training the mind, The elementary education was to be imparted to all the three classes. But after the age of twenty, those selected for higher positions in the guardian class between twenty and thirty five. The guardians were to be constituted of the auxiliary class, and the ruling class. These two classes were to have a higher doze of gymnasium and music, greater doze of gymnastics or the auxiliaries, and greater doze of music for the rulers. The higher education of the two classes was, in purpose, professional and for his curriculum Plato chose the only scientific studies – mathematics, astronomy and logic. Before the two classes could get on to their jobs, Plato suggested a further education till the age of about fifty, mostly practical in nature.

Platonic scheme of education was progressive and systematic. Its characteristics can be summarized as follows.

1. His educational scheme was state controlled compulsory and graded one moving from lower to higher levels of learning process.
2. It aimed at attaining the physical, moral, mental and intellectual development of human personality.
3. It is a graded process which consisted of different levels and stages starting from 6 to 50 years.
4. His scheme was particularly aimed at producing philosopher kings, the rulers in his ideal state;
5. His educational plan aimed at preparing the rulers for administrative statesmanship, soldiers for military skill, and producers for material productivity and finally.
6. His educational plans sought to bring a balance between the individual needs and social requirements.

For Plato, the educational systems serves both to undergrid and sustain the idea of political order and to provide a ladder, so to speak up which those who have the capacity can climb to escape the contingencies and limitations of political life. These two purposes, according to Plato, are not contradictory. Rather they support and sustain each other.

Plato's scheme of education was undemocratically devised in so far as it ignored the producing class completely. It was limited in nature and was restrictive in extent by laying more emphasis on mathematics and logic than on literature. The whole plan was unexpectedly and unduly expensive. It is further criticized that Platonic scheme of education will create an ideal philosopher more than an ideal man of action. Plato does not sufficiently realize that education should be relative to the character of the individual.

COMMUNISM

According to Plato, justice could be achieved by spiritual and material means. While education is the remedial measure for the achievement of justice through spiritual means communism is the solution through material means. While education was designed to create the proper environment for the nurturing and development of the human soul, the communism tried to eliminate all the negativities that obstructed the proper growth of the individual.

Platonic theory of communism has two parts - communism of family otherwise known as communism of wives and children, and communism of property. If his theory of communism of property is a logical corollary of his conception of justice, his theory of communism of families was a logical corollary of his views on communism of property.

Plato's ideal state consisted of three classes, those of the rulers, of the auxiliaries, and of the producers, each class doing its own assigned duties and responsibilities with utmost sincerity and devotion. The guardians are to live a life very different from that of the producers, one in which they must forgo all that makes life for the ordinary man worth living. Plato believed that justice would be ushered in if the ruling class does away with property, for property represents the elements of appetite, and to do away with property demands the communism of families. As Ernest Barker has rightly pointed out the abolition of family life among the guardians is thus, inevitably a corollary of their renunciation of private property. ' According to Prof. Dunning "primary property and family relationships appear to be the chief sources of dissension in every community, neither is to have recognition in the perfect state". Anxiety for one's children is a form of self-seeking more insidious than the desire for property.

Plato abolished private family life and property for the ruling class for they encouraged nepotism, favoritism particularism, factionalism and other corrupt practices commonly found among the rulers. Politics was to promote common good and interest of the state. Plato thereby established a high standard for the rulers. He proposed that the members of the guardian class live together in a common barrack. The life of the guardian class would be in accordance with the rule followed among the Greeks that friends have all things in common. In the Republic Plato devoted greater space and consideration to communism of family than to property. This was mainly because he had perturbed by the negative emotions of hatred, selfishness and the envy that the family encouraged. Plato believed that conventional marriage led to women's subordination, subjugation and seclusion. He rejected the idea of marriage as a spiritual union based on love and mutual respect. However, marriage was necessary to ensure the reproduction and continuation of the human race. He, therefore, advocated temporary sexual union for the purpose of bearing the children. He relieved women of child caring responsibilities. Once children were born, they would be taken care of by the

state controlled unserious, which would be equipped with well trained nurses. Except for the philosopher ruler, none would know the parentage of these children.

Plato's argument for communism of property and family was that the unity of the state demands their abolition. Prof. Sabine wrote thus: "The unity of the state is to secure; property and family stand in the way; therefore, property and marriage must go".

COMPARISON WITH MODERN COMMUNISM.

There are similarities and difference between Platonic communism and modern communism. Both are alike in the sense that both ignore the individuality of the citizens and are based on the supremacy of the state which absorbs the individual. Both are totalitarian covering various aspects of the life of the individual. Both are based on the ignorance of the essentials of human nature and human instincts. Further, both are calculated to eliminate unregulated economic competition based on individualism. Platonic communism and modern communism meant to promote political unity and social harmony and to develop the sense of social service.

There are some fundamental differences between Platonic communism and modern communism. Plato's communism has a political objective - an economic solution of a political ailment, Plato's communism is limited to only two upper classes – the rulers and the auxiliaries while Marx's communism applies to the whole society. As Prof. C.C. Maxey has rightly pointed out, Plato's basis of communism is material temptation and it's nature is individualist while Marx' basis is the growth of social evils, which result from the accumulation of private property in addition to the above differences, Platonic communism is opposed to modern communism on some other points. Plato's communism was calculated to prevent concentration of economic and political power in the same hands; modern communism gives political power to the producing class. Plato's communism involved abolition of private family life and private property; modern communism intends to abolish private property only.

Criticisms

Plato's theory of communism has been denounced by many from his disciple Aristotle down to Karl Popper. Aristotle criticizes Plato for having ignored the natural instinct of acquisition, making the scheme partial in so far as excluding the producing class from it was declaring it ascetic and aristocratic, surrendering all the best for the guardians. Others, including Karl Popper, condemn Plato's scheme of communism on numerous grounds. The following are some of the criticisms leveled against Platonic communism.

1. It is doubtful if communism of families would bring greater degree of unity by making the guardians a single family.
2. Communism of wives and children was found to create confusion if not disorder - one female would be wife of all the guardians and one male, the husband of all the females
3. Common children would tend to be neglected, for every body's child would be nobody's baby.
4. It is also doubtful if the state controlled mating would ever be workable; it would rather reduce men and women to the levels of mere animals by suggesting temporary marital relationship.

5. Plato's communism of family suggests a system of marriage which is neither monogamy nor bigamy, nor polygamy, nor polyandry; and finally.
6. Plato's theory of communism is too idealistic, too utopian, too imaginary and accordingly far away from the realities of life. Some critics have gone to the extent of criticizing Platonic communism as half communism'.

STATE AND GOVERNMENT

In all his works on political theory, there is a strong case, which Plato builds in favor of an Omni-competent state. Living is one thing but living well is another and perhaps a different thing altogether. According to Plato, it is the duty of the state or govt. to help people live a complete life. The problem which Plato addressed was not having best a govt. could be created but how best a govt. could be installed. His model state is an Ideal state ruled by an ideal ruler known as Philosopher King.

In his masterpiece, namely the Republic, Plato constructs his ideal state on the analogy between the individual and the state. According to Plato, human soul consists of three elements of reason, spirit and appetite, functioning within proper bounds. The state must reflect such a constitution, for the state was a magnified individual, the virtues and the constitution of the two being the same. This identification for the state with the individual makes Plato present a number of false analogies between the two.

Plato's Ideal state comprises or three classes, namely the ruling class, the warriors and the producing class. The main objective of his ideal state is good life and Plato let his imagination pursue this good which results in the portrayal of a utopia. Plato's portrayal of an ideal state may be compared to an artist's portrayal of an ideal landscape. His ideal state is an ideal in the sense that it is an exhibition of what a state ought to be. The ideal state was a reflection of man's best and noblest self and provided the medium in which a man found his best self. Plato believed that man found his perfection only in the ideal state.

Plato builds his ideal state in three successive stages. In the first stage, Plato believes that men and women are different in degree only and not in kind. Hence they should be given same educational facilities and should partake in the same public functions. In the second stage Plato advocates the abolition of the family on the basis of communism of property and wives among the two upper classes. In the third stage he introduced the rule of philosophy.

Plato's ideal state is hierarchical in composition and functions. At the head of the ideal state is a philosopher ruler highly qualified people capable of ruling the country either fear or favour. In order to ensure a steady supply of philosopher rulers, Plato advocated a state controlled compulsory scheme of education meant for the children belonging to all the three classes of people. The communism of family and property among the two upper classes was meant to keep them out of economic and world temptations and ambitions so that they could concentrate on their duty to the state. The other features of the ideal state were functional specialization, equality of men and women and censorship of art.

Having outlined the details of an ideal state, Plato examined other types of regimes, accounting for their decline and decay. He listed four types of governments namely timocracy, oligarchy,

democracy and despotism or tyranny. The first of these forms of state is timocracy "based on ambition and love of honor and war as represented by Crete and Sparta "so commonly admired". The second is oligarchy or plutocracy the rule of the wealthy, the third is democracy, the rule of the people, the fourth, and most important imperfect is despotism or tyranny, which develops inevitably out of the anarchy of the democratic state. In each instance, Plato correlates a type of human character with the form of govt. in which it is most reflected:" Constitutions cannot come out of sticks and stones, they must result from the preponderance of certain characters which draw the rest of the community in their wake".

In his classification of forms of state, Plato considered democracy the second worst type of government. His description of life in a democratic society may be overdrawn, but remains to this day the most incisive critique of democracy.

Democracy was characterized by license, wastefulness, insolence, anarchy and democratic man gave more importance to his desire and appetites. Quantity rather than quality was the main criterion honoring all values on an equal basis.

In the Statesman, Plato divided the states into lawful and unlawful states, a classification that Aristotle adopted when he spoke of good and perverted forms of government in his Politics. For Plato, there were three law abiding states, and their corresponding corrupt and lawless states. The rule of one yielding monarchy and tyranny, the rule of a few, aristocracy and oligarchy, and the rule of many included moderate and extreme democracy. For the first time, Plato conceded two kinds of democracy, and made it the best of the lawless states, though the worst of law - abiding states. Both forms of democracy were better than oligarchy and even monarchy, tacitly admitting the importance of popular participation and consent in the polity.

An assessment of Plato's Political Philosophy

Plato's political philosophy, which emerges from his writings, has its special importance in the history of western political theory. Plato was the first systematic political theorist and a study of the western philosophy of tradition begins with his masterpiece, the Republic, Jowett rightly describes Plato as father of philosophy, politics and literary idealism.

Plato's contribution to the western political thought is without any parallel. He was given it a direction, a basis and a vision. Political idealism is Plato's gift to western political philosophy. He innovated novel ideas and integrated them skillfully in a political scheme. His radicalism lies in the fact that his rulers are rulers without comforts and luxuries possessed by men of property. Plato's attempt in the Republic is to portray a perfect model of an ideal order. Plato was the first to allow women to become rulers and legislators. His scheme of collective households, temporary marriages and common childcare were accepted as necessary condition for the emancipation of women by the socialist of the 18th and 19th centuries. The whole bent of Plato's Political thought was the welfare and development of the community.

Aristotle (384 -322 BC)

In the history of political philosophy no one has surpassed Aristotle in encyclopedic interest and accomplishment. He is regarded as the father of political science as he was the first to analyse,

critically and systematically the then existing constitutions and classify them. His classification of constitutions is still used in understanding constitutions comparatively. He regarded political science as the master science, for it studied human beings in a political society implying that a human being can lead a meaningful life only as a member of a state.

Unlike Plato, Aristotle was not an Athenian by birth. He was born in Stagira, then a small Greek colony close to the borders of the Macedonian Kingdom. He was a disciple of Plato and subsequently taught Alexander and then established his own school, the Lyceum. Aristotle's relationship of Plato was similar to J.S.Mills' relationship with Jeremy Bentham as both Aristotle and J S Mill repudiated major portions of the teachings of their master- Plato and Bentham respectively. The difference between Plato and Aristotle is the difference between philosophy and science. Plato was the father of political philosophy, Aristotle, the father of political science, the former is a philosopher the later is a scientist, former follows deductive methodology, the latter, an inductive one.

Although not an Athenian, Aristotle lived in Athens for more than half of his life, first as a student at Plato's Academy for nearly twenty years and later as the master of his own institution, the Lyceum, for about 12 years. From 335 BC till his death (322 BC) he devoted himself to research, teaching and administrative duties in Lyceum. Lyceum was a public leisure centre, where Aristotle lectured to his chosen students in the mornings and to the general public in the evenings.

Aristotle is said to have written about 150 philosophic treatises. His works can be classified under three heading:

1. Dialogues and other works of a popular character;
2. Collection of facts and materials from scientific treatment,
3. Systematic works. Among his writings of a popular nature. On the polity of the Athenians is the interesting one. The works on the second group include 200 titles, most in fragments. The systematic treatises of the third, group are marked by a plainness of style. Aristotle's political theory is found mainly in the politics although there are references of his political thought in the Nichomachean Ethics. In the words of Prof. William Ebenstiein, the "politics lacks the fire and poetic imagery of the Republic, but it is more systematic and analytical and after twenty three hundred years it is still an introductory text book to the entire fields of political science.' In his writings Aristotle showed much regard for popular opinions and current practices, for he was essentially a realist philosopher. His works are really on justification of existing institutions like family, state and slavery or is calculated to suggest remedies for the ills of the body politics of the city states.

Theory of state

Aristotle believes that man is, by nature and necessity, a social animal and he who is unable to live in society must be either a god or beast. He finds the origin of the state in the innate desire of an individual to satisfy his economic needs and racial instincts. For the realisation of this desire the male and female on the one hand and the master and slave on the other, come together, live together and form a family, i.e., a household which has its moral and social use. It is in the

household that the three elements originate and develop which are essential to the building of a state, namely fellowship, political organisation and justice.

Aristotle opens the politics with two important ideas: the state is a community and that it is the highest of all communities, 'which embraces all the rest, aims at good in greater degree than any other, and at the highest good' the first thesis came naturally to a Greek of the classical period: his polis was city state with a small area and population. Aristotle may not have been the first to consider the state a community, but he was the first to define it clearly as such, and thus he laid the foundation for the organic conception of the state, one of the two major types into which all political theories of the state may roughly be divided.

According to Aristotle, state is a natural community, an organism with all the attributes of a living being. Aristotle conceives of the state as natural in two ways. First, he briefly delineates the evolution of social institutions from the family through the village to the city state; in the historical sense, the state is the natural and final stage in the growth of human relations. However, the state is also considered by Aristotle to be actual in a logical and philosophical sense: "The state is by nature clearly prior to the family and the individual, since the whole is of necessity prior to the part".

Aristotle maintains that the state is not only a community but it is the highest community aiming at the highest good. The family is the first form of association, lowest in the chain of social evolution and lowest on the rung of values, because it is established by nature for the supply of men's every day wants. The village is the second form of association, genetically more complex than the family, and aiming at something more than, the supply of daily needs. The third and highest in terms of value and purpose: whereas family and village exist essentially for the preservation of life and comforts of companionship, the state exists for the sake of a good life, and not for the sake of life only, and political society exists for the sake of noble actions, and not of mere companionship. It is clear from the above observations that the state is the highest form of association, not only in terms of the social and institutional value, but interns of man's own nature.

Aristotle believed that man was essentially good and the function of the state was to develop his good faculties into a habit of good action. Aristotle saw a good deal of identity between the individual and the state. Like the individual, the state must show the virtues of courage, self-control and justice. The function of the state was the promotion of good life among its citizens and, therefore, the state was the spiritual association into a moral life. As Prof. William Ebenstein has rightly pointed out his (Aristotle's) "is a conception of moral sovereignty rather than of legal sovereignty".

SLAVERY

The institution of slavery has been criticised by many and defended by few. Aristotle was one of its strong defenders. Aristotle justifies slavery, which in fact was the order of the day. He wrote in the Politics thus: "For that some should rule and others be ruled is a thing not only necessary, but expedient; from the hour of their birth, some are marked out for subjection other for rule". In fact Aristotle justifies slavery on grounds of expediency.

While discussing the origin of the state and family, Aristotle mentions the institution of slavery. He finds slavery essential to a household and defends it as natural and, therefore, moral.

A slave is a living possession of his master and is an instrument of a action. A man cannot lead a good life without slaves any more than he can produce good music without instruments. Men differ from each other in their physical and intellectual fitness. Aristotle justifies slavery on the grounds that there is a natural inequality between men.

Aristotle assumes that nature is universally ruled by the contrast of the superior and inferior: man is superior to the animals, the male to the female, the soul to the body, reason to passion. In all these divisions it is just that the superior rule over the inferior, and such a rule is to the advantage of both. Among men, there are those whose business is to use their body, and who can do nothing better' and they are by nature slaves. Slavery is not only natural it is necessary as well. If the masters do not tyrannise over the slave, slavery is advantageous to both the master and the slave. Slavery is essential for the master of the household because, without slaves he has to do manual work which incapacitates him for civic duties.

Aristotle was realistic enough to see that many were slaves by law rather than nature, particularly those who were reduced to slavery by conquest a custom widely practiced in the in the wars of antiquity. He concedes to slaves the mental ability of apprehending the rational actions and orders of their master but denies them the ability of acting rationally on their own initiative.

CRITICISMS

Aristotle's defence of slavery sounds very unconvincing and unnatural. He does not give reliable and fixed criteria for the determination of who is and who is not a natural law. Aristotle's assertion that some women are born to rule and others born to obey would reduce the society into two parts arbitrarily. Thus Aristotle's definition of slaves would reduce domestic servants and women in backward countries to the position of slaves. Karl Popper in his work "Open Society and its Enemies has criticized Aristotliean an doctrine of slavery when he wrote thus:" 'Aristotle's views were indeed reactionary as can be best seen from the fact that he repeatedly finds it necessary to defend them against the doctrine that no one is a slave by nature, and further from his own testimony to the anti slavery tendencies of the Athenian democracy".

CITIZENSHIP

Aristotle's conservative viewpoint is clearly expressed in his conception of citizenship. Aristotle defined a state as a collective body of citizens. Citizenship was not to be determined by residence since the resident aliens and slaves also shared a common residence with citizens but were not citizens. He defines citizen as a person who has the power to take part in the deliberative or judicial administration of any sate. Representative government was unknown to Aristotle because the Greek city- state was governed directly by its citizens. A citizen also enjoyed constitutional rights under the system of public law.

For Aristotle a citizen was one who shared power in polis, and unlike Plato, did not distinguish between "an active ruling group and a politically passive community". Aristotle stipulated that the young and the old could not be citizens, for one was immature and the other infirm. He did not regard women as citizens, for they lacked the deliberative faculty and the leisure to understand the working of politics. A good citizen would have the intelligence and the ability to rule and be ruled.

Aristotle prescribed a good citizen as someone who could live in harmony with the constitution and had sufficient leisure time to devote himself to the tasks and responsibilities of citizenship. A good citizen would possess virtue or moral goodness that would help in realising a selfless and cooperative civic life. In the words of William Ebenstein, "Aristotle's idea of citizenship is that of the economically independent gentleman who has enough experience, education and leisure to devote him to active citizenship, for citizen must not lead the life of mechanics or tradesmen, for such life is inimical to virtue. Thus he regarded citizenship as a bond forged by the intimacy of participation in public affairs.

Aristotle makes an important distinction between the 'parts' of the state and its "necessary conditions". Only those who actively share or have the means and leisure to share in the government of the state are its components or integral part. All the others are merely the necessary conditions who provide the material environment within which the active citizens freed from menial tasks, can function .

DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

Like Plato, Aristotle believed that justice is the very essence of the state and that no polity can endure for a long time unless it is founded on a right scheme of justice. According to him, justice is virtue, complete virtue, and the embodiment of all goodness. It is not the same thing as virtue, but it is virtue and virtue in action. Thus Aristotle makes it clear that 'the goodness in the sphere of politics is justice, and justice contains what tends to promote the common interest.'

Aristotle believes that justice saves the states from destruction; it makes the states and political life pure and healthy. For Aristotle, justice is either general or particular. According to Aristotle, general justice is complete goodness It is complete in the fullest sense, because it is the exercise of complete goodness not only in himself but also towards his neighbours. Particular justice is a part of complete or general justice.

Particular justice has two sub varieties, namely, distributive and corrective justice. Corrective justice is mainly concerned with voluntary commercial transactions like sale, hire, furnishing of security, etc: and other things like aggression on property and life, honor and freedom. Distributive justice consists in proper allocation to each person according to his worth. This type of justice relates primarily but not exclusively to political privileges.

From the point of view of distributive justice, each type of political organisation, its own standard of worth and , therefore, of distributive justice. Distributive justice assigns to every man his due according to his contributions to the society. Distributive justice is identifiable with proportionate equality.

Aristotle's concept of distributive Justice does not apply to modern conditions. Based on the notion of award of officers and honors in proportion to a man's' contribution to society, it could apply to a small city states and is not applicable to modern sovereign states with huge population. Thus his theory distributive justice is far away from the reality of the modern world.

EDUCATION

Like his master Plato, Aristotle was very keen on education. The end of the state, according to him, is good life of the individuals for which education is the best instrument. Education was meant to prepare the individual for membership of the state and as such had a political as well as intellectual aim.

According to Aristotle, education must be adapted to the constitution of the state and should be calculated to train man in a certain type of character suitable to the state. To him, the building of a particular type of character was more important than the imparting of knowledge and therefore proper educational authority was the states and not the private individuals. Aristotle was in favour of setting of state controlled educational institutions. However, Aristotle's view on education was less comprehensive and systematic compared to his master, Plato.

Classification of government

On the basis of his study of 158 constitutions, Aristotle has given a classification which became a guide for all the subsequent philosophers who tried to classify government. He classified governments on a twofold basis namely,

1. The end of the state and
2. The number of persons who hold or share sovereign power. This basis enables us to distinguish between the pure and corrupt forms of government. This because the true end of the state is the perfection of its members and the degree of devotion to this end is the criterion to judge whether a government is pure or corrupt.

The classification of government is as under:

	Pure Form	Corrupt Form
1.	Monarchy- with supreme virtue as its guiding principle	Tyranny – representing force, selfishness
2	'Aristocracy- representing a mixture of virtue and wealth	Oligarchy –representing the greed of wealth
3.	Polity-representing martial and medium virtues, power resting with the middle class people	Democracy – representing the principle of equality with power in the hands of the poor

In the table given above, monarchy represents the rule of a monarch for common good with tyranny as its perversion. According to Aristotle, monarchy is the pure form of government when the monarch rules for the benefits of the people without any discrimination. Of the three true forms Aristotles holds monarchy to be the most ideal kind of govt. Aristotle's deep sympathy for monarchy is to be understood in the light of his relations with the rising Macedonian monarchy.

Aristocracy is no where described in the Politics systematically, perhaps because the problem of aristocracy and democracy was not of such practical importance as that of monarchy.

Aristotle defines democracy as a government formed of the best men absolutely, and not merely of men who are relatively, that is in relation to changing circumstances and constitutions. The perverted form of aristocracy is oligarchy in which government by wealthy is carried on for their own benefit rather than for that of the whole state. Whereas merit and virtue the distinctive qualities to be considered in selecting the rulers in an aristocracy, wealth is the basis of selection in an oligarchy.

The third true form of state is polity or constitutional government. Aristotle defines polity as the state that the citizens at large administer for the common interest. Constitutional government is a compromise between the two principles of freedom and wealth the attempt to unite the freedom of the poor and the wealth of the rich, without giving either principle exclusive predominance. The degenerate form of constitutional government is democracy and defined it as a system in which the poor rule. It is government by the poor, and for the poor only just as tyranny is government by one for his own benefit and oligarchy government by the wealthy few for their class benefit.

REVOLUTION

The search for stability through polity made Aristotle examine the causes for instability, change and revolution and prescribe remedies against unnecessary and incessant change. In book v of the politics Aristotle discussed one of the most important problems which made it a hand book for all state men for all time to come. The analytical and the empirical mind of Aristotle gives numerous causes of revolution and suggest remedies to overcome them. As Prof. Ebenstein has rightly pointed out Politics of Aristotle is more a book on the art of government than a systematic exposition of political philosophy. In Aristotle analysis the evils that were prevalent in the Greek cities and the defects in the political systems and gives practical suggestions as to the best way to avoid threatening dangers.

Aristotle points out that there are varying degrees of revolution. A revolution may take the form of a change of constitution a state or the revolutionaries may try to grasp political power without changing the constitution. A revolution may be directed against not the entire system of government but a particular institution or set of person in the state. A revolution may be completing armed or peaceful and personal or impersonal.

In order to diagnose a revolution we must consider the temper of the revolutionaries and their motives and the causes and occasions of revolution. Aristotle discussed general causes of revolution and then looked into the reasons why individual constitutions changed. Unlike Plato, Aristotle perceived multiple reasons for revolutions rather than a regime's prominent deficiency. He placed greater responsibility on the rulers to ensure stability and justice.

Aristotle classifies the causes of revolution under two groups general and particular causes. The general causes of revolutions were broadly categorised into three.

1. Psychological motives or the state of mind.
2. The objectives in mind;
3. The occasions that gave rise to political upheaval and mutual strife

The psychological factors were the desire for equality in an oligarchy and inequality in a democracy. The objectives in mind included profit, honor, insolence, fear, superiority in some form, contempt, disproportionate increase in some part of the state, election intrigues, willful negligence, neglect of insignificant changes, fear of opposites and dissimilarity of component parts of the state. The occasions that give rise to revolutionary changes were insolence, desire for profit and honour, superiority, fear, contempt, and disproportionate increase in one part or element of the state.

The particular causes were analyzed in each constitution. Aristotle states that "poverty is the parent of revolution and crime" and that when there is no middle class and the poor greatly exceed in number, troubles arise, and the state soon comes to an end. In democracy the most important cause of revolution is the unprincipled character of the popular leaders. Demagogues attack the rich, individually or collectively, so as to provide them to forcibly resist and provide the emergence of oligarchy. The causes of overthrow of oligarchies can be internal as when a group within the class in power becomes more influential or external, by the mistreatment of the masses by the governing class. In aristocracies few people share in honour. When the number of people benefiting become smaller or when disparting between rich and poor becomes wider revolution is caused in a monarchy, sedition was usually due to fear, contempt, desire for fame, insults, hatred and desire by neighboring states to extend their boundaries.

Remedies to prevent revolution

Aristotle has suggested a number of useful and practical remedies for preventing revolutions. The first essential remedy are to inculcate the spirit of obedience to law, especially in small matters and to watch the beginning of change in the constitution. Aristotle suggested that too much power should not be allowed to concentrate in the hands of one man or one class of men and various classes in the state should be treated with consideration. Great political offices in the state should be outside the reach of unkind strangers and aliens, holders of offices should not be able to make private gain. Public administration, particularly financial administration, should be subjected to public scrutiny. Further, offices and honors should be awarded on considerations of distributive justice and no class of citizens should have a monopoly of political power. Again the higher offices in the state should be distributed only on considerations of loyalty to the constitution administrative capacity and integrity of character, but each citizen must have his due.

Democracy

Aristotle believes that democracy is characterised by twin principles of freedom and majority -rule. Aristotle was not opposed to democracy in the same measures as Plato was. According to him democracy is a form of government in which supreme power is in the hands of freemen. He believed that the aggregates virtue and ability of the mass of the people was greater than the virtue and ability of a part of the population. If the mass of the people do not understand the technicalities of a administration, they have the commonsense of appointing right administrators and legislators and of checking any misbehavior on the part of the latter. Aristotle's democracy means aristocracy of the free citizens because the large body of slaves and aliens can have no share in the government of the day. Direct democracy is possible only in a small city state Aristotle condemns only the extreme form of democracy namely mobocracy.

Assessment

Aristotle's *Politics* has served as a foundation work for the whole western tradition. His encyclopedic mind encompassed practically all the branches of human knowledge. Unlike Plato's *Republic*, Aristotle's works were measured in thinking and analysis, reflecting the mind of a scientist rather than that of a philosopher. He regarded as the father of political science because he was perhaps the first political thinker to analyse political institutions and behaviour systematically and scientifically. He considered man as a social animal and the state as a natural organisation which exists not only for life but for the sake of good life. He was a great pioneer in political science and no discussion is ever complete without a reference to his brilliant insights and method of analysis.

MODULE II

MACHIAVELLI

MACHIAVELLI is known as the father of modern political science. He is a transitional figure standing midway between the medieval and modern political thought. He was a historian who laid the foundations of a new science of politics by integrating contemporary history with ancient past. He commanded a sinister reputation as no other thinker in the annals of political theory. The initial reaction to Machiavelli's writing was one of shock and he himself was denounced as an inventor of the devil. This was because Machiavelli sanctioned the use of deception, cruelty, force, violence and the like for achieving the desired political ends. Spinoza regarded him as a friend of the people for having exposed the Prince. Montesquieu regarded him as a lover of liberty, an image that emerged in the Discourses and not from the Prince.

Machiavelli was born in Florence in 1469. He was the third child in a family that was neither rich nor aristocratic, but well connected with the city's famed humanistic circles. Florence was economically prosperous but suffered a long period of civil strife and political disorder. His father Berando, a civil lawyer, held several important public appointments. Besides his legal practice, Bernado also received rents from his land, making his family financially comfortable' Bernado took considerable interest in the education of his son. At the age of 29, Machiavelli entered the public service in the government of Florence. Later he was sent on a diplomatic mission to several foreign countries where he acquired firsthand experience of Political and diplomatic matters. Although not employed on the highest level of policy making, he was close enough to the inner circles of the administration to acquire firsthand knowledge of the mechanics of politics. In 1512, he lost his job when the republican government, based on French support was replaced by the absolute regime of the Medici, who has been restored to power with papal help. Machiavelli was accused of serious crimes and tortured, but he was found innocent and banished to his small farm near Florence. It was in such enforced leisure that he wrote the Prince (1513). The book was dedicated to the Medici family, Lorenzo II de Medici (1492-1519), Lorenzo the Maginificent's grandson. The Prince explored the causes of the rise and fall of states and the factors for political success. As Gramsci has rightly pointed out, the basic thing the Prince is that it is not a systematic treatment, but a 'live' work, in which political ideology and political science are fused in the dramatic form of a myth' The most elaborated work of Machiavelli is the Discourses on the First Ten Books of Titus Livius (1521). Taking Roman history as a starting point, the Discourses attempts to dissect the anatomy of body politic, and on a much more philosophical and historical foundation than that of the Prince.

For all its breadth and elaborateness, the Discourse is of interest primarily to students of political philosophy, whereas the Prince is destined to remain one of the half dozen political writings that have entered the general body of world literature. According to William Ebenstein, the Prince is "a reflection not only on man's political ambitions and passions but of man himself. The most revolutionary aspect of the Prince is not so much what it says as what it ignores. Before Machiavelli, all political writing - from Plato and Aristotle through the middle ages to the

Renaissance had one central question: the end of the state. Machiavelli ignores the issue of the end of the state in extra political terms. He assumes that power is an end in itself and he confines his inquiries into the means that are best suited to acquire, retain, and expand power.

CHURCH VS STATE CONTROVERSY

Middle Ages roughly mean the period between the Gregorian movement of the 11th century and the beginning of the protestant reformation movement. Medieval political theory was dominated by the ideal of unity as taught by the ancient Roman Empire. There was a general belief in a centralized secular power and a centralized ecclesiastical power. Even the state and the Church were fused into one system and represented two different aspects of the same society. The function of the universal empire was to help the growth of a universal church. When the struggle between papacy and the Holy Roman Empire broke out, the defenders of both quoted scriptures in support of their claims.

In the days when the Roman Empire adopted Christianity, the emperor was the head of both the state and the church; but the church grew more and more strong and began to exercise the right of excommunication. This right of excommunication was a powerful weapon in the hands of the church. Thus ecclesiastical authority began to interfere with and control secular authority. When the Holy Roman Empire was created, no attempt was made to define the relations between the emperor and the pope. It was impossible to determine whether the emperor derived his authority immediately from God or immediately through the pope.

The clash between the two began in the 11th century with the reforms of Gregory VIII who decreed that 'no ecclesiastic should be invested with the symbols of office by a secular ruler under penalty of excommunication'. This decree led to a conflict between emperor Henry IV and Gregory. This contest between the papacy and the empire lasted for about two centuries when at last the papacy came out victorious as the unrivalled head of western Christendom. The papacy was strongest in the 13th century under Innocent III. By the 14th century the king had become strong, and feudalism, the main support of the church, had become somewhat weakened.

IMPACT OF RENAISSANCE

Machiavelli was very much a creature of the Renaissance, his native city of Florence being then the centre of Italian Renaissance. As mentioned above, in the Middle Ages, the church and the state were closely interrelated; the church on the whole dominated the state and profoundly influencing the political philosophy of the latter. The Renaissance impelled men to reexamine things from other than clerical point of view. It was possible now to formulate political theories on a purely secular basis and Machiavelli is the chief exponent of this schools of thought.

Renaissance ushered in rationalism which viewed God, man and nature from the stand point of reason and not faith. The international conflict, following geographical discoveries, produced the concepts of nationalism and nation- state which went against medieval universalism in church and state. The most important discovery of the Renaissance- more significant than any single work of art or any one genius was the discovery of man. The Renaissance goes beyond the moral selfhood of stoicism, the spiritual uniqueness of Christianity, the aesthetic individuality of the ancient Greeks,

and views man in his totality. Displacing God man becomes the centre of the universe, the value of this new solar system are inevitably different from those of the God centered universe.

The Renaissance signified a rebirth of the human spirit in the attainment of liberty, self confidence and optimism. In contradiction to the medieval view, which had envisaged the human being as fallen and depraved in an evil world with the devil at the centre, the Renaissance captured the Greek ideal of the essential goodness of individual. This return to a pre- Christian attitude towards humans, god and nature found expression in all aspects of human endeavour and creativity. The Renaissance signaled the breakdown of a unified Christian society. Among the centers of Renaissance, Florence was always first, reaching its climax in Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), who most perfectly represented and lived, the Renaissance ideal of universal man.

Attitude towards Religion

The novelty in Machiavelli's writings was his attitude towards religion and morality, which distinguished from all those who preceded him. He was scathing in his attack on the church and its church for their failure to provide moral aspiration. He wrote thus: We Italians then owe to the Church of Rome and her priests our having become irreligious and bad, but we owe her a still greater debt and one that will be the cause of our ruin, namely that the church has kept and still keeps our country divided. '

Machiavelli was anti- church and anti clergy, but not anti religion. He considered religion as necessary not only for man's social life but also for the health and prosperity of the state. It was important within a state because of the influence it wielded over political life in general. Machiavelli's attitude towards religion was strictly utilitarian. It was a social force; it played a pivotal role because it appealed to the selfishness of man through its doctrine of reward and punishment, thereby inducing proper behaviour and good conduct that was necessary for the well-being of a society. Religion determined the social and ethical norms and values that governed human conduct and actions.

According to William Ebenstein, Machiavelli's views on morals and religion illustrate his belief in the supremacy of power over other social values. He has so sense of religion as a deep personal experience, and the mystical element in religion - its supernatural and supranational character is alien to his outlook. Yet he has a positive attitude toward religion; albeit his religion becomes a tool of influence and control in the hands of the ruler over the ruled. Machiavelli sees in religion the poor man's reason, ethics, and morality put together and 'where religion exists it is easy to introduce armies and discipline'

The role of religion as a mere instrument of political domination, cohesion and unity becomes even clearer in Machiavelli's advice that the ruler support and spread religious doctrines and beliefs in miracles that he knows to be false. Machiavelli's interest in Christianity is not philosophical or theological, but purely pragmatic and political. He is critical of Christianity because "it glorifies more the humble and contemplative men than the men of action", whereas the Roman pagan religion defied only men who had achieved great glory, such as commanders of republics and chiefs of republics' Machiavelli argues that "Christianity idealises humility, lowliness, and a contempt for

wordly objects as contrasted with the pagan qualities of grandeur of soul, strength of body, and other qualities, that render men formidable”.

Concerning the church, Machiavelli preferred two main charges. First, he states that the Italians have become ‘irreligious and bad’ because of the evil example of the court of Rome’. The second and more serious accusation is that the church ‘has kept and still keeps our country divided’. He goes on to say that the sole cause of Italian political disunity is the church. Having acquired jurisdiction over a considerable portion of Italy “she has never had sufficient power or courage to enable her to make herself sole sovereign of all Italy”.

Machiavelli distinguished between pagan and Christian moralities, and chose paganism. He did not condemn Christian morality, nor did he try to redefine the Christian conception of a good person. He dismissed the Christian view that an individual was endowed with a divine element and a supernatural end. He also rejected the idea of absolute good. He observed: Goodness is simply that which serves on the average or in the long run, the interests of the mass of individuals. The terms good and evil have no transcendental reference. They refer to the community considered as an association of individuals and to nothing else.

Though Machiavelli was critical of Christianity, he retained the basic Christian views on the differences between good and evil. For instance, he regarded murdering one’s co-citizens, betraying one’s friends, disloyalty and irreligiousness as lack of virtue not entitled to glory. Machiavelli was clear that Italy needed a religion similar to one that ancient Rome had, a religion that taught to serve the interest of the state. He was categorical that Florentines needed political and military virtues which Christian faith did not impart.

Machiavelli’s attitude to religion and morality made him highly controversial. Strauss characterized him as a teacher of evil. Prof. Sabine saw him as being amoral. It is beyond dispute that Machiavelli separated religion from politics and set the tone for one of the main themes of modern times, namely secularization of thought and life. Though conscious of the importance of religion as a cementing force in society, he was hostile towards Christianity and looked upon the Roman Catholic Church as the main adversary. He espoused hostility towards religion, considering he was writing in Italy prior to the Reformation.

Modern secular nation state

One of the major contributions of Machiavelli is that he separated religion from politics and set the tone for one of the main themes of modern times, namely secularisation of thought and life. Machiavelli criticised the church of his day precisely for political and not religious reasons. He recognised that the existence of the papal state and its ceaseless struggle to dominate political affairs was a primary cause of Italy’s inability to unite into one political unit.

Though culturally vibrant and creative, Italy remained politically divided, weak, and a prey to the imperial ambitions of the French, German and Spanish. All of them were unable to unite the entire peninsula. The Florentine Republic reflected severe factional conflicts and institutional breakdown Italians could not reconcile to the fact that an age of heightened cultural creativity and scientific discoveries coincided with loss of political liberty leading to foreign domination. As Prof. Sabine has rightly pointed out, Italian society, intellectually brilliant and artistically creative more

emancipated than many in Europe..... was a prey to the worst political corruption and moral degradation'. It produced some great minds and intellectuals of that period like Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo and Santi Raphael. Its galaxy of artists made Renaissance Italy compared to Athens of the 5th century B.C. However, While Athens flourished politically with a vibrant participatory democracy, in Italy there was a political vacuum.

Writing at a time of political chaos and moral confusion, Italian unification became the chief objective for Machiavelli, who could see clearly the direction that political evolution was taking throughout Europe. He desired to redeem Italy from servitude and misery. Like Dante he dreamt of a united regenerated and glorious Italy. In order to achieve this, any means, were justified, for the purpose was the defense and preservation of the state and its people. Thus freedom of the country and the common good remained the core themes of Machiavelli's writings. A perfect state, according to Machiavelli, was one promoted the common good, namely the observance of laws, honouring women, keeping public offices open to all citizens on grounds of virtue, maintaining a moderate degree of social equality, and protecting industry, wealth and property.

Machiavelli is perhaps the first political thinker who used the words state in the sense in which it is used nowadays, that is something having a definite territory, population, government and sovereignty of its own. It was on Machiavelli's concept of a sovereign, territorial and secular state that Bodin and Grotius built up a theory of legal sovereignty which was given a proper formulation by John Austin. In other words, Machiavelli gave the state its modern connotation. His state is the nation free from religious control. He has freed the state from the medieval bondage of religion. Machiavelli almost identifies the state with the ruler. The state being the highest forms of human association has supreme claim over men's obligations.

In both 'Prince and Discourses' Machiavelli insists on the necessity of extending the territory of the state. According to him, either a state must expand or perish. His idea of the extension of the dominion of state did not mean the blending of two or more social or political organisations, but the subjection of a number of states under the rule of a single Prince or common wealth. Roman state and its policy of expansion perhaps set an ideal before Machiavelli. Force of arms was necessary for both for political aggrandisement as well as for the preservation of states but force must be applied judiciously combined with craft.

POLITICAL REALISM

Machiavelli is regarded as the father of modern political science and the first realist in western political thought. He was a student of practical and speculative politics. A realist in politics he cared little for political philosophy as such. His writings expound a theory of the art of government rather than a theory of the state. He was more concerned with the actual working of the machinery of government than the abstract principles of the state and its constitution. As Prof. C.C Maxey has rightly pointed out 'his passion for the practical as against the theoretical undoubtedly did much to rescue political thought from the scholastic obscuratism of the middle ages.'

Machiavelli was the first to state and systematically expose the power view of politics, laying down the foundations of a new science in the same way as Galileo's Dynamics became the basis of the modern science of nature. Machiavelli identified politics as the struggle for the acquisition, maintenance and consolidation of political power, an analysis developed by Thomas Hobbes and Harrington in the 17th century, Alexander Hamilton and James Madison in the 18th century Pareto

Mosca and Robert Michels in the 19th century, and Robert A Dahl, David Easton, Hans J. Morgenthau Morton A Kaplan etc in the 20th century.

Machiavelli's writings do not belong to the domain of political theory, He wrote mainly of the mechanics of government, of the means by which the states may be made strong, of the policies by which they can expand their power and of the errors that lead to their decay and destruction. Prof. Dunning called Machiavellian philosophy as "the study of the art of government rather than a theory of state".

The Prince of Machiavelli is the product of the prevailing conditions of his time in his country, Italy. As it is not an academic treatise or value oriented philosophy; it is in real sense real politik. It is a memorandum on the art of government, is pragmatic in character and provides technique of the fundamental principles of states craft for a successful ruler. It deals with a machinery of government which the successful ruler can make use of it.

Chapter XVIII of the 'Prince' gives Machiavelli's ideas of the virtues which a successful ruler must possess. Integrity may be theoretically better than collusion, but cunningness and subtlety are often useful. The two basic means of success for a prince are the judicious use of law and physical force. He must combine in himself rational as well as brutal characteristic, a combination of lion and fox. The ruler must imitate the fox and lion, for the lion cannot protect himself from the traps and the fox cannot defend himself from wolves". A prudent ruler, according to Machiavelli, ought not to keep faith when by doing so it would be against his interest and when the reasons which made him bind himself no longer exist.

Machiavelli takes a radically pessimistic view of human nature and his psychological outlook is intimately related to his political philosophy. The individual according to Machiavelli was wicked, selfish and egoistic. He was fundamentally weak, ungrateful, exhibitionist, artificial, anxious to avoid danger and excessively desirous of gain. Lacking in honesty and justice, he was ready to act in a manner that was detrimental to the community. Being essentially anti social, selfish and greedy, the individual would readily forgive the murder of his father but never the seizure of property.; the individual was generally timid, averse to new ideas and complaints Machiavelli conceived human beings as being basically restless, ambitious, aggressive and acquisitive, in a state of constant trifle and anarchy. Interestingly, Machiavelli presumed that human nature remained constant, for history moved in a cyclical way, alternating between growth and decay.

According to Machiavelli, state actions were not to be judged by individual ethics. He prescribes double standard of conduct for statesmen and the private citizens. The moral code of conduct applicable to individuals cannot be applied to the actions of state. The ruler is the creator of law as also of morality, for moral obligations must ultimately be sustained by law and the ruler is not only outside the law, he is outside morality as well. There is no standard to judge his acts except the success of his political expedience for enlarging and perpetuating the power of his state. It was always working for an individual to commit crime, even to lie but sometimes good and necessary for the ruler to do so in the interest of the state. Similarly, it is wrong for a private individual to kill but not for the state to execute someone by way of punishment. Machiavelli strongly believes that a citizen acts for himself and as such is also responsible for his action, whereas the state acts for all.

Like other realists after him, Machiavelli identifies "power politics with the whole of political reality" and he thus fails to grasp that ideas and ideals can become potent facts in the struggle for

political survival. In the words of William Ebenstein, Machiavellian realists are usually realistic and rational in the choice of means with which they carry out their schemes of aggrandisement and expansion. Because Machiavelli was interested only in the means of acquiring, retaining, and expanding power, and not in the end of the state, he remained unaware of the relations between means and ends. Ends lead to existence apart from means but are continuously shaped by them. As one examines the references to rulers in the Prince more closely, one finds that Machiavelli was not interested in all forms of state or in all forms of power. What fascinated him above all was the dynamics of illegitimate power; he was little interested in states whose authority was legitimate but was primarily concerned with “new dominions both as to prince and state”. He realised that there is nothing more difficult to carry out nor more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to handle, than to initiate a new order of things. His primary concern with founders of new governments and state illuminates his attitude on the use of unethical means in politics. Thus, Machiavelli was little interested in the institutional framework of politics.

AN ASSESSMENT

Machiavelli's political theories were not developed in a systematic manner; they were mainly in the form of remarks upon particular situations. According to Prof. Sabine, the ‘character of Machiavelli and the true meaning of his philosophy have been one of the enigmas of modern history. ‘He has been represented as an utter cynic, and impassioned patriot, an ardent nationalist, a political Jesuit, a convinced democrat, and unscrupulous seeker after the favour of despots. In each of their views, incompatible as they are, there is probably an element of truth. Many political thinkers drew their inspiration and further developed solid and most important political concepts such as the concept of the state and its true meaning from Machiavelli. As Prof. Sabine has pointed out, “Machiavelli more than any other political thinker created the meaning that has been attached to the state in modern political usage”.

Machiavelli is regarded as the father of modern political theory and political science. Apart from theorising about the state he also given meaning to the concept of sovereignty. Machiavelli's importance was in providing an outlook that accepted both secularisation and a moralisation of politics. He took politics out of context of theology, and subordinated moral and subordinated moral principles to the necessities of political existence and people's welfare. The absence of religious polemics in Machiavelli led the theorists who followed to confront issues like order and power in strictly political terms. Thus Machiavelli was the first who gave the idea of secularism. The Machiavellian state is to begin within a complete sense, and entirely secular state.

Machiavelli was the first pragmatist or realist in the history of political thought. His method and approach to problems of politics were guided by common sense and history’ His ideas were revolutionary in nature and substance and he brought politics in line with political practice. By empathising the importance of the study of history, Machiavelli established a method that was extremely useful. Gramsci praised the greatness of Machiavelli for separating politics from ethics. In the ‘Prison Notebooks’ there were a number of references to Machiavelli, and Gramsci pointed out that the protagonist of the new prince in modern times could not be an individual hero, but a political party whose objective was to establish a new kind of state. Though critical of the church and Christianity Machiavelli was born and died a Christian. His attack on the church was due to his anti clericalism, rather than being anti - religion.

Module III

Thomas Hobbes (1588 -1679)

Thomas Hobbes is really the first Englishman who wrote comprehensively on political philosophy and made valuable contributions to it. He is one of the most controversial and important figures in the history of western political thought. His status as a political thinker was not fully recognised until the 19th century. The philosophical radicalism of the English utilitarian's and the scientific rationalism of the French Encyclopaedists incorporated in a large measure Hobbes's mechanical materialism, radical individualism and psychological egoism. By the mid- 20th century Hobbes was acclaimed as "probably the greatest writer on political philosophy that the English speaking people have produced". According to Micheal Oakeshott, "the Leviathan is the greatest, perhaps the sole, masterpiece of political philosophy written in the English language".

Hobbes lived at a time of great constitutional crisis in England when the theory of Divine Right of Kings was fiercely contested by the upholders of the constitutional rule based on popular consent. It is he who for the first time systematically expounded the absolute theory of sovereignty and originated the positivist theory of law. Though he was not a liberal, modern commentators believe that his political doctrine has greater affinities with the liberalism of the 20th century than his authoritarian theory would initially suggest. From a broad philosophical perspective, the importance of Hobbes is his bold and systematic attempt to assimilate the science of man and civil society to a thoroughly modern science corresponding to a completely mechanistic conception of nature. His psychological egoism, his ethical relativism and his political absolutism are all supposed to follow logically from the assumptions or principles underlying the physical world which primarily consists of matter and motion.

Hobbes was prematurely born in 1588 in Westport near the small town of Malmesburg in England at a time when the country was threatened by the impending attack of the Spanish Armada. His father was a member of the clergy (vicar) near Malmesburg .His long life was full of momentous events. He was a witness to the great political and constitutional turmoil caused by English civil war and his life and writings bear clear imprint of it. After his education at Oxford, Hobbes joined as tutor to the son of William Cavendish, who was about the same age as Hobbes. The association of Cavendish family lasted, with some interruptions until Hobbes' death. Through his close connection with the royal family he met eminent scholars and scientists of the day such as Bacon Descartes, Galileo etc. His first publication was translation in English of Thucydides History of the Peloponnesian War in 1629. Besides just before he died, at the age of 86, he translated Homer's Odyssey and Iliad into English. The important works of Hobbes include De Civic and the Leviathan.

Hobbes' political philosophy in the Leviathan (1651) was a reflection of the civil war in England following the execution of Charles I . According to William Ebenstein the Leviathan is not an apology for the Stuart monarchy nor a grammar of despotic government but the first general theory of politics in the English language' What makes Leviathan a masterpiece of philosophical literature is the profound logic of Hobbes' imagination, his power as an artist. Hobbes recalls us to our morality with a deliberate conviction, with a subtle and sustained argument.

State of nature and Human nature

Hobbes' political theory is derived from his psychology which in turn is based on his mechanistic conception of nature. According to Hobbes', prior to the formation of commonwealth or state, there existed state nature. Men in the state of nature were essentially selfish and egoistic. Contrary to Aristotle and medieval thinkers, who saw human nature as innately social, Hobbes viewed human beings as isolate egoistic, self interested and seeking society as a means to their ends. Unlike most defenders of absolute government, who start out with the gospel for inequality, Hobbes argues that men were naturally equal in mind. This basic equality of men is a principal source of trouble and misery. Men have in general equal faculties; they also cherish like hope and desires. If they desire the same thing, which they cannot both obtain, they become enemies and seek to destroy each other. In the state of nature, therefore men are in a condition of war, of every man against every man and Hobbes adds that the nature of the war consists not in actual fighting "but in the known disposition there to" force and fraud the two cardinal virtues of war, flourish in this atmosphere of perpetual fear and strife fed by three Psychological causes: competition, diffidence and glory. In such a condition, there is no place for industry, agriculture, navigation, trade; there are no arts or letters; no society, no amenities of civilised living, and worst of all, there is continual fear and danger of violent death, and the life of man solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short'.

According to Hobbes, there can be no distinction between right and wrong in the state of nature. Any conception of right and wrong presupposes a standard of conduct, a common law to judge that conduct and a common law giver. Again there is no distinction between just and unjust in the state of nature, for where there is no common superior, there is no law and where there is no law there can be no justice.

Hobbes asserted that every human action, feeling and thought was ultimately physically determined. Though the human being was dependent on his life, on the motion of his body he was able to some extent, to control those motions and make his life. This he did by natural means, ie, by relying partly on natural passions and partly on reason. It was reason, according to Hobbes, that distinguished human beings from animals. Reason enabled the individual to understand the impressions that sense organs picked up from the external world, and also indicated an awareness of one's natural passions. He mentioned a long list of passions, but the special emphasis was on fear, in particular the fear of death, and on the universal and perfectly justified quest for power. "

Hobbes contended that life was nothing but a perpetual and relentless desire and pursuit of power, a prerequisite for felicity. He pointed out that one ought to recognise a general inclination of all mankind, a perpetual and restless desire for power after power, that ceased only in Death. Consequently, individuals were averse to death, especially accidental death for it marked the end of attainment of all felicity. Power was sought for it represented a means of acquiring those things that made life worthwhile and contented. The fact that all individuals sought power distinguished Hobbes from Machiavelli. Hobbes observed that human beings stood nothing to gain from the company of others except pain. A permanent rivalry existed between human beings for honour, riches and authority, with life as nothing but potential warfare, a war of every one against the others.

Hobbes human relationships is as those of mutual suspicion and hostility. The only rule that individuals acknowledged was that one would take if one had the power and retain as long as one could. In this "ill condition" there was no law, no justice, no notion of right and wrong. Thus according to Hobbes, the principal cause of conflict was within the nature of man. As mentioned earlier, competition, diffidence and glory were the three reasons that were quarrel and rivalry among individuals. "The first, make the men invade for Gain; the second, for safety and the third, for reputation. The first use violence, to make them selves Masters of other men's persons.... the second to defend them; the third, for trifles....."

In a state of nature, individuals enjoyed complete liberty, including a natural right to everything, even to one another's bodies. The natural laws were not laws or commands. Subsequently, Hobbes argued that the laws of nature were also proper laws, since they were delivered in the word of God. These laws were counsels of prudence. Natural laws in Hobbes' theory did not mean eternal justice, perfect morality or standards to judge existing laws as the Stoics did.

It is clear from above observations that what is central to Hobbes' psychology is not hedonism but search for power and glory, riches and honour. Power is, of course, the central feature of Hobbes' system of ideas. While recognising the importance of power in Hobbesian political ideas, Michael Oakeshott wrote thus: "Man is a complex of power; desire is the desire for power, pride is illusion about power, honour opinion about power life the unremitting exercise of power and death the absolute loss of power"

Thus Hobbes in his well known work, 'The Leviathan' has presented a bleak and dismal picture of the condition of men in the state of nature. However, Hobbes does not extensively discuss the question of whether men have actually ever lived in such a state of nature. He noted that the savage people in many places of America have no government and live in the brutish and nasty manner. John Rawls thinks that Hobbes' state of nature is the classic example of the "prisoner's dilemma" of game – theoretic analysis.

Social contract

After presenting a horrible and dismal picture of the state of nature, Hobbes proceeds to discuss how man can escape from such an intolerably miserable condition. 'In the second part of the Leviathan, Hobbes creates his commonwealth by giving new orientation to the old idea of the social contract, a contract between ruler and ruled. Hobbes thus builds his commonwealth. 'the only way to erect such a common power as may be able to defend them (i.e, men) from the invasion of foreigners and the injuries of one another. is to confer all their power and strength upon one Man or upon one Assembly of men that may reduce all their wills, by plurality of voices unto one will the sovereign himself stands outside the covenant. He is a beneficiary of the contract, but not a party to it. Each man makes an agreement with every man in the following manner'

"I authorise and give up my right of governing myself to this man or to this assembly of man on the condition, that thou give up thy right to him, and authorise all his actions in like manner. This is the generation of that great Leviathan or rather (to speak more reverently) of that mortal god, to which

we owe under the immortal God, our peace and defence.' It is clear from the above statement that no individual can surrender his right to self-preservation.

In order to secure their escape from the state of nature, individuals renounce their natural rights to all things, and institute by common consent, a third person, or body of persons, conferring all rights of him for enforcing the contract by using force and keeping them all and authorising all his action as their own. According to Hobbes, the social contract institutes an office which may be held by one man or an assembly of men but which is distinct from the natural person of the holder. By the transfer of the natural rights to each man, the recipient becomes their representative and is invested with authority to deliberate, will and act in place of the deliberation will and action of each separate man. The multitude of conflicting wills is replaced, not by a common will but a single representative will.

According to William Ebenstein Hobbesian, social contract is made between subjects and subjects and not between subjects and sovereign. The sovereign is not a party to the contract, but its creation. This contract is a unilateral contract in which the contracting individuals obligate themselves to the resultant sovereign. Then again it is an irrevocable contract owe the individuals contract themselves into a civil society, they cannot annul the contract. They cannot repudiate their obligation. Repudiation of a contract is an act of public will of the individuals which they had surrounded at the time of the original contract. Thus Hobbesian contract is a social and not governmental contract. In this conception of social contact, the sovereign cannot commit any breach of covenant because he is not a party to it. By participating in the creation of the sovereign the subject is answerable of all the ruler does and must therefore not complain of any of the rulers' actions, because thus he would be deliberately doing injury to himself. Hobbes concedes that the sovereign may commit iniquity but not "injustice or injury in the proper signification", because he cannot by definition, act illegally; he determines what is just and unjust and his action is law.

Political Absolutism

The heart of Hobbes' political philosophy is his theory of sovereignty. He was not the first to use the term sovereignty in its modern sense. It is beyond dispute that before and after Thomas Hobbes the doctrine of sovereignty has been defended by various scholars on various grounds. Hobbes was perhaps the first thinker to defend the sovereignty of the state on scientific grounds. Hobbes freed the doctrine of sovereignty of limitations imposed by Jean Bodin and Hugo Grotius.

Hobbes saw the sovereign power as undivided, unlimited, inalienable and permanent. The contract created the state and the government simultaneously. The sovereign power was authorised to enact laws as it deemed fit and such laws were legitimate. Hobbes was categorical that the powers and authority of the sovereign has to be defined with least ambiguity.

The following are some of the major attributes of Hobbesian sovereign.

1. Sovereign is absolute and unlimited and accordingly no conditions implicit or explicit can be imposed on it. It is not limited either by the rights of the subjects or by customary and statutory laws.

2. Sovereignty is not a party to the covenant or contract. A sovereign does not exist prior to the to the commencement of the contract. Contract was signed between men in the state of nature mainly to escape from a state of war of every man against every man. The contract is irrevocable.
3. The newly created sovereign can do no injury to his subjects because he is their authorised agent. His actions cannot be illegal because he himself is the sole source and interpreter of laws.
4. No one can complain that sovereign is acting wrongly because everybody has authorised him to act on his behalf.
5. Sovereign has absolute right to declare war and make peace, to levy taxes and to impose penalties.
6. Sovereign is the ultimate source of all administrative, legislative and judicial authority. According to Hobbes, law is the command of the sovereign.
7. The sovereign has the right to allow or takes away freedom of speech and opinion.
8. The sovereign has to protect the people externally and internally for peace and preservation were basis of the creation of the sovereign or Leviathan. Thus Hobbesian sovereign represents the ultimate, supreme and single authority in the state and there is no right of resistance against him except in case of self defence. According to Hobbes, any act of disobedience of a subject is unjust because it is against the covenant. Covenants without swords are but mere words. Division or limitation of sovereignty means destruction of sovereignty which means that men are returning to the old state of nature where life will be intolerably miserable.

By granting absolute power to the sovereign, some critics went to the extent of criticising Hobbes as the 'spiritual father of totalitarian fascism or communism' However, William Ebenstein in his well known work 'Great Political Thinkers' has opposed this charge on following grounds. First, government is set up according to Hobbes, by a covenant that transfers all power. This contractual foundation of government is anathema to the modern totalitarians second, Hobbes assigns to the state a prosaic business; to maintain order and security for the benefit of the citizens. By contrast, the aim of the modern totalitarian state is anti-individualistic and anti hedonistic. Third Hobbesian state is authoritarian, not totalitarian. Hobbes' authoritarianism lacks one of the most characteristic features of the modern totalitarian state: inequality before the law, and the resultant sense of personal insecurity. Fourth, Hobbes holds that the sovereign may be one man or an assembly of men, whereas modern totalitarianism is addicted to the leadership principle. The Hobbesian sovereign is a supreme administrator and law giver but not a top rabble rouser, spellbinder, propagandist, or showman. Fifth, Hobbes recognises that war is one of the two main forces that drive men to set up a state. But whenever he speaks of war, it is defensive war, and there is no glorification of war in the Leviathan. By contrast, totalitarians look on war as something lightly desirable and imperialist war as the highest form of national life.

Thus it is clear from the above observations that Hobbes' theory of sovereignty is the first systematic and consistent statement of complete sovereignty in the history of political thought. His sovereign enjoys an absolute authority over his subjects and his powers can neither be divided nor limited either by the law of nature or by the law of God.

Hobbes' Leviathan is not only a forceful enunciation of the theory of sovereignty but also a powerful statement of individualism,. As Prof. Sabine has rightly pointed out, in Hobbesian political philosophy both individualism and absolutism go hand in hand. Granting absolute and unlimited power to the state is, in essence, an attempt to provide a happy and tension free life to the individuals.

CONCLUSION

The Leviathan of Hobbes has been regarded as one of the masterpieces of political theory known for its style, clarity and lucid exposition. He has laid down a systematic theory of sovereignty, human nature, political obligation etc. Hobbes saw the state as a conciliator of interests, a point of view that the Utilitarian's developed in great detail. Hobbes created an all powerful state but it was not totalitarian monster.

Hobbes is considered as the father of political science: His method was deductive and geometrical rather than empirical and experimental. His theory of sovereignty is indivisible, inalienable and perpetual. Sovereign is the sole source and interpreter of laws. Before and after Hobbes, political absolutism has been defended by different scholars on various grounds. Hobbes was perhaps the first political thinker to defend political absolutism on scientific grounds.

JOHN LOCKE

John Locke's first works were written at Oxford, namely the Two Tracts on Government in 1660-1662, and the Essays on the Law of Nature in Latin in 1664. In both these writings he argued against religious toleration and denied consent as the basis of legitimate government. Locke published his Two Treatises of Government in 1690. The same year saw the publication of his famous philosophical work The Essay Concerning Human understanding. Locke's other important writings were the Letters Concerning Toleration and Some Thought Concerning Education.

The Two Treatises of Government consists of two parts- the first is the refutation of filmer and the second, the more important of the two, is an inquiry into the 'true original, extent and end of civil government'. The work was ostensibly written to justify the glorious revolution of 1688. According to William Ebenstein, Locke's two treatises of government is often dismissed as a mere apology for the victorious Whigs in the revolution of 1688. The two treatises exposed and defended freedom, consent and property as cardinal principles of legitimate political power. Locke saw political power as a trust, with the general community specifying its purposes and aims.

Limited Government

In order to explain the origin of political power, Locke began with a description of the state of nature which for him was one of perfect equality and freedom regulated by the laws of nature. Locke's description of state of nature was not as gloomy and pessimistic as Hobbes's. The individual in the Lockean state of nature was naturally free and become a political subject out of free choice.

The state of nature was not one of licence, for though the individual was free from any superior power, he was subject to the laws of nature. From the laws of nature, individuals derived the natural rights to life, liberty and property (Together known as Right to Property). The laws of nature known to human beings through the power of reason, which directed them towards their proper interests.

Locke believes that man is a rational and a social creature capable of recognising and living in a moral order. Thus Lockean men in the state of nature led a life of mutual assistance, good will and preservation. Locke cannot conceive of human beings living together without some sort of law and order, and in the state of nature it is the law of nature that rules. The law of nature through the instrument of reason, defines what is right and wrong,; if a violation of the law occurs, the execution of the penalty is in the state of nature, 'put into every man's hands, whereby every one has right to punish the transgressors of that law to such a degree, as may hinder its violation' Locke penetratingly notes that in the law of nature the injured party is authorised to the judge in his own case and to execute the judgment against the culprit. In other words, in the Lockean state of nature, there was no organised govt. which alone can protect and enforce the natural rights.

According to William Ebenstein, Lockean law of the state of nature is deficient in three important points. First, it is not sufficiently clear. Second, there is no third party judge who has no personal stake in disputes. Third, in the state of nature the injured party is not always strong enough to execute the just sentence of the law. Thus the purpose of the social contract is to establish organised law and orders so that the uncertainties of the state of nature will be replaced by the predictability of known laws and impartial institutions. After society is set up by contract, government is established, not by a contract, but by fiduciary trust.

For the three great lacks of the state of nature - the lack of a known law, of a known judge, of a certain executive power – the three appropriate remedies would seem to be establishment of a legislative, of a judicial, and of an executive authority. In civil society or the state, Locke notes the existence of three powers, but they are not the above. There is first of all the legislative, which he calls 'the supreme power of the commonwealth.' The legislative power was supreme since it was the representative of the people, having the power to make laws. Besides the legislative there was an executive, usually one person, with the power to enforce the law. The executive which included the judicial power, has to be always in session. It enjoyed prerogatives and was subordinate and accountable to the legislature. The legislative and executive power had to be separate, thus pre-empting Montesquieu's theory separation of powers. The third power that Locke recognises is what he calls the federative- the power that makes treaties, that which is concerned with the country's external relations. Locke realises the great importance of foreign policy, and knows that its formulation, execution and control presents a very special kind of problem to constitutional states.

Characteristics of Lockean state

The first and foremost feature of Lockean state is that it exists for the people who form it, they do not exist for it. Repeatedly he insists that 'the end of government is the good of the community'. As C.L. Wayper has rightly pointed out the Lockean 'state is a machine which we

create for our good and run for our purposes, and it is both dangerous and unnecessary to speak of some supposed mystical good of state or country independent of the lives of individual citizens.

Locke further insists that all true states must be founded on consent. Further, the true state must be a constitutional state in which men acknowledge the rule of law. For there can be no political liberty if a man is subject to the inconstant, uncertain, unknown, arbitrary will of other man. Government must therefore be established standing laws, promulgated and known to the people, and not by extemporary decrees.

The most important characteristic of Locke's true state is that it is limited, not absolute. It is limited because it derives power from the people, and because it holds power in trust for the people. As only a fiduciary power to act for certain ends, its authority is confined to securing those ends. It is limited moreover, by Natural law in particular. The state should exist for the good of the people, should depend on their consent, should be constitutional and limited in its authority,.

Besides, Lockean state is a tolerant state which will respect differences of opinion. It is a negative state which does not seek to improve the character of its citizens nor to manage their lives. Again, Lockean state is also a transformer state, transforming selfish interest into public good.

Limitations of Government

John Locke advocated a limited sovereign state, for reason and experience taught him that political absolutism was untenable. Describing the characteristics of a good state Locke said it existed for the people who formed it and not the vice-versa. It had to be based on the consent of the people subject to the constitution and the rule of law. It is limited since its powers were derived from the people and were held in trust.

Locke does not build up a conception of legal sovereignty. He abolishes the legal sovereignty in favour of popular sovereignty. He has no idea of absolute and indivisible sovereignty as presented by Thomas Hobbes. Locke is for a government based on division of power and subject to a number of limitations. His limited government cannot command anything against public interests. It cannot violate the innate natural rights of the individuals. It cannot govern arbitrarily and tax the subjects without their consent. Its laws must conform to the laws of Nature and of God. It is not the government which is sovereign but law which is rooted in common consent. Its laws must conform to the laws of Nature and of God. It is not the government which is sovereign but law which is rooted in common consent. A government which violates its limitations is not worthy of obedience.

Most important in terms of limiting the power of government is the democratic principle itself. The legislature is to be periodically elected by the people. It could be no other way, in fact, since legitimate government must be based upon the consent of the governed according to Locke, and direct election of representatives to the legislature makes consent a reality. And since elected representatives depend of popular support for their tenure in office, they have every interest in staying within legal bounds.

A further limitation upon the legislative power recommended by Locke is limiting of the duration of legislative sessions because, he argues constant frequent meetings of the legislative could not but be burdensome to the people”.

In Locke’s mind, the less frequent the meetings of the legislature the fewer the laws passed and consequently, the less chance that mischief will be done.

Another crucially important structural principle in limiting the power of government is the separation of powers. Between the legislative and executive, the logic behind this principle, according to Locke, is that “It may be too great a temptation to human frailty apt to grasp at power for the same persons who have the power of making laws, to have also in their hands the power to execute them. .” Locke, however, does not go so far as to make the separation of powers an absolute condition for limited government.

Natural Rights and Private Property

The conception of Natural rights and the theory of property was one of the important themes in Locke’s political philosophy. According to Locke, men in the state of nature possessed natural rights. These rights are: Right to life liberty and property. Liberty means an exemption from all rules save the law of nature which is a means to the realisation of man’s freedom.

Locke spoke of individuals in the state of nature having perfect freedom to dispose of their possessions, and persons, as they thought fit. He emphatically clarified that since property was a natural right derived from natural law, it was therefore prior to the government. He emphasised that individuals had rights to do as they pleased within the bounds of the laws of nature. Rights were limited to the extent that they did not harm themselves or others.

According to Locke, human beings are rational creatures, and “Reason tells us that Men, being once born have a right to their preservation, and such other things as nature affords for their subsistence”. Rational people must concede that every human being has a right to life, and therefore to those things necessary to preserve life. This right to life, and those things necessary to preserve it, Locke calls it property. The right to life, he argues, means that every man has property in his own person. This nobody has any right to but himself “ Logically, the right to property in person means that all human beings have a right to property in those goods and possessions acquired through labour that are necessary to preserve their person.

Locke argues that the “Labour of his body, and the work of his Hands are properly his. What so ever then he removes out of the state that nature hath provided, and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with, and joined to it something that is his won and thereby makes it his property”. Since human beings have property in their persons and hence a right to life, it follows that they have property in those possessions that they have legitimately laboured to obtain. In other words, property in both person and possessions, is a right that belongs to every human being as human being. It is a right all people possess whether they be in a state of nature or in political society. Locke thus says that the great and chief end of men’s uniting into commonwealth’s, and cutting themselves under government is the preservation of their property”. Consequently, Government has no other end but the preservation of people ‘Lives, liberties, and Estates” Liberty is a property right for Locke because to have property in one’s person implies the right to think,

speak and act freely. Locke has argued that in the state of nature property is held in common until people mix their labour with it at which point it becomes their private property. A person has right to appropriate as much common property as desired so long as “there is enough and as good left in common for others”

It was the social character of property that enabled Locke to defend a minimal state with limited government and individual rights, and reject outright the hereditary principle of government. Locke also wanted to emphasise that no government could deprive an individual of his material possessions without the latter’s consent. It was the duty of the political power to protect entitlements that individuals enjoyed by virtue of the fact that these had been given by God. In short, Locke’s claim that the legitimate function of the government is the preservation of property means not just that government must protect people’s lives and possessions, but that it must ensure the right of unlimited accumulation of private property. Some scholars have argued that Locke’s second treatise provides not only a theory of limited government but a justification for an emerging capitalist system as well. Macpherson argued that Locke’s views on property made him a bourgeois apologist, a defender of the privileges of the possessing classes. As Prof. William Ebenstien has rightly pointed out, Lockean theory of property was later used in defence of capitalism, but in the hands of pre-Marxian socialists it became a powerful weapon of attacking capitalism.

Civil Society

According to Locke what drives men into society is that God put them “under strong Obligations of necessity, convenience, and inclination”. And men being by nature all free, equal and independent, no one can be put out of this estate (State of nature) and subjected to political power of another without his own consent. Therefore, the problem is to form civil society by common consent of all men and transfers their right of punishing the violators of natural law to an independent and impartial authority. For all practical purposes, after the formation of civil society this common consent becomes the consent of the majority; all parties must submit to the determination of the majority which carries the force of the community. So all men unanimously agree to incorporate themselves in one body and conduct their affairs by the opinion of the majority after they have set up a political or civil society, the next step is to appoint a government to declare and execute the natural law. This Locke calls the supreme authority established by the commonwealth or civil society.

The compulsion to constitute a civil society was to protect and preserve freedom and to enlarge it. The state of nature was one of liberty and equality, but it was also one where peace was not secure, being constant by upset by the “corruption and viciousness of degenerate men”. It lacked three important wants: the want of an established settled, known law, the want of a known and indifferent judge; and the want of an executive power to enforce just decisions.

J. J. ROUSSEAU (1712 – 1778)

Jean Jacques Rousseau was one of the greatest political philosopher that the French has produced. In the entire history of political theory he was the most exciting and provocative. He was a genius and a keen moralist who was ruthless in his criticism of 18th century French society. He

was one of the most controversial thinkers, as evident from the conflicting, contradictory and often diametrically opposite interpretations that existed of the nature and importance of his ideas. He is best remembered for his concept of popular sovereignty, and the theory of general will which provide a philosophical justification for democratic governance. He was the intellectual father of the French Revolution as well as the last and perhaps the greatest of the modern contract theorists.

Rousseau was born in Geneva to an artisan family. His mother died of complications arising from his birth, a tragedy that filled Rousseau with a lifelong sense of guilt and in all probability lay behind much of his neurotic behaviour and personal unhappiness. As a young man he was apprenticed in several trades, and in 1728 he set out for a period of travel during which he engaged in an extensive process of self-education. He was not like Hobbes and Locke, formally trained in the university, nor did he consider himself a philosopher in any formal sense.

In 1742 Rousseau set out for Paris where he met the leading cultural, scientific and philosophical luminaries of Enlightenment France. Among them was Diderot, a leading philosopher and the founder of the encyclopedia, a multi-volume work that aimed at encompassing all knowledge. Rousseau contributed several articles to the encyclopedia, the most important of which was the Discourse on Political Economy. This work along with the first and second discourses, and most importantly the social contract, constitutes the basic source of Rousseau's social and political thought, although he wrote several other minor political works, such as the Government of Poland. In addition, Rousseau wrote several novels and numerous essays, and he produced three autobiographical works, the most important of which is the Confessions. In 1761 Rousseau published Emile perhaps the most famous work on education ever written.

CRITIQUE OF CIVILISATION

Rousseau protested against intelligence, science and reason in so far as they destroyed reverence faith and moral intuition, the factors on which society was based. His protest was a "revolt against reason, for he regarded the thinking animal as a depraved, animal". His conviction was reflected by his unhappiness with Grotius, because his usual method of reasoning is constantly to establish right by force.

Rousseau attacked civilisation and enlightenment in a prize winning essay written in 1749 on the question : Has the progress of science and arts contributed to corrupt or purify morality? Rousseau argued that science was not saving but bring moral ruin upon us. Progress was an illusion, what appeared to be advancement was in reality regression. The arts of civilised society served only to 'cast garlands of flowers over the chains men bore'. The development of modern civilisation had not made men either happier or more virtuous. In the modern sophisticated society man was corrupted, the greater the sophistication the greater the corruption. Rousseau wrote thus : "our minds have been corrupted in proportion as the arts and science have improved".

In surveying history to support of his cult of natural simplicity, Rousseau is full of enthusiasm in for Sparta, a "republic of demi- gods rather than of men", famous for the happy and ignorance of its inhabitants. By contrast, he denigrates Athens, the centre of vice, doomed to perish because of its elegance, luxury, wealth, art and science. Rousseau sees a direct causal

relation between luxury constantly expanding needs, and the rise of art and science after which true courage flags and the virtues disappear.

According to Rousseau, arts, manners, and politeness not only destroyed martial values but also denied human nature, forcing individuals to conceal their real selves. In modern society happiness was built on the opinions of others rather than finding it in one's own hearts. Thus he dismissed modern civilised society as false and artificial for it destroyed natural and true culture.

GENERAL WILL

The doctrine of general will occupies a prominent place in Rousseau's political philosophy. In the *Discourse on Political Economy* Rousseau had already dealt with the problem of general will. He sees the body politic "possessed of a will and this general will, which tends always to the preservation and welfare of the whole and of every part, and is the source of the laws, constitutes for all the members of the state in their relation to one another and to it, the rule of what is just or unjust". By introducing the concept of General Will, Rousseau fundamentally alters the mechanistic concept of the state as an instrument and revives the organic theory of the state, which goes back to Plato and Aristotle.

In order to understand the meaning and importance of general will it is necessary to understand the meanings of related terms and concepts. According to Rousseau, the actual will of the individual is his impulsive and irrational will. It is based on self-interest and is not related to the well-being of the society. Such a will is narrow and self-conflicting. The real will of the individual is on the other hand, rational will which aims at the general happiness of the community. The real will promotes harmony between the individuals in society. Rousseau believes that an average man has both an actual and real will.

The general will is the sum total of or rather synthesis of the real wills of the individuals in society. It represents the common consciousness of the common good after proper discussion and deliberation. The chief attribute of the general will is not its sovereign power but pursuit of common interests and its public spiritedness. The character of the general will is determined by two elements: first it aims at the general good, and second, it must come from all and apply to all. The first refers to the object of the will; the second, to its origin.

Rousseau also makes differences between will of all and general will. There is often a great deal of difference between the will of all and the general will. The former considers only the common interests, while the latter takes private interest into account and is no more than a sum of particular wills. Thus the will of all is the aggregate of all the wills of the individuals of the community about their private interest into account and is no more than a sum of particular wills. Thus the will of all is the aggregate of all the wills of the individuals of the community about their private interest, wills which partly clash and partly coincide mutually. But the general will represents the aggregate of these wills which is common to all the citizens. In other words, the essential difference between the will of all and general will is one of motivation, i.e., service to the community without any prejudice or discrimination.

Unlike nearly all other major political thinkers, Rousseau considers the sovereignty of the people inalienable and indivisible. The people cannot give away or transfer to any person or body

their ultimate right of self government of deciding their own destiny. Whereas Hobbes identified the sovereign with the ruler who exercises' sovereignty, Rousseau draws a sharp distinction between sovereignty, which always and wholly resides in the people and government which is but a temporary agent of the sovereign people. Rousseau believes that the general will would be the source of all laws. The human being would be truly free if he followed the dictates of the law. He was categorical that the General will could emerge only in an assembly of equal law makers.

CHARACTERISTICS OF GENERAL WILL

The following are some of the important features of general will . Firstly, Rousseau's general will is permanent It is rational and not impulsive. It is not eternal but permanent and imparts stability to national institutions. Secondly, Rousseau locates sovereignty in the general will. General will and sovereignty are inalienable just as life of the individual is inalienable. Whereas in Locke the people transfer the exercise of their sovereign authority, legislative, executive and judicial to organs of government, Rousseau's concept of inalienable and indivisible sovereignty does not permit the people to transfer their legislative function, the supreme authority in the state As to the executive and judicial functions, Rousseau realises that they have to be exercised by special organs of government but they are completely subordinate to the sovereign people.

Thirdly, Rousseau's general will is unitary because it is not self contradictory. It gives a touch of unity to national character. Next, general will is unrepresentable because sovereignty lies in the community which is a collective body and cannot be represented but by itself: As soon as a nation appoints representatives, it is no longer free, it no longer exists.

Finally, the general will is infallible. Rousseau means little more than that the general will must always seek the general good. He says the general will is always right and tends to the public advantage. If the general will is always right, it is not always known. It does not follow that the deliberations of the people are always equally correct.

Rousseau saw the government as an agent of the General will, the sovereign entity in the body polity. Like Montesquieu, he believed all forms of government were not suited to all countries. A government had to reflect the character of a country and its people.

According to William Ebenstein, Rousseau's concept of sovereignty differs from both Hobbes' and Locke's In Hobbes the people set up a sovereign and transfer all power to him In Locke's social contract, the people set up a limited government for limited purposes, but Locke shuns the conception of sovereignty - popular or monarchical – as a symbol of political absolutism. Rousseau's sovereign is the people constituted as a political community through the social contract. Rousseau's theory of popular sovereignty is not only different from Locke's , it is in fact a through going critique of the whole tradition of Lockean liberal democracy. For while Locke recognises the principle of popular sovereignty in theory, he rejects it in practice, says Rousseau In point of fact , Locke's contract does not give the legislative power to the people, but to a representative legislature. As such, sovereign belongs to the elected representatives, or more precisely to a majority of representatives rather than to the community as a whole. Thus, Locke actually puts sovereignty in the hands of a very small minority , thereby denying to the people that political liberty that a correct reading of the contract shows they rightfully ought to possess.

SOCIAL CONTRACT

Though Rousseau criticised civil society, he did not suggest man to choose the savage existence, as some of his contemporaries mistook him. The main concern of the social contract is the central issue of all political speculation: Political obligation. 'The Problem' Rousseau says 'is to find a form of association which will defend and protect with the whole common force the person and goods of each associate, and in which each while uniting himself with all may still obey himself alone, and remain as free as before'.

Like his predecessors, Rousseau uses the conceptions of the state of nature and the social contract that puts to end to it. Rousseau's conception of man's life in the state of nature is not quite so gloomy as that of Hobbes' nor as optimistic as that of Locke. Each man pursues his self-interest in the state of nature until he discovers that his power to preserve himself individually against the threats and hindrances of others is not strong enough Rousseau's social contract opens thus: 'Man is born free and he is everywhere in chains' His purpose is how to make the chains legitimate in place of the illegitimate chains of the contemporary society.

The purpose of the social contract is thus to combine security which comes from collective association, with liberty which the individual had before the making of the contract. But the social contract consists in the total alienation of each associate, together with all his rights, to the whole community.' Each man gives himself to all, he gives himself to nobody in particular.

In Rousseau's social contract man does not surrender completely to a sovereign ruler, but each man gives himself to all, and therefore gives himself to nobody in particular. Rousseau shows in the social contract a much greater appreciation of civil society as compared with the state of nature than he showed in his earlier writings. As a result of the contract, private person ceases to exist for the contract produces a moral and collective Body, which receives from the same act its unity, its common identity, its life and its will. This public person formed from the union of all particular individuals is the state when it is passive,; the sovereign when it is active, a power when compared with similar institutions.

ASSESSMENT

There was no denying the fact that Rousseau's political philosophy was one of the most innovative striking and brilliant argued theories. His most important achievement was that he understood the pivotal problem that faced individuals in society - how to reconcile individual interests with those of the larger interests of the society. Rousseau is the first modern writer to attempt, not always successfully to synthesise good government with self government in the key concept of General will.

Rousseau's influence has changed over the last three centuries. In the 18th century he was seen as critique of the statusquo, challenging the concept of progress, the core of the enlightenment belief structure. In the 19th century, he was seen as the apostle of the French revolution and the founder of the romantic movement. In the 20th century he has been hailed as the founder of democratic tradition, while at the same time assailed for being the philosophical inspiration of totalitarianism.

MODULE IV

JEREMY BENTHAM (1748-1832)

Jeremy Bentham, the founder of Utilitarianism, combined throughout his active life the carriers of a philosopher, a jurist and that of a social reformer and activist. Though trained to be a lawyer, he gave up the practice of law in order to examine the basis of law and to pursue legal reforms. His utilitarian philosophy based on the principle of the “greatest happiness of the greatest number” was aimed at rearing the fabric of felicity of prison, legislation and parliament and stressed the need for a new penal code for England. It was for these reasons that he has been regarded by J.S. Mill as a “progressive philosopher”, the great benefactor of mankind’ and enemy of the status quo and the greatest questioner of things established.

From the middle of the 18th century, England experienced a technological and industrial transformation whose impact was revolutionary from the view point of new social ideas and a new material environment. Socially, the industrial revolution was responsible for three complementary developments; first the growth of new and the rapid expansion of old towns and cities; second the increase in population made possible by higher living standards and improved conditions of health; third the destruction of the existing social hierarchy headed by the landed aristocracy and its gradual replacement by the manufacturers, financiers, merchants and professional men as the new dominant social class. The war with France (1793-1815) provided the conservative government in Britain with a welcome opportunity to repress democratic and radical ideas under the pretext of fighting Jacobinism. The defeat of Napoleon and the revival of the old European order at the Congress of Vienna (1815) seemed to put an end to the nightmare of revolution and democracy. As Prof. Sabine has pointed out, the rising middle classes in Britain inevitably developed a new social and political philosophy that was clearly distinct from Burke’s adulation of landed aristocracy, as well as from Paine’s radicalism and Godwin’s anarchy”. What was needed was a political faith reflecting the outlook of the middle classes, which was essentially empirical optimistic willing to innovate and eager to translate natural science into technology and industry and political science into government and administration.

The most characteristic expression of this outlook is to be found in the work of Jeremy Bentham, the founder of Philosophical Radicalism. Bentham was born in 1748, only three years after the Jacobite rebellion of 1745 that sought to regain the throne of the Stuarts. Bentham’s father and grand father were well-to-do attorneys and Bentham was to enter upon the same carrier. At the comparatively early age of three Bentham was found poring over a big folio volume of Rapin’s History of England,; he read Latin before he was four, French at six and took to Voltaire for light reading at eight. He entered Oxford at twelve, received his bachelor’s degree at fifteen and then studied the law. He was called to the bar in 1769 but he soon decided that he was more interested in reforming the law than in practicing it. A small annual income of a hundred pounds enabled him to live independently though modestly; after his father’s death in 1792 his financial situation greatly improved and he was able to live comfortably in his house in London. There he spent his life, unmarried completely devoted to his literary and political activities.

Jeremy Bentham's political philosophy was influenced by the writings of David Hume, Priestly, Claude Adrien Helvetius, Cesare Bonesana etc. Bentham's first book *Fragment on Government* was directed against Blackstone, the oracle of English law. The *Fragment on Government* was published in 1776, the year of James Watt's first successful steam engine, the Declaration of Independence and the publication of another milestone of social thought, Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. In the *Fragment*, Bentham pragmatically describes the nature of political society in terms of the habit of obedience, and not of social contract, natural rights and other fictions. In this early work of Bentham there is more than a touch of Burke, because of the constant emphasis that government is not based on metaphysical generalities but on interest and advantage.

Bentham's most widely known book is his *Principles of Morals and Legislation* (printed in 1780 and published in 1789). Bentham welcomed the French Revolution and set his reform proposals, though more were adopted. But he was made an honorary citizen of France in 1792. In 1809, a close relationship between Bentham and James Mill (1773—1836) began, with Mill being convinced of the urgency for reforms. Bentham started and financed the *Westminster Review* in 1824 with the idea of propagating his utilitarian principles. Bentham lived till the age of 84.

QUANTITATIVE UTILITY

Utilitarianism as a school of thought dominated English political thinking from the middle of the 18th century to the middle of the 19th century. Some of the early utilitarians were Francis Hutcheson, Hume, Priestly, William Paley. But it was Bentham who systematically laid down its theory and made it popular on the basis of his innumerable proposals for reform. Bentham's merit consisted of not in the doctrine but in his vigorous application of it to various practical problems. Through James Mill, Bentham developed close links with Thomas Malthus and David Ricardo getting acquainted with the ideas of the classical economists.

The basic premise of utilitarianism was that human beings as a rule sought happiness that pleasure alone is good, and that the only right action was that which produced the greatest happiness of the greatest number. In the hands of Bentham, the pleasure-pain theory evolved into a scientific principle to be applied to the policies of the state, welfare measures and for administrative, penal and legislative reforms. He shared Machiavelli's concern for a science of politics, not in the understanding the dynamics of political power, but in the hope of promoting and securing the happiness of individuals through legislation and policies.

Utilitarianism provided a psychological perspective on human nature, for it perceived human beings as creatures of pleasure. Bentham began the first chapter of *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* thus: "Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think: A man may pretend to abjure their empire: but in reality he will remain subject to it all the while. The principle of utility recognises thus subjection, and assumes it for the foundation of that system, the object of which is to rear the fabric of felicity by the hand of reason and of law".

Bentham believes that human beings by nature were hedonists. Each of their actions were motivated by a desire to seek pleasure and avoid pain. Every human action has a cause and a motive. The principles of utility recognised this basic psychological trait, for it “approves or disapproves every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which it appears to have to argument or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question..... not only of every action of a private individual but of every measure of government’;. Thus the principle of utility or the greatest happiness of the greatest number, is that quality in an act or object that produces benefit, advantage pleasure, good or happiness or prevent mischief, pain, evil or unhappiness.

For Bentham, utilitarianism was both a descriptive and normative theory, - it not only described how human beings act so as to maximise pleasure and minimise pain, but it also prescribed or advocated such action. According to the principle of utility, the cause of all human action is a desire for pleasure. But utility is meant that property in any object, where by it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure good or happiness

Bentham viewed hedonism not only as a principle of motivation, but also an a principle of action. He listed 14 simple pleasures and 12 simple pains, classifying these into self- regarding and other regarding groups, a distinction that J.S. Mill borrowed in elaboration of the concept of liberty. Only two benevolence and malevolence, were put under other regarding action. Under self-regarding motives, Bentham listed physical desire, pecuniary interest, love of power and self-preservation. Self- preservation included fear of pain, love of life and love of ease.

As Prof. C.L. Wayper has pointed out, when Bentham spoke of the good and bad consequences of an action he simple meant the happy or painful consequences of that action. He accepted the association principle of Hartley that all ideas are derived from the senses as the result of the operation of sensible objects on these, and he conceived of life as being made upon of interesting perceptions. All experience, he believed, was either pleasurable or painful or both. Pleasures were simply individual sensations. But happiness, he thought of not as a simple individual sensations. Rather it was a state of mind, a bundle of sensations.

Bentham is fully aware that personal happiness and the happiness of the greatest number are not always identical and he sees two means by which the gulf between individual selfishness and communal good can be bridged. First education can elevate men’s minds so that they will understand that rationally conceived happiness of one’s self includes good will, sympathy, and benevolence for others. The second means of bridging the gap between individual selfishness and the greatest happiness of the greatest number is the creation of an institutional environment in which main’s selfish impulses can be channelled into socially useful purposes, so that it will be contrary to his selfish - interest to harm others.

Bentham claims in his principles to have developed a genuinely scientific comprehension of the nature of pleasure. Pleasure, he argues, may be said to be of lesser or greater value depending upon certain measurable variables such as intensity, duration, fecundity and so on. One pleasure, for example, may be more intense than another but of shorter duration . Another pleasure may be of greater duration but lack of fecundity that is the capacity to generate other subordinate pleasures.

Moreover, as Epicurus had also noted, pleasures are often accompanied by pain and some pleasures are more apt to be accompanied by pain than others.

All pleasures and pains, according to Bentham are effects produced by external causes but individuals do not experience the same quantity of pleasure or pain from the same cause and this is because they differ in sensitivity or sensibility. Bentham has listed around 32 factors which influence sensibility and these should be taken into account in any computation of the total amount of pleasure or pain involved in any given act. These factors are health, strength, hardness, bodily imperfections, quality and quantity of knowledge, strength of intellectual powers, firmness of mind, bent of inclination etc.

Bentham believes that every individual is the best of his happiness. The state is a group of persons organised for the promotion and maintenance of utility that is happiness or pleasure. The state could increase pleasure and diminish pain by the application of sanctions. These are the physical sanction which operates in the ordinary course of nature. The moral sanction which arises from the general feeling of society; the religious sanction, which is applied by the immediate hand of a "superior invisible being, either in the present life or in a future"; and the political sanction which operates through government and the necessity for which is the explanation of the state. The community according to Bentham is a fictitious body and its interests are the sum total of the interests of the several members who compose it.

Bentham distinguished pleasures quantitatively rather than qualitatively when he wrote that 'the pleasure of pushpin is as good as poetry'. He did not differentiate between pleasures, and in that sense he was not an elitist. He did not assign any inherent grading to activities and treated them at par in terms of their contribution to individual happiness. He taught men to govern by the simple rule of the greatest happiness of the greatest number' which in turn, could be measured by an apparatus known as felicific calculus

But it is important to recognise that Bentham's calculus works only so long as two assumptions hold. We must assume first that the ethical is identical to the pleasurable, and second that the pleasurable can be defined in strictly quantitative terms such that any pleasure can be mathematically compared to any other. When we measure pleasure, he says we must take note of their intensity and duration. We must take note of their certainty or uncertainty since a pleasure that is more certain is greater than one which is less certain. Their propinquity or remoteness must also come into our calculations a pleasure that is closer or more easily available being greater than one which is farther away and more inaccessible. Thus Bentham's doctrine of utility is a doctrine which is concerned with results not with motives.

Several criticisms have been levelled against Bentham's doctrine of quantitative utility. Prof. William Ebenstein in his major work 'Great Political Thinkers' has criticised Bentham's theory as "uninspiring, not imaginative enough and merely mechanical". His theory lacked originality and was full of prejudices and speculation. He was very much confused and contradictory in his own theoretical adventures. Prof. Carlyle has branded Benthamism as the "pig philosophy" just to remind us that hedonism of the kind is not very satisfactory, the happiness is much more than pleasure.

Bentham's theory has been criticised for its neglect of moral sense. What Bentham wanted to do was to establish a standard of right or wrong, good and evil related to calculable values. His psychological appreciation of human nature was inadequate. Many factors beside pleasure and pain, motivate individual and communal action.

Bentham distinguished pleasures and pains quantitatively rather than qualitatively. But in actual practice pleasures and pain differ qualitatively. Bentham believes that pleasures and pains could be arithmetically calculated with the help of an apparatus known as felicific calculus. However, modern researches in experimental psychology show that felicific calculus of pleasures with which Bentham supplied as turns out to have no practical significance at all. He provides no scale of values with which to measure the various factors and no way of determining the relative importance of the factors that he lists. How could we measure the fecundity or purity of a pleasure?

ASSESSMENT

Bentham was not an outstanding philosopher though paradoxically he occupies an important place in the history of political philosophy. Bentham's main contribution to political science was not that he offered a novel principle of political philosophy but that he 'steadily applied an empirical and critical method of investigation to concrete problems of law and government.' It was an attempt 'to extend the experimental method of reasoning from the physical branch to the moral'. Whatever may be the criticisms levelled against Bentham's theory of utility', it is beyond dispute that Bentham 'changed the character of British institutions more than any other man in the nineteenth century'.

We cannot regard Bentham as the greatest critical thinker of his age and country. According to C.L. Wayper, it was "Benthamism which brought to an end the era of legislative stagnation and ushered in that period of increasing legislative activity which has not yet ended and under the cumulative effects of which we are living our lives today". He supplied a new measurement for social reform- the maximising of individual happiness.

Bentham exercised a great influence upon theories of sovereignty and law. Law was not a mystic mandate of reason or nature. But simply the command of that authority to which the members of community render habitual obedience. He considered the power of the sovereign as indivisible unlimited, inalienable and permanent. As Prof. Sabine has rightly pointed out, Bentham's greatest contribution was in the field of jurisprudence and government.

Bentham was a firm believer in gradual reform. He had no faith in the violence of a revolution. He advanced numerous ideas which have become central to the liberal creed of the 19th century. His utilitarian principles not only dominated the liberal discourse but also influenced the early socialist writings of William Thompson.

JOHN STUART MILL (1806-1873)

John Stuart Mill was the most influential political thinker of the 19th century. In his political theory, liberalism made a transition from laissez faire to an active role for the state, from a negative to a positive conception of liberty and from an atomistic to a more social conception of individuality.

While Mill was a liberal he could also be regarded at the same time as a reluctant democrat, a pluralist a co-operative socialist, an elitist and a feminist.

John Stuart Mill was born in London on 20 May 1806. He had eight younger siblings. His father James Mill came from Scotland, with the desire to become a writer. At the age of 11 he began to help his father by reading the proofs of his father's book namely History of British India. In 1818 his father was appointed as Assistant examiner at the East India House. It was an important event in his life as this solved his financial problems enabling him to develop his time and attention to write on areas of his prime interest, philosophical and political problems. His father was his teacher and constant companion. At 16 he founded the Utilitarian Society, an association of young men who met to discuss Bentham's ideas. He became a member of a small group discuss political economy, logic and psychology. He joined the speculative debating society and the political economy club At 17. He obtained a post in the office of the examiner of India correspondence in the East India company which lasted until its abolition in 1853. He soon achieved distinction in the articles that he contributed to the Westminster Review. At the age of 20 he edited Bentham's Rational of Evidence.

In his thinking John Stuart Mill was greatly influenced by the dialogues and dialectics of Plato and the cross questions of Socrates. His studies were also influenced by the writings of John Austin, Adam Smith and Ricardo. He had inherited Bentham's principles from his father and Bentham himself and found the principles of utility the keystone of his beliefs. Among other influences, a special mention is to be made of the impact exercised on J. S. Mill by his own wife Mrs. Taylor whom he used to call a perfect embodiment of reason, wisdom, intellect and character. She touched the emotional depths of Mill's nature and provided the sympathy he needed.

J. S Mill was a prolific writer and he wrote on different branches of knowledge with equal mastery. His System of Logic (1843) tried to elucidate a coherent philosophy of politics. The logic combined the British empiricist tradition of Locke and Hume of associational psychology with a conception of social science based on the paradigm of Newtonian physics. His Essay On Liberty (1859) and the Subjection of Women (1869) were classic elaborations of liberal thought on important issues like law, rights and liberty. Another major work, The Considerations of Representative Government (1861) provided an outline of his ideal government based on proportional representation, protection of minorities and institutions of self government. His famous work Utilitarianism(1863) endorsed the Benthamite principle of the greatest happiness of the greatest number yet made a significant departure from the Benthamite assumptions. It was written an exposition and defense of the pleasure pain philosophy applied to ethics, but he makes so many changes that there is little left of the original creed. He seems that human nature is not entirely moved by self-interest as Bentham and his father had taught, but is capable of self-sacrifice.

Qualitative utility

J.S Mill was a close follower of his teacher, Jeremy Bentham and his services to Bentham are exactly the same as the service of Lenin to his master, Karl Marx. He saved Benthamism from death and decay by removing its defects and criticisms as Lenin made Marxism up to date Mill

criticized and modified Bentham's utilitarianism by taking into account factors like moral motives, sociability, feeling of universal altruism, sympathy and a new concept of justice with the key idea of impartiality. He asserted that the chief deficiency of Benthamite ethics was the reflect of individual character, and hence stressed on the cultivation of feelings and imagination as part of good life-poetry, drama, music, paintings etc. were essential ingredients both for human happiness and formation of character. They were instruments of human culture. He defined happiness and dignity of man and not the principle of pleasure, the chief end of life. He defined happiness to mean perfection of human nature, cultivation of moral virtues and lofty aspirations, total control over one's appetites and desires, and recognition of individual and collective interests.

In his desire to safeguard utilitarianism from criticisms levelled against it, Mill goes "far towards or overthrowing the whole utilitarian position. The strong anti hedonist movement of his day, personified by Carlyle, determined him to show that the utilitarian theory, although hedonistic, is elevating and not degrading. Therefore, he sought to establish the non-utilitarian proposition that some pleasures are of a higher quality than other. Bentham had denied this, maintaining quantity of pleasure being equal, pushpin is as good as poetry'. Mill offers a singular proof that Bentham is wrong. Men who have experienced both higher and lower pleasures agree, he says, in preferring the higher, and theirs is a decisive testimony, 'it is better to a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied, better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied. And if the fool or the pig is of a different opinion it is because they only know their side of the question. The other party to the comparison knows both the sides.' Mill's assertion that pleasures differ in quality is no doubt a truer reflection of human experience than is Bentham's insistence to the contrary. It is, nevertheless, non-utilitarian. If pleasures differ qualitatively, then the higher pleasure is the end to be sought and not the principles of utility. A Sodgwick, who was so ruthless and logical a thinker, saw, if we are to be hedonists we must say that pleasures vary only in quantity, never in quality. Utilitarianism, because it is hedonist, must recognize no distinction between pleasure except a quantitative one.

In the course of proving his thesis that the principle of utility can admit a qualitative distinction of pleasures, Mill makes use of the non- utilitarian argument that pleasures cannot in any case, be objectively measured. The felicific calculus is, he says, absurd and men have always relied upon the testimony of ' those most competent to judge. 'These are no other tribunal to be referred to even on the question of quantity. In the words of C.L. Wayper, "Mill was of course right in maintaining the absurdity of the felicific calculus- but if it is admitted that pleasures can no longer be measured objectively, a vital breach, has been made in the strong hold of utilitarianism."

Mill is concerned to establish the fact that pleasures differ in quality as well as quantity, so that he can maintain the further non- utilitarian position that not the principle of utility but the dignity of man is the final end of life. In his Liberty he makes the non- utilitarian complaint that "individual spontaneity is hardly recognized by the common modes of thinking as having any intrinsic worth, or deserving any regard on its own account' He approves of Humboldt's doctrine of self-realization. 'It is of importance', he says, not only what men do but also what manner of men they are that do it'. According to Bentham, not self-realization but the achievement of pleasure and the avoidance of pain was the end that they sort before men. Mill, on the contrary, is in effect saying that one pleasure is better than another if it promotes the sense of dignity of man. Mill is here introducing a

conception of the good life as something more than a life devoted to pleasure. Mill's Introduction into Utilitarianism of this moral criterion implies a revolutionary change in the Benthamite position. Thus Mill has once again made the state a moral institution with a moral end. Mill has defended utilitarianism only by abandoning the whole utilitarian position.

Mill's non-utilitarian interest in the sense of dignity in man leads him to give a non-utilitarian emphasis to the idea of moral obligation. For Mill the sense of moral obligation cannot be explained in terms of the principle of utility. Thus while his ethics are certainly more satisfying than Bentham's Mill is responsible for yet another important alteration in Benthamism.

Mills has pointed out that every human action had three aspects:

1. The moral aspect of right or wrong;
2. The aesthetic aspect (or its beauty) ; and
3. The sympathetic aspect of loveableness.

The first principle instructed one to disapprove, the second taught one to admire or despise, and the third enabled one to love, pity or dislike. He regarded individual self-development and diversity as the ultimate ends, important components of human happiness and the principal ingredients of individual and social progress.

Mill used the principle of utility which he regarded as the ultimate appeal on all ethical questions to support his principle of liberty, but then it was utilitarianism based on the permanent interests of the individual as a progressive being. He made a distinction between toleration and suppression of offensive practices. In case of offences against public decency, majority sentiment would prevail. Beyond these, the minorities must be granted the freedom of thought and expression, and the right to live as they pleased.

In one another respect J.S Mill definitely makes an improvement over the utilitarian theory of Bentham. Bentham had not spoken about the social nature of morality that society itself has a moral end- the moral good of its members. From the contention that every individual desires' his own happiness Mill held that the individual should desire and promote general happiness. It is thus obvious that Mill stood not for an individual's happiness but for the general happiness of the community as a whole. He regarded utility as a noble sentiment associated with Christian religion.

In addition to the above differences, Mill also tried to reconcile the interests of the individual and the society. He spoke of nobility of character, a trait that was closely related to altruism, meaning people did what was good for society, rather than for themselves. The pleasures they derived from doing good for society might outweigh the ones that aimed at self-indulgence, contributing to their happiness. Mill saw social feelings and consciences as part of the psychological attributes of a person. He characterized society as being natural and habitual, for the individual was a social person. As Prof. Sabine has rightly pointed out, Mill's ethics was important for liberalism because in effect it abandoned egoism, assumed that social welfare is a matter of concern to all men of good will and regarded freedom, integrity, self-respect and personal distinction as intrinsic goods apart from their contribution to happiness". Under the sociological influence of August Comte and others, Mill introduces a historical approach to the study of man and human institutions and is against the Benthamite static view of human nature and human institutions.

LIBERTY

Mill's ideas on liberty had a direct relationship with his theory of utility or happiness. Mill regarded liberty as a necessary means for the development of individuality which was to become the ultimate source of happiness. There was only one road for him to take and that was the road of higher utility. In his well known work, *On Liberty*, Mill thoroughly examines the problem of the relationship between the individual on the one side and the society and state on the other.

Mill lived at a time when the policy of *laissez faire* was being abandoned in favor of greater regulation by the state of the actions of the individual. Besides, due to the growth of democracy, the individual was getting lost in the society. To Mill this increasing regulation and elimination of the individual was a wrong and harmful development. He believed that the progress of society depended largely on the originality and energy of the individual. He, therefore, becomes a great advocate of individual freedom.

According to J.S. Mill, liberty means absence of restraints. He believes that an individual has two aspects to his life: an individual aspect and social aspects. The actions of the individual may be divided into two categories, i.e.

1. Self-Regarding activities and
2. Other regarding activities. With regard to activities in which he alone is concerned, his liberty of action is complete and should not be regulated by the state. However, in action of the individual which effects the society his action can be justifiably regulated by the state or society. In his *On Liberty*, J.S. Mill wrote thus: the sole end for which mankind are warranted individually or collectively in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their members is self-preservation. That is the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any members of a civilized community against his will is to prevent harm to other.

Mill defended the right of the individual freedom. In its negative sense, it meant that society had no right to coerce an unwilling individual, except for self defense. In its positive sense it means that grant of the largest and the greatest amount of freedom for the pursuit of individuals creative impulses and energies and for self- development. If there was a clash between the opinion of the individual and that of the community, it was the individual who was the ultimate judge, unless the community could convince him without resorting to threat and coercion.

Mill laid down the grounds for justifiable interference. Any activity that pertained to the individual alone represented the space over which no coercive interference either from the government or from other people, was permissible. The realm which pertained to the society or the public was the space in which coercion could be used to make the individual conform to some standard of conduct. The distinction between the two areas was stated by the distinction Mill made between self regarding and other regarding actions, a distinction made originally by Bentham. Mill in his *On Liberty* wrote thus: "The only part of the conduct of any one for which is amenable to society, is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right, absolute. Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign".

Mill defended the right of individuality, which meant the right of choice. As for self-regarding actions were concerned, he explained why coercion would be detrimental to self development. First, the evils of coercion far outweighed the good achieved. Second, individuals were so diverse in their needs and capacities for happiness that coercion would be futile. Since the person was the best judge of his own interests, therefore he had the information and the incentive to achieve them. Third, since diversity was in itself good, other things being equal it should be encouraged. Last, freedom was the most important requirement in the life of a rational person. Hence, he made a strong case for negative liberty, and the liberal state and liberal society were essential prerequisites.

Mill contended that society could limit individual liberty to prevent harm to other people. He regarded as theory of conscience, liberty to express and publish one's opinions, liberty to live as one pleased and freedom of association as essential for a meaningful life and for the pursuit of one's own good. His defiance of freedom of thought and expression was one of the most powerful and eloquent expositions in the western intellectual traditions. The early liberals defended liberty for the sake of efficient government whereas for Mill liberty has good in itself for it helped in the development of humane, civilized moral person. In the opinion of Prof. Sabine, "liberty was beneficial both to society that permits them and to the individual that enjoys them".

According to Mill, individuality means power or capacity for critical enquiry and responsible thought. It means self-development and the expression of free will. He stressed absolute liberty of conscience, belief and expression for they were crucial to human progress. Mill offered two arguments for liberty of expression in the service of truth; a) the dissenting opinion could be true and its suppression would rob mankind of useful knowledge, and b) (even if the opinion was false, it would strengthen the correct view by challenging it).

For Mill all creative faculties and the great goods of life could develop only through freedom and experiments in living. On Liberty constituted the most persuasive and convincing defense of the principle of individual liberty ever written. Happiness, for Mill was the ability of the individual to discover his innate powers and develop these while exercising his human abilities of autonomous thought and action. Liberty was regarded as a fundamental prerequisite for leading a good, worthy and dignified life.

Mill clarified his position on liberty by defending three specific liberties, the liberty of thought and expression including the liberty of speaking and publishing, the liberty of action and that of association. Mill wrote thus: 'If all mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind.' Mill provided some reasons for the freedom of expression. For Mill since the dominant ideas of a society usually emanate from the class interests of that society's ascendant class, the majority opinion may be quite far from the truth or from the social interest. Human beings, according to Mill are fallible creatures- and their certainty that the opinion they hold is true is justified only when their opinion is constantly opposed to contrary opinions.

When comes to the liberty of action Mill asserted a very simple principle: the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number is self protection..... The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others.

Mill defended freedom of association on three grounds. First 'when the thing to be done is likely to be done better by individuals than by government. Speaking generally, there is no one fit to conduct any business or to determine how or by whom it shall be conducted as those who are personally interested in it. Second, allowing individuals to get together to do something, even if they do not do it as well as the government might have done it is better for the mental education of these individuals. The right of association becomes a 'practical part of the political education of a free people taking them out of the narrow circle of personal and family selfishness and accustoming them to the comprehension of joint concerns habituating them to act from public or semi-public motives, and guide their conduct by aims which unite instead of isolating them from one another. Further, government operations tend to be everywhere alike, with individuals and voluntary associations, on the contrary there are varied experiments and endless diversity of experience. Thus Mill wanted individuals to constantly better themselves morally, mentally and materially. Individuals improving themselves would naturally lead to a better and improved society.

Mill's doctrine of liberty has been subjected to severe criticisms from different corners. Sir Ernest Barker made an interesting observation when he remarked that Mill was a prophet of an empty liberty and an abstract individual'. Mill had no clear cut theory and philosophy of rights through which alone the concept of liberty attains a concrete meaning. Ernest Barker's observation followed from the interpretation that the absolute statements on liberty like the rights of one individual against the rest was not substantiated when one assessed Mill's writings in their totality. For instance, his compartmentalization between self-regarding and other regarding actions, and the tensions between his tilt towards welfarism which conflicted with individualism were all indications of this incompleteness. But the point Barker ignored was the fact that the tension that emerged in Mill was an inevitable consequence of attempting to create a realistic political theory which attempted to extend the frontiers of liberty as much as possible. In fact, no political thinker including the contemporary thinkers like John Rawls, Robert Nozick etc are free from this inevitable tension.

MODULE V

EDMUND BURKE (1729-1797)

Edmund Burke is considered as the most important conservative political thinker and though there were conservatives before him conservatism as a school of political theory, began with him. Though there is near unanimity about his brilliance there is no consensus about him in terms of political categorisation. Berlin described him as an ultra conservative while O' Brien viewed him as a liberal and pluralist opponent of the French Revolution. Harold Laski called him a liberal because of his sympathetic attitude to the USA, Irish and Indian causes. Some saw him as a progressive conservative, for he supported political and economic progress within the framework of England's established institutions. There are liberal as well as conservative elements as evident by his support to the American revolution and his opposition to the French Revolution.

Edmund Burke was born in Dublin in 1729, the son of a successful British protestant attorney. His mother was a Catholic who did not change her faith and Burkes Catholic connection provided him with an early education in practical politics. Although Catholics formed the vast majority of the Irish population, they were cruelly oppressed by the ruling Protestant English aristocracy. Though Burke came to identify himself ultimately with England, his Irish background and experience always remained a powerful element in his outlook and sympathies.

In 1750 Burke went to London to prepare himself for the legal profession. But his heart was in literature and politics rather than in law. Burke never composed a systematic treatise of politics like Hobbes' Leviathan or Locke's Two treatises of Government, partly because he was a busy parliamentarian and partly because he needed a concrete issue around which he could develop his general principles. His political ideas cannot be found in one place but have to be gathered from his books, speeches, essays and letters, although the Reflections will always occupy first place.

In 1756 Burke published his first work A Vindication of Natural Society. A short essay, the Vindication contains nevertheless most of the key ideas of Burke, developed more exhaustively in his later and more elaborate, writings. His next work, A Philosophical Sublime and Beautiful (1757) was the only theoretical work that he attempted, inspired by the writings of Locke and Montesquieu. Burke joined politics and got elected to parliament in December 1765. His greatest success lay in oratory and he was regarded as one of the greatest orators of his time.

CONSERVATIVE REFORMISM

Conservatism, as philosophy dedicated to the defence of an established order or an attitude with a defensive strategy to maintain the present statusquo Conservatism, as a mood, prefers liberty over equality; tradition over changes, history over politics, past over present and ordered society over society demanding changes. Conservatism is a negative philosophy which preaches resistance to or at least wary suspicion of change. It is more than an attitude of mind or an approach to life or a natural disposition of the human mind.

Burke's political ideas were spread over his speeches and pamphlets, which originated in response to specific events. He had no philosophy beyond them and had little knowledge of the history of philosophy.

Burke, as a conservative reformer was equally opposed to Jacobitism and Jacobinism. He was for a cautious improvement in the working of the old established institutions like church, property etc. He was always a reformer and never a revisionary, always a conservative and never a Tory. He sums up his own view of reform in the statement 'the disposition to preserve and the ability to improve taken together would be my standard of a statesman'. He sharply distinguishes reform from innovation, which generally derives from a selfish temper and confined views. Whatever innovation or 'hot reformation' can accomplish is bound to be cured, harsh indigested, mixed with imprudence and injustice, and contrary to human nature and human institutions. True reform which can be brought about only by disinterested statesman, must be early in the interest of government, and temperate in the interest of the people, because only temperate reforms are permanent and allow room for growth.

As a true conservative reformer, Burke was highly critical of all revolutions. Every revolution contains some evil, Burke says, as it inevitably destroys part of the moral capital, the good will of the community and the moral capital of future generations should be considered as a trust that must not be treated highly. The English Revolution of 1688(The Glorious Revolution) was a revolution not made but prevented' because the nation was on the defensive seeking to preserve its institutions rather than to subvert or destroy them. The monarchy was continued, and the nation kept" the same ranks, the same order, the same privileges, the same franchises, the same rules for property, the same subordinations", and, above all, the Revolution was followed by happy settlement.

Burke thought that the British constitution was as good as it could possibly be and, therefore, conservative by nature as he was; he opposed all attempts to lower the suffrage or to make any changes in the structure of the parliament. In his political reform, he would neither initiate foreign political institutions, nor follow abstract reason but would accept the guidance of the 'rules of equity and utility, founded on and preserving the rights and liabilities which exist'. Burke believes that right to property is a fundamental right of all human beings in the world. In fact, property was, to him, the right index to power and therefore, property rights must be protected and safeguarded. Any reforms or changes must not harm any individuals and the method of change must be regulated by past experience. Burke laid more emphasis on preservation than on reform, for, he believed that a state given to radical changes was courting disaster". As a political reformer, Burke combined in himself devotion to liberty with respect for authority: hope for the future with reverence for the past ---sane conservatism with cautious reform.'

As a true conservative thinker Burke argues that rights are inherently social rather than individual because human beings are by nature social creatures. They are not individualists who leave the state of nature and enter society simply for purposes of securing their natural rights. He insists the state of civil society----- is a state of nature. Society is peoples natural state and any doctrine of rights, says Burke, must be premised upon this fact. Such socially recognised rights and institutions Burke calls prescriptive because they are given or prescribed by society. Thus speaking of his own political system, Burke states that "Our constitution is a prescriptive constitution; it is a constitution whose sole authority is that it has existed time out of mind".

Repudiation of Fundamental Revolutionary Principles

Burke contested the fundamental principles of the French Revolution such as the doctrines of natural equality, popular sovereignty, right of revolution, majority government and written constitutions. He was a firm upholder of the inequality of man and therefore of the divisions of society into the ruler and the ruled. Burke did not believe in popular sovereignty and would not allow the common people to participate in politics actively. In His Reflections on the French Revolution he vigorously denounced the character and content of philosophy of Revolution. According to him, the Revolution was undermining the existence of the state and the society and imperilling the very life of the French nation. Burke predicated the course of the revolution with remarkable foresight as leading to a republic, anarchy, war and military dictatorship .

CRITIQUE OF NATURAL RIGHTS AND SOCIAL CONTRACT

Burke was highly critical of Lockean doctrine of natural law, the rights of the individual and the separation of church and the state. The only laws that he recognised were the laws of God and the laws of a civilised society. For Burke, any parallel between the English Revolution of 1688 and the French Revolution of 1789 was totally misleading. The former was an acceptable and desirable change within a constitutional framework, whereas the latter was based on a rationalist and untested theory of the Rights of Man. It was an attempt to create a new order by making a total break with past practices.

Burke did not reject the argument of human rights except that he sought to rescue the real right from the imagined ones. He charged the doctrine of natural rights with metaphysical abstraction. Though Burke's criticism of Natural Rights seemed similar to that of Bentham, there were significant differences. Burke's conception of human well being was not hedonistic as in the case of Bentham Further, the philosophy of natural rights based on the new principles of liberty and equality was not conducive to the establishment of order.

Burke's views on religion and state exhibited both liberal and conservative perceptions. He defended traditional practices of the established church, unless there was an intolerable abuse' He equated attack on the established church of England as tantamount to an attack on England's constitutional order. He was convinced that the established church would foster peace and dissuaded civil discord.

According to Burke, state "is a partnership in all science, a partnership in all art, a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead and those who are to be born. Each contract of a particular state is but a clause in the great primeval contract of external natures, connecting the visible and invisible world, according to a fixed compact sanctioned by the inviolable oath which holds all physical and moral natures each in their appointed place".

Supporter of Reforms

Burke was known as a great reformer. Perhaps his most notable effort in this regard was his attempt to reform British rule in India. It must be kept in mind that Great Britain was at this time a major imperial power and did not always treat its colonies benevolently. In India, British rule was particularly harsh and no more so than under the governorship of Warren Hastings because of Hasting's violation of human rights, he attempted to have the man impeached. What particularly infuriated Burke was Hasting's assertion that the Indians were slaves, subhumans, and that he could therefore do as he pleased with them. In his impeachment speech to parliament, Burke asserted against Hasting's a principle that any Lockean or modern day liberal would commend. Burke says the laws of morality are the same everywhere..... and there is no action . of oppression in England that is not an act..... of oppression in Europe, Asia, Africa, and all over the world".

This same attitude about the universality of moral law led Burke to defend the Irish Catholics from unjust British laws directed against them. Again, Burke is best known for his defense of the American colonies. Taking an apparently Lockean position he agreed with the colonists that parliament had no right to tax them without their consent'

Critique of French Revolution

Burke's *Reflections on the revolution in France* (1790) was the outstanding event in his literary as well, as political career. What had started out as a discussion of the French Revolution became a searching enquiry into the nature of reform and revolution in general, and out of this inquiry emerged the bible of modern conservatism. According to Burke, the French Revolution was not the result of deep seated historical conflicts and forces, but of wrong doctrines of philosophers who were animated by fanatical atheism, and of vile ambitions of politicians who were driven by opportunist lust for power. Burke is particularly vehement in his denunciation of French philosophers and men of letters.

Burke was quick enough to realise that the French Revolution was more than an internal French affair, that it was a "revolution of doctrine and theoretic dogma' and he attacked the state that emerged from it as a college of armed fanatics, for the propagation of the principles of assassination, robbery, fraud faction, oppression and impiety". Every revolution contains some evil, Burk says, as it inevitably destroys part of the moral capital, the good will of the community, and the moral capital of future generations should be considered as a trust that must not be treated lightly. The English Revolution of 1688 was "a revolution , not made, but prevented" because the nation was on the defensive, seeking to reserve its institutions rather than to subvert or destroy them. The monarchy was continued, and the nation kept' the same ranks, the same orders, the same privileges the same franchises the same rules for property the same subordinates' and above all the revolution was followed by a happy settlement. Burke contrasts the English revolution of 1688 with the French Revolution of 1789 in which he sees but destruction , anarchy and terror.

In *Reflections*, Burke made a detailed criticism of both the theoretical and practical aspects of the revolution. He pointed out the dangers of abstract theorising, but was realistic enough to provide an alternative mode of social progression. *Reflections* was written during the revolutionary period. Unlike Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821) and Louis Gabriel de Bonald (1754-1840), who out rightly defended

orthodoxy and absolutism. Burke provided a framework for change with continuity, for a “state without the means of same change is without the means of its conservation---- without such means it might even risk the taste of that part of the constitution which it wishes to most religiously preserve. As Burke pointed out, these two principles of conservation and correction operated in England during the critical periods of the restoration and the revolution when England did not have a king. But in both these critical times the entire edifice of old order was not replaced by a totally new one.

Burke criticised Jacobinism for his whole sale attack on established religion, traditional constitutional arrangements and the institution of property which he saw as the source of political wisdom in a country. He did not support every things that was ancient, only those that held society together by providing order and stability. Burke’s main audience in the Reflections was the aristocracy and the upper middle class of English society, which he perceived to be the upholders of stability and order. He challenged the English ruling class to respond appropriately to the plight of the French queen, otherwise it would reflect lack of chivalry and demonstrate that the British political order was not itself superior to that of the continent.

Burke further argued that the period of the Magna carta to the Bill of Rights was one of slow but steady consolidation reflecting continuity and change. This enabled British constitution to preserve and provide unity with the contest of diversity. Inheritance was cherished as a political necessity for without it both conservation and transmission were not possible. Pointing out the enormous difference between the patterns of change in Britain and France, Burke said that in sharp contrast to the process of gradual change in British constitutional evolution, the French attempt had been to achieve a complete break with the past with a new emphasis on equality and participation. With this inherent belief in natural aristocracy, he debunked the very attempt to create a society of equals. Burke emphasised the necessity of well ordered state to be ruled by a combination of ability and property. Such an order would be inherently based on inequality. He linked the perpetuation of family property with that of societies. There was no place for either proportionate equality or democratic equality in his preference for aristocratic rule. Like Adam Smith (1723-1790), he stressed the importance of preserving and protecting property. He favoured accumulation of wealth, rights of inheritance and the need to enfranchise property owners. While Burke was socially conservative, he was a liberal in economics, the two being fused together uneasily.

Burke analysed the French revolution when the revolutionaries seized control of the capital and stormed the Bastille in July 1789. By 1790, the situation in France stabilised when the assembly of deputies declared martial law to prevent disorder. The French Revolution generated a great deal of debate in England . (Burke’s Reflection itself began as a letter to Thomas Paine’s Rights of Man)

Assessment

Burke’s importance as a political thinker lies in his insistence on the importance of the actually existing institutions and on the evolutionary nature of any reforms to be made in them. These reforms must be based on the realisation of the complexities of human and political life for which pure philosophy would not do. He was pragmatic and utilitarian in his views and historical in his method.

Burke used the historical perspective to understand politics. He considered state as a product of historical growth, and compared it to a living organism. In his well known work, 'Reflections on French Revolutions' he attacked the theory of natural rights, absolute liberty, equality, democracy, popular sovereignty, general will and abstract principles of change a revolution based on reason. He is known as a "philosophic conservative, opposed equally to undercharging reaction and to revolutionary change. Revolution, according to Burke, was undesirable because it would sweep away the sound principles of political action and discard the guidance of nature. ; Thus Reflections became the bible of conservatism to this day. Unlike his predecessors, Burke argued the French revolutionaries were attempting to impose strict rational a priori standards of natural right without any consideration for the real nature of society and the real needs of human beings.

GEORGE WILHELM FRIEDRICH HEGEL (1770-1831)

George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel and all the other important German thinkers, Kant, Fichte etc were the children of the French Revolution. Compared to both England and France, Germany was much more backward and feudal, consisting of more than 300 states linked to the Holy Roman Empire, with leadership provided by Francis I of Austria. It came to an end when Napoleon defeated this 1000 years old empire and subsequently in 1806 defeated another powerful German state, Prussia. Hegel was a resident of Prussia at the time of the defeat.

Hegel is the most methodologically self conscious of all philosophers in the western tradition His system encompasses philosophy, metaphysics, religion art, ethics, history and politics- In its range alone his work is impressive and of a truly encyclopaedic character. His position in Germany was so powerful that even the most ferocious attack against orthodox German philosophy that of Karl Marx, sprang largely from Hegelian assumptions.

Hegel was born in Stuttgart on 27 August 1770, the eldest son of a middle class family. His father was a civil servant, and most of his relatives were either teachers or Lutheran ministers. As a student, Hegel's major interest was theology But he soon gravitated towards philosophy. After completing his studies he accepted the position of a family tutor with a wealthy family in Switzerland from 1793-1796. This was followed by a similar position at Bern and Frankfurt from 1797 to 1800. In 1806 the French armies defeated Prussia at the decisive battle of Jena and Hegel saw Napoleon ride through Jena. During the French revolution he was an ardent sympathiser of Jacobin radicalism. As Napoleon's star rose, Hegel profoundly admired him for his genius and power. IN 1818, three years after the defeat of Napoleon, Hegel was invited to come to the university of Berlin, and he stayed there until his death in 1831. He became the dominant figure at the university, and his influence extended over all Germany. In the last phase of his life, Hegel was a follower and admirer of the Prussian police state, just as he had previously admired Jacobinism and Napoleon.

Hegel was the founder of modern idealism and the greatest influence in the first half of the 18th century, when the entire academic community in Germany was divided between the Hegelians the left Hegelians and the right Hegelians. He innovated the dialectic and the theory of self- realisation. Hegel wrote extensively on various aspects of political philosophy. The major works of Hegel

include the Phenomenology of Spirit. (1807) Science of Logic (1812-1816) Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences (1817) Philosophy of Right (1812), Philosophy of History (1837), Philosophy of Law (1821).

The best statement of Hegel's political ideas is to be found in his Philosophy of Law. It expresses his conception of freedom, natural and social, which provides the key to an understanding of his political thought. In his writings, Hegel combined the historical sense of Vico and Montesquieu with the philosophical eminence of Kant and Fichte. He was also influenced by the writing of Plato and Aristotle. The Keynote of the Hegelian system is evolution, the evolution of Idea by a dialectical process.

IDEALISM

In the history of political ideas there are two major schools of thought about the nature of reality - idealism and naturally, rationalism and empiricism. According to the idealist school, of which Hegel is a major exponent, true knowledge of every thing in the world - material and non material is deduced from the idea of the thing. In other words, according to idealist thinkers the idea of the thing is more important than the thing itself. Therefore, what is real and permanent is the idea of the thing not the thing as such. This is because that physical world is constantly in a state of flux and change but the idea is permanent. The knowledge of actually existing thing is relative and hence imperfect.

Hegel starts with the assumption that the universe is a coherent whole. In this organic unity what he variously calls the Idea or Spirit or Reason or the Divine Mind, is the only reality. Every thing, including matter and the external world, is the creation of the Idea or Spirit or Reason. Hence it is true to say that Reason is the sovereign of the world' It is the nature of this Spirit or Reason, Hegel tells us to know all things. At the beginning of the world - process the spirit or reason does not, in fact, know anything; its nature is as little achieved as is the nature of Aristotle's man before he enters the polis. As Hegel puts it: The truth is the whole The whole, however, is merely essential nature reaching its completeness through the process of its own development' .

According to Hegel, history is the process by which the spirit passes from knowing nothing to full knowledge of itself, is the increasing revelation of the purposes of the Rational Mind. "The history of the world therefore, says Hegel, presents us with a rational process". The spirit on the way to its goal makes many experiments. According to Hegel, the rational is real and the real is rational. It is to be noted that he is using real here in the sense of the important or the fundamental. In his theory of state he rejects Fichte's teaching that only the ideal state is rational whereas existing states are irrational, and he maintains on the contrary that actual existing states are rational and are accordingly to be treated with all reverence.

Hegelian idealism is often referred to as absolute idealism because it provided us with a set of categories in terms of which all human experiences of the past and the present can be understood. There is another dimension of Hegelian idealism. This may be called idealist interpretation of History. Hegel believes that all changes in society, economy, polity and culture take place because of development of ideas. Thus Hegelian idealism sees a close relationship between subject and the object.

DIALECTICS

The distinctive feature of Hegel's philosophical system is his dialectical method which he described as the logic of passion. Hegel borrowed this method from Socrates who is the first exponent of this method. The word 'dialectic' is derived from the Greek word *dialego* which means to discuss or debate. Dialectic simply means to discuss or conversation. Socrates believed that one can arrive at the truth only by constant questioning. So dialectics was the process of exposing contradictions by discussion so as ultimately to arrive at truth.

Hegel's dialectic method played major role in this political philosophy. By applying the principles of a thesis, anti-thesis and a synthesis, Hegel's major thrust was to solve the problem of contradiction. It attempted to reconcile the many apparent contradictory positions and theorems developed by earlier thinkers. As a method of interpretation, it attempted to reconcile the various different traits developed in the past.

Having taken a clue from Socrates, Hegel argued that absolute idea or the spirit, in search of self-realisation moves from being to non being to becoming. In other words, an idea move from a thesis to anti thesis until a synthesis of the two is found. As Prof. C.I. Wayper has rightly pointed out "in the Hegelian dialectics there will be a struggle between thesis and anti thesis until such time as a synthesis is found which will preserve what is true in both thesis and anti thesis until such time as a synthesis is found which will preserve what is true in both thesis and antithesis, the synthesis in this turn, becoming a new thesis and so on until the Idea is at last enthroned in perfection". 'The thesis' 'Despotism' for instance, will call into being 'democracy', the antithesis and from the clash between them the synthesis 'Constitutional Monarchy' which contains the best of both results. Or the thesis family produces its antithesis, bourgeois society, and from the resultant clash the synthesis, the state emerges in which thesis and antithesis are raised to a higher power and reconciled.

The synthesis will not, Hegel insists, be in any sense a compromise between thesis and anti thesis. Both thesis and anti thesis are fully present in the synthesis, but in a more perfect form in which their temporary opposition has been perfectly reconciled. Thus the dialectic can never admit that anything that is true can never be lost. It goes on being expressed, but in ever new and more perfect ways. Contradiction or the dialectic, is therefore a self generating process - it is very moving principle of the world'.

According to Hegel, dialectics is the only true method' for comprehending pure thought. He described dialectics as the indwelling tendency towards by which the one sidedness and limitation of the predicates of understanding is seen in its true light --- the dialectical principle constitutes the life and soul of scientific progress, the dynamic which alone gives immanent connect and necessity to the body of sciences.

In the Phenomenology, Hegel gave an example of its use in human consciousness, but a more comprehensive political use was found in the Philosophy of Right in which the dialectical process reflected the evolution of world history from the Greek world to Hegel's time. For Hegel, there was a dialectical pattern in history, with the state representing the ultimate body, highly complex formed as a result of synthesis of contradictory elements at different levels of social life..

However, the relationship between contradiction and synthesis was within concepts shaped by human practices. Marx too discerned a dialectical pattern in history but then understood contradictions between the means and relations of production at different stages of history.

STATE

The most important contribution of Hegel to political philosophy is his theory of state. Hegel regarded the state as the embodiment of the Geist or the Universal Mind. The state was the representative of the Divine Idea. His theory of state is rooted in the axiom: what is rational is real and what is real is rational. For Hegel, all states are rational in so far as they represent the various states of unfolding of Reason. He considered the state as march of God on earth or the ultimate embodiment of reason.

State, for Hegel, is the highest manifestation of reason because it emerges as a synthesis of family (thesis) and civil society or bourgeois society (antithesis). The family is too small for the adequate satisfaction of man's wants, and as children grow up they leave it for a wider world. That world is what Hegel calls the world of bourgeois society and it is the antithesis which is called into being by the original thesis, the family. Unlike the family, which is a unity regarded by its very members as being more real than themselves, bourgeois society is a host of independent men and women held together only by ties of contract and self-interest. Whereas the characteristic of the family is mutual love, the characteristic of bourgeois society is universal competition. The thesis, the family, a unity held together by love, knowing no differences, is thus confronted by the antithesis, bourgeois society, an aggregate of individuals held apart by competition knowing no vanity, even though it is manifestly struggling towards a greater unity which it has nevertheless not yet attained. The synthesis, which preserves what is best in thesis and antithesis, which swallows up neither family nor bourgeois society, but which gives unity and harmony to them is the state. The essence of modern state, according to Hegel, "is that universal is bound up with the full freedom of particularity and the welfare of individuals, that to interest of the family and of bourgeois society must connect itself with the state, but also universality of the state's purpose cannot advance without the specific knowledge and will of the particular, which must maintain its rights.

FEATURES OF HEGELIAN STATE

There are several characteristics of Hegelian state. To begin with it is no exaggeration to say that it is divine. It is the highest embodiment that the spirit has reached in its progress through the ages. It is the 'divine Idea as it exists on earth' It can be called the march of God on earth' It follows that Hegel makes no attempt, as does Rousseau, to square the circle and admit the possibility of a social contract.

The state also is an end in itself It is not only the highest expression to which the spirit has yet attained, it is the final embodiment of spirit on earth' There can thus be no spiritual evolution beyond the state, any more than there can be any physical evolution beyond.

The state, too, is a whole which is far greater than the parts which compose it and which have significance only in it. "All the worth which the human being possess", Hegel writes in the Philosophy of History, "all spiritual reality, he possess" only through the state". Individuals, therefore, must obviously be completely subordinated to the state. It has the highest right over the

individual, whose highest duty is to be a member of the state. In the words of Prof. Sabine, if the individuals in Hegel's world is nothing the state is all. In his *Philosophy of History* (published posthumously in 1837) Hegel defines the state as the 'realisation of freedom'.

The state is the actually existing, realised moral life and all the worth which the human being possesses- all spiritual reality he possesses only through the state. The individual has moral value only because he is part of the state, which is the complete actualisation or reason because the state is actualised reason and spirit, Hegel says, the law of the state is a manifestation of objective spirit, and only that which obeys law is free', for it obeys itself.

The state, moreover, is unchecked by any moral law, for it itself is the creator of morality. This can be seen clearly in its internal affairs and in its external relations. Firstly it lays down what shall be the standard of morality for its individual citizens. Secondly, the state can recognise no obligation other than its own safety in its relations with other states. In the *Ethics* he writes categorically: The state is the self- certain, absolute mind which acknowledges no abstract rules of good and bad, shameful and mean, craft and deception'. The state, according to Hegel, is the truest interpreter of the tradition of the community.

The state, Hegel insists, is a means of enlarging not restricting freedom; Freedom, he adds is the outstanding characteristics of modern state. He criticises the Greeks because they did not recognise that the state must rest on respect for personality. He believes that the state will help men to fulfill themselves'.

According to Hegel, rights are derived from the state and therefore no man can have any right against the state. The state has an absolute end itself. Prof. L.T. Hobhouse has beautifully summed up the Hegelian concept of state when he wrote that the state "as a greater being, a spirit, a super personality entity, in which the individuals with their private conscience or claims of right, their happiness or misery are merely subordinate elements'. As Prof. C.E.M. Joad has rightly pointed out, just as the personal abilities of all its individuals in the state are transcended by and merged in the personality of the state. So the moral relations which each citizen has to each other citizen are merged in or transcended by the social morality which is vested in the state. Hegel regarded the state as a mystic transcendental unity the mysterious union of all with the greater whole which embraces all other institutions of social life.

The fundamental law of the state is the constitution. He opposes the democratic idea of the constitution as an instrument of government a charter and compact consciously framed for desired ends. The constitution should not be regarded as something made, even though it has come into being in time. Because the state is "the march of God through the world", the constitution of the state is not something to be tampered with by ordinary mortals. Going back to the history of the state, Hegel finds that its origin "involves imperious lordship on the one hand, instinctive submission on the other". This leadership principle, so characteristic of fascism, is also stressed by Hegel in his discussion on the merits of the different types of constitution- democracy, aristocracy and monarchy. Because of his preference for monarchy, Hegel rejects the sovereignty of the people, especially if the term implies opposition to the sovereignty of the monarchy. In the words of Prof. William Ebenstein, Hegel anticipates the corporate organisation of the modern fascist state by his emphasis

that the individuals should be politically articulate only as a member of a social group or class, and not just a citizen as in the liberal democracies’.

FREEDOM

The concept of freedom occupies a prominent place in the political philosophy of Hegel. According to Hegel, ‘the history of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of freedom’. The spirit, he says, is free, for it has its centre in itself and self-containedness is the very essence of freedom. Matter, on the other hand, is not free, for it is subject to the law of gravity and always tends to a point outside itself. Therefore the development of history is thus the history of freedom. Human history culminates in the state in which the spirit finds its final embodiment. Therefore, the perfect state is the truly free state and the citizen who gives perfect willing obedience to the perfect laws of the perfect state has perfect freedom. The individual is also an embodiment of the spirit, though not of course as perfect an embodiment as the state.

Hegel’s doctrine of freedom was based on the old Greek notion of an individual finding his true personality and his freedom in the state. This represents a reaction against the notion of freedom born of natural rights which characterised the revolutionary era. Man had no inalienable rights and his freedom was a gift of the state. The state not only secures the freedom of the individual but enlarges it. For Hegel, freedom of the individual is a social phenomenon and there can be no freedom in the pre-social state of nature. Freedom is self-realisation which is possible only in the state through the media and institutions maintained by the state. True freedom is determined by reason, not the reason of the individual as with Kant but the reason of the community as embodied in the laws of the state.

Because the state is actualised reason and spirit, Hegel says, the law of the state is manifestation of objective spirit, and “only that which obeys law is free”, for it obeys itself. Hegel rejects the liberal concept of freedom as absence of restraints and call such freedom formal, subjective, abstracted from its essential objects and constraints or restrictions put on the impulses, desires and passions of the individual are not, Hegel maintains, a limitation of freedom but its indispensable conditions because such compulsion forces man to adjust his behaviour to the higher reason of the state. According to Hegel, man’s real, substantive freedom (as distinct from mere formal freedom) thus consists in his submitting to and identifying himself with the higher rationality of state and law.

Whether man submits voluntarily to the state or has to be constrained, makes little difference, as the Hegelian concept of freedom refers, not to the mode of action - free personal choice between existing alternatives, or forcible adaptation of conduct to prescribed rules- but to the object of action. As Prof. William Ebenstein has rightly pointed out ‘if man acts in harmony with the goals of the state regardless how the harmony is attained, he is free, because his action partakes of the highest form of actualised freedom- the state’. ‘On the basis of this assumption when the subjective will of man submits to laws, the contradiction between liberty and necessity vanishes.’

Hegel believes that freedom for the individual can never be the abstract and uneducated power of choice, but only the willing of what is rational, of what the spirit would desire and the power to perform it. His real will impels him to identify himself with the spirit. The spirit is embodied in the

state. Therefore it is his real will to obey the commands and dictates of the state. Indeed the dictates of the state are his real will. Thus the commands of the state give man his only opportunity to find freedom. He may obey the state because he is afraid of the consequences of disobedience. If he obeys because of fear he is not free he is still subject to alien force. But if he obeys because he wishes to, because he has consciously identified himself with the will of the state, because he has convinced himself that what the state demands he would also desire if he knew all the facts, then he is subject only to his own will and he is truly free. The state, Hegel says, is that form of reality in which the individual has and enjoys his freedom provided he recognises, believes in and wills what is common to the whole..”,

In the Philosophy of Right, Hegel formulates positive freedom in terms of self- determination. Self- determination essentially means two things;

- .1. That the self and not force out side itself determines its actions and
2. In determining itself it makes itself determinate, turning what is merely potential intended into something actual realised and organised. Self - determination is closely connected with autonomy. Hegel thinks that the very essence of the self consists in freedom. Like Rousseau and Kant, he maintains that the distinctive feature of a rational being is its freedom, more specifically, its autonomy; its power to act on universal principles.

ASSESSMENT

Karl Popper, in his major work “Open Society and its Enemies” has launched a frontal attack on Hegel as a major enemy of open society along with Plato and Karl Marx. He stressed the origins of Hegel’s historicism to three ideas developed by Aristotle:

- a. Linking individual or state development to a historical evolution;
- b. A theory of change that accepted concepts like an undeveloped essence or potentiality; and
- c. The reality or actuality of any object was reflected by change. The first one led to the historicist method, which in Hegel assumed a form of ‘Worship of history’; the second are linked the underdeveloped essence of destiny, and the third helped to formulate his theory of domination and submission, justifying the master slave relationship . As Popper has rightly pointed out, Hegel’s principle aim was “to fight against the open society, and thus to serve his employer, Frederick William of Prussia. Popper also argued that Hegel’s identification of the rational with the actual inevitably led to a philosophy of the pure politics of power, where might was right. The irrational forms of “State worship” led to the renaissance of tribalism. In the entire tradition of western political theory of over 2000 years, no other thinker aroused as much controversy about the meaning of his discourse as Hegel did Marx realized the formidable dominance of Hegelian philosophy, and compared it with the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle. He stressed that Hegel’s philosophy could be attacked only from within and not from outside. Because of this reason Marxian materialism was dialectically linked to Hegelian idealism.

Hegel’s teaching is valuable because it insists on man’s dependence on society. He is right in showing how much man is influenced by society. He made the idea of liberty richer

by showing that man's conception of it largely depends upon the institutions which have trained him and given him his education. In this his idealism is thoroughly realistic, and has been confirmed by recent psychology, which has proved how the early impressions made on our minds always remain. As C.L. Wayer has pointed out, Hegel "made politics something more than a mere compromise of interests, and that he made law something more than mere command." His whole work is valuable reminder that we would do well not to minimize the importance of natural growth of a community.

It is beyond dispute that Hegel is one of the greatest political thinkers of modern times. He exerted considerable influence on subsequent political theory, particularly Marxism and Existentialism. He has been claimed as the philosophical inspiration by both Communists and Fascists. The British idealist T. H. Green adapted Hegelianism to revise liberalism in the late 19th century

MODULE VI

KARAL MARX (1818-1883)

In the entire history of political thought, both on influence and in criticism, few political thinkers can match Karal Marx. He was truly the last of the great critics in the Western intellectual tradition. His ideas exerted a decisive influence on all aspects of human endeavour, and transformed the study of history and society. He was the first thinker to bring together the various strands of socialist thought into both a coherent world view and an impassioned doctrine of struggle. Along with Friedrich Engels (1820-1895) with whom he shared an unparalleled partnership, Marx dissected 19th century capitalism as scientific socialism or Marxism. Marxism is not only a critical appraisal of capitalism, but also a viable or credible alternative to it. Marx brought about a sea change in the entire methodology of the social sciences. He was “a brilliant agitator and polemicist, a profound economist, a great sociologist, and incomparable historian”.

Karal Marx was born in March 5, 1818 in a predominantly Catholic city of Trier in the Rhineland in a Jewish family. Marx attended the University of Berlin for several years where he studied jurisprudence, philosophy, and history. Young Marx was a brilliant student who read law and eventually took doctorate in philosophy with dissertation on ancient atomism. He quickly became engaged in political activities and in 1842 joined the staff of a democratic news paper in Cologne. In the following year the paper was suppressed by the Prussian Government and Marx went to Paris, then the European headquarters of radical movements. In Paris he met Proudhon, the leading French Socialist thinker, Bakunin, the Russian anarchist, and Friedrich Engels, a Rhinelander like Marx, and soon to become his life long companion and close collaborator. Engels was the son of a German textile manufacture with business interests, in Germany and England, and he was sent by his father to Manchester in 1842. His conditions of the Working Class in English (1844) was a remarkably penetrating study of drabness and poverty in the midst of luxurious wealth, and Engels was the first to draw Marx's attention to England as a laboratory in which industrial capitalism could be most accurately observed. In 1845 Marx was expelled from France through the intervention of the Prussian Government and he went to Brussels, another center of political refugees from all over Europe. There Marx composed with the aid of Engels, the Communist Manifesto (1848), the most influential of all his writings, a pamphlet that has made history, inspired devotion and hatred, and divided mankind more profoundly than any other political document. Marx participated in the revolutions of 1848 in France and Germany, and early in 1849 he was expelled again by the Prussian government, and forbidden to return to his native land.

He went to London in the late summer of 1849, soon followed by Engels, Marx had planned to stay in England for only a few weeks, but he stayed there until his death in 1883. Marx's writings show little penetration of English political ideas and ways of thought, and his lack of insight into the forces and innovations of English politics would have been little better or worse had he stayed in Germany all his life. By contrast, his writings demonstrate a profound knowledge of the English economic system based on detailed and painstaking research.

Marx's principal doctrines were not new; but he greatly amplified a systematised older ideas, putting them into new and effective communications. He attempted to show that a socialist

programme must be based upon a systematic interpretation of social evaluations and a critical analysis of the existing system of production and exchange. His design was to show how a socialist community is to be built upon capitalist foundations. Marx described his socialism as scientific.

Marx inherited and integrated three legacies, German philosophy, French political thought and English economics in his theoretical foundation. From the German intellectual traditions, he borrowed the Hegelian method of dialectics and applied it to the material world. From the French revolutionary tradition he accepted the idea that change motivated by a messianic idea was not only desirable, but also feasible. He applied his method with a view to bringing about large scale change within the industrialised capitalist economy of which England was the classical model in the 19th century. Marx interpreted liberalism and classical economics as articulating and defending the interests of the middle class. He proposed to create a social philosophy that was in tune with the aspirations of the rising proletariat. Like Hegel, he looked upon the French Revolution as an indication of the demise of feudalism, but while Hegel contended that the revolution would culminate in the emergence of nation states, Marx looked upon it as a prelude to a more fundamental and complete revolution beyond the nation state. The French Revolution, which brought the middle class to the forefront with the destruction of the nobility, was essentially a political revolution.

Marx has written so extensively on various issues of history, economics, philosophy, society and politics. As Prof. William Ebenstein has rightly pointed out, Marx's analysis of the capitalist system has influenced the making of history even more than the writing of history. During his student days, Marx was attracted to Hegelian Idealism but he soon shifted his interest to humanism and ultimately to scientific socialism. The books, articles, pamphlets of Marx were written during three decades from the early forties to the early seventies. Major works of Marx included Critique of Political Economy, The Communist Manifesto, Das Capital. Although the first volume of his great work Das Capital was published in 1867, the second and third volumes were edited after his death by Engels from the vast amount of manuscript material that he left. Marx's political philosophy has to be gathered from many incidental remarks and comments in his writing and letters, as he never wrote a systematic statements on the basic assumptions of his thought. In the preface to his Critique of Political Economy(1859), Marx briefly states his general philosophy of history, based on the thesis that "the anatomy of civil society is to be found in political economy".

Marx, before the Paris commune, never described himself as a socialist, let alone a scientific socialist. He always identified himself as a communist. There are good reasons for this. Socialism pre-dated Marx; it was already flourishing on French soil when Marx arrived in Paris in 1843, as a movement which advocated economic well being and legislative protection for the workers, universal suffrage, civil rights of association and freedom of opinion and cultural opportunities for the poor. Marx believed that socialism, like Proudhonism, was by definition utopian and doctrinaire, and that it was by the same token a false brother to communism; he thought that for this reason its very name should be avoided. Marxism made its bid after the socialist movement had already become organised, conscious, active, doctrinaire and French, which does much to explain the relative a slowness of the penetration of Marxism into the French radical tradition.

Base – Super Structure Relations

In order to understand the Marxist position on the origin and nature of the state, it is essential to distinguish between the foundation or base of society and the structure above its foundation or the super structure. In this building-like metaphor it is assumed that the character of the superstructure will depend on the character of the base. The forces of production constitute the basis of all social relationship; they belong to the base or sub structure. Legal and political structure, religion, morals and social customs belong to the superstructure of society, rests upon the prevailing economic conditions. In the preface to his Critique of Political Economy, Karl Marx observed that “Legal relations as well as form of state..... are rooted in the material conditions of life”. Elaborating the relation between the real foundation and the super- structure, Marx further observed:” In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, these relations of production correspond to a definite state of development of their material powers of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society - the real foundation, on which rise legal and political superstructures and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual process of life.”

This distinction between the economic structure or substructure of a society and its corresponding superstructure constitutes an important element of Marxian social analysis. The economic structure of society determines the superstructure of consciousness. This is simply another way of saying that life determines consciousness. This superstructure of consciousness corresponds to legal and political institutions that are also super structural, that is , determined by the economic base of society. Thus the economic structure(class) of society determines its political structure and determines as well corresponding social and political beliefs and values.

According to Marx, this superstructure of political consciousness, and indeed the whole cultural apparatus of ideas, beliefs and values, constitutes misperceptions of social reality. Thus, while it is true that life determines consciousness, it does not determine it in ways that necessarily illustrate the true character of social life. Indeed consciousness not only mistakes the nature of social reality but also plays the role of justifying the very reality that gives rise to these misperceptions. Marx calls these forms of social misperception as “false consciousness” There are a variety of ways in which consciousness may be characterised as ideological.

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

The doctrine of dialectical materialism is one of the most important contributions of Karl Marx to the world. Karl Marx is indebted to both Hegel and Hobbes for his theory of dialectical materialism. Dialectical materialism holds that the world is by its very nature material and it develops in accordance with the laws of movement of matter. The evolution of the world is not one of Idea or Universal Spirit as held by Hegelian idealists, but the evolution of matter or material forces. Matter generates sensations, perceptions and consciousness.

Marx borrowed is dialectic method from Hegel but modified it in a fundamental way. While Hegel had applied the dialectics to explain the domain of ideas, Marx applied the dialectics to explain the material conditions of life. In the process of doing so he denounced the Hegelian philosophy of

dialectical idealism, on the one hand and the theory of Hobbesian scientific materialism on the other. 'My dialectic method, wrote Marx, is not only different from the Hegelian but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life process of human brain, i.e, process of thinking which under the name of the idea even transforms into an independent subject is the demiurgos of the real world and the real world is only the external phenomenal form of the idea. With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind and translated into forms of thought. Thus Marx contrasted his materialistic to Hegel's idealistic interpretation of history. One of Marx most famous sayings is that men's "social existence determines their consciousness and not as had been generally accepted before Marx that the consciousness of men determines their existence".

' In the dialectical materialism of Marx evolution is the development of matter from within environment helping or hindering but neither originating the evolutionary process nor capable of preventing it from reaching its inevitable goal. Matter is active and not passive and moves by and inner necessity of nature. In other words, Dialectical materialism of Marx is more interested in motion than matter, in the vital energy within matter inevitably driving it towards, perfect human society. As Engels has rightly pointed out, the dialectical method grasps things and their images, ideas essentially in their sequence, their movement, their birth and death'. This motion that dialectical materialism entails is possible by the conflict of the opposites. According to Marx, every state of history which falls short of perfection carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Each stage reached in the march to the classless society, the thesis calls into being its opposite or anti-thesis and from the clash between the two, a new synthesis and from the clash between the two, a new synthesis emerges in which what was true in both thesis and anti-thesis and from the clash between the two. A new synthesis emerges in which what was true in both thesis and anti-thesis is preserved which serves as a starting point for the whole process again until the classless society has been achieved.

Nowhere unfortunately Marx tells us what he means by materialism, But at least he makes it clear that his materialism is dialectical not mechanical. In mechanical materialism evolution is the path taken by material. In mechanical materialism evolution is the path taken by material things under the pressure of their environment. In dialectical materialism evolution is the development of matter within, environment helping or hindering but neither originating the evolutionary process nor capable of preventing it from reaching its inevitable goal. Matter to the dialectical materialist is not passive, and moves by an inner necessity of its nature. Therefore, dialectical materialism is more interested in motion than in matter, in a vital energy within matter inevitably driving it towards perfect human society just as Hegel's demiurge drove forward to the perfect realization of spirit. As Engels said: ' the dialectical method grasps things and their images, ideas, essentially in their sequence, their movement, their birth and death".

"Contradiction" then, as Hegel says," is the very moving principle of the world. But for the Marxist as for the Hegelian, it works in a peculiar way. The change it produces takes place gradually until a certain point is reached beyond which it becomes sudden so that each synthesis is brought about very abruptly. As C.L. Wayper in his Political Thought has rightly pointed out, this change as:

“ Water becomes ice, Feudalism capitalism, capitalism socialism, as a result of a sudden qualitative change’.

How closely Marx follows Hegel here is obvious. For Hegel the universal substance is Spirit; for Marx it is Matter. Both Spirit and Matter used to develop themselves and both do so the idea fully conscious of itself; for Marx the inevitable goal is the classless society, perfectly organized for production, sufficient for itself. Neither Hegel nor Marx proves that the goal which they state to be inevitable is indeed so. Both begin with the assumption that it is and in both historical analysis serves to illustrate but not to prove the initial act of faith. The only important differences between them are that Marx applied the dialectic to the future and indulged in much pseudo- scientific which Hegel would have been the first to condemn, and that of course, he completely rejected Hegel’s philosophic idealism. As Marx wrote in the Preface to the second edition of *Das Capital* :

In Hegel’s writings, dialectic stands on its head. You must turn it right away up again if you want to discover the rational kernel that is hidden away with in the wrappings of mystification”.

It is beyond dispute that dialectic materialism is the corner- stone of Marxist philosophy. The materialistic interpretation of history and the theory of class struggle based on the theory of surplus value are its applications. Dialectic materialism helps us to distinguish the contradictions of reality, to understand their significance and follow their development.

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Historical materialism is the application of the principles of dialectical materialism to the development of society. It is, in fact, an economic interpretation of history, according to which all the mass phenomena of history are determined by economic conditions. The theory begins with the “simple truth” which is the clue to the meaning of history, that man must eat to live’. His very survival depends upon the success with which he can produce what he wants from nature. Production is, therefore, the most important of all human activities.

In his ‘Socialism: Utopian and Scientific’ Engels defined historical materialism as a theory which holds that the ultimate cause which determines the whole course of human history is the economic development of society. The whole course of human history is explained in terms of changes occurring in the modes of production and exchange. Starting with primitive communism, the mode of production has passed through three stages: slavery, feudalism and capitalism and the consequent division of society into three distinct classes(Slave- master, serf - baron and proletariat- capitalist) and the struggle of these classes against one another. The most profound statement of Marx which explains his theory of historical materialism is contained in his ‘ Preface to a contribution to the Critique of Political Economy’’. In this work Marx wrote thus.:

“The economic structure of society, constituted by its relations of production is the real foundations of society. It is the basis on which rises a legal and political super- structure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. Along with it the society’s relations of production themselves correspond to a definite stage of development of its material productive forces. Thus the mode of production of material life determines the social, political and intellectual life process in general. ‘

The forms of production which under the society change according to necessities inherent in them so as to produce their successors merely by their own working, The system, for instance, characterized by the “hand mill” creates an economic and social situation in which the adoption of the mechanical method of milling becomes a practical necessity. The “steam mill” in turn creates new social functions, new groups, new outlooks, which in turn outgrow their own frame. The factories which are necessary to solve the economic problems of the 18th century create the conditions of 19th century problems. These self-developing forms of production are the propeller which accounts first for economic and then for social change, a propeller which requires no external impetus.

Every society, Marx says, is confronted with problems which it must face and solve- or collapse. But the possibility of collapse is never considered, though no great knowledge of history is needed to convince one that civilizations can and do collapse. Indeed in his Critique of Political Economy Marx even says: ‘Mankind always takes up only such problems as it can solve’. Finally, the productive forces inherent in any society develop completely before a change takes place, and the change itself will be sudden as when water turns into steam. In such sudden revolutionary change, the entire structure of society will be evolutionally transformed, until the new society in its turn is overthrown and remoulded.

Marx developed his own materialist theory of history by way of a critique of idealism and the idealist interpretation of history. This critique and the basic outline of his own materialist conception were published in 1846 as the German Ideology, with Engels as co-author. The basic materialist proposition of this work is that “the first premise of all human existence, and therefore all of history.....is that men must be in a position to live in order to be able to make history”.? Before people can make history they must first exist, not abstractly as philosophical categories, but concretely as actual existing material entities. It thus follows for Marx that any valid historical analysis must begin with the ways in which human beings materially produce themselves, both as individuals and as species. This involves the study of those productive or “historical acts” as Marx calls them, by which people provide for the necessities of survival: and the social forms of reproduction by which the species as a whole is perpetuated; it is an obvious and undisputable fact that these historical acts of production have “existed simultaneously since the dawn of history and the first men, and still assert themselves in history today.”

The Marxian philosophy of historical materialism is different not only from Hegelian philosophy; it is also different from that of Feuerbach. While Feuerbach saw the unity of man and nature expressed by man’s being a part of nature, Marx sees man as shaping nature and his being, in turn, shaped by it. In other words, whereas Feuerbach materializes man, Marx humanizes nature. Marx argued that man not only satisfies his needs through his contact with nature but also creates new needs as well as possibilities of their satisfaction. Thus, according to Marx, man’s needs are historical, not naturalistic.

Historical materialism is a variety of determinism which as understood by Marx implies that social or political change is not really brought about by “ideas”, that is by various schemes for social or political reform. It is the modes of production and distribution that determine social and political forms of organization, not vice versa. Marx maintains that the prevailing ideology of a society reflects the class interest of those who control the means of production and distribution within the society ,

As Marx has rightly pointed out, “The mode of production of the material means of existence conditions the whole process of social, political and intellectual life.”

THEORY OF CLASSES: CLASS STRUGGLE

The understanding of the concept of “class” is central to the understanding of Marxian philosophy. The sole criterion on the basis of which the class of a person is determined is his ownership (or control) of means of production (land, capital, technology etc.,) those who own or control the means of production constitute the bourgeoisie (exploiters), and those who own only labour power constitute the proletariat (exploited.) Thus classes are defined by Marx on the basis of twin criteria of a person’s place in the mode of production and his consequent position in terms of relations of production. Since class is based on ownership of means of production and ownership of property, the disappearance of property as the determining factor of station. During different historical phases, these two classes were known by different names and enjoyed different legal status and privileges; but one thing was common that one of exploitation and domination. Class is determined by the extent to which people own most, same or little of the means of production or by their relationship to the means of production. Marx wrote thus: “Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and Rneyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another.”

In the Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels said, “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle”. They argue that class conflict is the real driving force of human history. In the capitalist societies class differentiation is most clear, class consciousness is more developed and class conflict is most acute. Thus capitalism is the culminating point in the historical evolution of classes and class conflict. The distinctive feature of bourgeois epoch is that society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other-bourgeoisie and proletariat.

Marx made a distinction between the objective facts of existence of a class and its subjective awareness about its being a class-consciousness. Division of labor is the main source of historical emergence of classes and class antagonisms. Through a detailed historical analysis Marx showed that no major antagonism disappears unless there emerges a new antagonism.

According to Marx, there has been class struggle since the breakup of the tribal community organization. In fact, humanity has evolved to higher stages of development through class conflicts. Marx believes that class – struggle in the modern period is simpler than earlier class struggle. This is because of greater polarization today compared with earlier times. Inspired by Hegel’s distinctive theory of history and idealist philosophy, Marx postulated that human social and political development are advanced through conflict between antithetical class forces. Marx made a major departure from Hegel, on the nature of this conflict. Marx is said to have “stood Hegel on his head” by claiming that it was conflict rooted in the material conditions of existence that drove history and not conflict over antithetical ideas, which Hegel asserted was the principal mover of human history.

Marx examined the dominant material conditions at various moments of human history and stated that each set of dominant conditions breed a conflictive conditions. In the hands of human beings, these contradictory conditions contributed to conflict; at times, this conflict became so

deep and irresolvable that it transformed human development in profound ways. Marx asserted that human beings drove this process by acting collectively and particularly as members of an economic class.

As a result for Marx and Engels, history moved in distinct stages or epochs, and within each epoch, one could find the contradictions (or class conflicts) that would pave the way to the next stage. Marx identified the following stage:

1. Primitive communism
2. Slave society
3. Feudalism
4. Capitalism
5. Socialism and communism

Unlike earlier liberal democratic theory, which held that there had been a time in human history when humans did not live in a society, Marx argued that humans had always lived in some kind of society. The first of these societies he called primitive communism. This stage was characterized by a society much like the tribal communities of the North American plains. Since this was a class less society, it was communist. What made it primitive was the very low standard of living and the great dangers facing tribal members.

Eventually, primitive communism gave way to the next stage of history, slave society. Although Marx and Engels are not clear as to how primitive communism collapsed, there is a suggestion by Engles that it was a “ natural” development, slave society was in many ways the first epoch with class contradictions. In slave societies was defined in terms of land ownership and slave ownership. In such societies, there were classes: those who owned some of the means of production; and those who owned nothing, not even themselves (slaves). Societies such as Rome were rocked by internal conflicts among these conflicts for control over the means of production . Eventually these conflicts led to the demies of slave society and the emergence of feudalism.

Feudalism, like slave society ,is characterized primarily by agricultural production controlled by large estates of land holding nobles. In feudalism. There were also other classes, particularly the merchants, or the early bourgeoisie. The early bourgeoisie, unlike the land holding nobility, directed their livelihood form the control of trade and finance. With the expansion of trade routes east and west the European bourgeois i.e. grew in economic status and emended political power as a results'

Theory of surplus value

The doctrine of surplus value is one of the important theoretical contributions of Karl Marx. Marx's theory of surplus value is an extension of Ricardo's theory according to which the value of every commodity is proportional to the quantity of labor contained in it, provided this labor is in accordance with the existing standard of efficiency of production. Labor power equals the brain, muscle and nerve of the laborer. Being itself a commodity, it must command a price proportional to the member of labor hours that entered into its production. This will be the number of labour hours required to house and feed the laborer and to bring up his family.

This is the value of his services, for which he receives corresponding wages. But labor is unique among commodities because in being used up to create more value. The employer, therefore, can make his work more hours than would be required to produce that stock. The value thus created over and above what the labourer is paid for, Marx calls surplus value, and he regards it as the source of all profit.

Marx explains the whole process of exploitation with the help of his theory of surplus value. It is a distinctive feature of capitalist means of production. Surplus value accrues because the commodity produced by the worker is sold by the capitalist for more than what the worker receives as wages. In his *Das Kapital*, Marx elaborated it in a simple technical manner. He argued that the worker produces a commodity which belongs to the capitalist and whose value is realized by the capitalist in the form of price. This capital has two parts- constant capital and variable capital. Constant capital relates to means of production like raw material, machinery tools set used for commodity production.

THEORY OF ALIENATION

Marx employed the term alienation to describe dehumanization and he devoted much theoretical effort in these younger years to analyze the nature of alienation in a capitalist system. His chief work on this subject is found in Marx's *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* (also known as the *Paris Manuscripts*) which were written in 1844 but only posthumously published much later, in 1932. In the *Manuscripts* Marx discusses a cluster of forms of alienation that centre on a central sense of 'alienation' which is virtually definitely of the capitalist economy. By alienation Marx means the separation of our specific human qualities, our "species being", as he termed it, into structures of domination. In a capitalist society or economy, work or labor itself becomes a commodity, something that is bought and sold on the open market. One result is the creation of the two principal classes of bourgeoisie- liberal, capitalist society: there is the bourgeoisie, which control the means of production and distribution in the society and in particular, have the power to buy labour. And there is the proletariat, composed of persons who have no share in the control of the means of production and distribution in the society and who are forced to sell their labour on the open market in order to sustain themselves and their families.

The class divisions generated by the existence of capitalist private property constitute the chief example and indeed the basic source of alienation. Given these class division, workers are separated from the capitalists and once separated, dominated. Indeed, it is precisely in their separation, that is in the alienation of their innate human capacity for community with their fellow creatures, that the domination of the worker becomes possible. Given this basic form of separation – domination, the entire world of workers becomes an alienated reality, Marx argues. They are alienated from the fruit of their labour, which is expropriated by the capitalist as profit. What rightfully belongs to workers as a direct human expression of their productive life is separated from them and then, in the form of surplus value or capital, becomes the source of their domination and exploitation. More than this, the whole technological infrastructure of industry takes on an alienated character.

All of these various forms of alienation achieve their highest and most tragic character itself- alienation, according to Marx. Having alienated the power to act upon the world in a directly human way, the workers finally alienated the power even to comprehend that world. Given Marx's proposition that life determines consciousness, it must follow that where life has become alienated, so must consciousness. It is clear from this analysis that alienated consciousness is nothing other than false consciousness, or ideology. The natural human ability to comprehend reality is quite literally separated from the workers by the conditions of their lives and replaced by false perception of reality. These perception, by blinding the workers to their real conditions and therefore preventing them from changing those conditioned, constitute structures of mental domination.

Given such extreme misery and alienation, particularly the alienation of consciousness itself, one may well wonder how Marx could assert the inevitable demise of capitalism. Marx proceeds to claim that a consequence of the alienation of the activity of the labour is that the worker looks elsewhere to find a true expression of himself or herself: "man (the worker) only feels himself freely active in his animal functions of eating, drinking, and procreating at most also in his dwelling and dress". This displacement of one's true human self into one's "animal " (biological) functions and into artificial and fairly trivial concerns interlocks with the sort of consumerism characteristic of capitalist economies.

Finally, there results from the objectification of labour the alienation of man from man: each man measures his relationship to other men by the relationship in which he finds himself placed as a worker. The main feature of this relationship is competition. Worker must compete with one another in the sale of their labour. One might conclude that the forms of alienation described by Marx only effect members of proletariat in a situation of unregulated competition . '

Critique of capitalism

In the *Das Capital* , Marx pointed out that " capitalism arises only when the owners of the means of production and subsistence meet in the market with the free labourer selling his labour power". The basis of capitalism was wage labour. In the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, Marx implied that even if the state owned the means of production, wage labour still continue. This was not real socialism, but a new variation of capitalism, namely state capitalism.

In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx paid handsome tributes to the bourgeoisie, while highlighting its negative side. There were three reasons that make capitalism attractive. First, it brought remarkable economic progress by revolutionizing the means of production and developing technology as never before. It built and econuraged the growth of commerce and factories on a scale unknown before. Secondly, capitalism undermined the national barriers, In its search for market and raw materials, capitalism and the bourgeoisie crossed national boundaries and pentetrated every corner of the world drawing the most backward nations into their fold. Thirdly, capitalism eliminated the distinctions between town and the country and enabled the peasants to come out of what Marx called, " the idiocy of rural life. " In spite of the achievements, Marx believed that capitalism had out lived its use because of the sufferings and hardships it caused.

Marx examined the sufferings within capitalism, which were rooted in its origin: the eviction of peasants from their land, the loss of their sources of income and most significantly, the creation of

the proletariat. According to Marx, capitalism facilitates an exploitative relationship between the two major social classes, the owners of capital (the bourgeoisie) and the working class (the proletariat). Marx claimed that the profit derived from the capitalist production process was merely the difference between the value generated by the proletariat and the wage that they earned from the bourgeoisie. Therefore, according to Marxian conception, the proletariat generated all value as a result of its labour but had only a portion of that value returned to it by the bourgeoisie in the form of wages. Since the proletariat created surplus value, but the bourgeoisie enjoyed the fruits of the value, the bourgeoisie was effectively exploiting the proletariat on a consistent and on going basis.

Marx asserted that this exploitative relationship was an essential part of the capitalist production process. Among other things, surplus value was used by the bourgeoisie to reinvest, modernize, and expand its productive capacity. Therefore, for Marx, capitalism could not continue as a mode of production without the unceasing exploitation of the proletariat, which comprises the majority of human beings in advanced industrial societies.

Not only Marx claimed that the capital wage labour relationship was exploitative, but he also claimed that this economic relationship left the majority of human beings feeling estranged from their own humanity. Because Marx believed productivity was a naturally human act, he concluded that the capital wage labour relationship degraded something that was a fulfilling, meaningful, and free act into drudgery that was performed solely for the purpose of basic survival.

Marx predicted that capitalism, like every dominant economic mode of production before it, possessed internal contradictions that would eventually destroy the system. These contradictions or recessions were moments of crisis, Marx thought, and not necessarily temporary in nature. Furthermore Marx predicted that, over time crisis periods would get progressively longer, recessions would get deeper, recoveries would be shallower, and times in between moments of crisis would get shorter.

In the meantime, Marx paints a picture of capitalism driven to ever more desperate, and ultimately irrational and futile attempts to stave off the inevitable. The intensity of capitalist competition increases in precise proportion to the decline of the system as a whole. Technologies are introduced at a feverish pace with resulting over production on commodities on the one hand and increasing unemployment on the other. The consequences of this "anarching of production" as Marx terms it, are periodic depressions in which all of the productive forces that had evolved up to that point are destroyed.

According to Marx, capitalism contains its own seeds of destruction. He rallied the working class under the call "workers of all countries unite". Within capitalism, increase in monopolies led to growing exploitation, misery and pauperization of the working class. Simultaneously, as the working class increased in number, it became better organized and acquired greater bargaining skills'. This initiated a revolutionary process, leading to a new socialist arrangement in which common possession replaced private ownership in the means of production. The clarion call given to the workers was to unite, shed their chains and conquer the world. Ultimately, like all modes of production before it, Marx claimed, capitalism would come to an end and be replaced by an economic system that had fewer internal contradictions.

Following the collapse of capitalism and the seizure of power by the proletariat, a transitional period would follow, Socialism. Marx spent very little space discussing his vision for socialism and

communism, but he and Engels discussed it briefly in the Communist Manifesto. During the transitional period, the proletariat uses the coercive power of the state to defend the revolution from the remnants of the bourgeoisie. In the Critique of the Gotha Programme, Marx states that in a socialist society, the labourer will receive, in return for a given quantity of work, the equivalent in means of consumption, from each according to his ability, to each according to his labour. Full communism would have some key characteristics. It would be a classless society, because class differences would disappear. Again communism would ultimately be a stateless society as well, “because the state would ultimately “wither away” Further more, communism would be a nation less society because, Marx and Engels believed, national identities were a product of capitalism, and such identities would disappear, to be replaced by a universal proletarian identity.

CRITICAL APPRISAL OF MARXISM

Marxism is undoubtedly one of the most influential philosophies of modern times. Marx’s ideas not only inspired a variety of schools of thought, but his ideas have inspired a vigorous debate over a whole range of issues- such as the balance of the state and the market in production and the proper role of government in society. His ideas of Base- super structure relations alienation, Dialectical Materialism, Class struggle, surplus value, Proletarian Revolution, vision of communism etc have been extensively discussed, debated, modified and sometimes even rejected by his followers and adversaries. His writings are so voluminous and his theories are so wide –ranging that Marx has come to mean different things to different people.

Marxism has been subjected to severe criticisms from different corners. Marx’s vision of a new social order in which there will be neither alienation nor exploitation, no classes, no class antagonism, no authority, no state is highly imaginative and fascinating and because of this attraction, Prof. Sabine called “Marxism a utopia but a generous and humane one” Marx did not foresee the rise of fascism, totalitarianism and the welfare state. His analysis of capitalism was at best, applicable to early 19th century capitalism, though his criticisms of capitalism as being wasteful, unequal and exploitative was true. However, his alternative of genuine democracy and full communism seemed more difficult to realize in practice, for they did not accommodate a world which was becoming increasingly differentiated, stratified and functionally specialized.

Karl Popper in his “Open Society and its Enemies” has criticized Marxism along with Plato and Hegel. Popper was suspicious of Marx’s scientific predictions, for scientific theory was one that would not try to explain everything. Along with Plato and Hegel, Marx was seen as an enemy of the open society, Marx was seen as an enemy of the open society. Marxism claimed to have studied the laws of history, on the basis of which it advocated total, sweeping and radical changes. Not only was it impossible to have first-hand knowledge based on some set of laws that governed society and human individuals but Popper also rejected Marx’s social engineering as dangerous, for it treated individuals as subservient to the interests of the whole. Popper rejected the historicism, holism and utopian social engineering of Marxism. In contrast, he advocated piecemeal social engineering, where change would be gradual and modest, allowing rectification of lapses and errors, for it was not possible to conceive of every thing. Popper claimed that Marx’s scientific socialism was wrong not only about society, but also about science. Popper wrote thus: “Marx misled crores of intelligent people by saying that historic method is the scientific way of approaching social problems.” Further, Marx made the economy or economic factors all important,

ignoring factors like nationality, religion, friendship etc.” As Karl Popper has rightly mentioned, Marx brought into the social science and historical science the very important idea that economic conditions are of great importance in the life of society..... There was nothing like serious economic history before Marx”. Like Popper, Berlin attacked the historicism of Marx which he developed in his essay” Historical Inevitability”.

Marx is wrong in his static conception of the classes. As Prof. C.L. Wayper has observed, classes are not fixed and rigidly maintained blocks. There is constant movement from class to class, so much so that perhaps the most salient fetures of social classes is the incessant rise and fall of individual families from one to another. Marx believed that he had “ scientifically proved” that the development of capitalism would leave facing each other in irreconcilable opposition two and only two classes. He did not allow for the emergence of a new class of managers and skilled technical advisers. The forecast based on his economic analysis of surplus value have similarly proved wide of the mark. He declared that working men must become ever poorer until the day of final reckoning. But real wages today are higher than they were a century ago, not lower as they should now be according to Marx. Further , Marx did not foresee the possibilities of the Trade union movement and of the social service state.

Marx was wrong in ignoring the psychological aspects of politics. Though his is an explanation of the state in terms of force, nowhere he gives us any adequate treatment of the problem of power. Nowhere in his work is there the realisation of that men desire power for the satisfaction of their pride and self respect and that for some men power must be regarded as an end in itself. One must go further and say that nowhere he shows any real appreciation of the defects in human nature.

The collapse of communism proved the serious shortcomings of Marxism, both in theory and practice. It at best remained a critique rather than providing a serious alternative to liberal democracy. However its critique of exploitation and alienation, and the hope of creating a truly emancipated society that would allow the full flowering fo human creativity, would be a starting point of any utopian project. In spite of Marx’s utopia being truly generous, it displayed a potential for being tyrannical, despotic and arbitrary. Concentration of political and economic power and absence of checks on absolute power were themselves inimical to true human liberation and freedom.. As Prof. Sabine has observed, Marx “ offered no good reason to believe that the power politics of radicalism would prove to be less authoritarian in practice than the power politics of conservative nationalism”.

Whatever may be the limitations and shortcomings of Marxian principles, it is beyond dispute that Marx would be remembered as a critic of early 19th century capitalism and politics. The “true and false together in him constitute one of the most tremendously compelling forces that modern history has seen”. Although the study of Marxism after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 has gone out of vogue in many intellectual circles, its relevance now has become increasingly apparent. The concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands via corporate mergers and hostile take overs, the disappearance of petite bourgeoisie, and the apparent collusion between big capital and the state - all were suggested by Marx. Perhaps a rediscovery of Marxism among students of social science would help them better understand the direction of the world in the 21st century.

MODULE VII

V.I.LENIN (1870-1924)

The founder of the modern communist party was the Russian Marxist V. I Lenin, and not Karl Marx . Viladimir Ilyich Lenin was not only a revolutionary leader of great sagacity and practical ability, but was also a writer and thinker of exceptional penetration and power. He made Marxism a practical creed in Russia. He was a rare combination of the theorist and a man of action. He had keen intellect and displayed considerable interest in the theoretical aspects of Marxian socialism, but his theoretical interests were directed the end goal of bringing about a successful socialist revolution in Russia. He was specially concerned with the period of transition from capitalism to socialism and contributed much in the theory on this subject Marx and Engels had neglected, or discussed ambiguously . Lenin's life – long passion was to serve the people. He showed an unceasing care for the people's welfare, a passionate devotion to the cause of the party and working class and a supreme conviction of the justice of this cause. Besides being one of the dogmatic disciples of Marx, Lenin is also regarded as one of he greatest political geniuses of modern history.

Lenin was born on April 10, 1870 in the town of Simbrisk. He came from a middle- class family, both his father and mother have been teachers with progressive ideas. Their five surviving children became revolutionaries, and Lenin's eldest brother, Alexander was hanged at the early age of 19 for complicity in an abortive plot against Czar Alexander III. Lenin had a typical middle- class education, first attending the secondary school at Simbirsk and then the law school of the University of Kazan. Because of his early political activities and the circumstances of his brother's execution, Lenin found himself under constant police supervision. However, the czarist police was not nearly so efficient as the later police systems of either of Lenin or Stalin, and Lenin managed to maintain political contacts and join illegal groups.

In December, 1895, Lenin was arrested in Petersburg and spent 14 months in prison. From his prison cell he guided a revolutionary organization he had formed, and he also found the time and means to write letter and pamphlets. He was able to obtain the books and magazines he needed, and he began in prison to work on the *Development of Capitalism in Russia*. Although in January, 1897, he was sentenced to three years exile in Siberia, he continued his political and philosophical studies there and maintained contacts with illegal revolutionary groups. In 1898 Lenin married a fellow revolutionary and their home became the head quarters for the political exiles.

After his release form Siberia in 1900, Lenin went aboard; he spent the next seventeen years with but few interruptions in various European countries, organizing from abroad the illegal revolutionary movement in Russia that was to culminate in the seizure of power in 1917, and it was liberal government that permitted him to return. In seven months he managed to overthrow the Kerensky government, only free government Russia has known in her entire history. Lenin was the leader of the Bolshevik party (the forerunner of what became the Communist Party of the former Soviet Union), which came to power in October 1917 at the culmination of the Russian Revolution. The Bolsheviks were initially only one faction of the Russian Social Democratic Party. Over time, they split entirely form the parent body. The split was based upon a dispute over how a Marxist revolutionary party ought to be structured.

The important works of Lenin include *What Is to Be Done* (1902), *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916), *State and Revolution* (1917). According to Joseph Stalin, Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution. He brought Marxism up to date in the latest stage of capitalism and by making use of his theory of imperialism.

Theory of State and Revolution

Lenin's most influential political work is *State and Revolution* (1918), written in the late summer of 1917. In the literature of Marxism and communism, *State and Revolution* is of immense importance. According to Lenin, the state is the product and the manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms. Though these antagonisms are irreconcilable, the state, being a capitalist organization, tries, by persuasion or compulsion to reconcile the workers to itself, thereby perpetuating their oppression and exploitation. In his *State and Revolution*, Lenin wrote thus: "History shows that the state as a special apparatus for coercing people arose only wherever and whenever there appeared a division of society into classes, that is a division into groups of people some of whom are permanently in a position to appropriate the labour of others, where some people exploit others".

The domination of the majority by the minority leaves little scope for justice or equality in capitalist state. All bourgeoisie democracies were, to him, dictatorships of the capitalists over the exploited workers. The state represents force and this force must be opposed by force and overpowered by the workers. Where Marx and Engels neglected the factors of political power, Lenin was keenly interested in the autonomy of the state. Lenin fully accepts the Marxian thesis that the transitional state between capitalism and communism "can be only the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat". He denies that capitalism and democracy always remains "a democracy for the minority, only for the possessing classes, only for the rich". In the words of the Communist Manifesto, the executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie".

Behind the formalities of capitalist democracy, Lenin sees, in effect, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. He also denies that the transition from capitalism to communism can be accomplished simply, smoothly, and directly, "as the liberal professors and petty-bourgeois opportunists would have us believe. No, development-toward communism- proceeds through the dictatorship of the proletariat; it cannot be other wise, for the resistance of the capitalist exploiters cannot be broken by anyone else or in any other way. As Prof. William Ebenstein has remarked, whereas Marx had left open the possibility for peaceful social change from capitalism to socialism in politically advanced countries like England, the United State, and the Netherlands, Lenin claims that, by 1917, "this exception made by Marx is no longer valid", because England and United States had developed bureaucratic institutions to which every thing is subordinated and which trample every thing under foot. Far from admitting that both England and the united states had moved steadily in the direction of social reform since Marx, Lenin maintains that both countries had become more repressive, authoritarian, and plutocratic in the mean time.

In the transitional stage between capitalism and communism the state will continue to exist, Lenin holds, because machinery for the suppression of the capitalist exploiters will still be required in the

dictatorship of the proletariat. But Lenin points out that the state is already beginning to “wither away” because the task of the majority (the defeated capitalist) is different, in quantitative and qualitative terms, from the previous capitalist state, in which a minority (of capitalists) suppressed the majority (of the exploited). Finally, once communism is fully established, the state becomes “absolutely unnecessary, for there is no one to be suppressed- “no one” in the sense of a class, in the sense of a systematic struggle against a definite section of the population.

As soon as communism is established, the state becomes unnecessary, holds Lenin. There will be true freedom for all, and “when freedom exists, there will be no state.” Lenin cautiously adds that he leaves the question of length of time, or “the withering away quite open”. Without indicating the time it will take to transform the lower phase of communist society (the dictatorship of the proletariat) into the higher phase (the withering away of the state), Lenin describes the conditions of such transformation: “the state will be able to wither away completely when society can apply the rule: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs; that is when people have become so accustomed to observing the fundamental rule of social life and when their labour is so productive that they will voluntarily work according to their ability”. Lenin, like Marx, denies that the vision of a society without a machinery of force and power (the State) is utopian.

In his Thesis and Report on Bourgeois Democracy and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, submitted to the first Congress of the Communist International (March 4, 1919) Lenin reiterates his belief that there is no democracy in general or dictatorship in general and that all bourgeois democracies are, in fact, dictatorships of the capitalists over the exploited masses of the people. He vehemently attacks democratic socialists who believe that there is a middle course between capitalist dictatorship and proletarian dictatorship. In his Theses on the Fundamental Tasks of the Second Congress of the Communist International (July 4, 1920), Lenin elaborates his belief in the right of the minority to lead, and rule, the majority, even after the dictatorship of the proletariat is established.

DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM

Lenin's Views on the role of the communist party, its organization based on the principle of democratic centralism etc are contained in his major book entitled “What is To Be Done ?” published in 1902. Lenin described the communist party as the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, an organization consisting chiefly of persons engaged in revolutionary activities as a profession”. According to him, a political party that intends to carry out a revolution successfully must be thoroughly disciplined, alert and ably led like an army. It was an elite organization, consisting of outstanding individuals who combined the thorough understanding of the critical issues and the general aspects of the situation confronting with them, with a relentless will and capacity for decisive action. These individuals formed “the core of revolutionary party, combining theory and practice, independence of mind with the strict discipline, freedom of discussion with a firm adherence to party line.”

Lenin's most important theoretical contribution to the theory of Marxism is the doctrine of professional revolutionary. Lenin drew a distinction between the organization of workers and organization of revolutionaries. The former must be essentially trade union in character, as wide as

possible, and as public as political condition will allow. By contrast, the organization of revolutionaries must consist exclusively of professional revolutionaries, must be small, and “as secret as possible.” Whereas Marx assumed that the working class would inevitably develop its class consciousness in the daily struggle for its economic existence, Lenin had much less confidence in the ability of the workers to develop politically by their own effort and experience:” “Class political consciousness can be brought to the workers only from without, that is, only outside of the economic struggle, outside of the spheres of relations between workers and employers”. Lenin did not care whether the professional revolutionaries destined to lead the proletariat were of working-class origin or not, as long as the professional revolutionary did his job well. But because of the difficulties of the work to be done, Lenin insisted that the professional revolutionary must be “no less professionally trained than the police”, and, like the police, the organization of professional revolutionaries must be highly centralized and able to supervise and control the open organizations of workers that are legally permitted.

Lenin’s views of the extreme concentration of power in the hands of a few leaders of professional revolutionaries led Trotsky in 1904 to assert that Lenin’s doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat really meant the dictatorship over the proletariat, and the struggle of centralism versus democracy became one of major issues of communist party organisation before and after 1917. Trotsky also predicted in 1904 that if Lenin ever took power, ‘the leonine head of Marx would be that first to fall under the guillotine’

Communist party is organised on the principle of democratic centralism. Democratic centralism means on the one hand, that the party is democratically organised from bottom to top. Every office bearer is elected democratically. Each organ of the party, whether the lowest cell or the highest central executive conducts its deliberations and arrives at its decision, on a democratic basis. Each party member is given freedom of speech and expression in party forums. Normally decisions are taken on the basis of majority. So the communist party is democratically organised. However, the party is centralised and in the normal course of functioning the decisions of the higher organs are binding on the lower bodies. There were a number of reasons behind Lenin’s advocacy of this kind of party structure, but they can all be reduced to the fact that he believed a social democratic structure to be incompatible with the social and political conditions of prerevolutionary Russia. To begin with the Tsarist autocracy prevented the existence of any kind of open and regime activity. But the deeper problem was the fact that Russia was essentially an agrarian, peasant-based economy. Modern industrial capitalism had yet to emerge in anything but outline form, and the Russian working class was, as a consequence, extremely small. Under these underdeveloped conditions, Lenin believed that only a small and tightly organised group of professional revolutionaries possessing a genuine socialist consciousness would be capable of leading the workers. In turn, Lenin argued, the workers would have to pull along large elements of the peasantry in any revolutionary transformation of Russian society.

In Lenin’s political philosophy, communist party becomes a staff organization in the struggle for the proletarian class of power. He has recommended two types of unions:

1. Ideal union through the principles of Marxism and
2. Material union which was to be achieved through rigid organisation and discipline. According to him, the communist party is a part of the organisation and discipline. According to him the communist party is a part of the working class: its most progressive, most class conscious and therefore most revolutionary part. The communist party is created by means of selection of the best, most class conscious, most self- sacrificing and foresighted worker.

Dictatorship of the Proletariat

According to Marx and Engels, the dictatorship of the proletariat meant the establishment of a truly democratic state with the worker's majority ruling over the bourgeois minority. To Lenin, the dictatorship of the proletariat meant the dictatorship over the proletariat of the communist party which was the only revolutionary party capable of crushing capitalism, establishing socialism and maintaining it. Lenin believed that the dictatorship of the communist party over the proletariat was true democracy because it was a dictatorship in the interest of the workers. Lenin believes that dictatorship of the proletariat was the instrument of the proletarian revolution, its organ and its mainstay. The object of this dictatorship is to overthrow capitalism, crush the resistance of the overthrown capitalists, consolidate the proletarian revolution and complete it to the goal of socialism. Revolution can overthrow the capitalists but cannot consolidate its gains and achieve socialism without the dictatorship of the proletariat. As Lenin has rightly pointed out, dictatorship of the proletariat is a persistent struggle- bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative - against the forces and traditions of the old society i.e, the capitalist society'.

The dictatorship of the proletariat of Lenin's conception presents certain features. It is a rule of unrestrained law and based on the superior force of the proletariat. It is not complete democracy of all. It is a democracy for the proletariat and a dictatorship against the capitalist elements. It is a special form of class alliance between the proletarian and the non- proletarian but anti- capitalist elements.

THEORY OF IMPERIALISM

Lenin's views on imperialism are contained in his well known work. Imperialism: the Highest stage of Capitalism. He completed this work in the summer of 1916 which is regarded by the Marxists as an outstanding contribution to the treasure store of creative Marxism, In this book Lenin made a comprehensive and detailed investigation of imperialism. He traces the development of world capitalism over the course of half a century after the publication of Marx's Das Capital. The outbreak of the first world turned Lenin's attention more definitely towards international affairs and led to the formulation of his theory of imperialist war and of communism in the imperialist state of capitalism. Basing himself of the laws of the emergence, development and decline of capitalism, Lenin was the first to give a profound and scientific analysis of the economic and political substance of imperialism.

Lenin maintained that the lower middle classes and the skilled workmen of advanced industrial countries were saved from the increasing misery which Marx had foretold for them only because of the colonial territories which their countries dominated. Their relationship to colonial peoples was the relationship between capitalists and proletariat. This stage of imperialism, Lenin

asserted, was in no sense a contradiction of Marx's teaching but a fulfillment of it, even though Marx himself had not sufficiently foreseen it. As capitalism develops, Lenin says, unit of industrial production grow bigger and combine in trusts and cartals to produce monopoly –finance capitalism is aggressively expansionist. Its characteristic expert is, capital , and its consequences are threefold: it results in the exploitation of colonial peoples, whom it subjects to the capitalist law of increasing misery and whose liberty it destroys. It produces war between the nations, since it substitutes international competition for competitions inside the nation, and in the clash of combines and powers seeking markets and territory war becomes inevitable. And ultimately it brings about the end of capitalism and the emergence of the new order, since with the arming and military training of the worker's war which begin as national wars will end as class wars.

According to Lenin, imperialism is moribund capitalism, containing a number of contradictions which ultimately destroys capitalism itself There is firstly the contradiction or antagonism between capital and labour. Capital exploits labour and brings the exploited workers to revolution. Secondly, there is contradiction between capital and labour. Capital exploits labour and brings the exploited workers to revolution. Secondly, there is contradiction between various imperialist powers and industrial combines for new territories, new markets and sources of raw materials. Finally, there is also the contradiction between the colonial powers and the dependent colonial people which arouses revolutionary outlook and spirit among the latter as happened in India and other countries. Imperialism, thus, creates conditions favourable to the destruction of capitalism by promoting class and international conflicts and revolutionary outlook among the proletariat. Lenin's scientific analysis of the contradictions of capitalism as its last stage brought him round to the conclusion that imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution. The revolution of transition to socialism has now become a vital necessity.

On the basis of his own study of imperialism, Lenin further developed the Marxist theory of socialist revolution, its contents, its motive forces and conditions and forms of development. He proved that the war had accelerated the growth of the requisites for revolution and that as a whole world capitalist system had matured for the transition to socialism. Lenin's capitalist socialism thus supplied him an additional justification for the revolutionary tactics which he had always advocated.

Assessment

Lenin was a follower of Marx and was highly critical of revisionism of his day. He was, however, compelled by the circumstances to interpret Marxism in such a way as to merit the characterisation of his own breed of Marxism as "inverted Marxism". Lenin's assertion that revolution could be and should be precipitated by professional revolutionaries was against the Marxian dialectic process. His emphasis on the potency of revolutionary ideas and ideology went counter to Marx with whom ideas merely reflected but did not create material conditions. Lenin differed from Marx in his conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat. To Lenin, this meant the dictatorship of the communist party over the proletariat; to Marx it had meant role by a proletarian majority and not by a communist party minority.

Lenin was a great leader of practical wisdom . As a great organiser, agitator and revolutionary, Lenin occupies a prominent place in the theory and practice of socialism. He made

Marxism upto date in the light of certain needs and developments which Marx had not anticipated Lenin was the leader of the Bolshevik party(The forerunner of what became the communist party of the former Soviet Union), which came to power in October 1917 at the culmination of the Russian Revolution. He saw the communist party as the main source of revolutionary consciousness destined to save the proletariat from the trade union mindset. It is beyond dispute that Lenin's formulas remained the formulas of Marx; the meaning of Leninism departed widely from the meaning of Marxism. Leninism is the theory and tactics of proletarian revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat.

MAO ZE DONG (1893-1976)

Maoism like Marxism and Leninism was one of the most debated subjects of the 20th century and is most likely to remain so in the 21st century in the face of the expanding process of capitalist globalization. This is because the formulations advanced by Mao and the later Maoists, challenge some of the dominant assumptions relating to the basic issues of struggle for liberation, equality, justice and self-development in course of social transformation in all societies. Born at Shaoshan in Hunan province of China in 1893 Mao is the second Marxist revolutionary (Lenin being the first) who brought about a successful revolution in a backward country like China. Mao, like Lenin, was both a theoretician and a practitioner. Mao Zedong thought initiated several innovative formulation on revolution and social transformation which continuer to reverberate leading to intense political debates on the nature of democracy, socialism and human future in the 21st century through out the world.

Mao was the son of a rich peasant who was intellectually restless by nature and was the profoundly dissatisfied with Chinese society. After graduating from college in 1918 in Chiangsha, he became a librarian at Peking university where he founded a Marxist student circle. However, he left the job and returned to Changsha and became active in the communist party of China. He travelled to various parts of China which gave him a first hand impression about the exploitative conditions under which the Chinese peasantry was reeling at that time. By 1927 the relations between Kuo mintang (KMT) and the Communist Party of China (CPC) became so bitter that the KMT and the CPC, Mao was asked to organize a rebellion of Hunan peasants. During the course of this rebellion, Mao wrote his first major work - Analysis of Chinese Society. Here, he identified the various strata of Chinese peasantry - small marginal middle and the big peasant and the revolutionary potential of each of them. He highlighted the contradiction between the peasantry and feudal lords. He attempted the Harvest Uprising of peasants in 1928, but the uprising was crushed and Mao had flee along with his supporters to nearby mountains. From these mountains, Mao started guerrilla warfare tactics. By these tactics, CPC was able to capture various parts of South East China. Mao set up a number of peasant soviets in the captured areas. However, the KMT tried to crush these guerrilla attacks and encircled the areas where peasant tsoviets had been set up. Finally, the KMT armies drove out of the revolutionaries who took shelter in the north-west hills of China. This escape became famous as Mao's stay in the north- west was the most fruitful period for the CPC. It was here that Mao began an extensive study of Marxist philosophy. His well known pieces of work namely "on Pracitce" and ' On contradiction" were written during this period.

In the 1940's, he gave a blue- print of the future Chinese's government titled New Democracy." He also advocated a strategy of mass mobilization of peasants which is known as Mao's Mass – Line Popullism. Basis of Mao's power was the success of party strategies and policies after the on set of the Sino- Japanese war in 1937 the conclusive success of these strategies and policies from 1945 to 1949 further bolstered his ultimate authority. Mao's authority was further enhanced by his major initiatives in the 1949-57 period. In the 1950s, Mao gave his famous call of "Let Hundred Flowers Bloom" which allowed different view points in the CPC to be expressed freely and openly.

CONTRADICTION

Maoism does not figure prominently either in the Western discourses on Marxism or the discourses on development and transformation in the west . Paradixically, communist movements and discourses on social transformation in the Asian, African and Latin American countries derive a lot of insights and inspirations from the Maoist tradition. This is because they find the ideological creativity in Mao Zedong's theory and political practice as attractive. In the two philosophical essays of Mao, On practice and On contradiction, both written in 1937, the essential point made by Mao is that theory has to be derived from practice.

The doctrine "Contradiction" occupies an important aspect in the political philosophy of Mao. In an essay entitled "On contradiction" Mao wrote thus: the law of contradiction in things, that is, the law of the unity of opposites, is the basic law of materialist dialectics. This choose the traditional Marxist notion of dialectics. In several places Mao stressed that the unity of opposites is the essence of dialectics. According to Mao, changes in nature as well as society take place primarily as a result of the development of internal contradictions. As Mao said: External causes are the condition of change and internal causes are the basis of change.' According to this law , contradictions in the society can be resolved mainly within the society. A revolutionary movement in a country can succeed only if it is backed by the masses of that country and if it is self- reliant. The principle of self- reliance in China's revolutionary people's war was manifestation of this law. In recent decades China's essentially self reliant strategy of economic development and particularly policies related to the Great Leap Forward which seek to generate resources within each sector, reflect the some approach. Mao's discussion on contradiction is profusely loaded quotations from Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Mao accepts Engel's assertion that" motion itself is a contradiction." Engels said that et was even more true of the highest forms of motion of matter Mao repeats Lenin's examples of unity of opposites given in Lenin's philosophical Note Books.

PRINCIPAL CONTRADICTION.

In the long process of development of things there are specific stages and in each stages some contradictions are more powerful than the others. According to Mao, " one of them is necessarily the principal contradiction whose existence and development determines or influences the existence and development determines or influences the existence and development of other contradictions. " Mao also insists that there is only one principal contradiction at every stage of the development of the process and when another stage emerges a new principal contradiction also emerges. He gives three major instances to explain this. In a capitalist society, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie form the principal contradiction society, the proletariat and bourgeoisie form the

principal contradiction and the other contradictions like the one between the remnant feudal class and the bourgeoisie are non-principal. During a war of imperialist aggression the principal contradiction is between imperialism and the country which is attacked. In this situation all the classes except the traitors temporarily unite against the national enemy for the contradictions among them are non-principal. But there are instances where imperialism operates through the ruling classes of a country and the principal contradiction comes to be the one between the masses on the one hand and the alliance of imperialists and the domestic ruling class on the other.

ANTAGONISTIC AND NON ANTAGONISTIC CONTRADICTIONS.

At different stages of development of a thing, its contending forces have different degrees of intensity in their confrontation. In the 1937 essay "On contradiction" Mao Zedong discussed this question and pointed out that antagonism was a particular manifestation of the struggle of opposites. It is true that contradictions between the oppressor and the oppressed classes are bound to contain an element of antagonism. But some of these contradictions remain latent and only at definite stages do they manifest antagonism. As Mao put it, "some contradictions which were originally non antagonistic develop into antagonistic ones, while others which were originally antagonistic develop into non-antagonistic ones".

On the basis of this perspective, Mao formulated his theory of new democracy and under it the strategy of a four-class united front with the national bourgeoisie, in it. The contradiction between the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie which had an element of antagonism in it was basically understood as non-antagonistic at that time so that there could be a united front on the other were antagonistic. This approach was further clarified in Mao's essay "On the people's Democratic Dictatorship" published in June 1949. Methods of dictatorship were to be applied to the handling of antagonistic contradictions whereas democratic methods of persuasion and education were to be used in case of non-antagonistic contradictions.

In his 1957 speech, 'On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People' Mao analyzed deeper into these concepts and explained their application to the contemporary problems facing China. He remarked that to deny the existence of contradictions is to deny dialectics. Society at all times develops through contradictions. Party leaders should recognize contradictions which exist between government and society, between the leaders and the led. These contradictions should be correctly handled. "By antagonistic contradictions he meant the contradictions between ourselves and the enemy while the contradictions among the people varies in content in different countries and in different periods of history. Mao said that those who supported the building of socialism in China at that point were among the 'people' and those who opposed it were 'the enemies of the people.'

Mao's 1957 speech criticized two erroneous lines of thinking. First was the rightist view point within and outside the Communist Party of China (CPC) which thought that class contradictions had disappeared with the socialist transformation which had taken place in the People's Republic of China (PRC). As against this, Mao emphasized the existence of numerous non antagonistic contradictions and also some continuing basis of antagonistic contradictions in the socialist society. The second view point which Mao criticized exaggerated the threat of counter revolution in China

and showed excessive alarm at the Hungarian uprising in 1956. He pointed out that they underrated the achievements of long years of popular revolutionary struggle and the success in the suppression of counter revolutionaries in China. Between these two extremes Mao asked for clearly distinguishing between the antagonistic and non antagonistic contradictions and correctly handling them.

Among the examples of non- antagonistic contradictions that Mao gives are: The contradictions between the working class and the peasantry, between the workers and peasants on the one hand and the intellectuals on the other, and so on. Correct handling of contradictions among the people's demands the practice of democracy under centralized guidance³ and not dictatorship. The 1942 formula of 'unity, criticism, unity' was applicable in resolving these contradictions.

An important aspect of this notion is the transformation of a non – antagonistic contradiction into an antagonist one and vice versa. The Chinese national bourgeoisie moved from its original antagonistic position vis-à-vis China's working classes and came to be included in the united front: it was generally co- operative with the ' people's democratic and then the socialist transformation of China's economy. It continued to have a dual character, containing both antagonism and non- antagonism. The role of the party policy is extremely significant in guiding the development of contradictions from one stage to another. If contradictions among the people are not handled properly, antagonism may arise. This many appear in the form of sharp difference between workers and peasants in terms of wages, living standards and cultural level, between the government and the people in the forms of bureucraticism and elitism, and between the party and the masses also in the same form.

Role of Peasantry in Revolution

Mao tried to apply Marxism- Leninism in China with reasonable modifications and changes to keep pace with changes in the Chinese society and polity. Thus he modified Marxism Leninism by relying heavily on the peasantry's revolutionary potential. It should be noted that Marx has treated the peasantry with some degree of contempt. For the most part, peasantry for him was conservative and reactionary; it was no more than a bag of potatoes unable to make a revolution . Even Lenin had relied mainly on the proletariat in the urban centers of Russia for mass insurrections and had not placed much faith in the peasantry's revolutionary potential. Mao's fundamental contribution, therefore, was to bring about a successful revolution in China mainly with the help of the peasantry's revolutionary potential. Mao's fundamental contribution, therefore was to bring about a successful revolution in China mainly with the help of the peasantry. More than any thing else, his revolutionary model became inspiration for several Afro-Asian peasant societies. Further, Mao in his cultural revolution phase drew some lessons from the course of post revolutionary reconstruction in the soviet Union and warned against the emergence of new bourgeoisie class who were beneficiaries of the transitional period.

New Democracy

Mao raised that the peasantry in China was not strong enough to win the revolutionary struggle against imperialism and feudalism. Therefore, it was necessary to seek the help of the other classes of Chinese society. It was in this context that Mao emphasized the concept of a united

front It was seen as an alliance between different partners who had some common interest like opposition to imperialism. Its object would be to pursue the resolution of the principal contradiction. Such a united front strategy was employed by Mao by establishing the alliance of Chinese peasantry with the proletariat, the petty bourgeoisie and even the national bourgeoisie. It also intended the non-party elements among the Chinese intellectuals. The united front is a broad alliance of the Chinese people against Japanese imperialism and western powers.

Mao published *On New Democracy* in January 1940 in the midst of Sino-Japanese war. In this essay he defined the nature of the current stage of the Chinese revolution most explicitly and discussed the crucial questions arising out of it. It is this essay and the writings on strategy and philosophy by Mao during the three preceding years which acquired a distinct character for the CPC's revolutionary outlook. In 1945 the CPC constitution acknowledged Marxism-Leninism and the "combined principles derived from the practical experience of the Chinese revolution- the ideas of Mao Ze dong- as the guiding principles of all its work" This revolutionary outlook assumed legitimation in the international communist movement.

In Pursuance of his united front strategy, Mao gave a call for a new democratic Republic of China. It was to be a state under the joint dictatorship of several classes. He proposed a state system which is called New Democracy. Mao wrote thus: Our present task is to strengthen the people's apparatus- meaning principally the people's army, the people's police and the people courts safeguarding national defense and protecting the people interests. Given these conditions, China under the leadership of the working class and the communist party, can develop steadily from an agricultural into a socialist and eventually, communist society, eliminating classes and realizing universal harmony".

New Democracy, according to Mao, meant two things. Firstly, democracy for the people and secondly, dictatorship for the reactionaries. These two things combined together constitute the people's democratic dictatorship. In New Democracy the henchmen of imperialism- the landlord class and bureaucratic capitalist class as well as the reactionary clique of the Kuomintang, will be completely suppressed under the leadership of working class. It will allow them to behave properly and prevent them from acting irresponsibly. Democracy shall be practiced by the ranks of the people and will be allowed freedom of speech, assembly and association. According to Mao, "the people's state is for the protection of the people once they have a people's state, the people then have the possibility of applying democratic methods on a nationwide and comprehensive scale to educate and reform themselves, so that they may get rid of the influences of domestic and foreign reactionaries. Thus the people can reform their bad habits and thoughts derived from the old society, so that they will not take the wrong road pointed out to them by the reactionaries, but will continue to advance and develop toward a socialist and then communist society".

In New Democracy, the supremacy of the communist party will remain fundamental. In its revolutionary struggle towards dictatorship, the party will act as a vanguard of the working class. The communist party is an organization of the working class which is filled with revolutionary fervour and zeal. The history of revolution every where proves that without the leadership of the working class, a revolution will fail, but with the leadership of the working class a revolution will be victorious.

According to Mao, in an era of imperialism no other class in any country can lead any genuine revolution to victory.

The society of New Democracy will be classless without which democracy and socialism cannot be established. A democratic and scientific culture shall be evolved in a new democracy. Mao is convinced that without this new culture, new democracy cannot be maintained. The new culture is of and for the Chinese people which, although possessing characteristics and peculiarities of its own, yet seeks to interlink and fuse itself with the national- socialist culture and the new democratic culture of other lands, so that they mutually become the component parts of the new world culture.

Cultural Revolution

The period of the Great Leap Forward (GLF) from mid- 1958 till the end of 1960 saw both successes and setbacks for the Maoist line. The enthusiastic mass upsurge of 1958 confirmed the popularity of the new line. But severe economic difficulties had begun to appear by the end of 1958. The great leap strategy entailed significant changes in the political situation. It stripped considerable power from the central government bureaucracy and transferred it in many cases to local party cadres. And it introduced important new strains into Sino- Soviet relations. The 1959 - 60 period saw great economic difficulties causing more modernization of the 1958 strategy. In 1959 the CPC experienced an intense inner party struggle with Defense Minister Pong Dehuai attacking the 1958 line and policies frontally.

The Great Proletarian cultural revolution which started in 1966 was “one of the most extraordinary events of this century”. From a purely narrative perspective, the cultural revolution can best be understood as a tragedy, both for the individual who launched it and from the society that endured it. The movement was largely the result of the decisions of Mao. Mao’s restless quest for revolutionary purity in a post revolutionary age provided the motivation for the cultural revolution, his unique charismatic standing in the Chinese communist movement gave him the resources to get it under way, and his populist faith in the value of mass mobilization lent the movement its form. Mao’s quest for revolutionary purity “led him to exaggerate and misappraise the political and social problem confronting China in the mid- 1960s. His personal authority gave him enough power to unleash potent social forces but not enough power to control them.

As Roderick Macfarquhar has rightly remarked in the Politics of China, the “ Cultural Revolution, which Mao hoped would be his most significant and most enduring contribution to China and to Marxism- Leninism instead became the monumental error of his latter years”, China’s present leadership now describe the “ Cultural Revolution as nothing less than a calamity for their country”. Although the economic damage done by the cultural Revolution was not as severe as that produced by the Great Leap Forward the effects of the cultural revolution in terms of careers disrupted, spirits broken, and lives lost were ruinous indeed. The impact of the movement on Chinese politics and society may take decades finally to erase.

The cultural revolution provided the form and the focus to the idea of continuing revolution. It established the need for revolutionary class struggle involving the masses to uphold proletarian line. The central committee circular of 16 May 1966 which launched an attack on the outline Report on the current Academic Discussion of the Group of five in charge of the cultural revolution, initiated the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR). The Eleventh Plenum of the Central

Committee passed the 16-point decision concerning the GOCR on 8 August 1966 which laid down the theory, strategy, and policies of the GPCR. It explicitly links the new campaign to the Basic Line. This document declares that a new stage has been reached in socialist revolution. This stage can be described as the stage of 'consolidation of the socialist system'. The document clearly identifies the focus of the new movement as the "work in the ideological sphere". It quotes from Mao's speech at the Tenth Plenum that "to overthrow a political power, it is always necessary, first of all to create public opinion, to do work in the ideological sphere". This is true for the revolutionary class as well as for the counter-revolutionary class. The Maoists believed that revisionists like Liu Shaoqi and Peng Zhen had used their high offices to support anti-proletarian ideas. Therefore, it was necessary to create a revolutionary public opinion to counter that. That is why the political report at the Ninth Congress described the GPCR as "great political revolution personally initiated and led by great leader chairman Mao under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a great revolution on the realm of superstructure".

From mid-January 1967, the cultural revolution became a nation-wide political movement aimed at drastic changes in the educational, social, cultural and administrative system of Chinese society and polity. The role of the Army escalated steadily throughout 1966 and 1967. Now, once the Cultural Revolution entered the stage of the seizure of power, the military played an even greater part in the Chinese politics. Its job was not only to help seize power from the party establishment, but also to ensure thereafter that order was maintained. It was estimated that altogether 2 million officers and troops of the Peoples Liberation Army (PLA) participated in civilian affairs during the cultural revolution.

Mao's ideas on building socialism which led him to launch the Great Leap Forward in 1958 and the Cultural Revolution in 1966 have been subjected to much criticism in China during the reform period and also by development analysts in the liberal and neo-liberal mould all over the world. These mass campaigns caused enormous hardships to millions of people. Yet it is important to understand the Maoist perspective which guided those initiatives. Essentially these campaigns, especially the Cultural Revolution raised qualitative questions about achieving high growth of production as in case of capitalist systems, but it was to be based on the socialist vision of creating an egalitarian society with socialist values and moving towards a classless society.

The Deng leadership (after the death of Mao) had four major criticisms against Mao's theory of Cultural Revolution. Firstly, socialism was not about poverty, but improving material conditions of people to achieve an egalitarian society. Second, mass campaigns in the name of fighting class enemies suspended all institutions, led to arbitrary use of power and harassed and killed many innocent people. Third, the theoretical premise that treats culture or ideology as autonomous is an idealist deviation of Mao which put superstructure independent of the economic base, thus violating the tenets of dialectical and historical materialism. Fourthly, the egalitarianism promoted during of equality irrespective of the contribution made by a worker. It is beyond dispute that Mao Zedong thought initiated several innovative formulations on revolution and social reformation which continue to reverberate leading to intense political debates on the nature of democracy, socialism and human future in the 21st century throughout the world.

Module VIII

ANARCHISM

Anarchism is the doctrine that political authority, in any of its forms, is unnecessary and undesirable. The word anarchy comes from Greek and literally means 'without rule'. The term anarchism has been in use since the French Revolution, and was initially employed in a critical or negative sense to imply a breakdown of civilized or predictable order. In every language anarchy implies chaos and disorder. It was not until Pierre - Joseph Proudhon proudly declared in *What is Property?*, I am an anarchist that the word was clearly associated with a positive and systematic set of political ideas.

Anarchists look to the creation of a stateless society through the abolition of law and government. In their view, the state is evil because as a repository of sovereign, compulsory and coercive authority, it is an offence against the principles of freedom and equality it is an offence against the principles of freedom and equality. Anarchists believe that the state is unnecessary because order and social harmony can arise naturally and spontaneously and do not have to be imposed "from above" through government. The core value of anarchism is thus unrestricted personal autonomy. Sebastian Faure, in *Encyclopedia anarchiste*, defined anarchism as the 'negation of the principle of Authority'. The anarchist case against authority is simple and clear authority is an offence against the principles of absolute freedom and unrestrained political equality.

Anarchists draws from two quite different ideological traditions: liberalism and socialism. This has resulted in rival individualist and collectivist forms of anarchism. Although both accept the goal of statelessness, they advance very different models of the future anarchist society

Origin and Development

Anarchist ideas have been traced back to Taoist or Buddhist ideas, to the, Stoics and Cynics of Ancient Greece or the Diggers of the English civil war. However, the first, and in a sense classic statement of anarchist principles was produced by William Godwin (1756-1836) in this *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice*, although Godwin never described himself as an anarchist. William Godwin, the son of the Calvinist minister, a minister himself for a brief period and an author of novels, plays children's stories and miscellaneous works in social theory has often been called first modern anarchist. Godwin was the husband of the celebrated feminist, Mary Wollstonecraft and the father-in-law of Shelly. His most important political work, *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice*, was first published in 1793.

He was the first to clearly to associate opposition to political authority with an attack on private property. He maintained that ordinary men act reasonably and justly when their normal desires for self-expression and fair dealing have not been perverted by unfair economic conditions, maintained by the coercive intervention of the state He admitted, however, that even if the most natural and equitable social relations were now restored, there would for a long period be some men whose conduct would require restraint. Godwin developed an extreme form of liberal rationalism that amounted to an argument for human perfectibility based on education and social conditioning. Though an individualist Godwin believed that human beings are capable of genuinely disinterested benevolence. The greater part of his theoretical work was devoted to an exposition of the social and

moral ills created by public government and private property which he believed sanction and sustain one another.

A somewhat similar utopian anarchism appears in the works of Thomas Hodgkin(1787-1869) in post Waterloo England. He became a convinced and extreme individualist as a result of reading Adam Smith. The theory of an ultimate and underlying harmony which the classical economists tended to assume-Hodgkin made the central point of this teachings. He believed that the whole universe is regulated by permanent and invariable laws. Man is part of this vast system, so that his conduct is influenced, regulated, and controlled or punished in every minute particular by permanent and invariable laws, in the same manner as the growth of plants and the motion of heavenly bodies. Consequently there is no need whatever for legislation or for planning. The pre established harmony of self interest achieves itself when man is left unhindered . Therefore, "all law making, except gradually and quietly to repeal all existing laws, is arrant humbug".

Along with this teaching, Hodgskin combined the individualistic doctrine of the right to the whole produce of labour. That principle, he believed, was guaranteed and underwritten by Nature himself. It is the natural property right in contradiction to the existing artificial right, When all present laws are repealed, Hodgskin believed and taught, this natural property right would be automatically achieved and all men would secure their deserts in proportion to the effects of their labour.

Hodgkin did not delineate the form of a community without government, and in most of his utterances he appeared willing to retain political authority, provided it should withdraw its sections from the unjust system of private industrial property and confine its tasks to maintaining peace and order. In promulgating the labour theory of value as a doctrine of revolt he appears to have had a considerable influence on that generation of London working men which later supported the Chartist movement.

Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865) was probably the first to call himself an anarchist. Proudhon was a largely self educated printer who was dawn into radical politics in Lyons before settling in Paris in 1847. As a member of the 1848 Constituent Assembly, Proudhon famously voted against the constitution because it was constitution. He was later imprisoned for three years. In Paris he at once came into close associations with radical socialists. Proudhon's best known work, *What Is Property?* (1840) attacked both traditional property rights and communism and argued instead of mutualism, a co-operative productive system geared towards need rather than profit and organized within self-governing communities.

His most important complaint against the state was that it had evolved out of the system of private property and had sustained the inequitable incidents of that institution. He condemned political authority also on the broader ground that it implied the dominance of passion over reason, justice, and understanding, In some of his writings he explained that in condemning property he had in mind chiefly that form of it made up of accumulations from profits interest and rent and his specific economic proposals seemed intended only to eliminate the monopolistic and exploitative features from private property rather than to destroy the institutions altogether. Proudhon's more elaborate fiscal proposals constitute a system of mutualism under which individuals and voluntary associations would be enabled to engage in productive enterprise through gratuitous credit supplied by co-

operative banking associations. He described his mutualism as positive anarchy' He believed that his banking plan would eventually eliminate all private capital by rendering it incapable of earning interest and that the plan would so encourage and facilitate voluntary co-operation that any sort of coercive social organization would become unnecessary.

It is the fiscal part of Proudhon's doctrine that became most widely known and most influential. In a sense, Proudhon's libertarian socialism stands between the individualist and collectivist traditions of anarchism. Proudhon mutualists were predominant in the French labour movements in the sixties and seventies. More systematic doctrines of anarchism were set forth by Josiah Warren (1799-1874) and his disciple Stephen Pearl Andrews (1812-1886) and later by Benjamin R Tucker and his disciples particularly Lysander, Spooner (1808-1887). These scholars like Greene and most of the leaders of the anti-slavery non-resistant's were generally interested in radical economic and social reforms. Josiah Warren published the first anarchist journal in the United States. Basing his social doctrine on the universal natural law of self-preservation, he argued that man's need for governmental protection to-day arises from evils originating not in his own nature but in the unfortunate errors committed by his forefathers in setting up the institutions of private property and coercive government. He advised working class men to renounce all interest in political affairs and confine their activities to voluntary cooperative efforts.

Benjamin Tucker accepted for the most part the economic proposals of Proudhon and Greene and acknowledged, Warren's influence in forming his general social doctrines. In 1881 he established a magazine, *Liberty*, acquired a considerable reputation as an exponent of philosophical anarchism. Tucker made intelligent self-interest the basis of his doctrine. He believed that Anarchists are egoists in the farthest and fullest sense. They totally discard the idea of moral obligation. He wrote that "all men have the right if they have the power to kill or coerce other men and make the entire world subservient to their ends". With Tucker, man's natural self-interest leads logically to a society in which all men are prevaillingly free, for liberty is the most effective agency of order as well as the chief ingredient of happiness. Liberty means the enjoyment of "rights" which are simply the practical limits which self-interest places upon might; men form associations in order to secure a better definition and recognition of these limits. Stable society is necessary for the enjoyment of liberty but any infringement of liberty beyond the point where a limitation is necessary to prevent interference by one individual with the liberty of another, is an invasion. 'The nature of invasion is not changed, whether it is made by one man upon another man, after the manner of the ordinary criminal, or by one man upon all other men, after the manner of an absolute monarch, or by all upon all men upon one man, after the manner of a modern democracy' Political authority therefore should be eliminated from society, for at all periods of history and whatever the form of government, the state has violated the principle of liberty. It has always put restraint upon non-invasive as well as invasive acts. This is the anarchist definition of government: the subjection of the non-invasive individual to an external will, The most important forms of the invasive action of the state, according to Tucker, are taxation, military protection and the administration of justice. Taxation is the compulsory exaction of a man's earnings for services which, in many cases, he does not want Military defense and judicial protection are services which should be supplied in the same way that all other social needs are supplied in a country whose government acts according to the traditional principles of *lasser-faire*. They should be sought and paid for by those who demand them. The state has moral

right to monopolise and compel acceptance of such services than it has the right to monopolise and impose educational and benevolent services or a regulation of private property.

According to Tucker, in place of the state there would have associations formed by individuals freely contracting. Evening such association should have the right to enforce upon its members whatever regulations the members agree upon, including and obligations to pay taxes. But entrance into any association should be without compulsions and members should retain the right of secession. Among the most important of these association would be the societies for defense.

BAKUNIN (1814-1876)

The most systematic and thorough going anarchist doctrines in modern times appear in the writings of Michael Bakunin (1814-1876) and Prince Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921). These high-born cultivated writers sought to show the orderly, evolutionary scientific aspects of their anarchist creeds; they recommended violence, but only in a carefully organized revolution, not in isolated and irresponsible acts of assassination and destruction; and they outlined systematic schemes of organization for a society without political control. Their arguments are thoroughly permeated by the familiar socialist criticisms of private property but they add other criticisms, and in their programme of social reconstruction they are radically different from the socialists. They condemn the centralized control in the Marxian system and would eliminate collective as well as private ownership of industrial property. Although there is much in common between these two brilliant Russians, they are also significant points of difference in their criticisms, in their programmes and in their general spirit of their social philosophy.

Both Bakunin and Kropotkin were born of old families of distinctions among the Russian nobility. Both were trained for military life and as young men served as officers in the army. Their experiences gave them first hand observation of the despotic and terrorist policies of the Russian civil and military administration in their day. Their reactions turned them to socialist and revolutionary, and soon to anarchist views. Their writings and their direct participation in surrectionary movements in various European states brought them conflict with the political authorities on several occasions; both served several terms in prison and spent most of their later years in exile- Bakunin in Switzerland, Kropotkin in France for several years and then for the last years of his life, in England.

Bakunin, the son of a diplomat, was born into a prosperous aristocratic family. He renounced a military career and after philosophical studies, was drawn into political activism by the 1848 revolutions. He is regarded as the founder of an extensive movement of anarchism among proletarian groups of Europe in the later 19th century. His activities were predominantly in the field of practical agitation and organization. By the 1860s he had renounced slave nationalism for anarchism and spent there of his life as an agitator and propagandist, famous for his interest in secret societies and his endless appetite for political intrigue.

Bakunin's anarchism was based on a belief in human sociability, expressed in the desire for freedom within a community of equals and in the sacred instinct of revolt. He embraced a view of collectivism as self governing communities of free individuals, which put him at odds with Marx and his followers. Bakunin founded his doctrine of anarchism upon what he described as a scientific basis. According to him, the whole evolution of man is from a condition in which animal impulses and physical

restraints control his conduct toward a condition in which ideal ends and sanctions predominate. He believed that human history consists in the progressive negation of man's original bestiality, the evolution of his humanity' Political authority, private property, and religion are natural institutions for the lower stages of man's development, for they are associated in one way or another with physical desires and fears: private property cultivates man's interest in material goods, the state supports private property through its physical compulsions'; religion sustains both state and property and it also appeals to man's desire for physical comfort and to his fear of physical suffering after his death. These institutions characteristic expressions of man's primitive nature, are under the natural laws of human evolution, destined to disappear.

Bakunin is explicit and uncompromising in rejecting all institutions of political control even those resting on universal suffrage. Despotism, he holds, lies not in the form of the state but in its essence, and the most democratic devices are of no avail whatever in modifying this essential characteristics of the state. The ignorance and inexperience of the masses make them helpless against the intrigues of the economically powerful classes who can mold any form of political machinery to their own advantage. In this sense Bakunin's repudiation of the state has an economic basis. The system of private property in the means of production keeps the masses of man in subjection to the owners of capital; the state rests upon and perpetuates this system. The object of every political system is to confirm and organize the exploitation of workers by property - owners.

According to Bakunin, the state is morally debasing to all members of a civilized community- to those who govern as well as those who are governed, for it acts by compulsions rather than by enlightenment and persuasion. In every act of the state, the judgment and will of the private citizen is displaced by a command of a public agency. Morality and intelligence in human conduct consist slowly in performing good and reasonable acts that are approved as good or recognized and reasonable by the doer. An act done under dictation is wholly lacking in moral or rational quality. Thus the inevitable tendency of state action is to degrade the moral or intellectual levels of those subject to its authority. Political authority also demoralizes those who participate in its exercise. To occupy a position of political power engenders attitudes of superiority quite out of relation to any actual distinction in merit. Among those who exercise the power natural sentiments of cooperation and fraternity are supplanted by traditions of prerogative, class differentiation and sacrifice of individual welfare to the interest of public office. Thus the state makes tyrants or egoists out of the few or servants or dependents out of the many.

According to Bakunin, private property which is both the ground of existence and the consequence of the state , creates physical and moral evils of all kinds to the millions of workers, it brings economic dependence laborious toil, ignorance and social and spiritual immobility, for the few wealthy, it provides superfluous luxury and special opportunities for physical pleasure and artistic and intellectual enjoyment. Religion, is an evil both because it sanctions evil institutions and because it is incompatible with man's better nature. It is consciously used by the possessors of economic and political privilege to sanctify their unnatural superiority. It diverts man's interest and effort from important affairs in the actual world of humanity, develops his fancy superstition, and aborts his reason and insight. Religious faith should be displaced by science and knowledge. The fiction of future divine justice by the actuality of present human justice.

According to Bakunin, the goal of anarchism is to be attained both through evolution and revolution. Anarchism has both a scientific and an insurrectionary technique. The current of events and facts flows automatically towards the anarchist goal. The task of anarchists is to eliminate the impediments to that current both by removing ignorance of the natural laws of social evolution and by demolishing the institutions which interfere with the evolution. An anarchist revolution means the destruction of all that is commonly understood in the expression 'public order'. The destruction will require some measures of violence. It cannot be effected through the ballot and inevitably there will be some bloodshed, as a result both of the stupidity of those who will stubbornly attempt to resist and of the natural feelings of revenge which many in the first moments of their uprising will feel towards their former oppressors. Although Bakunin deprecated such acts of personal vengeance he did not minimize the severity and thoroughness of the anarchist revolution: it will involve the forcible dissolution of churches, the army, courts, police, legislative assemblies and administrative offices and the invalidation of all titles to property.

Bakunin argued that an anarchist revolution is to be organized by barricades. The barricades will send representatives instructed and reliable to a council for a whole city which, in turn, will create out of its membership committees for the various functions of revolutionary administration. The task of this revolutionary organization will be on the one hand to execute thoroughly the programme of distinction: the prompt suppression of all political institutions; the immediate distribution, among worker's societies, of all productive property and the initiation of measures to guarantee that no new authoritative organization of any sort—not even a proletarian or socialist dictatorship will be set up. On the other hand, in order to consolidate the revolution on a national scale, the council will send agents, as propagandists and agitators, to the provincial and rural communities in order to secure their participation by informing them as to the actual ends and achievements of the revolution.

Bakunin did not maintain that the whole problem of human welfare would be solved by eliminating political authority and private property. It is true that he put emphasis upon the destructive phases of anarchism. But he had full appreciation of the social aspects of human life and recognized the need for a regular organization of human relations. Every advance in human evolution, he said, has come about through the sympathetic collaboration of man with his fellows. Human freedom has no meaning apart from society. For freedom is not a merely negative concept, it denotes more than the mere absence of external restriction of one's faculties; it means the ability to act in response to the characteristic impulses of a rational being. The true liberty of a human individual postulates, on the other hand, an equal respect on his part for the freedom of others. According to Bakunin, liberty is not a matter of isolation, but of mutuality not of separation, but of combination; for every man, it is only the mirroring of his humanity in the consciousness of his brothers. Bakunin calls this the principle of 'solidarity' by virtue of which a man feels himself as fully free only when he sees about him others enjoying the same freedom. In place of state, therefore, Bakunin would establish a free society, from which all classes and all relations of authority have disappeared and in which every one without distinction of race, color, nationality or belief is permitted to labor and enjoy the fruits of his labor on equal terms. The basis of this free society will be contract and voluntary association, instead of law and compulsive allegiance. The new society will operate on these basic economic principles: society itself will own the land and will

materials and instruments of production; it will permit them to be taken into possession by those person, acting individually or in freely formed associations who are willing to use them productively every individual will then be permitted to share freely in the enjoyment of the products as to extent of his needs subject only to the condition that he has to the best that he has, to the best of his ability, contributed his labours to the productive efforts. Local associations may combine into larger territorial combinations, provided that at every stage there is no compulsion about it. The abolition of the state will mean the end of political boundaries. There will be a free union of individuals into communes, of communes into province, of provinces into nations and finally of nations into the United States of Europe and later of the whole world. The associations will have a system of law that needs no penal sanctions, for it is made up of rules which the members perceive to be necessary in keeping society going.

Bakunin conceived this order of society not as an inspiring ideal for the remote future but as a goal to be soon achieved probably before the close of the 19th century. The immediate task of those who foresee the course of evolutions is he said, to organize and expedite the revolution. This is to be done by both education and other peaceful means.

PETER KROPOTKIN (1842-1921)

Peter Kropotkin was a Russian geographer and anarchist theorist. Kropotkin's writings are vivid and interesting and display a scientific temper as well as a breadth of sympathy. His doctrine of anarchism was imbued with the scientific spirit and based upon a theory of evolution that provided an alternative to Darwin's. By seeing mutual aid as the principal means of human and animal development he claimed to provide an empirical basis for both anarchism and communism. Kropotkin's major works include *Mutual Aid* (1897) *Fields, Factories and workshops* (1901) and *the Conquest of Bread* (1906). The son of a noble family who first entered the service of Tsar Alexander-II Kropotkin encountered anarchist ideas while working in the Jura region on the French Swiss border. After imprisonment in St. Petersburg in 1874, he travelled widely in Europe returning to Russia after the 1917 Revolution.

Kropotkin sought to give evolutionary and historical bases to his doctrines. He maintained that the method of the natural science was the only way to reach conclusions as to the nature of man and society. He was a student of biology and human geography and some of his anarchist propositions are stated in terms of generalizations in these fields. He represented his doctrine as based not on metaphysical conceptions of natural rights but on ideas of the actual course of human evolution. He held the view that the laws of natural evolution apply like to animals and their groupings and to men and human society. They define the processes of an increasing adaptation to surrounding conditions of life- the development of organs, faculties and habits that render more complete the accommodations of individuals and groups to their environment.

Kropotkin placed distinctive emphasis upon two phases of this evolution. He contended that in both individual and social life natural evolution takes place not solely through a process of steady development but also, at times, through accelerated, abrupt, apparently disruptive transformations. In the normal course of the life of an individual, vital forces operate in an orderly manner. Likewise in social life there is a slow and steady progress from lower to higher forms of organization, but there

are also quick and revolutionary movements forward. New ideas that appear naturally and that are necessary for the continued progress of mankind, attempt to come forth into the actual life of society but their action is sometimes blocked by the inertia of the ignorant and indifferent or by the perverted aims of those who have selfish interests in retaining old traditions and conditions.

The second, and more important principle in Kropotkin's evolutionary theory is found in his conception of the predominate part played in evolution by the co-operative as distinguished from the competitive attributes of animals and men. According to him, the law of organic evolution is primarily a law of mutual aid, not of conflict. Individuals and species that survive are those endowed with the most effective faculties for co-operative in the struggles to adapt themselves to their environment. He argued that the law of mutual aid manifests itself in social life, in a principle of equality, justice and social solidarity, which is nothing but the golden rule.

According to Kropotkin, the hindrances to the progress of human society are the state, private property and religion. Religious authority, according to him, is the servant of political oppression and economic privilege. The state is without any natural or historical justification. It is opposed to man's natural cooperative instincts. Its structure and manner of action are determined by the fallacious assumption that men's characteristic and prevailing impulses are competitive and unsocial so that restraint and compulsion are necessary in order to maintain society. Men lived together for ages without any politically enforced rules. The state is of relatively late historical origin having displaced the freer, more natural associations of earlier civilization, when the relations of men were regulated by habits and usages learned, like hunting and agriculture, from the years of childhood. Laws in their earliest forms were simply the customs that served to maintain society. State enacted laws appeared only when society became divided by economic conditions into mutually hostile classes, one of them seeking to exploit the other. As political authority developed laws came more and more to be merely rules confirming the customs that proved advantageous to the ruling groups and gave permanence to their economic supremacy.

Kropotkin argued that history reveals both the state's incompetence for the achievement of any high purpose and its positive contribution to human suffering and injustice. The state has not protected the factory workers and the peasant from exploitation by capitalists and land owners or secured food for the needy or work for the unemployed. It has not been the guardian of inherent rights of the individual' freedom of the press and association, the inviolability of the home and all the rest are respected only so long as the people make no use of them against the privileged classes. Neither the protective nor the beneficent services of the state are either necessary or effective. He believed that the people can defend themselves against domestic brigands and foreign aggressors' history shows that standing armies have always been defeated by citizen armies and that invasion is most effectively wasted by popular uprising. Finally the cultural and benevolent activities of government are superfluous; when men are released from their economic and political dependence, voluntary activity will supply all that is needed for both education and charity.

Kropotkin believed these facts to be true of all forms of state. The transformation of absolute monarchies into parliamentary governments have effected no change in the essential character of the state. A representative system based on universal suffrage is now unworkable. According to Kropotkin, the evil equality of private property is inherent in its essential character and manifest in its

actual effect. Actual social conditions reveal the consequences of private property; among the masses - want and misery, millions unemployed, children of retarded growth, constant debts for the farmers. Historically the parasitic institutions of state and property entered together into the midst of the free institution of our ancestors; and the whole reason for the existence of political authority today lies in its function of protecting property.

Kropotkin's picture of future society is in many details, like the one drawn by Bakunin. Men will continue to live together but they will no longer be held together by governmental authority. Free association will prevail throughout society. Individuals prosecuting the same ends will combine into groups and these groups into large associations, the course of organization proceeding from the simple to the complex according to the actual needs and desires. As the demands appear groups will be formed to build houses, construct roads, make tools, conducts schools etc. These groups will join into leagues and unions with various blending as economic and social interests dictate. All associations will be formed through voluntary contracts, whose observance will in general be assured by the necessity felt by every one for friendly co-operation with his neighbors. Within each group those exceptional individuals who fail to live up to their obligations will be expelled from membership. Disputes will be settled by voluntarily established courts of arbitration. Since the social order is based upon principles of freedom and justice, the incitement to antisocial acts will largely disappear. Where such acts occur, moral influence and sympathetic intervention will normally suffice to suppress them.

Economically the new order will be that of complete communism. So far as ownership is concerned there will be no discrimination between goods as production and goods for consumption. Kropotkin regarded as fallacious and impracticable the doctrine that productive goods – machines, raw materials, land, means of transportation should be the property of the community while finished products should remain under private ownership. Every normal individual will be driven into some association both by his natural impulse to labour when his work can be done under conditions which he regards as just and by the natural willingness of a society of workers to share the products of its labours with those who refuse to work. Every labour will be permitted to satisfy freely his needs from all that is abundant. Under such an organization of production and distribution the quantity of goods, Kropotkin believed, will be sufficient for all to live in comfort and the goods will be of better quality than under the present system.

Kropotkin believed that the natural course of events was moving towards the goal he pictured. It is no longer a matter of faith, it is a matter for scientific discussion. Already he argued the part played by government is becoming less important as compared with the co-operative activities in which citizens voluntarily engage. Millions of transaction; are now entered into and executed daily without any governmental intervention; agreements are faithfully kept not under the incentive of fear of punishment, but because of desire to retain the confidence and respect of one's neighbors or a natural habit of keeping one's word.

Although Kropotkin believed that the inevitable trend of social evolution was towards the anarchist goal, he did not believe that the goal could be reached through a wholly gradual and peaceful process. The evolution must culminate in a revolution. The revolution will be with first phase destructive and violent, existing governors must be deposed, prisons and forts demolished, the spirit of mutual aid revived. After the basic instruments of coercive authority are forcibly removed, the people will proceed to expropriate private property, peasants expelling landowners workers driving out factory owners, those having inadequate homes moving into dwellings that

contain surplus space Then they must follow the work of a constructive reshaping of society. This will be through a purely voluntary procedure. No government no transitional dictatorship, will be required that would mean death to the revolution.

Kropotkin considered some of the common criticisms of anarchism and offered answers to them. He insisted generally that anarchism does not means chaos or confusion. It means hostility to the state and to the peculiar social relations which the state sustains, but it is not true that where there is no government there is disorder. More over, order that is merely the consequence of the strong arm of government is of doubtful benefit. He considered more specifically the objections that in the absence of political authority men would fail to keep agreements, refused to work and commit antisocial acts.

According to Kropotkin , agreements are, in the first place essentially ,of two kind forced and voluntary, In the former case, the agreement is accepted by one of the parties out of sheer necessity as when a workman sells his labour to an employer because otherwise his family would starve; the fear of political authority is necessary to guarantee the observance of such an agreement but the agreement itself is unjust in the case of agreements entered into voluntary basis, no force is necessary to secure observance, they would be carried out as faithfully in an anarchist society as in a political society.

Secondly, Kropotkin argued that distaste for work is not the natural disposition of man. Man normally prefer work to idleness. Thirdly there is no natural disposition in men to violate the useful customs of society. The antisocial deeds that are perpetrated now are the consequences of perverted social rules: Most crimes are directly or indirectly to the injustices of the existing system of production and distribution, not to the perversion of human nature. When a man himself and his family in need of the bare existence of life, others about him living in superfluous case and luxury-commits a crime, he does so under the impulsion of conditions that will disappear when anarchism prevails. For the future society will not only remove existing incentive to crime, it will so develop social health competence and a general regard for one another's interests that positive incentives to good conduct will be firmly established and there will be no need for organized repression.

The anarchists are bitter critics of religion. Kropotkin rejected conventional religion on both scientific and spiritual grounds. Religion, he believed is either a primitive cosmogony , “a rude attempt at explaining nature” or it is an ethical system which through its appeal to the ignorance and superstition of the masses, cultivates among them a tolerance of the injustice they suffer under the existing political and economic arrangements. He was willing, however, to apply the term religion to his conception of a social morality that develops spontaneously among the masses of the people. Such a natural religion is necessary for any society, in the sense that no society can exist without certain moral habits and rules that evolve unconsciously and as consequence of which men respect one another's interests and rely upon one another words. A morality of this sort is anterior to and independent of formal religious creeds. It grows out of the social conventions that begin as soon as men begin to live together. Habits of mutual support and of self-sacrifice to the common well-being are necessary conditions for the welfare of the group in its struggle for life. The individuals who survive and thrive are those who best accustom themselves to a life in society. He wrote that, a “morality which has become instructive is the true morality, the only morality which endures while religious and systems of philosophy pass away”.

Kropotkin placed much emphasis upon man's sense of social responsibility, his feeling of human brotherhood, and his disposition to engage in labours that satisfy both and impulse to create and a desire to see commodities produced in amounts sufficient to meet the needs of his fellowmen. He regarded these natural human attributes as adequate guarantees of peace, order and fair dealing in a society that has got rid of the unnatural institutions of private property and political coercion.

The numerous and devoted followers of Bakunin and Kropotkin added no essentially new ideas; Prominent among these disciples have been Elisee Reclus, Jean Grave, and Emile Gautier in France, Enrico Malatesta in Italy, and Emma Goldman, a Russian American. Reclus who was a distinguished geographer is the most important of his group. Although he drew from Kropotkin the principal counts in his indictment of the modern political and economic order, he showed some originality in presenting the evidences. He proposed briefly negative and pacific measures for getting rid of political authority.

The doctrines of Bakunin and Kropotkin were spread among the working men of Europe through numerous journals, some of them ably edited, most of them very short lived. Some anarchists contend that violence is inadmissible even as a means of resistance or revolution. The most celebrated among recent advocate of anarchism was Count Leo Tolstoy, probably the most widely Russian of the later 19th century and one of the greatest literary figures of recent times. Tolstoy's doctrine has been called Christian anarchism. He rejected many of the traditional dogmas of Christianity - particularly, the trinity, the divinity of Christ, and personal immortality but he was thoroughly Christian in his outlook. Tolstoy described Christianity as a simple code of moral rules, offering the one adequate solution for the problems of human conduct. Both the state and private property are, in Tolstoy's theory incompatible with true Christianity. The state based on force and executes its will through armed men- police men and soldiers, trained to kill.

Tolstoy said little as to the future organization of society. He laid stress upon individual regeneration and regarded most institutional schemes for reforming society as futile. He was emphatic in condemning force as a means of social reconstruction. The only effective methods are those of enlightenment. He wrote thus: 'Awaken the conscience of the people; live according to the principles of love and equality, practice passive resistance; refuse obedience to the clearly un-Christian commands of a government;'

CRITICISMS

The anarchist doctrines of Bakunin and Kropotkin have been subjected to severe criticisms by various schools of political thought. Major criticism of anarchism is that in the absence of political authority, men would fail to keep agreements refuse to work and commit anti social activities. As Hobbes has rightly pointed out in his well known work *Leviathan*, "Covenants without the swords are but words; and of no strength to secure a man at all". The communists criticise the anarchist theory on the ground that an unorganized and unplanned revolution can never be successful. A revolution can be accomplished only under the leadership of a highly dedicated and disciplined political party and with the help of a large mass of people.

Module IX

POLITICAL PLURALISM

The form of sovereignty as developed by Jean Bodin to John Austin was generally regarded as an essential attribute of the modern state till the 19th century. Accordingly, it was almost universally admitted that the state is superior to all other human associations in society because sovereignty is exclusive to the state. The rise of capitalism combined with the theory of absolute state posed a real threat to freedom in society. Many thinkers expressed serious concern at this state of affairs. Pluralist theory launched a systematic attack on the doctrine state-sovereignty. The pluralist theory, in short, sought to redefine that nature of the state as one of the several associations of human beings operating in society to secure the multifarious interests of individuals.

Dictionary of Social Science defines political pluralism as “those doctrines..... which assert that certain groups in society embody important social value prior to and independent of their authorization or approval by the state”. The pluralist theory is marked by a shift in focus from the legal to the sociological character of the state. It recognizes the role of several associations in society formed by men in pursuance of their multifarious interests. Some of these associations have been in existence prior to the origin of the state itself. Some of them exist independent of the state, that is, they are neither created nor sponsored, nor maintained, nor even regulated by the state. The state is but one of these associations, standing side-by-side with them, not above them. Such associations include the church and other religious organizations, trade unions, cooperative societies and chambers of commerce and so many voluntary associations devoted to education, cultural and scientific pursuits. All these associations embody some social value, means of satisfying some needs and other worthwhile pursuits.

Political pluralism is inspired by the notion that liberty is to be found in the division of powers between state and other associations and corporations. Not only centralized sovereignty of the state destroys democracy and freedom, according to them, but its action is wasteful and injurious to the personality of the individuals. However, the pluralists are not in favour of abolition of the state. Their state is not a sovereign state but merely a useful social institution among so many other social institutions. In other words, the pluralist deny sovereignty of the state but not the state itself.

Pluralistic tendency in politics represents a reaction against state absolutism which grew out of the traditional theory of state sovereignty as developed by political philosophers like Jean Bodin, Thomas Hobbes, J. J. Rousseau, John Austin etc. The pluralists view the state differently and adopt various lines of attack against the sovereignty of the state. They hold that the conception of the state as an absolute legal sovereign hardly fits in with political practices now-a-days. It is also a reaction to the breakdown of state administration due to expansion and over centralization of the functions of the state. The doctrine of political pluralism was developed by a number of social and political thinkers from Europe and America. Emile Durkheim- a French sociologist, F. W. Maitland an English legal historian, and GDH Cole- an English economist are regarded as the fore runners of the pluralist theory. The important exponents of pluralism include Ernest Barker, Harold Laski, A.D. Lindsay, Hobhouse, Mao Iver etc.

HAROLD LASKI

Harold Laski is the most ardent exponent of political pluralism. Born on June 30, 1893, Harold Laski was the second son of Nathan Laski and Sarah Laski. His father was Jew who had from Hungary. Since Harold's father was an orthodox Jew, he wanted his son to follow strictly the principles of orthodox Judaism. From the very beginning of his career Harold was an extraordinarily brilliant child and he struck his teacher John Lewis Paton with his outstanding ability. He published an article under the title "On the Scope of the Eugenics" in the Westminster Review in July 1910. This essay was so profoundly scholarly that it won him praise from the greatest scientist, sir Francis Galton. Laski left the school in 1910 and for a period of six months he carried his studies in Eugenics with Karl Pearson at University College in London. In 1909 he met Frida Kerry whom he married in the summer of 1911. From 1911 to 1914 he studied at the New College, Oxford. He carried his studies under the able guidance of eminent professors like H.A.L. Fisher, Ernest Barker and was highly influenced by the writings of F.W. Maitland. Later he accepted an invitation Lansbury to work on the Daily Herald to which he contributed a number of articles from the point of view of the trade union, dealing with Ireland and other constitutional problems. He then accepted the job of a lecturer at the McGill University, Montreal, Canada, and then shifted to Harvard University in USA where he worked for a period of five years. He then left Harvard and joined the prestigious London School of Economics and Political Science as a lecturer. He succeeded Prof. Graham Wallas as Professor of Political Science and remained in the school till his death in 1950.

As teacher of political science he was extremely popular and his lectures were highly inspiring and stimulating. Students from different parts of the world came to receive instructions from him and considered it an honour to study under his guidance. It is interesting to note that Jawaharlal Nehru, K.R. Narayanan, V.K. Krishan Menon, Dr. K. N. Raj etc were his brilliant students. He had great love for his students and they in return had all respect and regard for him.

Besides being a political thinker of repute, Laski was also active in politics. He was closely associated with the activities of Labour party. For many years he was a member of its executive committee and was also its chairman when the Labour party came to power in 1945. He had a great knowledge of political affairs and was always in a position to guide the official leaders of the party like Attlee, Morrison etc.

In his political thinking, Laski was influenced by many factors. The period in which Laski was living was the period when different ideologies, such as Utilitarianism, Fabian socialism, and Communism were spreading with a view to reforming the various prevalent conceptions regarding sovereignty, parliamentary democracy and the economic and political liberties of the individual. As a young boy he spent most of his time reading books on all these issues. Thus he wanted to reform source of the conservative and orthodox dogmas and opinions regarding the social and political institutions. Besides, Laski was greatly influenced by Leon Duguits book, 'Law in the Modern State', which he translated from French. The writings of Ernest Barker, Maitland Figgis etc also influenced the political philosophy of Laski. The important works of Laski include

1. Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty(1917)
2. Political Thought from Locke to Bentham(1920)

3. Foundation of Sovereignty (1921)
4. A Grammar of Politics(1925)
5. Communism(1927)
6. Liberty in the Modern State (1930)
7. Democracy in Crisis (1938)
8. The Rise of European Liberalism (1936)
9. An introduction to Politics (1931)
10. Parliamentary Government in England (1938)

It is to be noted that Laski's political ideas underwent changes according to the changing conditions in different parts of the world from time to time. At different stages of his career he was an advocate of pluralism, Fabianism, Marxism and Socialism. In other words, though very brilliant, he has not been very consistent in his formulations. He has been adjusting his pluralist position between liberalism and Marxism, but ultimately he emerged as an exponent of new- liberalism- a combination of liberalism and socialism. In his scheme of the reorganization of the state on the basis of democratization of power, Laski comes out as an ardent pluralist.

In the early phase of his political philosophy, that is in the 1920s, Laski advance vigorous criticism of the theory of state sovereignty and held that his theory would pass like the theory of the divine right of kings He thought of sovereignty as nothing more than a legal fiction and a barren concept But in the later phase, that is, in the 1930s, Laski began to evolve a balanced view of pluralism identifying the points of its strength and weakness, and then he conceded the importance of sovereignty as an essential element of state- power, though he viewed the state itself as an agency for regulating class- relations in society, while he himself prepared a classless society .

Liberty and Rights

In his Authority in the modern state, Laski elaborates his views on liberty. Laski does not believe that separation of powers ensures individual liberty. By liberty Laski means " the eager maintenance of that atmosphere in which men have the opportunity to be their best selves" Liberty, therefore , consists in the enjoyment of certain system of rights . Without rights there cannot be any liberty because in that case men are the subjects of law unrelated to the needs of personality. If the rights are not guaranteed liberty shall always remain an empty slogan. Laski does not accept Mills' classification of human actions into two parts, namely, self- regarding and other – regarding activities.

According to Laski, there are three aspects of liberty namely, private, political and economic. Private liberty means freedom of choice and action in areas of life which affect the individual himself such as religion. Writing about private liberty he says thus: "private liberty is that aspect of which the substance is mainly personal to a man's self. It is the opportunity to be fully himself in the private relations of life". The state should not interfere with the affairs of private liberty. Political liberty means freedom of choice and action to be active in the affairs of the state Enjoyment of political liberty depends upon factors like education and free press. Economic liberty means that the citizens should be free from the constant fear of unemployment and in sufficiency; It also means that

the workers should have a share in the administration of the productive system. All other freedoms become useless and fruitless in the absence of economic liberty.

Laski also discusses some safeguards of liberty. There should be no special privileges in society. All persons must be regarded equal in the eyes of law and all should have equal opportunities. Special privileges is in compatible with freedom because the latter quality belongs to all alike in their character has human beings. All people according to Laski, should enjoy equal access to power. Laski, therefore, suggests that all special privileges must be abandoned. The second safeguard suggested by Laski is that rights of some should not depend upon the pleasure of other. No groups of men must be in position to encroach upon the rights of others which they are entitled to enjoy as citizens. The common rules must be binding upon those who exercise power as well as upon those who are the subjects of power. Finally, the effective safeguards of liberty depends upon the determination of the people to fight for it.

RIGHT

According to Laski, rights are “those conditions of social life without which no man can seek in general to be himself at his best”. A state is known by the rights that it maintains. The state briefly does not create, but recognizes rights, and its character will be apparent from the rights that, at any given period, secure recognition. But, the possession rights does not mean the possession of claims that are empty of all duties.

The individual is entitled to number of rights.

1. He has the right to work, but this does not mean right to any particular work. It means the right to useful work for the society and the right of self- expression and existence.
2. An individual has the right to adequate wages, but it means sufficient wages for a reasonable living .
3. He has the right to reasonable hours of work. This would ensure leisure to every worker for intellectual pursuits.
4. Right to education. This means not equal education for all, but a minimum of education for everybody.
5. Political rights of voting, being elected and holding public office.
6. Freedom of speech
7. Freedom of association
8. Equality of all in the eyes of law and equitable administration of justice and
9. Right to property.

According to Laski, there are three general conditions which are necessary for the fullest realization of rights. The first is that the state must be centralized state. The organs which exercise power must not be concentrated at a single point in the body politic. Secondly, every

department of the government must be associated by a consultative committee. The third condition is the limitation upon its authority to intervene in the internal life of other associations.

Attack on Absolute Sovereignty of state

In his 'A Grammar of Politics', Laski proceeds to scrutinize the theory of sovereignty from three aspects and discovers its weaknesses everywhere: in the first place his tropical analysis of the state repudiates the idea of absolute sovereignty. He accepts Sir Henry Maine's criticism of Austin and shows how custom and tradition substantially limit the exercise of sovereign power. These are not legal checks imposed by some determinate human superior, nor do they operate with the express or tacit consent of the sovereign himself. The deference which even omnipotent monarchs and sultans have to show to custom, is a political need, a dictate of prudence and expediency. Besides these limitations in the internal sphere, sovereignty is also subject to limitations in the eternal sphere. Here Laski finds the claims of absolute sovereignty incompatible with the interest of humanity. As he observes in his A Grammar of Politics, in a creative civilization what is important is not the historical accident of separate state, but the scientific fact of world interdependence. The real unit of allegiance is the world. The real obligation of obedience is to the total interest of our fellow – men”.

In the second place, the theory of absolute sovereignty fails as a theory of law. Here Laski accepts Dicey's distinction between legal and popular sovereignty as a proof of the absurdity of Austin's definition of sovereignty as determinate and indivisible. He proceeds to show how even the idea of popular sovereignty is not workable. In Laski's words” everyone knows that to regard the king in parliament as a sovereign body in the Austinian sense is absurd. No parliament would dare to disfranchise the Roman Catholics or to prohibit the existence of trade unions. If it made the attempt, it would cease to be a parliament. That is to say that in practice legally unlimited power turns out to be power exercised under conditions fairly well known to each generation’.

Finally, the theory of sovereignty does not hold good in the analysis of a political organization. Laski cites the case of the federal state, particular of the United States, to show that the location of sovereignty-as envisaged by Austin is very difficult in the case of such political organization.

Further, Laski attacks the unlimited authority of the sovereign. He wrote thus : “No sovereign has anywhere possessed unlimited power; and the attempt of exert it has always resulted in the establishment of safeguards” It is not possible to find an unlimited sovereign in a unitary or federal state. Again, Laski does not agree with Austin's view that law is the same for the legislator and the citizen, the command is not binding on the giver.

Authority is Federal

According to Laski, society is federal and therefore authority must also be federal. Man has many wants, social, economic, cultural, Political or religions and forms or joins many associations to satisfy them. Each one of these associations has a part in the development and enrichment of his personality. In the 'Foundations of Sovereignty', Laski argues that the state is only one of many forms of human associations and, as compared with other associations, it has no superior claims to an individual's allegiance. This is because rights and powers are relative to function. Authority is federal in character always and everywhere.. The state cannot regulate the whole life of man and must share its function and its authority with other associations. The state “is not unitary, it is not

absolutistic, it is not independent. It is pluralistic and constitutional and responsible. It is limited in the force it exercises, it is directive rather than dominating.” In his *A Grammar of Politics* Laski argues that the larger function of the state postulate larger responsibility as well. The state can justify its existence only as a public service corporation: The state differs from every other association in that it is, in the first place an association in which membership is compulsory. It is, in the second place, essentially territorial in nature....The state controls the level at which men are to live as men. It is, in administrative terms, a government whose activities are shaped by the common needs of its members. To satisfy those common needs, it must control other associations to the degree that secures from them the service such needs require.

According to Laski, the state must justify exercise of its social authority by ensuring an effective coordination of functions of other human associations in the best public interest. While not reducing that state to the level of a trade union, Laski is of the opinion that sovereignty in the state should be shared by a many groups according to the respective value of the functions of each group. The state, according to Laski, should perform its co-ordinating function, but has no right to omnipotence. Laski’s plea to make authority federal is the cornerstone of his pluralist doctrine.

Its logical conclusion may be found in his concept the democratisation of power. In his pluralist fervor, Laski feels deeply concerned about the undemocratic control of industry and politics by the economic overlords in society. This state of affairs cannot be transformed, Laski feels, unless the vital instrument of production are owned and controlled by the community. Socialization of these vital resources will avert concentration of economic power in society and start the process of the democratization of powers.

Assessment

Conflicting views have been expressed about Laski’s place in the history of western political thought. On the one hand is the opinion of Blum who compared Laski with Montesquieu and De Tocqueville and held that he did not think any other man in Europe or America having such a profound and original knowledge of democratic thought and institutions since the 17th century. Against this expression of splendid admiration, Herbert Deane opined that Laski never achieved the distinction a a political theorist or as a scholar in the field of political philosophy. His published works were repetitions and rhetorical to the point of bombast. To call him a mere pamphleteer and a propagandist is no doing justice to the political reasoning of Laski. It s true that Laski was not only a great scholar, a great thinker. His greatest contribution to political thought lies in his synthesis that he has effected between liberalism and Marxism.