Unit- I

Machiavelli (1469-1527)

1.0 Introduction

Niccolo Machiavelli was born in Florence, (Italy) in 1469 in a family with modest means. His father was a jurist. Machiavelli as a child could not receive proper education and he studied the Latin classics, especially on Roman history under the guidance of his father. As he grew young he joined the government of Florence as the secretary of Chancery. In this new capacity he got a chance to handle the departments of war and interior. Most of the diplomatic correspondent also passed through him. But with the change of power Machiavelli was not only obliged to leave the job but was thrown in the prison on a charm of conspiracy on an account of his failure to side with the new rulers. In 1513 Machiavelli produced his masterpiece 'The Prince'. Eight years later he produced 'Discourses' in 1521.

1.1 Unit Objectives

- After reading this unit, you will be able to understand:
- 1. Influence on Machiavelli
- 2. Human Nature
- 3. The impact of Renaissance on Machiavelli
- 4. Machiavelli's separation of Politics and Ethics

1.2 Influences on Machiavelli:

Machiavelli since his early life has been influenced by number of factors which can be seen in his philosophy some of the factors which influenced the thinking and philosophy of Machiavelli deserve mention under the following headings.

(a) Conditions in Italy: At the time of Machiavelli the Italian peninsula was divided into a number of small but independent states which were constantly at war. These states possessed different forms of governments; while some were republics the other were ruled by despotic rulers. No doubt by the beginning of the sixteenth century some sort of consolidation of these states had been achieved but still they were divided into five groups viz. kingdom of Naples. Territory of Roman Catholic Church, the Duchy of Milan, the Republic of Venice and the Republic of Florence. Apart from the internal dissension amongst these states there was a serious threat to their existence due to presence of strong states like France and Spain on the borders. Machiavelli ardently desired to unity these warring states and makes them sufficiently strong so that they could deal with the foreign power effectively. With this end, Machiavelli wrote books like Art of War, the Discourse on Livy and the Prince in which he laid down the principles which he wanted these states to follow, so that they could prosper and flourish. Though Machiavelli hailed from Florence, a Republic, he pleaded for a strong ruler who could unite the country and expel the foreign invaders. He particularly considered the papacy as a great obstacle in the way of secular integration and supported gradual transfer of power from the church of the monarch.

(b) *Impact of Republic:* The Renaissance Movement which stood for the revival of ancient values and culture also exercised profound influence on Machiavelli because this

movement was strongest in Florence. This movement not only revived that was ancient and had been forgotten during the medieval period, but also created a consciousness of life, a new sense of liberty, and new values of life. Man became the center of all study and God was relegated to the background. This was a sort of revolt against the authority of the Church. The impact of Renaissance on Machiavelli is quite evident from strong plea for gradual transfer of power from the church to the state.

(c) *Emergency of strong Monarchies*: the emergency of strong monarchs who had concentrated the entire political power in their own hands, which earlier rested with the feudatories and corporations, also left a deep impact on Machiavelli. Though the concentration, of absolute powers in the hands of the rulers meant a death knell of the medieval representation institutions, Machiavelli saw in it as the only remedy for the unification of Italy.

Apart from these contemporary influences, Machiavelli was also influenced by the writings of Aristotle and Marsiglio. He learnt the idea of separation of ethics and politics from Aristotle. The other important things which he borrowed from Aristotle were the idea that the state was the highest organization of human beings. The three fold division of the states as Monarchy, Aristocracy and Democracy, and the famous historical method. Likewise he felt the influence of Marsiglio in so far the idea of secularism and the political utility of religion are concerned.

But without any doubt, he felt the maximum impact of the contemporary conditions. It has been rightly said of Machiavelli that he was the epitome of his times. In fact hardly any other thinker has been more deeply influenced by the contemporary politics as Machiavelli. Sabine also says "Clear and broad as his vision of politics was Machiavelli was still in a peculiar sense an Italian of the first quarter of sixteenth century. Had he written in any other time and place, his conception of politics must have been significantly differently".

1.2.1 Renaissance and its Impact

Laski (1936) rightly observes that "the whole of the Renaissance is in Machiavelli. There is its lust for power; its admiration for success, its carelessness of means, its rejection of medieval bonds, its frank paganism, its conviction of national unity makes for national strength. Neither his cynicism nor his praise of craftiness is sufficient to conceal the idealist in him". To comprehend the full importance of Machiavelli's writings and their context, it is important to understand the series of cultural, economic, social and political changes that began in the fourteenth century called the Renaissance. Its immediate impact was in Italy, which gradually spread to the rest of Europe by the late fifteenth century. 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 the individual, the beauty and glory of the earth, the joy of existence, the insignificance of the supernatural and the importance of the present, as compared to an irrecoverable past and an uncertain future. This return to a pre-Christian attitude towards humans, God and Nature found expression in all aspect of human Endeavour and

creativity. Humanism, affirming the dignity and excellence of the human being, became the basis of comprehending the modern world. In contrast to the medieval Christian stress on asceticism, poverty, humility, misery and the worthlessness of the earthly person, Humanism defended the freedom of the human spirit and knowledge. The Renaissance signaled the breakdown of a unified Christian society.

At the centre of the Renaissance was the emergence of the new human, an ambitious restless individual, motivated by his self- interest, seeking glory and asceticism, were seen as the true ends of human existence and education. Self-fulfillment was no longer viewed as being achievement by repressing natural facilities and emotion. Jacob Burckhardt in his classic, The *Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy* (1860) pointed out that it was the conception of the new human, the individual motivated by fame and glory, self- actualization and happiness, rather than self- denial and religious faith that formed the essence of the Renaissance. The spirit of individualism and the cult of privacy led to the growth of self-assertion and ushered in the idea of the highest development of the individual.

Alongside the development of the modern individual was the beginning of the modern state. The idea of the modern state, omnipotent and Omni-competent, was worked out. The prince had to take change of everything – preservation of public buildings and churches, maintenance of the municipal police, police, drainage of the marshes, ensuring the supply of corn, levying taxes and convincing the people of their necessity, supporting

the sick and destitute, lending support to distinguished intellectuals and scholars on whose verdict rested his fame for the years to come. More than anybody else, it was Machiavelli who could understand the dynamics of this modern state and the modern individual.

Alongside the development of the modern individual was the beginning of the modern state. The idea of the modern state, omnipotent and Omni-competent, was worked out. The prince had to take charge of everything- preservation of the public buildings and churches, maintenance of the municipal police, drainage of the marshes, ensuring the supply of corn, levying taxes and convincing the people of their necessity, supporting the sick and destitute, lending support to distinguished intellectuals and scholars on whose verdict rested his fame for the years to come. More than anybody else, it is Machiavelli who could understand the dynamics of this modern state and the modern individual.

Equally important were the end of the clerical monopoly and the replacement of papal supremacy by secular, sovereign, independent states, each with its own national culture identity and language. The nation state came into existence and its success was determined not by religious or chivalric, but by political criteria. Explorations and voyages led to geographical discoveries, altering the perceptions regarding the world. The Medievalists had viewed the universe with a flat earth at the centre, hell beneath it and heaven as its canopy. The discoveries of Christopher Columbus (1451-1506) and Vasco-Da-Gama (1469-1524) enlarged the geographical horizons beyond the Mediterranean basin and Europe. A new world map magnified the view of the educated.

New geographical discoveries opened up new vistas of trade and religion. This led to growth in commerce and economic development as the basis of modern capitalism. Cities and urban centers emerged. Rational methods of book keeping and accounting and complex banking operations mushroomed, eroding the taboo on monkey making, entrepreneurship and the profit motive. Education, Science and humanism ended clerical monopoly, relegating religion to the private space. The invention of printing, the establishment of libraries and universities increased and spread literacy, and revived an interest in Latin classics.

In Europe, it was Italy that experienced the onslaughts of these new commercial, entrepreneurial, and economic forces. All this reflected in the political and societal organization in Italy. Politically, Italy was divided into a number of small principalities and five large states: Milan, Venice, Florence, the papal domain and Naples. Of these, Florence was the most cultured city, the seat of the Italian Renaissance, producing some eminent and renowned figures. It was the first modern state in the world (Burckhardt 1921).

Though cultural vibrant and creative, Italy remained politically divided weak, and a prey to the imperial ambitions of the French, German and Spanish. Most of the Italian states were ruled by an oligarchy or an individual tyrant. All of them were unable or unwilling to unite the entire peninsula. The Florentine Republic reflected serve factional conflicts and institutional breakdown. It was a period of heated constitutional experimentation, accelerated by Savonarola who expelled the Medici and destroyed their wonders and wealth.

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. Italian society, "intellectually brilliant and artistically creative, more emancipated than many in Europe... was a prey to the worst political corruption and moral degradation" (Sabine 1973). It produced some great minds and intellects of that period, like Alexander Botticelli (1444-1510), Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), Buonarroti Michelangelo (1475-1564) and Santi Raphael (1483-1520). Its galaxy of artists made Renaissance Italy comparable to Athens of the fifth century BC. However, while Athens flourished politically, with a vibrant participatory democracy, in Italy there was a political vacuum. The old, feudal order had begun to collapse and disintegrate, but the new age, marked by the emergence of the territorial nation state as a sovereign legal political entity was still in its embryonic form.

Writing at the time of political chaos and moral confusion, Italian unification became the chief objective of Machiavelli, who could see "clearly the direction that political evolution was taking throughout Europe. No man knew better than he the archaism of the institutions that were begin displaced or accepted more readily the part that naked force was playing in the process. Yet no one in that age appreciated more highly the inchoate sense of national unity on which this force was obscurely based" (Sabine 1973). Machiavelli's attachment was to his country Italy, and not to a state as an abstract entity. 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 prevention of the state and its people. Considerations of justice or injustice, humanity or cruelty, glory or shame were immaterial in light of protecting the life and liberty of the country.

Freedom of the country and the common good remained the core themes of Machiavelli's writings. A prefect state was one which promoted the common good, namely the observance of laws, honoring woman, keeping public offices open all the citizens on grounds of virtue, maintaining a moderate degree of social equality, and protecting industry, wealth and property. The freedom of the country had to be safeguarded with the help of war and explanation. War was a horror, but not worse than military defeat and subjugation. Machiavelli was the precursor of Hegel in making a realistic appraisal of war in understanding reality.

Check your Progress

- 1. Name some of the important works of Machiavelli?
- 2. What are the important factors that helped in shaping the political philosophy of Machiavelli?
- 3. 'Renaissance movement had a deep impact on Machiavelli', Explain?

1.2.2 Machiavelli's conception of Human Nature

Machiavelli's concept of Human Nature was identical to John Calvin and Thomas Hobbes as he also alike them didn't believe in the goodness of human beings and human Nature. 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 the honesty and justice, he was ready to act in a manner that was detrimental to the community. It was only under compulsion or when there was personal gain that an individual was ready to do good. Being essentially anti social anarchical, selfish, greedy and sensual, the individual would readily forgive the murder of his father, but never the seizure of property. He desire power, glory and material well-being. Elsewhere, Machiavelli observed that the desire for novelty, fear and love dictated human actions. Individual establish a government with the strongest and the most courageous becoming law givers and leaders as they desire personal safety and security of possessions. Like Aristotle, he believed that the government made the individual just and fair.

Machiavelli conceived human beings as being basically restless, ambitious, aggressive and acquisitive, in a state of constant strife and anarchy. They were discontented and dissatisfied, for human needs were unlimited, but fortune limited their possessions and capacity for enjoyment. Under such circumstance, politics got "plagued by the dilemma of limited goods and limitless ambition". Interestingly, Machiavelli presumed that human nature remained constant, for history moved in a cyclical way, alternating between growth and decay. This enabled one to discern general laws of political behavior with a view to maximizing one's gain. He observed that there was not much difference between how individuals lived and how they ought to live, for one who sacrificed what had to be done in favor of what ought to be done normally sowed the seeds of destruction rather than preservation.

Furthermore, Machiavelli pointed out that the human mind tended to glorify the past, decry the present and hope for a better future. Like Aristotle, Machiavelli characterized the individual as a political animal. While Aristotle implied the innate sociability of the human being, Machiavelli referred to the individual's love for power, reputation, keenness to establish superiority over others, and the innate desire to control and dominates others. However, Machiavelli confined these traits to the elite. He did not like Hobbes; see the desire for power and domination as a universal aspiration.

Machiavelli recognized the importance of order provided by a stable, lawful political community consisting of public-spirited and virtuous citizens. Such an arrangement fulfilled the human need of being admired, respected and remembered. A ruler who preserved the state without undermining or flouting laws and or inflicting harm attained fame and respect. On the contrary, the absence of civic virtue led to moral degradation and corruption.

1.3 Machiavelli on Ethics, Religion and Politics

Machiavelli made a clear distinction between distinctions between politics on the one hand and religion and ethics on the other and in doing so he has accorded subordinate position to the latter. He ignores the ethical purpose of the state. To him state is not a means but an end in itself with its own interest. The interest of the state justifies everything. The state has no ethics. State actions are not to be judged by individual ethics. In excersing political power, Machiavelli opines that a ruler should give priority to what is good for the state rather than what is moral or immoral. A ruler should not lag behind even in the employment of violence, cruelty and bad faith. Appreciating the good qualities of a ruler, Machiavelli emphasized that he cannot part with the bad means to be an able leader. He says public morality need not necessarily be identical with the private morality because the ends of public morality may not necessarily be identical with those of private morality. Hence Machiavelli prescribed double standard of conduct for the ruler and for the individual citizens.

Moral virtue is good for individual but they may or may not be so for the prince. For instance it is always wrong for an individual to tell lie but sometimes it is necessary and good for the ruler to do so in the interest of the state, particularly dealing with problems of external and internal security of the state. State is the highest form of human association and has superior claim to a man's obligation. The state is neither moral nor immoral but it is non-moral actions are also just. Machiavelli brings a complete divorce between politics and ethics.

He pointed out that "the keeping of faith is praiseworthy, but for the sake of maintaining political power, deceit and hypocrisy are indispensable. The prince must appear or be sincere, upright and religious but he must have his mind so disciplined that when it is necessary to save the state, he can act regardless of these. Let the prince then look to the maintenance of the state, the means will always be deemed honored and will receive general approbation." Machiavelli was clear in his conception of the relationship between religion and politics. He opined that religion should be exploited for the sake of political expediency. Otherwise religion and politics should be kept separate, religion always being subordinated to politics. A ruler has supreme powers, and he is above the norms of moral or religious tenets. Thus, Machiavelli gives greatest importance to political power and political expediency. He holds that religious and ethical principles have only a secondary role and in no way they should be a hindrance to the exercise of political power.

One of the reasons for Machiavelli to separate politics from ethics and religion was his contention that such separation is more true to facts of human existence. He tries to discover the actual working of a real and not an ideal political life. His purpose is to investigate how men actually live, not how they ought to live. He is not concerned with state as an instrument of good life. The state, for him is a dynamic force. The role of the prince is to direct this force for the preservation and expansion of his power.

1.3.1 Central theme Of Prince

"The discourses" and "The art of war" are Machiavelli's important contributions. It contains analysis of body politics. "The Prince" is a handbook on the "Art of government" and "State craft". Hence it is said that "The Prince" is not an academic work on political-science but it is a book on the art of governance. It is in the form of advice and addressed to any ruler in the form of a manual book.

1.3.2 Advise to the Prince about Statecraft

Machiavelli's "The Prince" is in the form of advice given to a ruler on the state craft. Some significant aspects of the advice to the ruler are as follows:

1. End justifies the Means: It is a very famous statement of Machiavelli which he justified for the "Reason of state". He assumed that state is highest form of human association. State is to be worshipped like a deity even by sacrificing the individual. A ruler must remember that whatever brings success and power is virtuous even cunningness, shrewdness is justified.

2. State is sovereign, autonomous and non-religious: Machiavelli states that the state is superior to all associations in the human society. It is sovereign and is autonomous, moral and religious considerations cannot bind the prince. He is above and outside the morality. He can use religion to realize his ends. Religion cannot influence politics and the church cannot control the state. In fact sovereign state enjoys absolute power over all individuals and institutions. State is must necessary of all institutions. It stands on a wholly different footing and therefore be judged by different standards. State power is the end and religion is its organ and instrument. He said politics is an independent activity with its own principles and laws.

3. A prince must combine both the qualities of a lion and a fox: Machiavelli advised the prince he should imitate the qualities of fox and lion. The imitation of the fox (cunningness, foresight) will enable him to visualize his goal and means to achieve it. The imitation of the lion will give him necessary strength and force to achieve that goal. A fox might have shrewdness and foresight, but he is powerless without necessary force of a lion. Similarly a lion without shrewdness and prudence of a fox would be reckless. Hence a ruler who wants to be very successful must combine in himself the qualities of both fox and lion. He must possess bravery of lion and cunningness of fox, physical force is necessary when there is anarchy and indiscipline. But law and morality is essential to check selfishness of people and to generate civic virtues.

4. Use double standard of politics: One for the ruler and another for his subjects. He said morality is not necessary for the ruler. He is creator of law and morality hence price is above the both. A ruler has primary duty of preserving the state. For this purpose he may use instruments of lie, conspiracy, killings and massacre etc. Thus Machiavelli prescribes double standard of morality.

5. Favored despotic ruler: Machiavelli did not recommend the republican form of Government, because republican form requires virtuous, honest and patriotic citizens. He also advised the prince to convert his monarchy into a republic. If his heirs are corrupt and misuse their power for evil purposes. According to Machiavelli foundation of Government is the reason of state Government is not created by God to punish men for their sin. Machiavelli says that the government is founded upon the weakness and insufficient capacity of men. If in a society men are corrupt and selfish and the law is powerless, then normal administration is not possible at all. A superior power is essential for bringing the society into order. The government with absolute power stop the excessive desires and control the behavior of the people.

6. Maintain strong army: He recommended constant military preparedness for the preservation of the state. Prince should organize a strong army to meet any internal and external threat to his power. Strong and regular army was must for a state for its own defense. The state should try to build up its own independent, regular and faithful army. Such an army should consist of its own citizens and be prepared not only to defend its national borders but also to expand. The citizens must be trained for army service and there should be compulsory military training for all able persons.

7. The prince must consider Human nature: According to Machiavelli rational analysis of politics must begin with an account of human nature, Machiavelli viewed the activities of man with special interest and explained human nature. He viewed men to be a compound of weakness, ungrateful, fear, lust for power and assumed all men are bad. Prominent traits of human nature are (1) there is no limit to human desires. He is selfish and aggressive. Hence there is strife and competition. (2) The masses are interested in security. They realize that only laws of the state can ensure security hence they cooperate with the state and obey the laws. Hence a ruler who wants to be successful must ensure security of life and protection of people. (3) People must be restrained by force because force breeds fear. Only force and repression can keep control and check on the

evil tendencies in man. Hence the method of government should be force and not persuasion. (4) By nature every human being is ambitious and remains unsatisfied. No human being in content with his position. He is always after domination. The enmities and wars are the outcome of this desire. Thus human nature is selfish, power hungry, quarrelsome and guided by materialistic considerations. Only fear of punishment is a powerful bond and it never fails.

8. Prince must try to win popularity of his people: Prince should try to win popularity, goodwill and affection of his people. He should keep his subjects materially contented by not taxing them. The prince should not interfere in age old customs and traditions of his people because by nature people are conservative. He should not have craving for wealth and women of his own subjects. He should keep a watchful eye on his dissidents.

9. A prince must have council of wise men: Powerful government and internal unity were essential for any state. Prince must choose wise men in his council and should give them full liberty to speak the truth to him. He must ask them about everything and hear their opinion and afterwards deliberate by himself in his own way.

10. Prince must be free from emotions: Prince should exploit emotions of his people for the purpose of the state. He should be cool, calculating and opportunist. His suggestion is that a prince must know how to act as a beast.

11. Ordered state: In "The Prince" Machiavelli advocated absolutism and an effective government. This advocacy of absolutism was due to the fact that he had witnessed

anarchy, lawlessness, corruption and misrule that prevailed in Italy of his times. He had witnessed how King Charles VIII of France had captured Florence without being offered resistance. Therefore Machiavelli advocated a well organized ordered and militarily strong state. Without a strong state, any country had no hope of survival in international politics. He believed that an ordered state was the only security against forces of external aggression and internal chaos.

Check your progress

- 4. Describe Machiavelli's conception of the Human Nature?
- 5. The 'Prince' is a master piece of Machiavelli, Explain.
- 6. Examine Machiavelli's advice to the Prince for maintaining a state?

1.3.3 Machiavelli's Justification for a Powerful State

1) He acquired practical experience of politics of his time. He was born in Florence, Italy in 1469 in a well-to-do family, when Prince Medici was at the height of his power. At the age of 25, he entered the government service as a clerk chancery. Within a very short period he was appointed as an ambassador, after that he became secretary of the king. Thus he acquired practical experience of politics. His administrative and political experience determined his views about politics.

2) As already mentioned, Machiavelli lived in Renaissance Italy and was greatly influenced by the new spirit of Renaissance. The intellectual awakening injected rational

scientific approach in every sphere of human life; renaissance replaced the faith by reason. Italy was the leader of Renaissance, the most modern and urbanized country of Europe. But in Italy the wealth, intellect and artistic achievements were accompanied by moral degradation and political chaos. The worst aspect of the period during which Machiavelli lived was the rampant corruption and selfishness among the Italian rulers and the church officials Machiavelli represents the culture which was undergoing a period of deep political crisis. Italy consisted of a very large number of small but Independent states. Some of these states like Florence and Venice were republics, while others were ruled by despots. Internally these states were the home of fierce political rivalries and personal ambition and externally they were involved in a constant struggle with one another. This political division of Italy and the struggle between the states made the country weak and a prey for the ambitions of the powerful neighboring states of France, Prussia and Spain. France invaded Italy and defeated the Medici rulers. Machiavelli was witness to this tragedy. It was out of this traumatic experience that made Machiavelli conclude that unless Italy was united under a strong central government, the country would always remain under the threat of conquest and annexation by neighboring countries.

3. Machiavelli was a true patriot, thinking on the plight of Italy and to find remedies for this. He suggested a strong and unscrupulous prince for the Italy. He did not recommend the republican form of government for Italy, as it presupposes virtuous, honest and patriotic citizens, whereas the sixteenth century Italians was corrupt and selfish. Hence Machiavelli suggested a strong and powerful ruler for Italy.

4. The central theme of Machiavelli's political ideas is power. He highlighted power as an essential ingredient of politics. According to him moral code of individual prescribed by the church cannot provide guidelines to the ruler. According to Machiavelli a ruler must remember that whatever brings success is due to power. For acquiring political power he can use any type of Means. He said politics is a constant struggle for power. All politics is power politics.

5. For Machiavelli absolute state was the End; and for this Means was power. He said the sole aim of the Prince was to make the country strong and united, establish peace and order and expel the foreign invader. To achieve this end any means would be satisfactory.

1.4 Let's Sum up

Some of the important Contributions of Machiavelli in political thought are:-

He laid the foundation of modern political thought – Machiavelli is regarded as the founder of modern political thought- 1) He is the first exponent of power-politics.
He is the first who put the theory of nation states. 3) He was the first thinker who separated religion from politics and justified secular state. 4) He is responsible for the growth of modern nationalism. 5) He was the first advocate of autonomy for the state. 6) Put forward the concept of supreme, sovereign state and justified all powerful central authority. 7) State is an end i.e. survival of the

state is the central theme. 8) Gave a great insight for Art of Government and modern diplomacy.

1.5 Key Terms

- Chancery- A high court of equity in England and Wales with common-law functions and jurisdiction over causes in equity
- Diplomatic- concerned with the art and practice of conducting negotiations between nations relating to, or concerned with diplomacy or diplomats
- Papacy- the system of government of the Roman Catholic Church of which the pope is the supreme head
- Renaissance- the transitional movement in Europe between medieval and modern times beginning in the 14th century in Italy, lasting into the 17th century, and marked by a humanistic revival of classical influence expressed in a flowering of the arts and literature and by the beginnings of modern science
- Monarchs a person who reigns over a kingdom or empire: such as: a sovereign ruler or as a constitutional king or queen

Ethics- moral principles that govern a person's behavior or the conducting of an activity.

Politics- the activities associated with the governance of a country or area, especially the debate between parties having power.

Secularism - the principle of separation of the state from religious institutions."He believes that secularism means no discrimination against anybody in the name of religion"

Epitome- a person or thing that is a perfect example of a particular quality or type.

- Paganism a religion other than one of the main world religions, specifically a non-Christian or pre-Christian religion.
- Liberty- the state of being free within the society from oppressive restrictions imposed by authority on one's way of life, behaviour, or political views.
- Supernatural attributed to some force beyond scientific understanding or the laws of nature "a supernatural being"
- Asceticism severe self-discipline and avoiding of all forms of indulgence, typically for religious reasons.
- Monopoly the exclusive possession or control of the supply of or trade in a commodity or service.

Exhibitionist - a person who behaves in an extravagant way in order to attract attention.

- Anarchical is a situation in which there is no organization and control, especially in society due to an absence of effective Government.
- Shrewdness- clear understanding and good judgment of a situation, usually resulting in an advantage.
- Absolutism-is a political system in which a single ruler, group or a political party has complete power/domination over a country.
- Unscrupulous behaving in a way that is dishonest or unfair in order to get what you want

Statecraft- The art of running a Public affairs; Statesmanship.

Egoism- An ethical doctrine that morality has its foundations in self-interest

Opportunist- Someone who tries to get power or an advantage in every situation

Polity- The form of government of a nation, state, church or an organization.

Liberalism- Liberalism is a political and moral philosophy based on liberty, consent of the governed, and equality before the law. Liberals espouse a wide array of views depending on their understanding of these principles, but they generally support limited government, individual rights (including civil rights and human rights), capitalism (free markets), democracy, secularism, gender equality, racial equality, internationalism, freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of religion. Republic- it is a political order whose head of the state is not a monarch and in modern times is usually a president.

Nationalism- Devotion to the interest or culture of one's nation.

- Feudalism- The dominant social system in medieval Europe, in which the nobility held lands from the Crown in exchange for military service, and vassals were in turn tenants of the nobles, while the peasants (serfs) were obliged to live on their lord's land and give him homage, labour, and a share of the produce, notionally in exchange for military protection.
- Maxim- A succinct formulation of a fundamental principle, general truth, rule of conduct
- Pragmatist- A person who takes practical approach to the problems and concerned primarily with the success or failure of the actions.
- Machaivellanism Machiavellianism is the political philosophy of the Italian Renaissance diplomat Niccolò Machiavelli, expressed notably in his theoretical and historical writings such as *Il Principe (The Prince)*, and the Discourses . The words *Machiavellian* and *Machiavellianism* gained popularity in the late 16th century, due to the notoriety of Machiavelli's books.

1.6 Answer's to 'check your Progress'

1. There are many works of Machiavelli, but some of the important works are 'The Prince', and 'The Discourses'.

2. Machiavelli was greatly influenced by the conditions of Italy as the Italian peninsula was divided into a number of small but independent states which were constantly at war. Machiavelli wanted to unite this independent states and unity could only be possible under a Monarchy.

3. Renaissance Movement exercised profound influence on Machiavelli because the movement not only revived that was ancient and had been forgotten during the medieval period, but also created a consciousness of life, a new sense of liberty, and new values of life.

4. Alike Hobbes, Machiavelli was also conceived that the individual was wicked, selfish and egoistic. He was fundamentally weak, ungrateful, exhibitionist, artificial, anxious to avoid danger and excessively desirous of gain.

5. Machiavelli's "The Prince" is considered as a master piece because it consists of advice given to a ruler on the state craft.

6. Machiavelli came up with a list of suggestions for the prince in order to establish a strong and stable state. A prince must combine both the qualities of a lion and a fox, Use double standard of politics, Maintain strong army etc.

1.7 Short-Answer Question

- 1. When was Machiavelli's 'The Discourses' written?
- 2. Why is Machiavelli considered as the Father of modern political theory?

3. What is the similarity between Thomas Hobbes and Machiavelli's concept of Human Nature?

4. Why according to Machiavelli state as an apex institution?

1.7.1 Long- Answer Questions

- 1. Write a note on the spirit of the Renaissance.
- 2. Examine Machiavelli's concept of Human nature.
- 3. Analyse Machiavelli's thought on ethics and religion.
- 4. Machiavelli wanted to establish a strong 'Monarch' comment?
- 5. Discuss Machiavelli as a modern political thinker.

1.8 Further Readings

Arora Prem, Grover Brij (2005). *Selected Western and Indian PoliticalThinkers*. Gurgaon: cosmos Bookhive

Burckhardt, J. (1921): *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, S. middlemore (Trans.), London, Allen & Unwin.

Laski, H.J (1936). An Essay: London, Unwin Books.

Mukherjee Subrata, Ramaswamy Sushila (2015). A History of Political Thought-Plato to Marx. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.

Sabine, GH. (1973): *A history of Political Theory*, 4th ed., revised by T.L Thorson, New Delhi, oxford and IBH, First Published in 1937.

UNIT 2 HOBBES, LOCKE AND J.J.ROUSSEAU

Structure

- 2.0 Introduction
- 2.1 Unit Objectives
- 2.2 Thomas Hobbes
 - 2.2.1 Human Nature
 - 2.2.2 State of Nature
 - 2.2.3 Laws of Nature and the Covenants
 - 2.2.4 Concept of Sovereign

2.3 John Locke

- 2.3.1 Human Nature
- 2.3.2 State of Nature
- 2.3.3 Social contract
- 2.4 Jean Jacques Rousseau
 - 2.4.1 Human Nature
 - 2.4.2 State of Nature
 - 2.4.3 Social Contract and General Will
- 2.5 Summary
- 2.6 Key Terms
- 2.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress''
- 2.9 Further Reading

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The origin of state, when and how the state came into existence is a mystery. Nobody knows how and can give evidence about the origin of the state. In the study of Political Science, the origin of the state theory became a centre during 16th-17th century among the scholars. A number of political thinkers have suggested the different theories of the origin of the state. Some of the prominent theories are:

- 1. The Theory of Divine Origin
- 2. The Force Theory
- 3. The Patriarchal and Matriarchal theories
- 4. The Historical and Evolutionary theory
- 5. The Marxian theory
- 6. The Social Contract theory

The Social Contract theory of state is propounded by the trio philosophers- Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau. These three thinkers believed in social contract as the basis of the origin of the state. Therefore, they are known as Contractualists to the origin of the state. As per these three thinkers natural social instinct of man has made enormous contribution to the growth of the state. This theory holds that the state is the result of a deliberate and voluntary agreement on the part of primitive men emerging from a state of nature. It assumes that there was a period in human history when there was no state and no political law. This precivil or pre-political period was considered as state of nature. In this state of nature the only law which governed human relations was the law of nature and human instinct. Contractualist believed that the state of nature was either too idyllic to last long or too inconvenient and unbearable for man to put up with it. Hence man in this state of nature soon abandoned the primitive state and set up a political society through social contract among them. As a result of the social contract or covenant each man lost his natural liberty in part or in whole and in its place men obtained the security and protection of the state provided by political law. Contractualist believed that the state as manmade institution created by a contract. To justify the origin of state as manmade, the contract assumed that there was a state of nature. In that state of nature was depicted different conditions of human nature by the three thinkers. Though these three thinkers depicted different conditions and situations of state of nature, human nature and types of contract but the harmony of the contractualist is that the state was created by man through contract or covenant.

2.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Explain the political ideas of Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau.
- Explain the origin of state according to social contract theory.

2.2 Thomas Hobbes (1581-1679):

Life sketch

Thomas Hobbes, an English philosopher born in Malmesbury in 1581 A.D. to a humble family of an Anglican clergyman's. Hobbes was a brilliant youth but his parents could not afford to give higher education. It was, however, with the intervention of his relative that Hobbes could be sent to Oxford at the age of 15. After completing his studies he joined a powerful Cavendish family as a tutor which fortunately gave patronage to the tutor. It was due to this patronage that Hobbes could travelled throughout Europe. There he could meet a leading scientists and literary figures and was impressed by those intellectual mind. In 1610, England was in the jaws of civil war and thus facing great constitutional crisis between monarchy and republicanism. He had seen with his own eyes the bloodshed and fighting which made him to think that was blood thirsty and had an animal like instinct. He was brilliant student but timid in nature. He could not bear the bloodshed situation and he fled to France to find a shelter. He was in France for quite long time that's how he was influenced by the French political system. His patronage to the royal family made him to support the monarchy.

Influence on Hobbes:

Hobbes was influenced by the condition of time and situation of England and France during that time. He was also influenced by the great philosopher like Gloucon, Plato and Hooker in respect of social contract, Machiavelli on human nature, Grotius on law of nature as dictates of reason, Bodin on concept of sovereignty, Galileo on mechanical nature of world and Deseates and Euclid on geometry.

He studied physics, geometry, psychology and politics. That's why he used the scientific materialism method to understand the politics and society.

His writings and works:

Political philosophy of Hobbes was expressed in his writings. In 1640, De-corpe politico was published which deals with human nature. In the first part of the book he has tried to express that fear and glory are two dominating factors in human nature but it is fear which regulates man's actions and saves him from becoming savage. In this part he has given the idea of absolute and inalienable monarchy to tame the brutish nature of man.

His another work De-cive (1612) was published. In this book he stresses further in establishment of superior authority of the state by saying that both spiritual and temporal lords should bow before the authority of lord sovereign. That means he further strengthen the sovereign authority.

His finest work was his Leviathan that has made him immortal and elucidated the vivid view of state of nature and vis-a-vis of man there. It was published in 1651 which gave a solid foundation to the social contract theory of origin of state. Later on it was further strengthen and supported by Locke and Rousseau. In this book he has dealt with the origin of state and nature of sovereign and finally the creation of absolute, invisible and inalienable authority of the sovereign which knows no limitation from anyone.

2.2.1 Human Nature:

Hobbes was essentially product of his time. He witnessed the cruel and chaos during that time in England. It was the influenced of his time that he felt man is by nature nasty, brutish and selfish. Man required a strong authority to check or control him. He, therefore, pleaded for a strong monarch on to check the selfish habits of man.

Hobbes philosophy to derive the reason for the creation of state begins with analysis of political problem it was essential that human nature should be clearly understood. He tried to give a scientific explanation which determines the human nature. Hobbes presumed that motion of particles create sensation in human mind. He also believes that there is relationship between stimulus and sensation. It is a result of stimulus and sensation by which mental phenomenon came into being. Moving particles create sensation and all mental phenomenons are the result of sensations. These moving particles generate active and receptive forces, desires and aversions. These two principles of emotions is result of moving particles in brain. He believes that emotions and passions are inborn and reason is artificial.

He also presumes that movement of particles either helps on the way of vitality and on that depends desires and aversions. Each man desires something which will enhance his vitality and pleasure. To Hobbes conception of good or bad is nothing fixed. It is ever changing phenomenon and subjective in nature. So as human desires go on changing there is no final goal of life. The end of every man is continued success in getting his desired things. Life is self centered and his desire for security is mans fundamental need. The desire for security is most essential thing which makes man to maintain balance and co-existence in the society. It is the man's concern for security that deters the man to become as wild beast. Each one is solitary individual and thus each one has his own concept of pleasure, pain, good and bad.

Hobbes conception of human nature was essentially based on two basic tenets. First, all man are equal. Second is men fight with each other. Unlike Machiavelli, Hobbes believed that man was not an idle spectator in political drama. He was always ready to struggle and achieve something noble, gentle and higher. The desire to achieve more and more makes men fight with each other always. Hobbes said that no individual is capable of behavior independent of external stimuli. His reaction is with reference to the environments around him.

Hobbes concept on his ideas about human nature is the pivot around which his whole philosophy revolves. Hobbes concept of sovereignty is based on his ideas about human nature. He believes that the state of nature (pre-civil society) was an uncontrolled society because of brutish, selfish and nasty nature of man. That society was full of chaos and unbearable, turbulent and war. The men desire to get rid of that ugly and undesirable atmosphere. Thus, the man made a contract and as a result the state came into being with political power and authority.

2.2.2 State of nature:

Hobbes believed that before man came in the civil society they lived in the state of nature. The state of nature is an imaginary view of pre-civil and pre-political society. In the state of nature people were guided only by passion and desire. Hobbes has given a very gloomy picture of man at that stage. There were no state, authority, laws and regulations. He did not give any historical evidence or date when it happen but it is an imaginary view that once upon a time there was a state of nature. At this stage pre-civil society man were guided by natural instinct being inherent in the individuals. Hobbes believed that human nature were brutish, nasty, selfish and quarrelsome. Every individual were competetitors of the other and thus it become difficult to satisfy all. There were always conflict between man to man and man to natural conditions. Every man has feelings of superiority and wishes to outdo the others. This makes the competition unavoidable and everyone was potential enemy of other for acquiring wealth, reputation, honor and power and wisdom. That's why there was continuous fight against the other. Because of the uncivilized and unsocial nature of man, the state of nature was dark, unhappy, chaos and short. People lived in constant fear from each other. Man was without any civil society, art and culture. There was no common law and no common lawgiver. He says in his Leviathan, that in such state of affairs there is no place for industry, no navigation, no knowledge of the face of the earth, no letter and no society. What was worst of all, there was continual fear and danger of violent death. The life of man was solitary, poor, nasty and unhappy. The fear of being surpassed by others in power and desire for admiration and recognition as superior.

He believes that in the state of nature essentially and basically all were un-social, selfish and brute. Man was without society, art and culture but in security was the only secure thing in that pre-state society.

2.2.3 Hobbes theory of origin of state

Hobbes believed that before people came in the society they lived in the state of nature where they were nasty and brutish. They lived in constant fear from each other. According to Hobbes at the first stage there was realization that if all the people obeyed laws of nature they could live together in harmony. It was thereafter that they felt that since all were short sighted to follow these rules, therefore, there was a need of powerful sovereign who could enforce these rules. Since the people were antisocial, therefore need for a power which was respected by all was badly felt. Mere words are not enough. These could be overthrown at any time by a powerful person and compelled others to accept his viewpoint. Any person whose strength was more could take it into his head to put others to trouble. In order to avoid such situation, Hobbes thinks it necessary to create a supreme authority. According to Hobbes, it was the dictate of reason, in other word he said that "the counsels of prudence" make men to realize and understand the necessity of common rulers or sovereign body. "Following the dictates of reason Hobbes individuals undertake not to exercise their natural right to everything. But the surrender of natural right alone is not sufficient unless there is some guarantee that they will not violate the contract on the impulse of passions. So such guarantee is to be created as the passions can understand only force. Hence an artificial person, a Leviathan, an all powerful sovereign is created by the individuals themselves for keeping them in check" (R.M.Bhagat.p.511)

At the time when all individuals make up their mind to end the state of nature is that they enter into what Hobbes calls 'contract'. Each individual made a contract with every other individual. By this contract they promised to each other, not to will their own will. In other way they undertake to accept a limitation on their will. According to him unless there was common sovereign power to regulate this competeition, conflicts, clashes and quarrel were unavoidable. In that there was also no distinction between right and wrong or just and unjust. There was also no concept of private property. Everyone owned that much which he could forcible acquire.

After surrendering their own will they accepted their limitations. They submitted to the will of one in the hope of getting peace and security which are to be found in the state. This contract among the individuals is the basis of Hobbes on origin of state. It was to remove constant fear that men thought of surrendering their rights or will to a sovereign body as a protector to whom they wanted to be custodian of their rights, duties and social justice. According to Hobbes the individual made a contract among themselves without the ruler or sovereign being party to it.

Nature of Contract:

In this contract the sovereign was not the party. People themselves were a party. They agreed to surrender all their rights except that of life to a supreme power (state). That supreme power remained out of the contract. Thus, whereas before the contract all were equal, after that out of all equals one superior was created in form of state. That superior represented the power of all individuals and became above the equals. All rights were transferred to a common depository. "Though this gives the impression of a deliberate selection of their ruler by the individuals but actually this was only a desperate submission of the weaklings to the powerful with the hope that the latter will protect their lives which were in imminent danger in the state of nature." (Bhagat.p.512). Then it was not a contract between unequal's, but between those who were equal with each other on their own, without any compulsion and without any fear. Hobbes called 'commonwealth or sovereign or Leviathan was an artificial body made out of contract. He believed that sovereign cannot be unjust, because he is not a party to the contract. The contract was perpetual and irrevocable. The contract once entered cannot be revoked. It is binding not only on this generation but on succeeding generations as well. A lawfully constituted sovereign

can be replaced only by a unanimous decision of the commonwealth. Hobbes state gets sovereign powers by institution and not by acquisition. This is how the state was created as per Hobbes. The individual resigned his natural rights to state. The second law of nature of Hobbes, men should agree to lay down the natural rights to everything has cumulatively resulted in the creation of an all powerful sovereign. It is thus that a lawful government is brought into existence. Thus the society comes into being as well.

Features of Hobbes Contract:

- 1. The parties to the contract are not groups or associations but the individuals living in the state of nature. The contract was not between a superior and an inferior or between a sovereign and his subjects but among equals of their own free volition.
- 2. The sovereign authority in the state is the artificial creation of the contract. According to Hobbes there is no distinction between state and society and between state and government.
- 3. The sovereign is not a party to the contract and he can never make a breach of the contract. Sovereign cannot be unjust. Therefore, he is infallible.
- 4. The contract made by the individual is perpetual and irrevocable. If there is any violation of the social contract it means return to the anarchy state of nature.
- 5. Minority are subjected to the majority at the time of contract. If minority rebel the majority that means they would remain outside the civil society and can be justly destroyed by the majority.
- 6. The state is the result of contract and is bound to protect individual's life from inside or outside encroachments.
- 7. His theory of social contract arose because he was out to support to a particular system of government that is absolute monarchy.

2.2.4 Hobbes concept of Sovereignty:

Hobbes contends that the sovereign must be absolutely supreme and all powerful. He allows exception to the absolute power of the state. At the time of contract individual surrender all their rights except natural right (right to life). The subject's liberty to defend his own life even against sovereign. They created the sovereign in order to save their lives. The obedience to the sovereign lasts so long as he can protect the subjects. The moment he is unable to do so or become ineffective, the subject can overthrow him and elect another sovereign. If the government fails to give the security which is the only reason for subjects' submission the individuals have the right to disobey a weak sovereign. If the Leviathan (Sovereign) fails to give desired protection, men are then back to the state of nature and free to obey a defecto monarch. Hobbes sovereign can be limit by the law of nature and laws of God. Otherwise sovereign is not bound by any earthly power.

Besides the limitations Hobbes mentioned certain duties that the sovereign has to ascertain. The first is the general duty of being successful by performing the duties which he was instituted. The second duty of Hobbes's sovereign is that to make only equitable and necessary laws. The laws become inequitable when they violate the articles of peace. The main concern of the sovereign is to watch that no individual infringes the rights of any other individual or life and liberty. Hobbes Leviathan has nothing to do with development work, the cultivation of moral virtue, art and literature. All these things left to the individuals to pursue. Hence it has been rightly said that "Hobbes's Leviathan is a policeman, not an instructor".

2.2.5 Criticism on Hobbes Philosophy:

- 1. Hobbes depicted the negative attributes of human nature. Human nature cannot be concluded with one sided. Human nature is neither so reasonable nor so unreasonable. Human being has both good and bad nature. If men were so egoistic and savage, they would never be able to set up a government.
- 2. Hobbes state of nature, he could not give any evidence or proof of being existence of state of nature. There is no historical evidence that can confirm the existence of the state of nature.
- 3. His contract is not a charter of freedom, rather becomes the bond of slavery. The individual lose their liberty altogether and get nothing but the chains.
- 4. The contract once for all, their rulers. The ruler once chosen may prove to be corrupt. But due to the fear of relapse into the state of nature the people would be helpless in replacing the sovereign.
- 5. His theory is that it puts the cart before the horse. It is the society come first then state and government but his contract has reversed the same order of precedence.
- 6. He fails to give convincing theory of ever binding contract on all generations to come, grandchildren or great grand children has no right to reverse the contract made by his forefather even they want to do so.
- 7. Prof. Vaughn criticizes on Hobbes theory that it has given only two choices to his individual that is their slavery or anarchy.
- 8. Hobbes sovereign may be one person, two persons or many persons. But his preference is for one.

2.3 John Locke (1632-1704)

Life Sketch

John Locke is one of the greatest figures in the history of political thought. He was a renown English philosopher who was born in the year 1632 in the family of a puritan lawyer. He too studied at Oxford. He was a physician by profession. His patronage to Lord Ashley (the then chancellor of England) gave him an opportunity to become a political philosopher. Later on, Locke fled to Holland with Lord Ashley to take refuge where he found a free society in operation. He came to contact with the William of oranges. With the fall of Stuart monarchy, William of oranges was called to England to occupy the vacant throne. The new king appointed him as commissioner of Appeals. In this way Locke had long patronage to the Royal of England.

Another turning point of his life was when he witnessed the Glorious Revolution of England in 1688. This silent revolution established supremacy of people over monarchy. This made Locke feel that the people were efficient and capable enough to decide their own government and also could sit in judgment over the actions of their sovereign.

His works:

He wrote as many as 35 books, but his important works in his philosophy are:

- 1. His letters on toleration (1689)
- 2. Treaties on civil government. He wrote two treaties the first treaties refuting Filmer and second treaties devoted to the social contract on origin of state.
- 3. "Essays concerning human understanding" which deals with the empirical theory.
- 4. Fundamental constitution concerning California.

But essence of his political thought is found in his book "second treatise on civil government". He was the father of philosophical liberalism, a great champion of the rights of men, a prophet of consent in politics, and a great supporter of the course of individuals. His political philosophy was contained in two essays with the sole object of defending the Glorious revolution.

Influence on Locke:

Each and every political thinker is influenced by his time. Locke was no exception to this.

1. His association with Earl of Shaftesbury: As already said from the very start of life Locke came in contact with Lord Ashley, who was the founder of Wing party of England. His association with Lord Ashley gave him an opportunity to have had direct experience of practical political affairs. Lord Ashley himself was personally opposed to monarchy and had been charged with treason on his alleged support to the cause of restoration. Locked also liked and supported the idea of Lord Ashley in this regard. As Wayper rightly points out "this association with brilliant but erratic Shaftesbury was to influence Locke's life,

just as his connection with the Devonshire had influenced Hobbes and it gave him what Hobbes lacked, direct experience of practical political affairs." (Wayper, political thought, p.65.).

- 2. Glorious Revolution of 1788: The second powerful influence on Locke or rather the starting point of his philosophy was the Glorious Revolution. Just as Hobbes got the clue to his philosophy from the civil war, Locke found it from the Glorious Revolution in which English people peacefully and bloodlessly overthrown their monarch and established a more responsible government. This had a great impact on Locke. He formed a good opinion about human nature. He learnt from the revolution that men are quite capable of ruling themselves. The Glorious revolution was bound to mould the concept of human nature in Locke's philosophy as did the civil wars in case of Hobbes.
- 3. Filmer, Hobbes, Hacker and Sydney: The third powerful influence on Locke was that of Filmer, Hobbes and Hooker. Both Filmer and Hobbes supported absolute government though on different ground. Filmer in his book "Patriarcha" enunciated the theory of divine origin of the state and justified the restoration of the Stuart kings. Hobbes had justified the absolute monarchy on the basis of utility. Locke was in favor of constitutional government which should work for the welfare of the people. The first treatises on civil government were written to refute Filmer and second treatise on civil government was written to refute the Hobbes ideas. He strongly disputed the political ideas of both these philosophers and also the basis on which he had been developed his theory. On the other hand Hooker believed in the theory of consent and that of contract as well. Both these theories found favor with Locke. Then another influence on Locke was that of Sydney. Sydney strongly attacked Filmer and Hobbes. He believed that government was created by the people for their own security and personal interest. He concluded that the authority resided with the people. Thus Locke borrowed his ideas from him though he presented them in his own way.

2.3.1 Locke's concept of human nature:

Locke's political theory like that of Hobbes rest on a certain conception of human nature. This determines the end or purpose for which the state exists on both moral and psychological levels and also determines the means for attaining this end. For both the philosophers, the purpose of the state is peace, security and well being of its individual members. But both differ fundamentally about the way in which the end is to be achieved as their conceptions of human motivation differ profoundly. Thus, for understanding Locke's political theory it needs to start with his view on human nature.

"Mind is a Tabula rasa"- means human knowledge is acquired by experience. At the time of birth of a person, mind is like a clean state, a blank paper on which nothing has been written.

Locke's conception of human nature has been summed up in his Essay on human understanding. Unlike Hobbes, Locke believed that man was rational as reason was the dominant factor in individual and social life. For him, men were basically good, decent, orderly, social minded and quite capable of ruling themselves, were also naturally and innately more or less equal. To Locke, all men are naturally equal, there being nothing more evident that the creatures of the same species and rank, promiscuously born to all same advantages of nature and the use of the same faculties, should also be equal one amongst another without subordination and subjection. The natural liberty of man is to be free from any superior power on earth, and not to be under the will or legislative authority of man, but to have only the law of nature for his rule. Every man is the equal of every other and that he has rights which belong to him simply as a human being and not on account of his pre-eminence in strength, wealth or position. Of course, Locke admits that there may be some differences in men regarding strength and ability, but such differences may be the result of experiences, environments, education, etc. If one man appears wise and another stupid, it may simply mean that one man has had a better up bringing than the other. Then according to Locke, men are not only rational, decent, orderly and social but also utilitarian. Locke holds the view that the object of all human action is to substitute pleasure for pain. According to Locke "what has an aptness to produce pleasure in us is what we call good, and what is apt to produce pain in us we call evil." Man has natural rights (life, liberty and property), these rights belong to and can be exercised and respected by only rational human beings.

This pleasure or utility becomes one of the bases of Locke's covenant which gives peace and harmony to individuals and makes sure of protection of their rights which makes life worth living and worth enjoying. Locke's views on human nature are basically moral and rational creatures. They are not always selfish, but sometimes altruistic also. Another important idea is that all human beings are born equal, not physically speaking as in the case of Hobbes but morally speaking. Like Hobbes, Locke also believed that state, society and government exist to protect those in indefeasible rights which they have not created. But he differed from Hobbes on regarding the motive power behind all human behavior. Hobbes regarded instinct of self preservation as the basic motive power while Locke thinks in terms of pleasures and pain. Unlike Hobbes, he fails to give any scientific basis for his concept of human nature. According to Locke, human beings are reasonable, social, cooperative and sympathetic. Men of these qualities lived in the state of nature prior to their formation of the civil society.

2.3.2 Locke's State of Nature:

Like Hobbes, Locke also conceives of a situation in which individuals live without the control and the regulation of the state. Like his predecessor, he also calls this situation as state of nature. Locke's state of nature is vertically opposite to that of Hobbes. Locke's theory and his ideas about the state of nature are closely linked with his ideas of human nature. Hobbes notorious state of war of all against all becomes with Locke the state of good will, mutual assistance and preservation of peace. Hobbes had conceived of the state of nature was rule by law of jungle, fear and fraud prevailed. There was anarchy and constant war. Hobbes believed that the state of nature as a condition in which men lived even before the society came into existence. It was a sort of pre-social condition. For Locke, on the other hand, the state of nature is a pre-political rather than pre-social condition. The condition in which Locke's individuals find themselves is more than a society an organized society. Hobbes believed that in the state of nature there was perpetual war, nasty and selfish people quarreled with each other. But for Locke in the state of nature there was natural goodwill and a situation of perfect peace prevailed. He also believed that in the state of nature the life was not intolerable and there was no perpetual hostility but peace and reason prevailed. The fellow beings were socially inclined towards each other and they had bond of union among themselves. There was spirit of sociability and brotherhood. They live peaceful, innocent and happy lives. They were equal and free and possessed of the right to property. Locke conceived that the condition of state of nature was conducive and peaceful because of divine nature of human being. "Reason in man which finds ultimate manifestation in law of nature which is defined as the 'spark of divine nature' induces man to be socially inclined towards his fellow beings." (Bhagat.p.574). Thus life of the people in Locke's state of nature was just, peaceful and happy in contrast to the one depicted by Hobbes.

Locke believed that the people before joining the civil state there was an organized society. In that organized society, the law of nature is not as Hobbes had made it, but rather its condition precedent. It is a set of rules which governs, at times and all places the conduct of men. The arbiter is reason and in the state of nature was rule by reason that reveals that men are equal. This is the basic principle as per Locke that equality take birth men's natural rights, which he calls right of life/liberty and property. Men are free and equal to act as they think fit within the bound of law of nature. The individuals have liberty but no license. This right to liberty is his right to do whatever he was as long as that it does not contradict with the law of nature. And reason tells the men as to what to do at particular set of circumstances. The law of nature, through reason defines what is right and what is wrong. If a violation of the law of nature, every individual is authorized to judge wrong person and execute the judgment against the culprit. The enforcement agency of the law of nature is every individual who will act according to his own judgment. 'Law of nature not only accords rights to men, it imposes duties also. It commands them to do what they can to preserve others.

The law of nature governed in the state of nature. He believed with Grotius that law of nature was not only legal in character but it represented moral and rational reasoning of the society. According to Locke "The state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges every man and reason which is that law teaches all mankind who will but consult it that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty and possessions." Though the state of nature was nice and peaceful as per Locke's but the peace was not secure.

The law of nature which rules the state of nature was deficient in three points. Due to deficient in the law of nature it was inconvenient for every individual. Thus they entered into contract to remove the inconvenient.

- 1. The first deficiency of the law of nature is the lack of an established, settled and known law. Every individual interprets it in his own way. There is definitely a lot of confusion and uncertainty about the law of nature.
- 2. The second defect is the lack of a known, indifferent and impartial judge. Every individual is the judge and executioner. There is no third party judge who has no personal link in disputes. In that case, the individual who become judge in their own conflicts with others, there are chances that the rule will influence by passions and revenge. There is no common organ for interpretation and execution of the law of nature.
- 3. The third point of defect is the lack of an executive power to enforce just decision. The individuals themselves have to enforce laws in the state of nature. Due to differences of like and dislike and conflicts of interests disputes arise which cannot be settled without their being a power executive.

Apart from the inconvenient in Locke's state of nature, there is also a problem of insecurity of their property. Thus the people agreed upon to make contract to remove the difficulties of the state of nature.

2.3.3 Locke on Social Contract or Origin of State:

Locke believed that the human nature is good and social. It is obvious that they live in relative peace and harmony with their fellow beings. People were neither nasty nor uncivilized nor brutish but they lived happily and peacefully with each other. They enjoyed certain natural rights and there was no perpetual war in state of nature. It is certain inconvenience that people wanted to remove and enter into contract. Out of that contract state came into being.

According to Locke, the people created civil state because it was their internal desire to establish contract with each other to overcome certain difficulties. Uncertainty about common decisions and common interpreter of law and also to enforce the decisions of common approved social laws were the consideration with the people to join civil state and leave the state of nature. Locke himself says that "It is unreasonable for men to be judges in their own cases, self love will make men partial to themselves and their friends, and on the other hand ill will, passion and revenge will carry them too far in punishing others; and hence nothing but confusion and disorder will follow." Men's inability to keep his natural rights against injustice was another

reason which forced him to think of leaving the state of nature. Since everybody was competent to punish the other for breach of law, the confusion was bound to originate, which could be avoided only when there was a common law giver, law interpreter and law executer.

Locke believed that the people abandoned the state of nature and joined the civil state in order to avoid inconveniences and confusions which arose because of every man becoming a sole interpreter of law. Then another reason for man's uniting into a commonwealth and putting themselves under government was the preservation of their property. Man's property was not secure as that should have been. According to Locke property preceded society, state and government. In his views rights are attributes of individual and come to him with his birth including right to property. That means right of life, liberty and estate (property) are natural rights of man.

Locke concept of property

Right to property hold a special concept and character in Locke's contract theory. He uses it in two sense. In broad sense, it includes the right to life, liberty and estate. In the narrow sense, it is used only for the right to possess and retain one's estate. His broad view of property has connection with the social contract. Locke says that the individuals enter into the contract and institute the state only in order to preserve their property. Property here is used in the broad sense. He has discussed that in the state of nature there were three deficiencies in the law of nature. Due to uncertainties and confusion of law of nature, lack of uniform administering agency and the lack of impartial judge, the protection of the three rights of the individuals was at stake. Hence they made a contract and created a state. The political community or commonwealth or state created by such a contract tried to remove the three inconveniences and to protect the rights of individuals. Thus according to Locke property precedes society, state and government. The institution of political society is generated in order to preserve and get secure the rights of individual. The society and government exist with the sole object to protect and preserve the natural right of life, liberty and state. These rights were born with individual and hence the society and state cannot claim it.

Life, liberty and property of the individuals can be secured in the civil society if these three conditions are fulfilled: First, the standard interpretation of the law of nature. Secondly, an impartial authority to apply this interpretation as between the individuals. Thirdly the employment of the force of the community to executing the judgment of this authority. In other words, the rights can be protected only if the three organs of the government are createdlegislature, the executive and the judiciary. So in order to protect their rights better, the individuals enter into contract.

Locke's Nature of Contract:

- i) It is a contract of every one with every other individual, to unite and constitute a community. Unlike Hobbes contract, which was general and total, Locke's contract is limited and specific in character. So Locke's individual do not surrender all their rights in whole to be agreed upon third party but only the right of interacting the law of nature and the protection of their natural rights. The other rights and power were retain with individuals.
- ii) Locke's contract is a political contract rather than a social contract. Unlike Hobbes, society was there. An organized society already existed as per Locke's views. Hence it is misnomer to call Locke's contract a social contract. In Hobbes, a government is created directly by the contract. Both Locke believed that government draws its authority from the political community and hold it in trust.
- Unlike Hobbes, the individuals do not resign their rights to be single individual of an assembly of men but in the community as a whole which the state came into being. The main tasks of the state are to interprete and enforce the law of nature to punish the guilty person. Locke's contract does not create any absolute and unlimited sovereign power. Supreme power lies with the people even after the contract.
- iv) Like Hooker, Locke says that political society is formed with the consent of the people. That means the contract was not imposed from above, but something that comes from below. The contract was unanimous and as per the consent of the individuals. Every person living in the state of nature agrees to form a political society. But while entering into contract all the parties agree to submit, henceforth, to the determination of the majority. That the will of the majority must prevail over the minority is inevitable on the ground of sheer necessity, since without such rule the corporate action is impossible.
- v) Like Hobbes's, Locke's contract is also irrevocable once it made. According to Locke's a person who has signed the contract can never again in the liberty of the state of nature. Even if the government is dissolved, the individual cannot go back to the state of nature. Once in a political community, individual will have to remain in it and submit to the decision of the majority.
- vi) Locke's contract is the contract of consent. He says that a contract to which each generation must consent. It is just contrast to Hobbes who had said of a contract in which once the agreement was made it was binding on all the future generations.
- vii) In Locke's contract, the community came into being out of contract. At the time of original contract the individuals hand over certain rights to the community which thus becomes the beneficiary of the contract.
- viii) Locke believes in the historicity of the contract. He believes that there was some time in history when people lived in the state of nature. It is the primitive society, which was switched over to the political society, such a contract might have been made tacitly if not expressly.

- Unlike Hobbes's contract, Locke's contract does not put an end to the law of nature. The law of nature becomes more important which is enhanced by the institution of the state. It is for the protection of natural rights which are themselves the gifts of law of nature and for the interpretation of law of nature that the state and government exist.
- Unlike Hobbes, Locke's contract is not a bond of slavery, rather a charter of freedom. Individual do not lose anything by contract. Instead the difficulties and inconveniences in the enforcement of their rights are sought to be removed by this contract.

2.3.4 Locke on Revolution:

Locke was in favor of Glorious Revolution of 1688. The major aim of Locke was to defend the moral validity of the Glorious Revolution. He has devoted a large space to discuss the right to resist tyranny. In view, the individual have every right to rise against tyranny and revolt against it if the government failed to protect their rights. In his view, government holds power in trust only for the welfare of the community. If the government fails to perform purposes of the trust, the people have every right to revolt. They can take to arms and set up new government.

The government loses its legitimacy as soon as it becomes arbitrary and exceeds its authority. He has however, made it clear that right to revolution is a reserve right and need not be misunderstood as encouragement to rebellion. The revolutions should be considered as last resort when the other methods have failed. He however, has said this right should be treated valid if it is supported by majority. Thus Locke revealed his love for individualism through theory of revolution. According to him, the people had power, although not the right, to remove a government whose policies they are curtailing their rights. He believed that people had certain basic minimum rights and that no authority in the state had any right to snatch these rights from him. His love for individuals is clearly reflected when he assumes that individual is everything and that state is only means to achieve certain ends. It is the duty of the state to preserve natural rights of the individual and that revolution is justified when such rights are curtailed, disregarded or disrespected. As soon as the people rise in revolt there is sufficient indication of betrayal and the legislature becomes defunct for all practical purposes.

2.3.4 Criticism:

Locke's theory of contract can be criticized on the following ground:

1. Contradiction in his ideas of natural rights which is inherent in man and theory of "Tabula Rasa". He begins his theory of Tabula Rasa empty mind or blank knowledge

during a birth, but again says that man has innate rights to liberty, life and property. Without social relationship his natural rights cannot be define in terms.

- 2. Locke does not give any logical or scientific ground as to why human beings are social or good or capable of ruling themselves.
- 3. Contradiction on idea of individual morality. On one hand it has been said that each and every individual wants maximum pleasure for the self. On the other hand he enjoys upon his people that they should struggle for maximum public and general happiness. One fails to understand as to how the individual, who cannot but seek his own pleasure can be required morally to wish for general happiness.
- 4. Locke probably did not realize that majority could also be tyrannical. The rights in his case are transferred to the majority of people. If right are to be taken away from the individual, it does not matter whether by majority or one individual. Therefore there is no guarantee that majority can never be tyrannous.
- 5. regarding unanimous consent of generation after generation to make a contract is doubtful. There is no guarantee the future generation would thoroughly follow their past generation.
- 6. there is contradiction on his idea of contract and majority. If contract is unanimous than how can the majority decision be prevail on minority? If majority decisions overpower the minority than it is not unanimous consent rather minority are compel or force to abide by the majority.
- 7. his theory of consent do not justify every time. In practice we find the most of the political societies are founded and maintained force. Conception of consent is vague and utopian and no societies founded on consent have ever existed.
- 8. Locke's natural rights in the state of nature are idealistic and impracticable. How rights could exist in the state of nature unless they are recognized by the sovereign? But the sovereign does not exist in the state of nature. It is difficult to think of rights without the authority of law.
- 9. Law of nature was something complete, finite and finished as per Locke's view. He did not explain as to where from the law of nature originated. Hence his theory of law of nature is incomplete and unconvincing.
- 10. it is doubtful whether Locke created a society or a government.

2.4 Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778):

Life sketch: Rousseau is one of the controversial political thinkers, because his ideas contradict itself. He was born in 1712 in Geneva. His parents originally belong to France and taken shelter in Switzerland. He lost his mother at the time of birth and he was brought up by a single parent. He was very much interested in studies. Adventure and romance inspired limitless imagination in him. Studying such topics was quite uncommon for a boy of his age in those days who could only understand but not realize the complexities of the study. His father used to read to him aloud romance and adventures all through the light. This is the education he got. Rousseau grew into an easy going and irresponsible and passionate man. He could not reconcile himself to the common trodes of Europe and left his home at the tender age of 16 to wander like a vagabond. Unlike Hobbes and Locke he could not get proper education nor get neither employment nor patronage of a noble. He had experience the life of poverty and deprivation. He changed his profession many times due to lack of perseverance. There came a time when he became completely frustrated with his life and himself. Then came the turning point in his life. While on his way to visit Detroit, he came to know about an essay competition to be conducted by the Dijon Academy on the topic 'Has the Revival of the Sciences and the Arts helped to purify or to corrupt Morals'. He participated and won the prize for his essay. He became famous overnight, but he could not adapt himself to the high social environment in which he had been placed. This also provided him an opportunity to come in touch with the intellectuals and publicists of his age in France. But being poor, he could not win their high esteem and he died in poverty in 1778 A.D.

His Writings:

Woman and writing was his only hobbies. He wrote some famous essay and books. Some of his famous works are:

- 1. Essay on "Has the progress of science and arts contributed to corrupt or purify the morale? (1749)
- 2. The origin of inequality in 1753
- 3. La Nouvello Hodoise in 1761
- 4. Social Contract in 1762
- 5. Emile (1762)
- 6. The confession
- 7. The Dialogues
- 8. The Reveries

His writings were revolutionary in character and finally stirred the authorities' old regime to action. He was a fearless critic of the misdeeds of the old regime. Rousseau's publications were very popular even in his own lifetime. His concept of popular sovereignty appeal to masses. It found a solution for the irrational and despotic rule of France. Thus he became one of the popular influences for the French Revolution.

Influence on Rousseau:

Rousseau though he could not get formal education but he was ferocious reader of all the great master minds of political thought. He borrowed few ideas from them. He was much influenced by Hobbes and Machiavelli who depicted man as selfish, nasty, brutish and self centered. But he believed that by nature man is reasonable, thought provoking and acted with goodwill towards others. He is mostly influenced either by Plato and Locke. He borrowed two basic ideas from Plato. First, political subjection is essentially ethical. It is only a secondary matter if the state maintains law and order. Secondly like Plato, he also believed that the community itself is the chief moralizing agency and therefore represents the highest moral order and value.

The main influence on Rousseau is that of Locke. Locke's ideas of concept of Natural Rights, the State of Nature, the ultimate sovereignty of community, theory of consent of the people had a lasting influence on Rousseau. Rousseau is profoundly influenced by such ideas of Locke, and starts where Locke starts but ends by reaching a very different conclusion. Part of Rousseau's philosophy is devoted to the attempt at solving certain problems which had been left as open question by Locke.

Another source or reason on Rousseau's political philosophy is moulded by his personal life and experience. He was unstable, dejected and frustrated person. He was living at a time it was being increasingly felt that political equality without economic equality was meaningless. He therefore could not remain influenced by these communistic tendencies of his times.

2.4.1 Rousseau on Human Nature:

He believed that man by nature has no evil tendencies but it is because of wrong social actions which made me evil and bitterly quarrelsome with others. According to Rousseau the original man or the natural man is nothing but pure instinct free from all artificialities and at liberty to do anything, of them one is 'self love.' Man's first preference as per natural law is to attend to his preservation and he is the master in devising ways and means for securing such preservation. That means that nature destines man to be free and independent in all respects. Freedom to act according to the dictates of instincts seems to be the birth right of man according to Rousseau. Second natural instinct is the gregarious instinct. That is sympathy or instinct of mutual aid. These instincts, Rousseau believed always make our struggle for existence easier and do us more good than harm.

There was every possibility of the clashing of either these instincts at one time or the other. As a result of clash another instinct called conscience emerges. This conscience is something above education and instincts. Reasoning comes only when the complexities of problems come to the front.

These two instincts give birth to the earliest of all societies and the natural one namely the family. Up to this stage of development, everything is natural and man remains as free as he was born. Beyond this stage, everything become unnatural and man is everywhere in chains. It means that original man was free and independent as his actions were based on instincts, but his efforts to make himself perfect tied him so much in artificiality and conventions that he found himself bound in chains everywhere. Man was born good but the wrong social customs and institutions made him corrupt. When man's evil part becomes powerful he had to be subjected to the power of the state. Reason was the outgrowth of human development. Reason was not natural with man but artificial. Reason tells what is right what is wrong. In his prize winning essay, Discourse on Arts and Science, he said that man is by nature good and has been degraded by the impact of social institutions. Man was ignorant and innocent and thus was happy. He believed that nature has also gifted mankind the freedom to choose his own path which distinguishes a man from an animal. This freedom is essential for the perfection of mankind.

2.4.2 Rousseau's State of Nature:

Rousseau believed that in the state of nature all lived an isolated life and had neither ties of obligation nor of duties. Man did not know how to deliver a speech and had no care for dress. He was not even afraid of death and had no fear of loss property or family because men had neither property nor family. Men lived free, healthy, honest, and happy lives. To him everyone then was in peaceful ignorance. But that blissful age was not to survive long. Men

could not lead a solitary life. The element of reason in human mind and existence of inequality in powers of individuals induced one individual to own private property. That was like the Adam's fall. He therefore said "the first man, having enclosed a piece of ground, he thought himself of saying 'this is mine and found other people simple enough to believe him, was the first real founder of civil society." Man's social instinct compelled him to live in groups. Social institutions began to gradually develop. Then everybody found himself in chains everywhere, though it was his own doing. Though individual may be in chains everywhere, yet if this phenomenon is of his own volition then such chains are legitimate. But if the chains are based on force, such phenomenon cannot be justified.

Rousseau believed that this institution of private property, which entered the society, disturbed the whole atmosphere of pre-civil state. "It came as a serpent and bit all. It brought misery, sorrow and evil in the minds of men who were otherwise good and noble." To Rousseau "so long as man remained content with their rustic huts and confined themselves to such arts as did not require several hands, they live free, healthy and happy lives so long as pleasures of mutual and independent intercourse; from the moment it appeared advantageous to anyone to have provisions for two, equality disappeared, property was introduced; work become indispensable and the vast forests became smiling fields; which men had to water with sweat of his brows, and where slavery and misery were soon seen to germinate and grow up with the crops." Further he believed that with the passage of time many other complicate problems also came to the man. Private property created a problem and the society was divided into rich and poor. There was also a division labor and thus whole social set up was disturbed.

Rousseau also begins with the state of nature like Hobbes and Locke. But his concept of state of nature is very different from that. In Rousseau's state of nature all men were equal and living peacefully and having joint ownership over all property. People were living simple and natural life. Rationality, morality and artificiality had not yet crept into their lives. The life was not, yet organized. His state of nature is not historical but hypothetical one. In the hypothetical state of nature men only were possessed with gregarious instinct. Everybody lived with peace and harmony. The man in the state of nature was leading the happy and carefree life of truth, without fixed abode, roaming about, with his herd like a nomad. The man in Rousseau's state of nature was noble savage. Men life was self sufficient; there was no law, no morality and no family. Noble savage was basing his behavior purely on instincts. The state of nature was prudish and blissful. His description of state of nature is more romantic than real, more poetic than practical. People enjoy the bliss of liberty.

According to him the origin of civil society lies in the institution of private property. It became a cursed as Adams's biblical fall. In the state of nature prior to the conception of private property there was no question of "Thine and Mine". Everything was owned in common by all. The land was filled in common and the grain was distributed according to their needs. According to his word "the scramble for land and other private property resulted in war, murder, wretches and horror." The people started leading a miserable life. They wanted to get rid of that state of things in which they found themselves. Thus we find that in Rousseau's state of nature there were two stages or periods.

- 1) Pre-property state of nature and
- 2) Post-property state of nature.

Pre-property state of nature was ideal while the post property state of nature was trouble. Therefore, social contract comes as device to solve the trouble state of things. Thereby the state came into being.

2.4.3 Rousseau's Social Contract:

Rousseau's concept of social contract is a kind of mixture of the views of Hobbes and Locke and a sort of improvement upon the two. According to him, soon after the idea of the private property, the society became disorder, disturbed and chaos. There they began to feel the necessity of bringing about the old order of calmness and happy life. This problem was solved by the creation of a social or a political association to which all the members of the society agreed. Reconciliation between the individual on the one hand and society on the other was to be arrived at by the way of contract. He agreed with Locke that individuals consent was necessary for binding him in the contract.

Rousseau combines the method of Hobbes with the substance of Locke while he talks about the individuals surrender their rights to the body politics. Like Locke he believed that as a result of contract what emerges is the political society and not society as such. The society existed even before. The improvement made by Rousseau upon Hobbes and Locke is that, according to Rousseau what emerges as a result of his contract is an organism with a will, as against the ideas of Hobbes and Locke of an artificial thing. "The body politics" is also a moral being possessed of a will. Such a will, he calls a General Will. "Each member puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will, and, in our corporate capacity, we receive each member is an invisible part of the whole." The contract was made by the individual to arrive at the best possible reconciliation of liberty and authority. "Each gave himself unreservedly to the whole community-surrendered all his rights and liberties." Thus equality preserved, But in giving himself to the community as a whole, each gave himself to nobody in particular. Thus liberty was preserved. While people came into contract by mutual alienating all the liberties, not to any human superior but to General Will, of which every individual is an integral part. They transfer their freedom from themselves as individuals to themselves collectively. By such contract a political society was created. The creation of political society was based on the consent of all members. His consent is the constant flow that comes the General Will; as every individual is a constant participant in the General Will.

By this contract, the state of nature came to an end. The political society came into being. The contract substitute justice for injustice and equal for inequality. Man is transformed from stupid and limited animal to an intelligent man. Individual became rational and moral. Every individual became as active participant of the General Will. According to Rousseau, out of the contract only political society or the state comes into being, with the powerful and sovereign General Will as the central figure of the society. Rousseau thinks of government only as subservient agent of the political society or community in order to implement the decisions of the General Will. Here Rousseau disagrees both with Hobbes and Locke. Hobbes's contract brings forth both the state and the government. Similarly Locke's view that government come into being as a result of second contract. But Rousseau disagrees both in this regard.

Features of Rousseau's Contract:

- 1. Surrender to society: Individual surrendered his everything to society and yet as a member of society he retained everything with himself.
- 2. Gain to everyone: In his contract everyone seemed to be the gainer and none appeared to be a loser.
- 3. Surrender to state: The rights were surrendered not to an individual but to a body to whom everyone surrendered.
- 4. Organic concept: The contract had organic character. It was moral, collective and had a public person.
- 5. Transformation: Under this contract an individual got material and moral transformation.

2.4.4 Rousseau's Concept of General Will:

According to Rousseau men grew uncomfortable which was caused by the serpent of private property in the state of nature. The anarchy conditions also brought in the society the idea of private society. Hence man thought to do away with anarchy by creating a sovereign through social contract. The contract concluded by a pact between the individuals and the community consisting of the individuals who formed the political society. The individuals surrendered all their powers and rights to the community as a whole and bowed before the General Will, which was the Sovereign (State)

Rousseau believed that there are types of will which are different from the General Will. They are:

- 1. Actual Will: By actual will Rousseau understood the will which was selfish, irrational and thought of the good of the individual alone. It has no concern with the welfare of the society. It was the will of self centre.
- 2. Real Will: Real will was something higher, nobler and supreme. It was concerned more about the well being of all of them than that of an individual. It was more social than anti-social, more collective than individualistic. Real will was permanent and transitory. It was based on reason and criticism. Thus it was goodwill.

The General Will was the sum total of Real Wills of the individuals which were based on reason and farsightedness. It was will of all the individuals for the collective welfare. But Rousseau said that the General Will was not the sum total of good and bad will of the individuals by a method of plus and minus but was something nobler. It was the product of deliberations, discussions and consciousness. Everybody was free in General Will. Further Rousseau tried to distinguish between the General Will and the will of all. General Will considered about the good of the community as a whole whereas will of all was only majority will and considered about the welfare of few only. The will of all could become General Will when the selfish ends are taken away from it.

Attributes of General Will:

- 1. It is indivisible: It cannot be divided
- 2. It is un represent able.
- 3. It is unlimited, absolute and supreme.
- 4. It is inalienable.
- 5. It is infallible
- 6. It is right will.
- 7. It is disinterested
- 8. It is non executive and impersonal

2.4.5 Contradiction in Rousseau's philosophy:

Rousseau was the last important social contract philosopher. But there are many self contradictions in his philosophy. Contradict points are as follows:

- 1. Individualist: In his Emile, he represents himself as an individualist. He said that the people should be educated for their own sake
- 2. Absolutist: Whereas on the one hand, Rousseau was an individualist, on the other hand an absolutist. He tried to justify the chains in which man was tied. His General will is absolute and infallible. Man has no right against General will.
- 3. Democrat: He was democrat also when he said General will is nothing else but the will of the people. French Revolution slogan's "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" have been derived from Rousseau's ideas of General will.
- 4. Socialist: Rousseau was not only a democrat but also a socialist. It was his "Discourse on Inequality" which became the basis of the socialist movement in 19th century. As a true socialist he believed that private property was the source of all problems and inequality in the society.
- 5. Thus Rousseau is considered as one the most controversial and self contradict philosopher of his time. These contradictory and inconsistency in his philosophy might have been because of his trouble life and he did not have any proper education in his life.

2.4.6 Criticism:

- 1. Confused: Theory of General Will is confused. There is no clear explanation about the difference of real and actual will. Rousseau has no clear conception of General Will.
- 2. No difference in General Will and Will of all: Rousseau has tried to distinguish between 'General Will' and 'Will of all' which is in practice is impossible to achieve. He has provides us with no standard judgment whether a decision taken by the people represents the General Will or merely a Will of all.
- 3. Unanimous and not Majority Will: General Will of Rousseau is unanimous will and not a majority. Unanimous will and decisions are possible only in the animal and not in human.
- 4. Wills cannot be divided: According to him, essential will is rational and represent sum total. However, individuals and their wills are corporate. It is impossible to distinguish the wills of individuals.
- 5. No reconciliation of General Will and Justice: Rousseau believes that General Will is the standard of justice. But by this conception he created more confusion. Justice is equally abstract conception and reconciling the two is not only impossible but undesirable.
- 6. General Will cannot be reconciled with freedom: Rousseau has tried to reconcile individual freedom with the authority of the General Will or freedom with force but has failed to do so.
- 7. Distinction in General Will and Individual good: Rousseau tried to distinguish between the individual and state. In actual practice, however, the state consists of individuals and their interests are inseparable.
- 8. Direct Representation not possible in nation state: Rousseau's General Will refers to the direct representation, but in the nation it is not possible. It can only be applicable on small state or community.

In spite of criticism to his philosophy in different angle, but we cannot forget his brilliant presentation of his ideas which became the foundation of the modern Democratic Republic state.

- 1) Will not force is the basis of state. It has made the community realize the worth of human cooperation.
- 2) Theory of General Will is the basis of true democracy in the true sense.
- 3) Idea of General Good
- 4) Corporate character of state.
- 5) Theory of nation state

He was the forerunner of English and German idealism. After Aristotle, it was Rousseau who preached that man was a political animal. His gospel of political people as ultimate authority has become the central pillar of modern democracy.

2.5 Summary

In this unit you have learnt that:

- What is Contractualists.
- Origin of state as per social contract theory.
- Brief life sketch of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau.
- Political Philosophy of three contractualists.

Further Reading:-

George.H.Sabine.2011. A History of Political Thought: Plato to Marx, Delhi: Surjeet Publications.

H.R.Mukhi.2000. Political Thought, Delhi: SBD Publishers Distribution

O.P.Gauba.2008.*Political Theory and Thought*, Delhi: Shiva Enterprises Navin Shahadra.

R.M.Bhagat.2007.*Political Thought: Plato to Marx,* Jalandhar: New Academic Publishing Co.

R.M.Bhagat and Satish Tandon.2017.*Poltical Thought: Plato to Marx*, Jalandhar: New Academic Publishing Co.

Subrata Mukherjee and Sushila Ramaswamy.1999.*A history of Political Thought: Plato to Marx,* New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.

Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832)

1.0. Introduction

Jeremy Bentham, the father of utilitarian school of thought, was born in a well-to-do family England in 1748. His father was a learned lawyer and wanted his son to follow his profession. After receiving his education at west minister school and Queen College Oxford, he entered the Lincoln's Inn in 1763. In 1769 he was called to the Bar. But as Bentham was more interested in the problems of social welfare than practice of law, he gave up the practice and devoted himself to the study of the defects of the legal system with a view to effect necessary reform in the system. Although he never practiced law, Bentham did write a great deal of philosophy of law, spending most of his life critiquing the existing law and strongly advocating legal reform. Throughout his work, he critiques various natural accounts of law which claim, for example, that liberty, rights, and so on exist independent of government. In this way, Bentham arguably developed an early form of what is now often called "legal positivism." Beyond such critiques, he ultimately maintained that putting his moral theory into consistent practice would yield results in legal theory by providing justification for social, political, and legal institutions.

Bentham is primarily known today for his moral philosophy, especially his principle of utilitarianism, which evaluates actions based upon their consequences. The relevant consequences, in particular, are the overall happiness created for everyone affected by the action. Influenced by many enlightenment thinkers, especially empiricists such as John Locke and David Hume, Bentham developed an ethical theory grounded in a largely empiricist account of human nature. He famously held a hedonistic account of both motivation and value according to which what is fundamentally valuable and what ultimately motivates us is pleasure and pain. Happiness, according to Bentham, is thus a matter of experiencing pleasure and lack of pain.

Writing was the centre of Bentham's life. He shut himself away in remote cottages and even when in London described himself as a 'hermit'. Increasingly, the hermit merely produced large sheets of manuscript, and the task of selecting from these and turning them into books was left to others, such as the young John Stuart Mill, who produced five large volumes of Bentham's thought on evidence from a much larger mass of nearly illegible manuscript. When Bentham died he left 70,000 sheets of foolscap manuscript behind him – theoretical work, but also highly detailed designs for states, prisons, banknotes, and much else. His principal writings on language, ontology and the philosophy of law were only published posthumously. Bentham's best works are Fragments of Government (1776); Essays on political Tactics (1791); Discourses on civil and Penal Legislation (1802); The theory of punishments and Rewards (1811); A Treatise on judicial Evidence (1813); Paper upon Codification and public instruction (1817); The book of Fallacies (1824); Catechism of parliamentary Reforms (1809); principles of International law etc.

1.1 Unit Objectives

- After reading this unit, you will be able to understand:

1. Understand the early life and writings of Bentham

2. Important sources and influences on Bentham

3. Understand Bentham's Human nature, moral and political philosophy

4. Bentham's Principle of Utility

5. Concept of Modern State

6. Bentham's idea on Law and liberty

1.2. Influence's on Bentham.

Like other thinkers, Bentham was also greatly influenced by several conditions of his times. Bentham lived and wrote at a time when the people of England did not enjoy any political rights. The lot of laborers, a prisoner etc. was quite miserable. The emergence of Britain as a leading colonial power had resulted in new out book. But it was the American War of Independence and the French Revolution of 1789 which exercised maximum influenced his philosophy and thought.

Among the political thinkers who influenced Bentham, Hume and Priestley exercised profound influence on him. He drew the concept of utility mainly from Hume's Treatise of Human Nature and Priestley's Essays on Government. However, Prof. Hallowell says that Bentham is indebted to the French philosopher Helvetius for his concept of 'utility'; this view is not acceptable to most of the scholars. Bentham himself admits that the borrowed the idea of utility from priestly. He says, as soon as "I discovered it, I cried out as it were an inward ecstasy" He was also greatly influenced by Mill. Bentham's love for democracy and democratic institutions bear a testimony to this influence.

1.3 Human Nature

For Bentham, morals and legislation can be described scientifically, but such a description requires an account of human nature. Just as nature is explained through reference to the laws of physics, so human behavior can be explained by reference to the two primary motives of pleasure and pain; this is the theory of psychological hedonism. There is, Bentham admits, no direct proof of such an analysis of human motivationthough he holds that it is clear that, in acting, all people implicitly refer to it. At the beginning of the Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, Bentham writes: Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, *pain* and *pleasure*. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think: every effort we can make to throw off our subjection, will serve but to demonstrate and confirm it. From this we see that, for Bentham, pleasure and pain serve not only as explanations for action, but they also define one's good. It is, in short, on the basis of pleasures and pains, which can exist only in individuals, that Bentham thought one could construct a calculus of value.

Related to this fundamental hedonism is a view of the individual as exhibiting a natural, rational self-interest—a form of psychological egoism. In his "Remarks on

Bentham's Philosophy" (1833), Mill cites Bentham's *The Book of Fallacies* (London: Hunt, 1824, pp. 392-3) that "in *every* human, self-regarding interest is predominant over social interest; each person's own individual interest over the interests of all other persons taken together." Fundamental to the nature and activity of individuals, then, is their own well-being, and reason—as a natural capability of the person—is considered to be subservient to this end.

Bentham believed that the nature of the human person can be adequately described without mention of social relationships. To begin with, the idea of "relation" is but a "fictitious entity," though necessary for "convenience of discourse." And, more specifically, he remarks that "the community is a fictitious body," and it is but "the sum of the interests of the several members who compose it." Thus, the extension of the term "individual" is, in the main, no greater and no less than the biological entity. Bentham's view, then, is that the individual—the basic unit of the social sphere—is an "atom" and there is no "self" or "individual" greater than the human individual. A person's relations with others—even if important—are not essential and describe nothing that is, strictly speaking, necessary to its being what it is.

Finally, the picture of the human person presented by Bentham is based on a psychological association indebted to David Hartley and Hume; Bentham's analysis of "habit" (which is essential to his understanding of society and especially political society) particularly reflects association presuppositions. On this view, pleasure and pain are objective states and can be measured in terms of their intensity, duration, certainty,

proximity, fecundity and purity. This allows both for an objective determination of an activity or state and for a comparison with others.

Bentham's understanding of human nature reveals, in short, a psychological, ontological, and also moral individualism where, to extend the critique of utilitarianism made by Graeme Duncan and John Gray (1979), "the individual human being is conceived as the source of values and as himself the supreme value."

Check your Progress

- 1. Why is Bentham known as the father of Utilitarian school of thought?
- 2. Mention some names of early utilitarian's.
- 3. Mention some of the important works of Jeremy Bentham.
- 4. From whom did Bentham drew his idea of utility.

2.0 Moral Philosophy

As Elie Halevy (1904) notes, there are three principal characteristics of which constitute the basis of Bentham's moral and political philosophy: (i) the greatest happiness principle, (ii) universal egoism and (iii) the artificial identification of one's interests with those of others. Though these characteristics are present throughout his work, they are particularly evident in the *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, where Bentham is concerned with articulating rational principles that would provide a basis and guide for legal, social and moral reform. To begin with, Bentham's moral philosophy reflects what he calls at different times "the greatest happiness principle" or "the principle of utility"—a term which he borrows from Hume. In adverting to this principle, however, he was not referring to just the usefulness of things or actions, but to the extent to which these things or actions promote the general happiness. Specifically, then, what is morally obligatory is that which produces the greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people, happiness being determined by reference to the presence of pleasure and the absence of pain. Thus, Bentham writes, "By the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question: or, what is the same thing in other words, to promote or to oppose that happiness." And Bentham emphasizes that this applies to "every action whatsoever". That which does not maximize the greatest happiness (such as an act of pure ascetic sacrifice) is, therefore, morally wrong. (Unlike some of the previous attempts at articulating a universal hedonism, Bentham's approach is thoroughly naturalistic.)

Bentham's moral philosophy, then, clearly reflects his psychological view that the primary motivators in human beings are pleasure and pain. Bentham admits that his version of the principle of utility is something that does not admit of direct proof, but he notes that this is not a problem as some explanatory principles do not admit of any such proof and all explanation must start somewhere. But this, by itself, does not explain why another's happiness—or the general happiness—should count. And, in fact, he provides a

number of suggestions that could serve as answers to the question of why we should be concerned with the happiness of others.

First, Bentham says, the principle of utility is something to which individuals, in acting, refer either explicitly or implicitly, and this is something that can be ascertained and confirmed by simple observation. Indeed, Bentham held that all existing systems of morality can be "reduced to the principles of sympathy and antipathy," which is precisely that which defines utility. A second argument found in Bentham is that, if pleasure is the good, then it is good irrespective of whose pleasure it is. Thus, a moral injunction to pursue or maximize pleasure has force independently of the specific interests of the person acting. Bentham also suggests that individuals would reasonably seek the general happiness simply because the interests of others are inextricably bound up with their own, though he recognized that this is something that is easy for individuals to ignore. Nevertheless, Bentham envisages a solution to this as well. Specifically, he proposes that making this identification of interests obvious and, when necessary, bringing diverse interests together would be the responsibility of the legislator.

Finally, Bentham held that there are advantages to a moral philosophy based on a principle of utility. To begin with, the principle of utility is clear (compared to other moral principles), allows for objective and disinterested public discussion, and enables decisions to be made where there seem to be conflicts of (*prima facie*) legitimate interests. Moreover, in calculating the pleasures and pains involved in carrying out a course of action (the "hedonic calculus"), there is a fundamental commitment to human equality. The principle of utility presupposes that "one man is worth just the same as

another man" and so there is a guarantee that in calculating the greatest happiness "each person is to count for one and no one for more than one."

For Bentham, then, there is no inconsistency between the greatest happiness principle and his psychological hedonism and egoism. Thus, he writes that moral philosophy or ethics can be simply described as "the art of directing men's action to the production of the greatest possible quantity of happiness, on the part of those whose interest is in view."

2.1 Political Philosophy

Bentham was regarded as the central figure of a group of intellectuals called, by Elie Halevy (1904), "the philosophic radicals," of which both Mill and Herbert Spencer can be counted among the "spiritual descendants." While it would be too strong to claim that the ideas of the philosophic radicals reflected a common political theory, it is nevertheless correct to say that they agreed that many of the social problems of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century England were due to an antiquated legal system and to the control of the economy by a hereditary landed gentry opposed to modern capitalist institutions. As discussed in the preceding section, for Bentham, the principles that govern morals also govern politics and law, and political reform requires a clear understanding of human nature. While he develops a number of principles already present in Anglo-Saxon political philosophy, he breaks with that tradition in significant ways.

In his earliest work, *A Fragment on Government* (1776), which is an excerpt from a longer work published only in 1928 as *Comment on Blackstone's Commentaries*, Bentham attacked the legal theory of Sir William Blackstone. Bentham's target was, primarily, Blackstone's defense of tradition in law. Bentham advocated the rational revision of the legal system, a restructuring of the process of determining responsibility and of punishment, and a more extensive freedom of contract. This, he believed, would favor not only the development of the community, but the personal development of the individual.

Bentham's attack on Blackstone targeted more than the latter's use of tradition however. Against Blackstone and a number of earlier thinkers (including Locke), Bentham repudiated many of the concepts underlying their political philosophies, such as natural right, state of nature, and social contract. Bentham then attempted to outline positive alternatives to the preceding "traditionalisms." Not only did he work to reform and restructure existing institutions, but he promoted broader suffrage and self (that is, representative) government.

2.2 Bentham's Utilitarian Principle

Bentham is a generally given the credit of being the first of emphasis the principle of utility. However it is not correct. He was not the original profounder of the principles because Hume and Priestley in England, Helvetius in France and Beccaria in Italy had already talked of it Bentham simply emphasized the significance of this principle and made it the basic principle of his political thought. Emphasizing the importance of Bentham's contributions in this regard prof. Massey says. Spinoza and Hume undoubtedly gave him the leading clues; Priestley's Eassy on government suggested the 'pain' and 'pleasure' criterion; and Hutcheson's moral philosophy furnished the phrasethe greatest happiness of the greatest number-which arrested public attention. Bentham added the concept of utility as a mathematical computation of satisfaction worked out by balancing pains against pleasures and supplied the ideology by which this was expanded into a system of political thought".

As Bentham wanted to remove the defects present in the English law and judicial procedure, he could not reconcile with the plea that the English common law was faultless because it had an ancient origin and was developed by eminent jurists. He had no respect for the antiquity and wanted that the law must be in keeping with the needs of today, and that the sole criterion of those needs must be the greatest number of man. In other words he insisted that the old laws must be judged on the basis of their utility. If any existing law did not contribute to the happiness of the individual it should be discarded.

According to Bentham all the actions of man were motivated by the considerations of 'pleasure' and 'pain' and every man tried to get pleasure and avoid pain. In his words nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure; it is for them to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the other 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

say, in all we think; every effort we make to throw off our subjections will serve but to demonstrate and confirm it. In words a man may pretend to adjure their empire: but in reality he will remain subject to it all the while".

Bentham tried to formulate a scale of values for the various kinds of pleasures and classified them. He believed that the pleasures and pains could be measured with the help of seven factors viz. intensity duration, certainty, propinguity, fecundity, purity and extensiveness. On the basis of these principles Bentham himself classified these pleasures. He gave a list of 14 simple pleasures and 12 simple pains. He argued that all other pains or pleasures were the compound of these. The fourteen simple pleasures enumerated piety, benevolence, malevolence, memory, imagination, expectation, asassociation and relief. The twelve simple pains enumerated piety, benevolence malevolence memory, imagination, expectation, association and relief. The twelve simple pains enumerated by Bentham were privation, sense, awkwardness, ill-name, enemity, expectation association etc. the goodness and badness of an act was to be determined on the basis of these pleasures and pains. Thus an act was good or right if it produced a surplus of pleasure over pain and bad or wrong if it produced more pain than pleasure. Bentham made as the sole criteria for judging all the actions. He asserted it was the duty of the legislator and moralists to "sum up all the values of all the pleasure on the one side and those all the pains on the other. The balance, if it be on the side of pleasure, will give the good tendency of the act upon the whole while respect to the interest of that individual person; it on the side of pain, the bad tendency of it upon the whole". In short,

to Bentham the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question. I say of every action whatsoever, and therefore not only of every action of a private individual, but of every measure of Government".

The principle of utility propounded by Bentham exercised profound influenced on the legislators and statesmen in the nineteenth century. It provided them the yardstick by which they could measure the usefulness of a particular law. In the words of Ivor Brown the principle has "an immense value because it denied the infallibility of the supreme person who endeavors' to foist his own type of happiness upon other whom he believed to be the pitiful dupes of ignorance".

2.3 The Greatest Happiness of the greatest number

In this book introduction to the principles of morals and legislation, Bentham made a few basic assumptions to simplify and systematize morals, law and politics. According to him man seeks pleasure and avoids pain. The state exists to regulate this pursuit with minimum of interference. Utility is an abstract term and Bentham used this term to indicate happiness. For him, everything that brings happiness has utility. Everything that brings misery is not utilitarian. The doctrine of utility is a Hedonistic concept. Bentham considered all experience as pleasurable or painful or both. He defined pleasure as individual sensation. To him happiness is a state of mind. He holds that pleasure must be pursued as a matter of natural inclination. However, happiness is not the piling up of all pleasures; it represents the net result after pursuing a number of pleasures. He thought happiness was the surplus over pain.

Bentham feels that there can be only a quantitative distinction between one pleasure and another. He also tells us how to measure pain and pleasures. For this purpose he introduces his famous Felicific Calculus. While measuring pain and pleasure Bentham takes the following factor into consideration. They are intensity, duration, certainty or uncertainty and proximity or remoteness. The value of pain or pleasure depends upon these considerations. Bentham attaches great importance to pleasure and pain.

In a famous passage Bentham say's "Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters-pleasure and pain. To them we refer, all our decisions, every resolve that we make in life" for Bentham, everything is measured in terms of pleasure and pain. He says "an adherent to the principle of utility holds virtue to be a good thing by reason only of the pleasures which results from the practice of it, he considers vice to be a bad thing by reason only of the pains which follows in its train." Bentham observes that a man should not only aim at his own pleasure but also at the collective happiness of the greatest number of people. He argued for utilitarian legislation which seeks to promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number. According to Bentham, every individual being a selfish creature will aim only at his personal happiness. Therefore, he says that man ought to aim at the happiness of the greatest

number. So it is a matter for hedonistic calculus, summing up pleasure and pains in any particular case and balancing the pleasure against the pain, considering the number of persons affected and seeing whether the law contemplated produces the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Briefly, the point of the view of jermy Bentham may be summed up as, all man desire happiness, which may be defined as the surplus of pleasure over pain. Pleasure and pain are therefore, the main springs of human action.

Check your Progress

- 5. What are the principal characteristics of which constitute the basis of Bentham's moral and political philosophy?
- 6. According to Bentham what is the motivating factors of all human actions.
- 7. Nature has placed mankind under the Governance of which sovereign masters.

2.4 Bentham's view on Modern state

Bentham regarded the nation of the modern state as an ideal, an aspiration, and examined the techniques of state building and methods that would promote modernization. He regarded diversity and fragility within political order as inevitable. For Bentham, the state was a legal entity with individualism as its ethical basis. He was categorical that modernization required two things: first, it needed a broad-based and diversified legal system which would take into account individuals' desires; and second, institutions that would support the legal system, namely bureaucratization of public service and legislation as a continual process, accommodating both change and diversity. Bentham characterized the state as a legal entity, with individualism as its ethical basis. "Bentham's theory brought together in a particular way the two great themes of modern political thought: individualism and the modern sovereign state" (Hume1981:238).

Bentham preserved the individualist nation of moral autonomy, with priority to individual interests. He also recognized that these Autonomous individuals, governed by their interest, constituted themselves into fragile groupings which the state had to maintain through discipline cohesion; of it had to be an effective body. Through institutions and other techniques, the community was made responsive to the state, but the state was not allowed the temple on individual interests and wills. It would have to protect them by getting the individuals involved in the state through consent, or by representing them as a meters and judges of the state's actions. Bentham thought of ideas and devices to grantee governmental protection of individual interest, namely the public happiness should be the object of public policy, government was a trust (as it was in the case of Locke), with legislation as the primary function, and that uniformity, clarity, order and consistency were essential to bought law and order. He was equally conscious of the need for institutional safeguards to ensure that the government pursued public interest. He contended that the reason for misrule was that the government was controlled by those whose interest it was to perpetuate bad governance. This could be changed if people who desired good government were made to take charge.

Bentham was confident that representation would ensure congruence between the interests of the government and those the community as a whole. It was for this reason that the championed universal adult franchise, and early as 1970 recommended it to all those who could read the list of voters.

As opposed to national rights and natural law, Bentham recognized legal laws and rights that were enacted and enforced by a duly constituted political authority or the state. A state was sovereign, being primarily a law making body. He define the state or political society as, *A number of person (whom we may style subjects) are supposed to be in the habit of paying obedience to a person, or a assemblage of persons, of a known and certain description (whom we may call governor or governors) such person all together (subject and governed) are said to be in a state of political society (Bentham 1977: 140).*

Interestingly, Bentham opposed the concept of division of powers for three reasons. First, he argued that if the rulers were already accountable to the people, there was no need for additional checks. Division of power by itself did not secure and protect constitutional liberty. Second, even with the divisions would give the minorities the right to veto legislation. He could foresee evil consequence in the displacement of majority rule. Third, he argued that in the absence of effective opposition, division of power would be redundant. He emphasized the importance of accountability of the rulers, instead of division of powers, as nor only good in itself, but also good as a means of constitutional liberty.

3.1 Bentham on Liberty, Rights and Law

Liberty, according to Bentham is the absence of restraints and coercion. He had tried to link the idea of civil and political liberty to security. A government establishes a framework of security through law, within which the individual enjoys liberty. The government also though the enactment of civil laws secures right to property, prevents interference and encourages healthy commercial competitiveness. In the realm of the criminal law, government protects the individual against crime through a system of criminal code, police force and the judiciary. At the level of constitutional law, the government guarantees against misrule, abuse and arbitrary exercise of power.

Bentham recognized the importance of right as being crucial for the security of the individual. He defined right and duty in the context of positive law, sovereign, and sanctions are concrete terms whereas right and duties are abstract concepts. The former are tangible and identifiable. The latter terms assumed sense only if translated into propositions about laws and sanctions. Duty implies an action by the sovereign on pain of some sanction. Whereas when we talk of right- it means that one benefitted from another's performance of an action which is required of him by a sovereign on pain of sanction.

A law, in Bentham's thought, is the expression of a will in the form of a command. Nature or reason or justice cannot be the supreme power in a state, because

they cannot make law. According to Bentham God and man do the only forms of existence possess will? Therefore, law in any precise sense must emanate from one of them. The great task of law in this world is to reconcile interests- so to regulate the motive of self interest that it shall operate, even against its will, towards the production of the greatest happiness. This it does by attaching artificial pain. Or punishment to certain actions of a particular kind which would not be conducive to the general happiness. It cannot, and it ought not try to, concern itself with all actions which would not be conducive to the general happiness.

Since law emanates from human will, law making will have to be evaluated in its capacity to promote happiness. Bentham believed that without positive law, human life would be intolerable, insecure and miserable. Law must be the command of a superior authority. It is only when such an authority is habitually obeyed that Bentham is prepared to admit the existence of civil society. He rejects both natural law and natural right.

3.2 Key Terms

Utilitarianism - Utilitarianism is a moral theory that advocates actions that promote overall happiness or pleasure and rejects actions that cause unhappiness or harm. A utilitarian philosophy, when directed to making social, economic, or political decisions, aims for the betterment of society. The philosophy is associated with Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, two towering British philosophers, and political thinkers.

Enlightenment thinkers- The Age of Enlightenment was an intellectual and philosophical movement that dominated the world of ideas in Europe during the 18th century. The Enlightenment emerged out of a European intellectual and scholarly movement known as Renaissance humanism. Some consider the publication of Isaac Newton's *Principia Mathematica* (1687) as the first major enlightenment work. French historians traditionally date the Enlightenment from 1715 to 1789, from the beginning of the reign of Louis XV until the French Revolution. Most end it with the turn of the 19th century. Philosophers and scientists of the period widely circulated their ideas through meetings at scientific academies, Masonic lodges, literary salons, coffeehouses and in printed books, journals, and pamphlets. The ideas of the Enlightenment undermined the authority of the monarchy and the Church and paved the way for the political revolutions of the 18th and 19th centuries.

Empiricist- The theory that all knowledge is based on experience derived from the senses. Stimulated by the rise of experimental science, it developed in the 17th and 18th centuries, expounded in particular by John Locke, George Berkeley, and David Hume.

Hedonism - Hedonism is a school of thought that argues that the pursuit of pleasure and intrinsic goods are the primary or most important goals of human life. A hedonist strives to maximize net pleasure (pleasure minus pain). However upon finally gaining said pleasure, happiness may remain stationary.

Ethical hedonism - it is the idea that all people have the right to do everything in their power to achieve the greatest amount of pleasure possible to them. It is also the idea that

every person's pleasure should far surpass their amount of pain. Ethical hedonism is said to have been started by Aristippus of Cyrene, a student of Socrates. He held the idea that pleasure is the highest good.

Radicals - a person who advocates thorough or complete political or social change, or a member of a political party or section of a party pursuing such aims.

Principle of Utility- The principle of utility states that actions or behaviors are right in so far as they promote happiness or pleasure, wrong as they tend to produce unhappiness or pain. Hence, utility is a teleological principle. Many utilitarian's believe that pleasure and pain are objective states and can be, more or less, quantified.

Pleasure and Pain Theory - The pain pleasure theory of motivation is based upon the assumption that human nature seeks pleasure and avoids pain.

3.3 Answers to check your progress

1. Bentham is widely regarded as the father of Utilitarian school of thought for his concept of utility and his principles of pain and pleasure.

2. The seeds of the concept of utility can be found in hedonists Aristippus and Epicurus. The tradition of utilitarianism properly began with Bentham, J.S mill, Hume and Priestley. 3. Some of the most important works of Bentham's are Fragments of Government (1776); Essays on political Tactics (1791); Discourses on civil and Penal Legislation (1802); The theory of punishments and Rewards (1811).

4. He drew the concept of utility mainly from Hume's Treatise of Human Nature and Priestley's Essays on Government.

5. The principal characteristics which constitute the basis of Bentham's moral and political philosophy are (i) the greatest happiness principle, (ii) universal egoism and (iii) the artificial identification of one's interests with those of others.

6. According to Bentham all the actions of man were motivated by the considerations of 'pleasure' and 'pain'.

7. Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, *pain* and *pleasure*.

3.4 Short – Answer Question

- 1. What is Jeremy Bentham best known for?
- 2. Write a short note on the influence on Bentham's life.
- 3. Examine the important contributions of Bentham.
- 4. Write a short note on Bentham's concept of Liberty.
- 5. Examine Bentham's idea on Rights.

3.5 Long- Answer Question

1. 'Pain and pleasure' is the linchpin on which the principle of Utility is based, comment.

2. Examine Bentham's concept of modern state.

3. Write an essay on 'Greatest happiness of the greatest number' as advocated by Bentham.

4. Why is Bentham considered as a liberal thinker?

5. Write an essay on Bentham's perception on State.

3.6 Suggested Readings

Arora Prem, Grover Brij (2005). *Selected Western and Indian PoliticalThinkers*. Gurgaon: cosmos Bookhive

Bentham, J. (1962): An introduction to the principles of Morals and Legislations, *The work of Jeremy Bentham*, (1838-1843), 11 Vols, J. Bowring (Ed.), New York, Russell.

Bentham Jeremy, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <u>https://www.iep.utmedu</u>

Berik, R.N (1977): *The History of Political Thought: A short Introduction*, London, Dent.

Hume, J.L (1981): Bentham and Bureaucracy, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Mukherjee Subrata, Ramaswamy Sushila (2015). A History of Political Thought- Plato to Marx. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.

Unit – 4

JOHN STUART MILL (1806-1873)

4.0 Introduction: -

John Stuart Mill, an English philosopher, Economist and Administrator, was the most influential philosopher in the western world during the nineteenth century and, is regarded as the champion of individualism and liberty. Despite of numerous flaws in his theories, he succeeded in providing an alternative to existing views on moral and politics and their foundation which was both specific and cohesive enough to give a markedly liberal tendency to social and political opinion. Mill cannot be ranked among the greatest of pure philosopher, either for his originality or for his synthesizing power. His work in Logic, however, he brought new ground and gave a badly needed impetus to the study of the subject. 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 a atomistic to a more social conception of individuality, while J.S. Mill was a liberal, he could also be regarded, at the same time, as a reluctant democrat, a pluralist, a cooperative socialist, an elitist and importantly a feminist.

4.1 Objectives

In this unit, we shall see the early life of J.S. Mill and his works. We also go through his views on Liberty, Rights of women, Representative Government and criticism of his views.

4.2 His life and Works

J.S. Mill was born in London on 20th May, 1806. He was the eldest son of James Mill and Harriet Burrow Mill. Outwardly, his life was not eventful. He was educated by his father and never attended school. His education did not include any children's books or toys, for he started to learn Greek at the age of 4 and Latin at 8. By the time he was 10, he had read many of Plato's dialogues, logic and history.

In 1823, at the age of 17 years, he becomes a clerk in the East India Company, where his father was a high official, and worked there until 1858. Mill got an opportunity to sit in parliament from 1866 to 1868. As Parliamentarian, he could not stick to his radical party and even many a time displeased party bosses by speaking against party line. In parliament, he stood for the protection of the interest of the laboring classes, women suffrage and land reforms in Ireland.

Mill started publishing various articles on philosophy and politics since his teenage. Mill got his fame through his writing in Westminster Review and London Review and also in many other journals of his time. He was a prolific writer and he wrote on various branches of knowledge with equal mastery. Some of his important works are:-

1. System of Logic (1843)

- 2. Principal of political economy (1848)
- 3. On liberty (1859)
- 4. Utilitarianism (1863)
- 5. Women suffrage (1873) etc.

Mill acknowledged that both of his work "On liberty" and "Women Suffrage "were joint endeavors with Harriet hardy Taylor. Whom, he met in 1830. Harriet was a married woman. After the death of Harriet's husband, Mill married Harriet after 19 years of friendship.

Mills health did not run well and it further deterioted after his retirement. He was not yearly old towards the closing years of 1850's but protracted illness made him ill and weakness. Finally, he died in 1873 A.D.

4.3 J.S. Mill on liberty:-

In fact, Mill's greatest contribution to Benthamite school of thought was his changed concept of liberty to suit his time. Bentham had pleaded for reforms and with the passage of time; state had to yield to his opinion. This, however, gave rise to the increased scope of state activity. The individual were politically growing conscious and then Parliament was concentrating all powers in its own hand. Further, Bentham pleaded for more and more powers to legislature which in practice produced dangerous effects. It was under these circumstances that Mill comes out as champion of individual liberty to protect the individual from the tyranny of the legislative, majority dominance and so called public opinion.

In his essay "On liberty" which was published in 1859, Mill sought to demonstrate the danger to which individuals liberty was exposed in a democracy. Mill believed that in present form of democracy, the rule of all does not mean the rule of each man by himself. Some people rule the others. Again, what is commonly known as the will of the people is in practice is the will of majority. The will of minority is neglected. Mill called this rule of the majority, the oppression or dictatorship or despotism of majority. This short coming of democracy is deplorable but it is the fact and democracy must be saved from it. Mill says, "Whenever there is an ascendant class, a large portion of the morality of the country emanates from its class interests and its feeling of class superiority. So, Mill denounces both the tyranny of opinion and superiority of class. In a real democracy, both these must not be allowed to prevail.

Mill defends liberty of individual to ensure fullest development of his personality. He identifies the major areas in which liberty of an individual must be protected.

Freedom of Thought and Expression:-

Mill believed that freedom of thought and expression belongs to an individual's inwards domain of consciousness. Mill asserts that it is illegitimate for state to interfere with the liberty of thought and expression. He assumes that it is to the advantage of mankind that knowledge should increase among and must be possessed by as many of them as possible. So, Mill strongly believed that it was wrong to think in any way that any authority on earth had a right to suppress the opinion of others. Even a single dissent opinion should not be suppressed because it was disgracing to human race. Such a denial could possibly result in exchanging error for truth. So, everyone should be given essential basic liberties for expression of self as it is essential for self development of an individual. It also helps for the mental development and spiritual originality of individual. So, Mill stressed for the need and necessity of varieties of opinions.

Freedom of action:-

To understand the freedom of action, Mill has given the" Harm principle". According to these principles, he divided the human actions into two types, that is, self-regarding actions and others regarding actions.

According to Mill, self regarding actions are that actions which are concerned to self and has no affects to the community. He advocated for complete freedom in the case of self regarding actions. In simple words, Mill was of the opinion that so far as individual action concerning his own self were concerned and which did not prejudice his action about other, to that extent, he was free and there were no limitation on him. However, in the case of other regarding actions i.e. in mattes which do affect the others or community or when his actions influence others, in that case, he was bounded by certain limitation. Mill conceded the right of the community to coerce the individual if his conduct is prejudicial to its welfare. Mill supported the rational interference by state or authority in case of others regarding actions.

Mill, however, put certain restriction on the enjoyment of liberty. Only those who were mature could enjoy that. He had no care for social customs and conventions nor had anything to say about age-old institutions. However, he believed that in the interest of individual liberty, it was essential that the state should deny liberty in case where it felt that individual was not acting in his self interest.

<u> Criticism:-</u>

Despite of being regarded as the champion of individualism and liberty, he has been severely criticized on many issues. Barker has characterized him as the champion of empty liberty. Some of the grounds on which he has been criticized are as follows.

- 1. Mill held atomistic conception of society which became a great obstacle in his concept of liberty. He could not declare society as an organic growth but simply an aggregate of isolated individuals.
- 2. Mill has divided the human actions into Self regarding actions and others regarding actions. So far self regarding actions are concerned, he is completely free and his independence should not be checked. But there, he is wrong. Moreover, it is not possible to divide human actions practically.

- 3. Mill has not dealt with individual as a part of society but in isolation. But in actual practice that is not possible. In fact, individuals can enjoy liberty only when he is part of society.
- 4. He has made the state autocrat and has also allowed it to interfere in individuals affairs in the name of safeguarding his liberty. This, in actual practice, is dangerous.
- 5. He is also been criticized that he is not consistent in so far as his concept of liberty is concerned. He is not clear whether liberty is absence of restraints or freedom to do what one desires.
- 6. Another drawback of his concept is that his approach is negative in nature. He stress on what others should not do, but silent on what others should do. Thus, he does not have positive suggestions in this regards.

4.4 J.S.Mill on Representative Government

J.S. Mill as champions of individual liberty was of the opinion that representative government, if rightly and properly constituted, was an ideal one. He believes that liberty and democracy, taken together, can create the possibility of human excellence. Development of independence mind and autonomous judgment of an individual is necessary for social progress. These can be possible through the liberty. So, Mill believed that representative government is essential for the protection and enhancement of liberty as well as human reason. If we do not have a representative government, the rulers are likely to make arbitrary laws and create a atmosphere of tyranny. So, Representative Government is the most suitable device for the enactment of laws based on human reason and the principle of liberty. Moreover, it makes government accountable to the citizenry and creates wiser citizens capable of pursuing the public interests.

Mill on system of voting and election.

Mill believed that all should be given the right to vote. But he did not favored the Ballot System or secrete voting system. According to him, vote was a trust and not a right and thus, the right to vote means loading one with great responsibility. It was moral duty of all to exercise this right for general and collective good. So, he pleaded for open system of voting. He supported the voting right for all, at the same time, he was reluctant to believe that all were not competent enough to exercise that right properly and had interest in national affairs. He believed that different individuals are having different capacity. Hence, some citizens should have a larger share in the process of governance than others. In view of this, Mill sought for "Plural voting system". Those who had better abilities and capabilities should have weightage in exercising votes. Accordingly, all adult should have a vote but the wiser and more talented should have more votes than the ignorant and less capable.

Mill had closely observed the democracy of his time. So he felt that democracy was heading towards tyranny. He strongly felt that minorities were not being properly and sufficiently represented according to their voting strength. He also felt that the majority was trying to suppress the views of minority apart from ruling them. He, therefore, favors the idea

of Proportional Representation System of election based on single transferable vote. This, he felt, would give the minorities' more or less equal representation. It will also check unjust domination of numerical majority and will give adequate and proper representation to both. He also felt that men of caliber and intelligence will be distinguished from those of ignorance. So, he pleaded for certain basic qualification for voters.

Mill also favored and pleaded for the women's voters' right. He said that the external differences between men and women would disappear once women were given social and political freedom.

<u> Criticism :-</u>

Some of the drawbacks in his ideas about the representative government are as follows.

- In order to make the working of democracy a successful, Mill has suggested public voting as against the secret ballot system and go for open voting. But he had forgotten that his system is bound to result not only in intimidation and corruption but also in many social tension and lifelong hostilities. The people will then not be in position to fearlessly cast their vote.
- 2. He also favored plural system of voting. If followed, it is bound to divide the society into classes.
- 3. He also opposed the basic principle of democracy that all are equal. He advocate for certain qualification for voters. This is bound to make legislative a body of elitist group or class. Moreover, it will disfranchise vast majority from voting rights. And thus, legislative will no longer be a representative body.

4.5 J.S Mill on the Rights of Women

J.S. Mill, better known as the champion of individual liberty, was also one of the early advocates of equal rights for women. In view of the present day popularity of feminism, Mill's defense of feminist cause has assumed a special significance. His essay on *"The subjection of women"* published in 1869, is now being highly appreciated and read more closely. In this work, he has strongly maintained that there is no known difference between men and women and that would justify attributing different rights to them.

Mill argued that women are naturally worse of some things than men and should, therefore, be discourage or forbidden from doing them. He says that, we simply do not know what women are capable of; because, we have never let them try - one cannot make authoritative statement without evidence. We cannot stop women from trying things because they might not be able to do them. Whether they can or not do them, be found out in practice. In reality, we do not know what women's nature is. Because it is so wrapped up in how they have been raised.

Mill pointed out that opposition to sexual equality was not based on reason. He agreed that the majority opinion favored inequality, but this, he contended went against reason. The basis for such a supposition was that it was derived from the generality of the practice in

history of human kind and hence, was regarded as good. But the Mill pointed out that the subordination of women was only due to fact that they were physically not as strong as men. In fact, the origin of women's subjugation was in physically force, of the allegedly superior bodily strength of men. Consequently, patience, resignation and submission to power, have been regarded as characteristic of a gentle and graceful women. So, Mill lamented that the subjection of women was similar to slavery.

Mill looks on other side of fact too. He pointed out that the rule of men over women was not entirely based on force. Women also accepted it voluntarily without complain and become consenting parties to their subordination. Men, on their part, expected not only obedience, but even affection from women.

Mill lamented that half of mankind - t he women - have so long been held in subjection to the other half the men. He questioned the grounds of this subjection of women to men in the eye of law as well as custom. He argue that the biological differences between men and women cannot be logically involved to justify the exclusion of women from the suffrage, from the professional and from all the avenues of progress which have so far remained open to men.

So, Mill strongly pleaded for improving women's position by giving them suffrage, education and employment opportunities. Mill believed that the improvement in the position of women as concern is not restricted to women alone, but of entire human kind. So, in his book '*The subjection of women*', he made strong claim for equal status in three key areas: Women's right to vote, Right to equal opportunities in education and Employment.

As a parliamentarian, Mill supported a married women's property bill. He contended that England had to move beyond the" savage state "where marriage was based on the idea that one had to have absolute power over the other. Mill further pointed out that marriage did not give the women the dignity and equal status that she ought to get. Once married, she was totally under the control of her husband. She was denied by law over right to her children and property. Hence, they must have the right to property, inheritance and custody.

Mill further argued that, men alone should not be trusted with absolute power because it may lead to brutalization of women. Mill also convinced that if suitable domestic help was made possible, then women, and in particular, the talented and exceptional ones, could take up a profession or a vocation.

So, in this book" *Representative Government*", commented that difference of sex could not be the basis of political rights. So, he pleaded for women's voting right.

According to Mill, the solution of above discussion is to give the women, the freedom of choice, whether married or unmarried. He defended the right of individual women who wanted the opportunity to choose a life other than that of motherhood and marriage. He also defended the right of exceptional women to have the freedom of choice and make the home a dignified and honorable place. So, equality as a legal right between the sexes was Mill's main concern.

4.6 Summary

He improved utilitarian. Mill holds a very important and proud place in England political system. He moulded and improved utilitarianism in such a way that it could face the challenge of time and could survive in the face of all odds. Had Mill not appeared at scene it would have been a different story altogether.

He pleaded Franchise for women. The credit for raising a voice for female suffrage goes to Mill. He was the first utilitarian who stood for universal adult suffrage and not for manhood suffrage as was preached and propagated by his teacher Bentham.

He stood for individualism. Then again credit goes to Mill for raising voice for individualism. Before him, Bentham had also stood for individualism but his individual was an isolated entity struggling for his own pleasures and pains. But individual of Mill was thinking in terms of not external pleasures but only in terms of internal sanction and conscience. He thought not in term of individual but collective happiness.

His faith in Democracy. In those days when democracy has not got deep root in the world, he pleaded for democracy. He was of the view that democratic outlook was a matter than rough and rustic dictatorship. He appealed the people to realize the strength of vote and to cast their votes very judiciously. It was really his great contribution to politics and political philosophy.

He preached for liberty. Another salient point of his philosophy is that he preached for liberty which was a bold step in those days. He went to extent of saying that he did not like that individual should be put in any way even under the control of their legislatures. Like a very great realist and champion of liberty he stood for the combination of administrator and legislators.

He supported the cause of minorities. Then another contribution which he made to philosophy is his support for minority representation. Though this is still a problem yet he made an attempt to solve it. He was thus a true and real supporter of democracy. One cannot deny that unless minorities are properly represented the whole system of democracy is bound to fall.

4.7 Key Terms

- 1. *Liberalism*: Theory which favors greatest possible freedom for the individual.
- 2. *Utilitarianism*: It is the moral, social and political theory states that whatever measure or policy maximizes the positive balance of pleasure over pain across a population or for a person.
- 3. *Subjugation*: It defines the state of gaining control over somebody or something.
- 4. *Representative Government*: A form of government which is elected by the people. It represents the will of the people. It is also called as popular government.
- 5. *Suffrage*: It refers to the privilege of participating in the determination of political matters submitted to the electorate; Voting.

4.8 Question and Exercise

Short – Answer Questions.

- 1. What do you mean by the term Liberty?
- 2. Write a short note on Harm Principle.
- 3. Mention some of the great works of J.S. Mill.
- 4. Differentiate between self regarding and other regarding actions by Mill.
- 5. What do you mean by the term adult suffrage?

Long – Answer Questions.

- 1. Discuss briefly about the early life and works of J.S. Mill.
- 2. "Mill was the prophet of empty liberty and abstract individual" (Barker). How far do you agree with this view?
- 3. Critically examine Mill's concept of Liberty.
- 4. J.S. Mill has been described as reluctant democrat. Discuss.
- 5. Discuss Mill's contribution towards emancipation of women.
- 6. Examine the views of J.S. Mill on representative government and estimate their validity today.
- 7. Discuss the contribution of J.S. Mill to European political thought.

4.9 Further reading

Mukherjee, Subrata and Ramaswamy, Susila. 2018, *A history of political thought Plato to Marx*. PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd. Delhi

Guaba, O.P., 2013, Western Political Thought. Macmillan Publisher India Ltd.

Gupta, M.G. 2017, Western political thought from Plato to Lenin. Surjeet Publication. Delhi

UNIT - 5

GEORGE WILHEM FRIEDRICH HEGEL(1770-1831)

5.0 Objectives

After going through this unit, we will have highlights on early life and the works of George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. In this unit, we will also discuss him as an idealist, his Method of Dialectics and his views on State.

5.1 Introduction

George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel was an eminent German Philosopher and one of the chief exponents of idealism. He was born in a middle class protestant family in 1770 at Stuttgart in Germany. His father was a civil servant. The solvent financial position enabled his father to give young Hegel the best possible education.

He was graduated from Tubingen in 1793 with a certificate. After the death of his father in 1799, he inherited certain amount of money which he thought sufficient and went to Jena to get chance in that university. In 1801, he was appointed as a private teacher and began lecture on logic and metaphysic. As a teacher he earned wide reputation in 1805, he was given the post of professorship which was highly coveted in those days.

With the invasion of Napoleon's army in Prussia in 1806, University of Jena was closed and he was in great financial crisis. Later he was offered professorship at Heidelberg in which he stay till 1818. Then he went to Berlin to take chair of philosophy left vacant by the death of Fitche. At Berlin, Hegel's fame reached far and wide and within a short time he became an international figure. In the University of Berlin he continued to stay till his death in 1831.

5.1.1 Major works of Hegel

Hegel's major works include the following.

- 1. Phenomenology of spirit (1807)
- 2. Science of Logic (1812)
- 3. Encyclopedia of philosophical science(1817)
- 4. Philosophy of Rights (1821)
- 5. Philosophy of History (1837)

5.2 <u>Hegel as an idealist</u>

The idealism refers to a philosophical outlook which holds that idea, spirit, and consciousness is the essence of the universe and that all forms of physical existence as well as social and Political institutions are the manifestation of the prevailing idea at a particular historical point of times. It is a reaction against the liberal and the individualistic theory. It based on ethics and rejects the idea that human welfare can be measured in terms of actual or material comforts and satisfaction. In this sense, idealism is opposite to materialism. After the death of last great philosopher of Utilitarian School of Thought, their whole philosophy came under severe criticism. Even the chief exponent of utilitarianism, J.S. mill was also been criticized as the prophet of empty liberty without no clear vision about the rights.

Europe strongly began to feel that the utilitarian philosophy had reduced state simply to an aggregate of individuals who were after seeking pleasure and avoiding pains. They felt that this school of thought had failed to address their problems.

It was at this stage that the idealism came to front to solve the problems which the Europe seriously faced. This soon spread throughout the world. The philosophers might differ in details but basically their ideas remained unchanged.

So far German idealism is concerned; there was a chequered and colorful background. It originated in the idealism of Plato and Aristotle and than for several centuries, it was buried in oblivion. Then it was resuscitated in the hands of Rousseau. From him, it went to the German philosopher Kant and then to fitche. Gettel has rightly commented that, *"the climax of German idealism in political philosophy was reached in the speculation of Hegel"*. The profound knowledge and extraordinary genius of this philosopher not only enriched the idealist philosophy, but also raised it to the pinnacle of glory. Hegel is the greatest idealist political philosopher who exalted the state into the position of god. He regarded the state as a perfect rationality and an absolute fixed end in itself. The state is a moral organism and it is the sole organizer of rights and guardian of moral values. It poses a super personality representing the best individual will. Hegel says that, *"The state is a self- conscious ethical substance and a self- knowing and self- actualizing individual.....the State is a march of God upon Earth"*.

Hegel's system including politics is the largest expression of his cultural idealism. He made philosophy and also idealism a concrete historical factor and drew history into philosophy. Hegelian idealism is often referred to an absolute idealism because it provides us with a set of categories in terms of which all human experiences of the past and present can be understood.

German idealist Kant wanted to see all powerful state and for that reason he did not accepted John Lock's concept of liberalization. He rather inclined to the absolutism of Thomas Hobbes and J.J. Rousseau. Hegel's idealism accommodated this philosophy of Kant. His idealism teaches that man must show unconditional obedience to state. The morality, freedom and will of the individual are not separated from those of the state. So, Hegel's philosopher thought of institutions are repugnant to the all- round development of human personality and idealism. According to him, idea constitutes the true motor of history whereas what gives momentum to history is the development of idea. All the changes in society, economy, polity and cultural take place because of development of ideas. So, for him, the world is the manifestation of absolute idea.

5.3 Hegelian's Dialectics

Philosophy of dialectics as expounded by Hegel is nothing new, but only a development of methods as initiated by Kant. His main objective of discussing dialectic was to reveal the necessity of history which he felt was a growth. In the development of his idea, he got inspiration from the writings of Greek thinkers who believed that each force gave birth to an opposite force. This method was successfully applied by Plato. Immanuel Kant also applied this method successfully to study the

contradictions arising from the employment of reason to the impressions received through the sense. Then, Hegel applied this method to identify the process whereby such contradictions are resolved for arriving at a higher place of truth. His method is based on the principle of contradiction. He described

these process in terms of thesis (The initial idea), antithesis (the opposite or contradicting idea) and finally, Synthesis (absolute idea that result from the contradiction between thesis and antithesis).

The term "dialectic" has been derived from the Greek word "Dialektos" (Discuss) and "Dialektike" (art of debate and discussion). It means, dialectic is a method of investigation of truth through the art of disputation. That is by the process of argument and counter argument.

To him, contradiction is not hindrance but indication of progress and can be removed by valid and convincing arguments on both sides rather than by the use of force or coercion. So, contradiction is eternal and moving ahead since the beginning of the world.

According to Hegel, the Dialectic is a triadic movement – a movement in which a finite object or motion develops contradiction and passes over into its own negations. Triadic movement means that every idea or motion or event produces a contrary idea or force. Contradictions started with initial idea (thesis) and contradicting or opposing idea (antithesis). Their conflict produces a new third force which dissolves and displaces the pre-existing ideas (thesis and antithesis). This third force is the synthesis and it drew qualities from both. The synthesis is not a compromise between thesis and antithesis nor does it represent the victory of one over the other. Both the thesis and antithesis are present in the synthesis but in a higher and more perfect form. Again, the synthesis turns into thesis and it produces its opposite. And, thus, the process goes on till it reaches perfection or an absolute idea. For example, if man in the thesis and women is the antithesis, the synthesis is the family, a higher form of thesis and antithesis. Again, if the family is thesis and civil society in antithesis, the synthesis is a higher form i.e. The State.

In other words, the initial idea (thesis) does not represent absolute truth. The opposite idea (antithesis), which is just the opposite or negation of thesis, too, does not represent absolute truth, when thesis and antithesis contradict with each other; they tend to destroy each other's untrue `elements. As a result, the synthesis, which consist of the element of both thesis and antithesis developed. Synthesis is relatively free from the untrue elements of both thesis and antithesis and thus, nearer to the truth or perfect.

Again, synthesis takes the position of new idea again and undergoes the same process of contradiction with antithesis and resulted into the emergence of new synthesis. This process of negation of negation continues till it reaches the stage of absolute idea which is free from contradiction.

Hegel believed that the philosophy of history represents partial truth and thus each facts supplements the others. From this, he developed that the theory of dialectics determines the graph of human progress from inorganic world to organic world of plants and animals. The men are the ultimate or highest end of physical evolution. Thus, beyond man, there can be no further physical evolution. Man evolves intellectually and morally through the above discussed triadic principles.

Hegel considered that the agent of idea of progress is this man and the state is the agents of the dialectics and the idea of progress.

Criticism:-

Hegel's theory of dialectic has undergone severe criticism on many grounds as follows.

- 1. Hegel's philosophy of change has preaches for war. This cannot be justified on any ground.
- 2. According to Hegel, dialectic explains the logic of history-a conception which is not clear. His concept is rather selective process which neither possible nor clear.
- 3. According to Hegel, culmination of everything comes in due course. In other words, there is no need to make any specific efforts for achieving any aim or object and that is the natural process of history. But he is basically wrong. It is fatal to preach and follow such an idea in practice. It makes mankind fatalist which is bound to retard the progress of civilization.
- 4. Hegel has also been criticized on the ground that, though unsuccessful, he tried to combine revolution ad conservatism together, which is complete opposite in concept. These two opposite concept cannot go together in actual practice.
- 5. His philosophy of dialectics is self contradictory. It at one and at the same time believes in active as well as passive. It is the result of struggle that thesis and anti thesis are to be achieved and that these are pre destined and lastly, it is rational and at the same time vague.

5.3 Hegel's views on state

To start with Hegel's views on state, we should address his two main concern or issue.

Firstly, theoretically, Hegel's view is different from that of liberal understanding of State. The liberalist believes that the state is the product of individual's activities or will. Individual plays major role in constructing the state. State is authored by individual. So, liberalist viewed State as threat to individual liberty. They considered State as "necessary evils". So, they restricted the role of State in individual's life. But for Hegel, state is the result of spirit or the expression of absolute idea. He considered State as "March of God upon Earth". So, individual enjoys full freedom under State. The individual realize his actual freedom by obeying the State. Hegel considered individual and State in two different domains which is opposed to each other. For Hegel, these two opposite domain should be united to result into a higher or more perfect form. He explains it through his method called "Dialectic Method".

Secondly, to explain the origin of state, Hegel has successfully adopted a method called Dialectics method. Through this method, Hegel explained that the state is the result of Dialectical process. He argues that every social change is the result of development of idea.

Hegel believed that, originally, man was like many other animals. But now he has reached the final stage of physical evolution. As a conscious being, he does not like to live alone. He likes to live with others and to form association. Hegel says that the earliest form of association was the family which is built upon the feeling of love and affections. Hegel called family as thesis. In order to meet their growing demands, people move for better and larger society i.e. civil society which Hegel called as an antithesis.

The family is thus, thesis while the civil society is the antithesis. The clash between thesis and antithesis produces synthesis which is the state, the higher form of both the thesis and antithesis. So, the final stage of dialectical process is the state. In Hegelian formulation, there can be no change. It is not only the super-organism but also the highest manifestation of idea or spirit or reason.

The state is, therefore, the embodiment of rational freedom, realizing and recognizing itself in an objective form. It is the idea or spirit in the eternal manifestation of human will and its freedom. Whatever spiritual realities a man can posses, he can posses only through the State.

5.4 Characteristic of State

It is a divine State:-

Hegel's state is a mechanism, but it is a mechanism for different purpose. It's not an instrument to maximize the happiness of individual nor is it an institution to preserve the life, liberty and property of man. It is a super organism. Thus, the State is product of long, unconscious but divinely ordained growth. It is not the outcome of any contract. Hegel's state was not real but the highest form of reality. Hegel considered state as "The March of God on Earth".

It is an Organic State:-

According to Hegel, State is a natural growth. It regarded the state as an organism or an ethical whole. State is a whole and it must be comprehend as whole. Its parts are always inferior to the whole. Individuals are considered as parts. They can realize their best self only by merger with the state.

Thus, according to Hegel, the citizen is part of a valuable whole and has value as such; but isolated from the whole, he is useless. All the worth which the human being possess, it is possess only through the State. Outside the State, the individual has no value and therefore, the state make the individual and is supreme.

The State as a moral institution:-

Hegel regarded the state as a moral institution. The moral law cannot bind the state because the state is the creator of morality. The State fixes the standard of morality for its citizens. A man does not possess the wisdom to challenge the morality or ethics of the state. Man's activities are guided by his conscience, but conscience cannot tell what is right and just. That decision is taken by the State. Man is just a machine to perform Duty.

State represent perfect rationality:-

Hegel gave a systematic and vigorous exposition of the theory of idealism. According to him, the State represents, "perfect rationality" and "it is the embodiment of reasons". To him, rational is the real. What is rational is actual and what is actual is rational. This is how the idealist applies metaphysics to the State.

State is sovereign:-

Another feature of Hegel's State is that the State is sovereign both in national and international affairs. In relation to other State, its own safety is of prime consideration. It cannot make any compromise. To safeguard its own interest and protect its own sovereignty is the highest morality.

The state is a end in itself:-

Hegel's state is an end in itself. State's will is considered to be superior to the individual's will. The state has a personality and the development of individual's personality can take place only through the personality of the state. It's through the state, the real personality of an individual express himself.

Real freedom lies in the state:-

According to Hegel, the State represents the real freedom or real will. It is this will which should be supreme in society. Real will alone represent the common good. It is based on reason and rationality. The state represents this free moral will which is the duty of individual to obey this will.

War is not an absolute evils:-

Hegel believed that state is an absolute power on earth and as such every state is absolute and sovereign autonomous. He, therefore, does not liked the idea of any state being absorbed or conquered by the other. He, very clearly says that war is reality which must be accepted. Not only this, but he clearly says that for a number of reasons wars are wholesome. Peace stagnate both men as well as nations. If the body politics is to be provided necessary stimulus, it is essential that there should be the wars.

Constitutional monarchy as the best form of government:-

According to Hegel, the best form of government is the constitutional monarchy of the type of Prussia of his time. It would be better if it is hereditary. Out of three branches of the Government, legislature is the thesis or universal aspect. The administrative wins are the antithesis or particular aspect. The monarch who represents the best in the two is the synthesis. According to Hegel, sovereignty of state resides in monarch not in the people. Hegel dislike for the parliamentary system of England. He denounced territorial representation and propounded functional representation.

Criticism:-

- 1. Hegel has stress that state is an end in itself that man without state cannot progress and show what is best in itself. But his conception has been put to criticism that the state can never be end in itself. He has not only made the state an absolute identity but also has given it a totalitarian concept which is against the spirit of liberty and democracy.
- 2. Another criticism is that if his theory is taken to its logical conclusions, then it will go very near to idea of Fascism, which in actual practice has been rejected by the world and has considered danger to world peace.

- 3. His philosophy subordinate individual to the state. Giving absolute power to state may create danger of exploitation and subordination leading to slavery by those who held the power.
- 4. Hegel considered state as "March of god on earth". State is sole creator of morality and no moral law can bind the state. But, if the state do not advance or promote or accept moral code, then it is bound to wither away and state authority shall have no rights to govern the people.

5.5 <u>Summary</u>

1. It was Hegel's philosophy of dialectic which reached a realistic conclusion that the world culture was not the monopoly of one nation but essence of cultures of all states and that world culture represented the best of all the nations.

2. Hegel's another contribution is that he was tried to prove that the whole universe is coherent whole. He believes in reason and perfection and like a realist feels that all rational was real is rational.

3. Then his contribution is that he has properly assessed the value of history and place of personalities and events in the making of history. Still, more credit goes to him for clarifying his stand without any ambiguity.

4. He has also given the idea that man is an end in itself and not means to an end and that state is required to promote the welfare of all. His views are highly valued even today.

5. Hegel is regarded as the spiritual father of Bismarck it has been said that what Hegel demanded in theory was carried out in actual practice by Bismarck. The later, under the influence of former carried forward the idea of nation state based on force and the idea of state as an organic whole.

5.<u>6 Key Terms</u>

- 1. *Idealism*: Refers to one of the two principal trends in philosophy which, in oppose to materialism, holds that idea, spirit or consciousness are primary and that nature, being or matter are secondary.
- 2. *Dialectical Process*: According to Hegel, the term used for the process which characterized historical changes in which there has been a necessary movement from thesis to anti- thesis, followed by synthesis, which is the higher or perfect idea.
- 3. **Totalitarianism**: It is the state where political rulers control every aspect of private and social life in a society, as well as having so extensive a political power that virtually no liberty or autonomy in decision making is left to individuals or groups outside the system.

5.5 Question and Exercise

Short- Answer Questions.

- 1. What do you mean by the term Idealism?
- 2. Write the name of some of the great works of Hegel.
- 3. Write a short note on Hegelian Dialectic.
- 4. What influenced Hegel's political philosophy?

Long- Answer Questions.

- 1. Discuss briefly the early life and works of Hegel.
- 2. "The state is a divine idea as exists on earth". (Hegel). Discuss.
- 3. Critically examine Hegel as an absolute Idealist.
- 4. Explain the ideas of dialectic and historical necessity in the thoughts of Hegel.
- 5. "Hegel is prophet of Totalitarianism". Discuss this statement in view to his idea of state.
- 6. Discuss briefly the silent feature of Hegel's political philosophy and also the contribution which he has made to political philosophy of his age.

5.6 Further reading

Dickey, Laurence. 1987. *HegeL: Religion, Economic, and the Politics of Spirit, 1770-1807*. Cambridge University Press.

Gupta, M.G., 2017, Western political thought from Plato to Lenin. Surject Publication, Delhi

Guaba, O.P., 2013, Western Political Thought. Macmillan Publisher India Ltd.

Mukherjee, Subrata and Ramaswamy, Susila, 2018, A history of Political thought, Plato to Marx, PHI Learning Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.

Coleman, Janet. 2000, A history of political thought. New Delhi: Willy Blackwell.

Wolf, Jonathan. 2006, An introduction to political philosophy. New Delhi: OUP Oxford.