

MODERN WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT

V SEMESTER

CORE COURSE

BA POLITICAL SCIENCE

(2013 Admission- CCSS)



UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

Calicut university P.O, Malappuram Kerala, India 673 635.

253-A

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIAL

Core Course

BA POLITICAL SCIENCE

V Semester

MODERN WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT

*Prepared &
Scrutinized by:*

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

Layout: Computer Section, SDE

©
Reserved

CONTENTS	PAGES
Module - I	05-24
Module - II	25-39
Module - III	40-53
Module - IV	54-86
Module - IV	87-100

Core Course VIII-Modern Western Political Thought

Module I : Social Contractualists:

Thomas Hobbes: State of nature, social contract, nature and attributes of state.

John Locke: State of nature, natural rights, nature and functions of state.

J.J. Rousseau: State of nature, social contract and general will.

Module II : Utilitarians :

Jeremy Bentham: Pleasure pain theory

J.S.Mill: Modifications of Bentham's theory, on Liberty and representative government

Module III : Idealists:

Hegel: On Dialectics, state and freedom

T.H.Green: State, freedom and rights

Module IV : Socialists:

Karl Marx – Materialistic Dialectics and Historical Materialism, Theory of Surplus Value, Class Struggle, Base-superstructure Relations, Critique of Capitalism

V.I. Lenin – Imperialism and democratic centralism

Mao-Tse-Tung – On contradiction, role of peasantry

Module V – Anarchism

Bakunin and Kropotkin

MODULE I: SOCIAL CONTRACTUALISTS

Thomas Hobbes (1588 -1679)

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

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

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

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

State of nature and Human nature

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

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

Hobbes asserted that every human action, feeling and thought was ultimately physically determined. Though the human being was dependent on his life, on the motion of his body he was able to some extent, to control those motions and make his life. This he did by natural means, ie, by relying partly on natural passions and partly on reason. It was reason, according to Hobbes, that distinguished human beings from animals. Reason enabled the individual to understand the impressions that sense organs

picked up from the external world, and also indicated an awareness of one's natural passions. He mentioned a long list of passions, but the special emphasis was on fear, in particular the fear of death, and on the universal and perfectly justified quest for power. “

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

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

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

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

Thus Hobbes in his well known work, ‘The Leviathan’ has presented a bleak and dismal picture of the condition of men in the state of nature. However, Hobbes does not

extensively discuss the question of whether men have actually ever lived in such a state of nature. He noted that the savage people in many places of America have no government and live in the brutish and nasty manner. John Rawls thinks that Hobbes' state of nature is the classic example of the "prisoner's dilemma" of game – theoretic analysis.

Social contract

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

"I authorize and give up my right of governing myself to this man or to this assembly of man on the condition that thou give up thy right to him, and authorise all his actions in like manner. This is the generation of that great Leviathan or rather (to speak more reverently) of that mortal god, to which we owe under the immortal God, our peace and defence.' It is clear from the above statement that no individual can surrender his right to self-preservation.

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

According to William Ebenstein, Hobbesian, social contract is made between subjects and subjects and not between subjects and sovereign. The sovereign is not a party to the contract, but its creation. This contract is a unilateral contract in which the contracting individuals obligate themselves to the resultant sovereign. Then again it is an irrevocable contract owe the individuals contract themselves into a civil society, they

cannot annul the contract. They cannot repudiate their obligation. Repudiation of a contract is an act of public will of the individuals which they had surrounded at the time of the original contract. Thus Hobbesian contract is a social and not governmental contract. In this conception of social contract, the sovereign cannot commit any breach of covenant because he is not a party to it. By participating in the creation of the sovereign the subject is author of all the ruler does and must therefore not complain of any of the rulers' actions, because thus he would be deliberately doing injury to himself. Hobbes concedes that the sovereign may commit iniquity but not "injustice or injury in the proper signification", because he cannot by definition, act illegally; he determines what is just and unjust and his action is law.

Nature and attributes of state

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

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

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

1. Sovereign is absolute and unlimited and accordingly no conditions implicit or explicit can be imposed on it. It is not limited either by the rights of the subjects or by customary and statutory laws.
2. Sovereignty is not a party to the covenant or contract. A sovereign does not exist prior to the commencement of the contract. Contract was signed between men in the state of nature mainly to escape from a state of war of every man against every man. The contract is irrevocable.
3. The newly created sovereign can do no injury to his subjects because he is their authorised agent. His actions cannot be illegal because he himself is the sole source and interpreter of laws.
4. No one can complain that sovereign is acting wrongly because everybody has authorised him to act on his behalf.

5. Sovereign has absolute right to declare war and make peace, to levy taxes and to impose penalties.
6. Sovereign is the ultimate source of all administrative, legislative and judicial authority. According to Hobbes, law is the command of the sovereign.
7. The sovereign has the right to allow or takes away freedom of speech and opinion.
8. The sovereign has to protect the people externally and internally for peace and preservation were basis of the creation of the sovereign or Leviathan. Thus Hobbesian sovereign represents the ultimate, supreme and single authority in the state and there is no right of resistance against him except in case of self defense. According to Hobbes, any act of disobedience of a subject is unjust because it is against the covenant. Covenants without swords are but mere words. Division or limitation of sovereignty means destruction of sovereignty which means that men are returning to the old state of nature where life will be intolerably miserable.

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

Thus it is clear from the above observations that Hobbes' theory of sovereignty is the first systematic and consistent statement of complete sovereignty in the history of

political thought. His sovereign enjoys an absolute authority over his subjects and his powers can neither be divided nor limited either by the law of nature or by the law of God.

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

CONCLUSION

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

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

JOHN LOCKE

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

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

principles of legitimate political power. Locke saw political power as a trust, with the general community specifying its purposes and aims.

STATE OF NATURE

In order to explain the origin of political power, Locke began with a description of the State of Nature. Locke's description of State of Nature was not as gloomy and pessimistic as Hobbes'. As all of us know, the State of Nature is the stock in trade of all contract theories of the state. It is conceived as a state prior to the establishment of political society. Locke believes that man is a rational and social creature and as such capable of recognizing and living in a moral order. He is not selfish, competitive and aggressive.

The Lockean state of nature, far from being a war of all is a state of 'Peace good will, mutual assistance and preservation". It represents a pre-political rather than a pre-social condition. Men do not indulge in constant warfare in it, for peace and reason prevail in it. The state of nature is governed by a law of nature. This law "obliges every one, 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 one another in his life, health, liberty or possessions for men being all the workmanship of one omnipotent and infinitely wise maker; all the servants of sovereign master, sent into the world by his order, and about his business; they are his property whose workmanship they are, made to last during his, not one another's pleasure....."

In the Lockean state of nature men has equal natural rights to life, liberty and property together known as Right to Property. These rights are inalienable and inviolable for they are derived from the Law of Nature which is God's reason. Everyone is bound by reason not only to preserve oneself but to preserve all mankind in so far as his own preservation does not come in conflict with it. Men are free and equal and there is no commonly acknowledged superior whose orders they are obliged to obey. Everybody is the judge of his own actions. But though the natural condition is a state of liberty, it is not a state of license. Nobody has the right to destroy himself and the destroy the life of any other men. Because there is no common judge to punish the violation of natural law in the state of nature, every individual is his own judge and has executive power of punishing the violators of law of nature. William Ebenstein in his 'Great Political Thinkers' wrote that the law of nature in the Lockean state of nature is deficient in three important points. First, it is not sufficiently clear. If all men were guided by pure reason they would all see the same law. But men are biased by their interests and mistake their interests for general rule of law. Second, there is no second party judge who has no personal state in dispute. Third, in the state of nature the injured party is not always strong enough to execute the law. In

other words, in the Lockean state of nature there are some short comings and inconveniences. Absence of a law making body law enforcing agency and an impartial judicial organ in the state of nature where the serious short comings in the state of nature. Thus we find that the state of nature, while it is not a state of war is also not an idyllic condition, and, therefore, it has to be superseded sooner or later. Conflict and uncertainties are bound to arise on account of the selfish tendencies in human nature. The state of nature is always in danger of being transformed into a state of war. Where everyone is the judge in his own case and has the sole authority to punish peace is bound to be threatened.

Natural Rights and Private Property

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

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

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

Locke argues that the "Labour of his body, and the work of his Hands are properly his. What so ever then he removes out of the state that nature hath provided, and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with, and joined to it something that is his won and thereby makes it his property". Since human beings have property in their persons and

hence a right to life, it follows that they have property in those possessions that they have legitimately laboured to obtain. In other words, property in both person and possessions is a right that belongs to every human being as human being. It is a right all people possess whether they be in a state of nature or in political society. Locke thus says that the great and chief end of men's uniting into commonwealths, and cutting themselves under government is the preservation of their property". Consequently, Government has no other end but the preservation of people 'Lives, liberties, and Estates" Liberty is a property right for Locke because to have property in one's person implies the right to think, speak and act freely. Locke has argued that in the state of nature property is held in common until people mix their labour with it at which point it becomes their private property. A person has right to appropriate as much common property as desired so long as "there is enough and as good left in common for others"

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

Limited Government

In order to explain the origin of political power, Locke began with a description of the state of nature which for him was one of perfect equality and freedom regulated by the laws of nature. Locke's description of state of nature was not as gloomy and pessimistic as Hobbe's. The individual in the Lockean state of nature was naturally free and become a political subject out of free choice. The state of nature was not one of license, for though the individual was free from any superior power, he was subject to the laws of nature. From the laws of nature, individuals derived the natural rights to life, liberty and property

(Together known as Right to Property). The laws of nature known to human beings through the power of reason, which directed them towards their proper interests.

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

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

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

foreign policy, and knows that its formulation, execution and control presents a very special kind of problem to constitutional states.

Characteristics of Lockean state

The first and foremost feature of Lockean state is that it exists for the people who form it, they do not exist for it. Repeatedly he insists that 'the end of government is the good of the community'. As C.L. Wayper has rightly pointed out the Lockean 'state' is a machine which we create for our good and run for our purposes, and it is both dangerous and unnecessary to speak of some supposed mystical good of state or country independent of the lives of individual citizens.

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

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

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

Limitations of Government

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

Locke does not build up a conception of legal sovereignty. He abolishes the legal sovereignty in favour of popular sovereignty. He has no idea of absolute and indivisible sovereignty as presented by Thomas Hobbes. Locke is for a government based on

division of power and subject to a number of limitations. His limited government cannot command anything against public interests. It cannot violate the innate natural rights of the individuals. It cannot govern arbitrarily and tax the subjects without their consent. Its laws must conform to the laws of Nature and of god. It is not the government which is sovereign but law which is rooted in common consent. Its laws must conform to the laws of Nature and of God. It is not the government which is sovereign but law which is rooted in common consent. A government which violates its limitations is not worthy of obedience.

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

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

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

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

Civil Society

According to Locke what drives men into society is that God put them “under strong Obligations of necessity, convenience, and inclination”. And men being by nature all free, equal and independent , no one can be put out of this estate (State of nature) and subjected to political power of another without his own consent. Therefore, the problem is to form civil society by common consent of all men and transfers their right of punishing the violators of natural law to an independent and impartial authority. For all practical purposes, after the formation of civil society this common consent becomes the consent of the majority; all parties must submit to the determination of the majority which carries the

force of the community. So all men unanimously agree to incorporate themselves in one body and conduct their affairs by the opinion of the majority after they have set up a political or civil society, the next step is to appoint a government to declare and execute the natural law. This Locke calls the supreme authority established by the commonwealth or civil society.

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

J. J. ROUSSEAU (1712 – 1778)

Jean Jacques Rousseau was one of the greatest political philosopher that the French has produced. In the entire history of political theory he was the most exciting and provocative. He was a genius and a keen moralist who was ruthless in his criticism of 18th century French society. He was one of the most controversial thinkers, as evident from the conflicting, contradictory and often diametrically opposite interpretations that existed of the nature and importance of his ideas. He is best remembered for his concept of popular sovereignty, and the theory of general will which provide a philosophical justification for democratic governance. He was the intellectual father of the French Revolution as well as the last and perhaps the greatest of the modern contract theorists.

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

In 1742 Rousseau set out for Paris where he met the leading cultural, scientific and philosophical luminaries of Enlightenment France. Among them was Diderot, a leading philosopher and the founder of the encyclopedia, a multi-volume work that aimed at encompassing all knowledge. Rousseau contributed several articles to the encyclopedia, the most important of which was the Discourse on Political Economy. This work along with the first and second discourses, and most importantly the social contract,

constitutes the basic source of Rousseau's social and political thought, although he wrote several other minor political works, such as the *Government of Poland*. In addition, Rousseau wrote several novels and numerous essays, and he produced three autobiographical works, the most important of which is the *Confessions*. In 1761 Rousseau published *Emile* perhaps the most famous work on education every written.

STATE OF NATURE

Rousseau built his political theory on the conception of pre-political state of nature. The reason is that he grew up in the rigorously Calvinist atmosphere of the small city of Geneva. Throughout his life, in spite of his conversion to Catholicism and a great humiliation which he suffered in Geneva, his love for his home strongly shaped his political thought. As he was restless man by nature he was never completely at home in any profession. He could never tolerate external restraint.

In the *Discourse on Inequality* published in 1754, Rousseau started with the analysis of human nature. He considered the natural man, living in natural surroundings or in the state of nature as a noble savage. Man, as a natural animal lived the happy and care free life of the brute, without fixed abode without articulate speech, with no needs or desires that cannot be satisfied through the mere instinct. According to him, men in the state of nature were equal, self sufficient and self controlled. Their conduct was based not on reason, but on emotions of self interest and pity. Man's first feeling was that of his own existence, and his first care that of self preservation. Hunger and other appetites made him at various times experience various modes of existence.

According to Rousseau, men in the state of nature lived in isolation and had a few elementary, easily appeased needs. It was neither a condition of plenty or scarcity, neither there was neither conflict nor cooperative living. There was no language or knowledge of any science or art. In such a situation man was neither happy nor unhappy, had no conception of just and unjust virtue or vice. The noble savage was guided by two instincts-self love or the instinct of self preservation and sympathy or the gregarious instinct. As these instincts are always beneficial, man is by nature good. But self love and sympathy often come in to clash with each other hence, according to Rousseau, man takes the help of a sentiment to resolve the clash, which men can conscience. But since conscience is only a blind sentiment, it will not teach men what is in fact right. Conscience, therefore, requires a guide and that guide is reason which develops in man as alternate courses of action present themselves before him. Rousseau's taught that reason was the outgrowth of a artificial life a man in organized society and that the results of its development were calamities. The noble savage was Rousseau's ideal man.

State of nature did not last forever. In course of time the noble savage who lived in isolation discovered the utility and usefulness of labor which gave rise to the idea of property. Property led to the domination of one man over other.

SOCIAL CONTRACT

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

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

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

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

CRITIQUE OF CIVILISATION

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

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

In surveying history to support of his cult of natural simplicity, Rousseau is full of enthusiasm in for Sparta, a “republic of demi- gods rather than of men”, famous for the happy and ignorance of its inhabitants. By contrast, he denigrates Athens, the centre of vice, doomed to perish because of its elegance, luxury, wealth, art and science. Rousseau sees a direct casual relation between luxury constantly expanding needs, and the rise of art and science after which true courage flags and the virtues disappear.

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

GENERAL WILL

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

instrument and revives the organic theory of the state, which goes back to Plato and Aristotle.

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

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

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

Unlike nearly all other major political thinkers, Rousseau considers the sovereignty of the people inalienable and indivisible. The people cannot give away or transfer to any person or body their ultimate right of self-government of deciding their own destiny. Whereas Hobbes identified the sovereign with the ruler who exercises sovereignty, Rousseau draws a sharp distinction between sovereignty, which always and wholly resides in the people and government which is but a temporary agent of the sovereign people. Rousseau believes that the general will would be the source of all laws. The

human being would be truly free if he followed the dictates of the law. He was categorical that the General will could emerge only in an assembly of equal law makers.

CHARACTERISTICS OF GENERAL WILL

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

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

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

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

According to William Ebenstein, Rousseau's concept of sovereignty differs from both Hobbes' and Locke's. In Hobbes the people set up a sovereign and transfer all power to him. In Locke's social contract, the people set up a limited government for limited purposes, but Locke shuns the conception of sovereignty - popular or monarchical - as a symbol of political absolutism. Rousseau's sovereign is the people constituted as a political community through the social contract. Rousseau's theory of popular sovereignty is not only different from Locke's, it is in fact a thorough going critique of the whole tradition of Lockean liberal democracy. For while Locke recognises the principle of popular sovereignty in theory, he rejects it in practice, says Rousseau. In point of fact, Locke's

contract does not give the legislative power to the people, but to a representative legislature. As such, sovereign belongs to the elected representatives, or more precisely to a majority of representatives rather than to the community as a whole. Thus, Locke actually puts sovereignty in the hands of a very small minority, thereby denying to the people that political liberty that a correct reading of the contract shows they rightfully ought to possess.

ASSESSMENT

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

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

MODULE II: UTILITARIANS

JEREMY BENTHAM (1748-1832)

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

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

The most characteristic expression of this outlook is to be found in the work of Jeremy Bentham, the founder of Philosophical Radicalism. Bentham was born in 1748, only three years after the Jacobite rebellion of 1745 that sought to regain the throne of the Stuarts. Bethan’s father and grandfather were well-to-do attorneys and Bentham was to enter

upon the same carrier. At the comparatively early age of three Bentham was found poring over a big folio volume of Rapin's History of England; he read Latin before he was four, French at six and took to Voltaire for light reading at eight. He entered Oxford at twelve, received his Bachelor's degree at fifteen and then studied the law. He was called to the bar in 1769 but he soon decided that he was more interested in reforming the law than in practicing it. A small annual income of a hundred pounds enabled him to live independently though modestly; after his father's death in 1792 his financial situation greatly improved and he was able to live comfortably in his house in London. There he spent his life, unmarried completely devoted to his literary and political activities.

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

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

Pleasure – Pain Theory

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

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

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

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

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

Bentham viewed hedonism not only as a principle of motivation, but also a principle of action. He listed 14 simple pleasures and 12 simple pains, classifying these into self-

regarding and other regarding groups, a distinction that J.S. Mill borrowed in elaboration of the concept of liberty. Only two benevolence and malevolence, were put under other regarding action. Under self-regarding motives, Bentham listed physical desire, pecuniary interest, and love of power and self- preservation. Self- preservation included fear of pain, love of life and love of ease.

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

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

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

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

factors are health, strength, hardness, bodily imperfections, quality and quantity of knowledge, strength of intellectual powers, firmness of mind, bent of inclination etc.

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

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

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

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

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

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

ASSESSMENT

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

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

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

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

JOHN STUART MILL (1806-1873)

John Stuart Mill was the most influential political thinker of the 19th century. In his political theory, liberalism made a transition from laissez faire to an active role for the state, from a negative to a positive conception of liberty and from an atomistic to a more social conception of individuality. While Mill was a liberal he could also be regarded at the same time as a reluctant democrat, a pluralist a co-operative socialist, an elitist and a feminist.

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

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

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

Modification of Bentham's theory

J.S Mill was a close follower of his teacher, Jeremy Bentham and his services to Bentham are exactly the same as the service of Lenin to his master, Karl Marx. He saved Benthamism from death and decay by removing its defects and criticisms as Lenin made Marxism up to date Mill criticized and modified Bentham's utilitarianism by taking into account factors like moral motives, sociability, feeling of universal altruism, sympathy and a new concept of justice with the key idea of impartiality. He asserted that the chief deficiency of Benthamite ethics was the reflect of individual character, and hence stressed on the cultivation of feelings and imagination as part of good life- poetry, drama, music, paintings etc. were essential ingredients both for human happiness and formation of character. They were instruments of human culture. He defined happiness and dignity of man and not the principle of pleasure, the chief end of life. He defined happiness to mean perfection of human nature, cultivation of moral virtues and lofty aspirations, total control over one's appetites and desires, and recognition of individual and collective interests.

In his desire to safeguard utilitarianism from criticisms leveled against it, Mill goes "far towards or overthrowing the whole utilitarian position. The strong anti hedonist movement of his day, personified by Carlyle, determined him to show that the utilitarian theory, although hedonistic, is elevating and not degrading. Therefore, he sought to establish the non-utilitarian proposition that some pleasures are of a higher quality than

other. Bentham had denied this, maintaining quantity of pleasure being equal, pushpin is as good as poetry'. Mill offers a singular proof that Bentham is wrong. Men who have experienced both higher and lower pleasures agree, he says, in preferring the higher, and theirs is a decisive testimony, 'it is better to a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied, better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied. And if the fool or the pig is of a different opinion it is because they only know their side of the question. The other party to the comparison knows both the sides.' Mill's assertion that pleasures differ in quality is no doubt a truer reflection of human experience than is Bentham's insistence to the contrary. It is, nevertheless, non-utilitarian. If pleasures differ qualitatively, then the higher pleasure is the end to be sought and not the principles of utility. A Sodgwick, who was so ruthless and logical a thinker saw, if we are to be hedonists we must say that pleasures vary only in quantity, never in quality. Utilitarianism, because it is hedonist, must recognize no distinction between pleasures except a quantitative one.

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

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

institution with a moral end. Mill has defended utilitarianism only by abandoning the whole utilitarian position.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition to the above differences, Mill also tried to reconcile the interests of the individual and the society. He spoke of nobility of character, a trait that was closely related to altruism, meaning people did what was good for society, rather than for themselves. The pleasures they derived from doing good for society might outweigh the ones that aimed at self-indulgence, contributing to their happiness. Mill saw social feelings and consciences as part of the psychological attributes of a person. He

characterized society as being natural and habitual, for the individual was a social person. As Prof. Sabine has rightly pointed out, Mill's ethics was important for liberalism because in effect it abandoned egoism, assumed that social welfare is a matter of concern to all men of good will and regarded freedom, integrity, self-respect and personal distinction as intrinsic goods apart from their contribution to happiness". Under the sociological influence of August Comte and others, Mill introduces a historical approach to the study of man and human institutions and is against the Benthamite static view of human nature and human institutions.

LIBERTY

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

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

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

1. Self-Regarding activities and
2. Other regarding activities.

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

Mill defended the right of the individual freedom. In its negative sense, it meant that society had no right to coerce an unwilling individual, except for self defense. In its

positive sense it means that grant of the largest and the greatest amount of freedom for the pursuit of individuals creative impulses and energies and for self- development. If there was a clash between the opinion of the individual and that of the community, it was the individual who was the ultimate judge, unless the community could convince him without resorting to threat and coercion.

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

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

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

According to Mill, individuality means power or capacity for critical enquiry and responsible thought. It means self-development and the expression of free will. He

stressed absolute liberty of conscience, belief and expression for they were crucial to human progress. Mill offered two arguments for liberty of expression in the service of truth; a) the dissenting opinion could be true and its suppression would rob mankind of useful knowledge, and b) even if the opinion was false, it would strengthen the correct view by challenging it.

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

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

When comes to the liberty of action Mill asserted a very simple principle: the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number is self protection..... The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. Mill defended freedom of association on three grounds. First 'when the thing to be done is likely to be done better by individuals than by government. Speaking generally, there is no one fit to conduct any business or to determine how or by whom it shall be conducted as those who are personally interested in it. Second, allowing individuals to get together to do something, even if they do not do it as well as the government might have done it is better for the mental education of these individuals. The right of association becomes a 'practical part of the political education of a free people taking them out of the narrow circle of personal and family selfishness and accustoming them to the comprehension of joint concerns habituating them to act from public or semi- public motives, and guide their conduct by

aims which unite instead of isolating them from one another:. Further, government operations tend to be everywhere alike, with individuals and voluntary associations; on the contrary there are varied experiments and endless diversity of experience. Thus Mill wanted individuals to constantly better themselves morally, mentally and materially. Individuals improving themselves would naturally lead to a better and improved society.

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

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

Mill began his views on Representative government by stating that we can only decide which the best form of government is by examining which form of government fulfils most adequately the purposes of government. For Mill, a good government performs two functions: it must use the existing qualities and skills of the citizens to best serve their interests and it must improve the moral, intellectual and active qualities of these citizens. A despotic government may be able to fulfill the first purpose, but will fail in the second. Only a representative government is able to fulfill these two functions. It is a representative government that combines judiciously the two principles of participation and competence which is able to fulfill the two functions of protecting and educating the citizens.

Mill regarded Representative democracy as necessary for progress as it permitted citizens to use and develop their faculties fully. It promoted virtual intelligence and excellence. It also allowed the education of the citizens providing an efficient forum for conducting the collective affairs of the community. Interaction between individuals in a democracy ensured the possibility of the emergence of the wisest and recognition of the best leaders. It encouraged free discussion which was necessary for the emergence of the

truth. He judged representative democracy on the basis of how for it promotes the good management of the affairs of the society by means of the existing faculties, moral, intellectual and active, of its various members and by improving those faculties.

Mill tried to reconcile the principle of political equality with individual freedom. He accepted that all citizens regardless of their status were equal and that only popular sovereignty could give legitimacy to the government.

J.S. Mill hopes that democracy was good because it made people happier and better. Mill laid down several conditions for representative government. First such a government could only function with citizens who were of an active self helping character. Backward civilizations, according to Mill, would hardly be able to run a representative democracy. Second, citizens had to show their ability and willingness to preserve institutions of representative democracy. Influenced by De Tocqueville's thesis on majority tyranny, Mill advocated a liberal democracy which specified and limited the powers of legally elected majorities by cataloguing and protecting individual rights against the majority. He pleaded for balancing the numerical majority in a democracy by adjusting franchise.

Mill recommended open rather than secret ballot, for voting was a public trust which should be performed under the eye and criticism of the public. Open voting would be less dangerous for the individual voter would be less influenced by the sinister interests and discreditable feelings which belong to him either individually or as a member of a class. Mill emphasised that representative democracy was only possible in a state that was small and homogeneous.

Although a great champion of equal voting rights, universal suffrage are guaranteed in democracy, Mill was fully aware of the weaknesses and danger of democracy. His mind was particularly upset by the inadequate representation of minorities in parliament and the tyranny of the majority over the minority. In order to ensure adequate representation of minorities, Mill supported the system of proportional representative first proposed for parliamentary elections by Sir Thomas Hare in England and propounded its theory in his work: "Machinery of Representation" In addition to proportional representation he has advocated plurality of votes to the higher educated citizens.

MODULE III : IDEALISTS

GEORGE WILHELM FRIEDRICH HEGEL (1770-1831)

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

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

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

Hegel was the founder of modern idealism and the greatest influence in the first half of the 18th century, when the entire academic community in Germany was divided between the Hegelians the left Hegelians and the right Hegelians. He innovated the dialectic and the theory of self- realisation. Hegel wrote extensively on various aspects of political philosophy. The major works of Hegel include the Phenomenology of Spirit. (1807)

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

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

IDEALISM

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

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

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

maintains on the contrary that actual existing states are rational and are accordingly to be treated with all reverence.

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

DIALECTICS

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

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

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

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

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

In the Phenomenology, Hegel gave an example of its use in human consciousness, but a more comprehensive political use was found in the Philosophy of Right in which the dialectical process reflected the evolution of world history from the Greek world to Hegel's time. For Hegel, there was a dialectical pattern in history, with the state representing the ultimate body, highly complex formed as a result of synthesis of contradictory elements at different levels of social life.. However, the relationship between contradiction and synthesis was within concepts shaped by human practices. Marx too discerned a dialectical pattern in history but then understood contradictions between the means and relations of production at different stages of history.

STATE

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

State, for Hegel, is the highest manifestation of reason because it emerges as a synthesis of family (thesis) and civil society or bourgeois society (antithesis). The family is too small for the adequate satisfaction of man's wants, and as children grow up they leave it for a wider world. That world is what Hegel calls the world of bourgeois society and it is the antithesis which is called into being by the original thesis, the family. Unlike the family, which is a unity regarded by its very members as being more real than themselves, bourgeois society is a host of independent men and women held together only by ties of

contract and self-interest. Whereas the characteristic of the family is mutual love, the characteristic of bourgeois society is universal competition. The thesis, the family, a unity held together by love, knowing no differences, is thus confronted by the antithesis, bourgeois society, an aggregate of individuals held apart by competition knowing no vanity, even though it is manifestly struggling towards a greater unity which it has nevertheless not yet attained. The synthesis, which preserves what is best in thesis and antithesis, which swallows up neither family nor bourgeois society, but which gives unity and harmony to them is the state. The essence of modern state, according to Hegel, "is that universal is bound up with the full freedom of particularity and the welfare of individuals, that to interest of the family and of bourgeois society must connect itself with the state, but also universality of the state's purpose cannot advance without the specific knowledge and will of the particular, which must maintain its rights.

FEATURES OF HEGELIAN STATE

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

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

The state, too, is a whole which is far greater than the parts which compose it and which have significance only in it. "All the worth which the human being possess", Hegel writes in the Philosophy of History, "all spiritual reality, he possess" only through the state". Individuals, therefore, must obviously be completely subordinated to the state. It has the highest right over the individual, whose highest duty is to be a member of the state in the words of Prof. Sabine, if the individual in Hegel's world is nothing the state is all. In his Philosophy of History (published posthumously in 1837) Hegel defines the state as the 'realisation of freedom'.

The state is the actually existing, realised moral life and all the worth which the human being possesses- all spiritual reality he possesses only through the state. The individual has moral value only because he is part of the state, which is the complete actualisation or reason because the state is actualised reason and spirit, Hegel says, the

law of the state is a manifestation of objective spirit, and only that which obeys law is free', for it obeys itself.

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

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

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

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

the people, especially if the term implies opposition to the sovereignty of the monarchy. In the words of Prof. William Ebenstein, Hegel anticipates the corporate organisation of the modern fascist state by his emphasis that the individuals should be politically articulate only as a member of a social group or class, and not just a citizen as in the liberal democracies'.

FREEDOM

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

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

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

freedom) thus consists in his submitting to and identifying himself with the higher rationality of state and law.

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

Hegel believes that freedom for the individual can never be the abstract and uneducated power of choice, but only the willing of what is rational, of what the spirit would desire and the power to perform it. His real will impels him to identify himself with the spirit. The spirit is embodied in the state. Therefore it is his real will to obey the commands and dictates of the state. Indeed the dictates of the state are his real will. Thus the commands of the state give man his only opportunity to find freedom. He may obey the state because he is afraid of the consequences of disobedience. If he obeys because of fear he is not free he is still subject to alien force. But if he obeys because he wishes to, because he has consciously identified himself with the will of the state, because he has convinced himself that what the state demands he would also desire if he knew all the facts, then he is subject only to his own will and he is truly free. The state, Hegel says, is that form of reality in which the individual has and enjoys his freedom provided he recognises, believes in and wills what is common to the whole..",

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

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

ASSESSMENT

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

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

Hegel’s teaching is valuable because it insists on man’s dependence on society. He is right in showing how much man is influenced by society. He made the idea of liberty richer by showing that man’s conception of it largely depends upon the institutions which have trained him and given him his education. In this his idealism is thoroughly realistic, and has been confirmed by recent psychology, which has proved how the early impressions made on our minds always remain. As C.L. Wayper has pointed out, Hegel “made politics something more than a mere compromise of interests, and that he made law something more than mere command.” His whole work is valuable reminder that we would do well not to minimize the importance of natural growth of a community.

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

THOMAS HILL GREEN (1836-1882)

T.H. Green was born in Yorkshire in 1836. He was the son of a clergyman in the Church of England. For a period of fourteen years he was educated at home. Green entered Oxford in 1855 and was intimately associated with it until the last day of his life. The regular studies did not appeal to him and more than to Hegel, but he read widely and profitably in many fields. In 1860 he was elected a fellow of Balliol and continued in this capacity right up to 1878. In 1879 he was chosen a Whyte professor of Moral philosophy. Green's teaching at the University of Oxford covered a wide range of subjects including history, ethics, logic, metaphysics, education and history of philosophy. He was a frequent campaign speaker for the liberal party, served as member in several committees and commissions. He was stricken with blood poisoning in 1882 and died comparatively at an early age of 46.

Green was most influential during his lifetime as a teacher and it was not until his death his most important works were published. His most important work 'Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation' was first delivered during his tenure of the chair of Moral Philosophy at Oxford which was published in 1882. Likewise his Prolegomena to Ethics' was published after his death. Other books written by Green were Lectures on Liberal Legislation and Freedom of Contract' and Lectures on the English Revolution.

His Principles of Political Obligation was an attempt to restate political theory in all its branches in the light of the concept of general will working towards rational and moral ideals. His prolegomena to ethics is fully occupied with an attack on the earlier utilitarian doctrine of pleasure as expounded by Jeremy Bentham. In his Lectures of the English Revolution, Green sees typically in the civil war, something of which the justifying fruit was that England was saved from catholic reaction.

Green was profoundly influenced by classical Greek thought, German Idealism and English liberalism. The ultimate basis of his philosophy is to be found in the writings of Plato and Aristotle. He learnt from Plato and Aristotle that man is by nature a social and political animal and the state was a partnership in virtue and civic duties. That law is the expression of pure and poison less reason; that righteousness consists for each man with fulfillment of his appointed function in the life and section of the community. All these high ideals of the Greeks played a considerable part in shaping the political reasoning of T.H. Green.

Another and more important influence of the political ideas of T.H. Green was that of German Philosophy. Green drew his inspiration from the writings of Kant and Hegel . In developing their theories both Kant and Hegel had started from Rousseau's doctrine of moral freedom as the distinctive quality of man and both consider the state entirely in relation to this freedom. Rousseau's doctrine of general will also influenced the writings of Green. He discusses the conception of the general will in connection with an effective

criticism of the Austinian definition of sovereignty. Green's philosophy was not only a reaction against individualism, Hegelianism and Bentham's but it was also against certain interpretations of 19th century science.

GREEN'S VIEWS ON STATE

T.H. Green was the first man in the nineteenth century to construct a comprehensive philosophy of state. Green does not believe in the social contract theory of the origin of the state. The social contract theory has been rejected on the ground that it makes the state voluntary association. He also rejected the force theory of the origin of the state because it makes the force as the very basis of the state. According to Green, the basis of state is neither consent or contract or force but it is will of the people who compose it.

There is a direct relationship between his metaphysics and politics between which his ethics serves as a necessary interlude. It is this perfect harmony between a speculative thought and the practical problems that has conferred on Green a unique position in the history of English political thought. According to Green, state is a means to an end and that end was the full moral development of the individuals who compose it. His ethics made him to believe that every man has a worth and dignity which forbids his exploitation for any purpose whatever. The life of the state, he insisted, has no real existence except as the life of the individual composing it. Green wrote in his well known work *Principle of Political Obligation* thus: To speak of any progress or improvement or development of a nation or society or mankind except as relative to some greater worth of persons is to use words without meanings' it is in this context he regarded the function of state as being negative. According to Green, the state cannot teach morality to man or can it make man moral since morality consists in the disinterested performance of self imposed duties. It is to remove obstacles which prevent men from becoming moral.

Green regards state as natural and necessary institution. He regards it as an ethical institution essential to the moral development of man. Its primary purpose was to enforce rights. The authority of the state is either absolute or omnipotent. It is limited both from within and without. It is limited from within because the law of the state can deal only with the externality of an action and intentions. It is limited again by the fact that in exceptional circumstances particularly when the laws of the state are tyrannical and the state fails to promote the common good, the individual has the right of resistance. According to Green, resistance under this circumstance is not merely a right but it becomes a duty. He further recognises that the various permanent groups with society have their own inner system of rights and that the right of the state over them is one of adjustment. As Prof. Ernest Barker has observed, the state adjusts for each group its system of rights internally and it adjusts each system of rights to the state externally.

The authority of the state is limited from without in the sense that it has to show its respect to the existence of international law. Like Kant, Green is a believer in international law and international organizations.

WILL NOT FORCE IS THE BASIS OF THE STATE.

Green agrees that the existence of a supreme coercive power is necessary for society and this power is state. According to Green, the essence of state is not the supreme coercive power but the exercise of such coercive power in accordance with law and for maintenance of rights. The sovereign may be a creator of laws but he is also bound by them. The real sustaining power behind the state is general will. The essence of sovereignty and state is not force but that they represent the general will of the community. The true basis of the state, therefore, is the will of the community. Men habitually obey only those institutions which they feel represent general will.

NEGATIVE ROLE OF THE STATE

Green was in favor of granting only negative function to the state. The negative role which Green assigns to the state as the remover of obstacles is nevertheless significant. The state can do everything which will help but it must do nothing which will hinder the free development of moral personality. The basic function of the state, according to Green, is to remove obstacles to freedom. The three greatest obstacles to freedom were ignorance, drunkenness and poverty. Classical liberalism, he thinks, went wrong in regarding freedom simply in negative terms. Thus Green laid the foundations for the modern social welfare state which guarantees old age pension, unemployment insurance, health insurance and all the other legislative schemes designed to promote self- security.

Although Green held that will, not force, was the true basis of the state, he was fully conscious that there were states in which force was predominate. For such status he had no liking as they could not fulfill their ideal function. While Green reflected Rousseau's view that the general will was entirely in abeyance in all existing states, he also rejected Hegel's view that the laws in all existing state were synonymous with the General will. Thus Green, unlike Hegel, tried to safeguard the individual against the absolute power of the state.

FREEDOM

TH Green is indebted to Immanuel Kant for his Theory of Freedom. According to Kant, a 'person who is really free is one who is morally free'. Kant was a believer in moral freedom and freedom, according to him, consist in the realisation of the free moral will. It is from this moral will TH Green has taken his start. According to Prof. Ernest Barker, Green begins from, always clings to and finally ends in the Kantinian doctrine of the free moral will in virtue of which man always wills him as an end. The most valuable thing, therefore, this moral will the realisation of which should be considered as the supreme object of a man's endeavor. When this moral will is realised individual which ceases to be selfish and starts doing those things which aims at promoting the common good. In this connection there is one thing which the state should not do and there is another which it should do. Firstly, it should not check its self determination. It means that morality is something which

is self imposed and it is not something which can be imposed from outside. Secondly, it is the duty of the state to remove all hindrances that prove to be destructive in the realization of moral will. Since the aim of the state is to establish ideal conditions for the performance of moral acts, such functions may be rightly termed as moral negative functions. In this connection Green has rightly observed. The state has no business of making its members better but it has those moral negative functions. In this connection Green has rightly observed, 'the state has no business of making its members better, but it has those moral. Negative functions which present them from making themselves better. 'Freedom is, therefore, 'no absence of restraint any more than beauty is the absence of ugliness'".

According to Green, freedom does not mean mere absence of restraints, but the "positive power of doing and enjoying something worth doing and worth enjoying" . The true personality of the individual is his will. The will is not only good and moral; it is also free because the moral restraints on it are self imposed. Such a free moral will seeks its good in the context of social good and enjoys freedom to do the right thing which Green calls 'positive freedom'. Positive freedom represents an approximation between will and reason and morality and law. T.H. Green in his major work wrote the meaning of freedom thus: 'We do not merely mean freedom from restraint or compulsion. We do not mean merely freedom to do as we like irrespective of what it is that we like. We do not mean a freedom that can be enjoyed by one man or one set of men at the cost of the loss of freedom to others. When we speak of freedom as something to be so highly prized, we mean a positive power or capacity of doing or enjoying something worth doing or enjoying and that too something that we do or enjoy in common with other."

According to Prof. G.H. Sabine, Green's contrast between positive and negative freedom reproduced a line of thought which came to him both from Rousseau and Hegel. In his concept of freedom, Green was influenced by Aristotle's idea of common life. In fact he owed more to Aristotle than he did to Hegel. The Self realization whose conditions a community ought to secure for its members was in the main Aristotle's realization of Greek citizenship but with its aristocratic implications omitted.

Green believes that freedom was possible only in the state. His doctrine of freedom is based on some important aspects. It is a positive freedom to do something worth doing and worth enjoying. Further, his concept of freedom is determinate. It has an individual and social aspect. He tries to reconcile the claims of the individuals with the authoring of the state.

HIS THEORY OF RIGHTS

According to Green, human consciousness postulates liberty; liberty involves rights and rights demand the state. Rights are the outer conditions necessary for a man's inner development of personality. Rights are inherent in individuals, but they can be internet in individuals only as members of a society which gives its recognition, and in virtue of the community of ideal objects which causes that recognition. The rights with which he

concerned are not legal rights but ideal rights: they are the rights which society properly organized on the basis of the good will should ideally recognize, if it is true to its basic principles. Such rights are termed as natural rights. They are natural rights not in the sense that they are pre social but they are natural in the sense that they are pre-social but they are natural in the sense that they are pre-social but they are natural in the sense that they are inherent and innate in the moral nature of associated man who are living in some form of society.

The rights of which Green speaks are relative to morality rather than law; and recognition of which he speaks is recognition by a common moral consciousness rather than by a legislature. The rights are relative to morality in the sense that they are the conditions of the attainment of the moral end. And the recognition is given by the moral consciousness, because it knows that they are the necessary conditions of its own satisfaction.

Green's concept of rights is quite different from that of John Locke in the sense that rights are concessions granted by the society or state rather than as rights belonging to individuals by virtue of their humanity. The state does not create rights but rights are derived from the state. People have no right to resist the state except in the interest of the state, ie, to compel the state to make its laws conform to the general will and general welfare. Green is against the utilitarian view of rights as the gift of the state. Green wrote that 'Natural rights are rights which should be enjoyed by a normally rational and moral being in a rationally constituted society'.

AN ASSESSMENT

T.H. Green gave to idealism a new lease of life. He rejected the mechanistic theory of the state on the ground that it had made the state as an artificial institution and ignored the various factors which had contributed to state building. He rejected the force theory of the origin of the state and was convinced that will not force was the basis of state. Green is an idealist but he can also be hailed as an individualist. He gave the individual a far more effective protection against the undue exercise of the state's power than anything with which utilitarianism could provide him. Green revitalized the principle of liberty and instead of giving it a negative gave it a positive social meaning. To conclude, Green, with his practical knowledge of the problems of the state and his faith in political liberalism, tried to make individualism moral and social and idealism civilized and safe. If he paved the way for speculative thinking in the field of metaphysics, he attempted to liberalize the politics and safeguard the dignity of the self-conscious individual against the restraining character of the state.

MODULE IV: SOCIALISTS

KARL MARX (1818-1883)

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

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

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

Marx's principal doctrines were not new; but he greatly amplified systematised older ideas, putting them into new and effective communications. He attempted to show that a socialist programme must be based upon a systematic interpretation of social evaluations and a critical analysis of the existing system of production and exchange. His design was to show how a socialist community is to be built upon capitalist foundations. Marx described his socialism as scientific.

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

Marx has written so extremely on various issues of history, economics, philosophy, society and politics. As Prof. William Ebenstein has rightly pointed out; Marx's analysis of the capitalist system has influenced the making of history even more than the writing of history. During his student days, Marx was attracted to Hegelian Idealism but he soon shifted his interest to humanism and ultimately to scientific socialism. The books, articles, pamphlets of Marx were written during three decades from the early forties to the early seventies. Major works of Marx included Critique of Political Economy, The Communist

Manifesto, and Das Capital. Although the first volume of his great work Das Capital was published in 1867, the second and third volumes were edited after his death by Engels from the vast amount of manuscript material that he left. Marx's political philosophy has to be gathered from many incidental remarks and comments in his writing and letters, as he never wrote a systematic statement on the basic assumptions of his thought. In the preface to his Critique of Political Economy (1859), Marx briefly states his general philosophy of history, based on the thesis that "the anatomy of civil society is to be found in political economy".

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

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

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

Marx borrowed his dialectic method from Hegel but modified it in a fundamental way. While Hegel had applied the dialectics to explain the domain of ideas, Marx applied the dialectics to explain the material conditions of life. In the process of doing so he denounced the Hegelian philosophy of dialectical idealism, on the one hand and the theory of Hobbesian scientific materialism on the other. 'My dialectic method, wrote Marx, is not only different from the Hegelian but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life process of human brain, i.e., process of thinking which under the name of the idea even transforms into an independent subject is the demiurgos of the real world and the real world is only

the external phenomenal form of the idea. With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind and translated into forms of thought. Thus Marx contrasted his materialistic to Hegel's idealistic interpretation of history. One of Marx most famous sayings is that men's "social existence determines their consciousness and not as had been generally accepted before Marx that the consciousness of men determines their existence".

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

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

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

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

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

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

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

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

In his ‘*Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*’ Engels defined historical materialism as a theory which holds that the ultimate cause which determines the whole course of human

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

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

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

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

Marx developed his own materialist theory of history by way of a critique of idealism and the idealist interpretation of history. This critique and the basic outline of his own materialist conception were published in 1846 as the German Ideology, with Engels as co-

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

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

Historical materialism is a variety of determinism which as understood by Marx implies that social or political change is not really brought about by “ideas”, that is by various schemes for social or political reform. It is the modes of production and distribution that determine social and political forms of organization, not vice versa. Marx maintains that the prevailing ideology of a society reflects the class interest of those who control the means of production and distribution within the society, As Marx has rightly pointed out, “The mode of production of the material means of existence conditions the whole process of social, political and intellectual life.”

Theory of Surplus Value

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

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

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

THEORY OF CLASSES: CLASS STRUGGLE

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

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

two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other-bourgeoisie and proletariat.

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

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

Marx examined the dominant material conditions at various moments of human history and stated that each set of dominant conditions breed conflictive conditions. In the hands of human beings, these contradictory conditions contributed to conflict; at times, this conflict became so deep and irresolvable that it transformed human development in profound ways. Marx asserted that human beings drove this process by acting collectively and particularly as members of an economic class.

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

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

Unlike earlier liberal democratic theory, which held that there had been a time in human history when humans did not live in a society, Marx argued that humans had always lived

in some kind of society. The first of these societies he called primitive communism. This stage was characterized by a society much like the tribal communities of the North American plains. Since this was a class less society, it was communist. What made it primitive were the very low standard of living and the great dangers facing tribal members. Eventually, primitive communism gave way to the next stage of history, slave society. Although Marx and Engels are not clear as to how primitive communism collapsed, there is a suggestion by Engels that it was a “natural” development; slave society was in many ways the first epoch with class contradictions. In slave societies was defined in terms of land ownership and slave ownership. In such societies, there were classes: those who owned some of the means of production; and those who owned nothing, not even themselves (slaves). Societies such as Rome were rocked by internal conflicts among these conflicts for control over the means of production. Eventually these conflicts led to the demise of slave society and the emergence of feudalism.

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

Base – Super Structure Relations

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

consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual process of life.”

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

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

Critique of capitalism

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

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

Marx called, “the idiocy of rural life. “ In spite of the achievements, Marx believed that capitalism had out lived its use because of the sufferings and hardships it caused.

Marx examined the sufferings within capitalism, which were rooted in its origin: the eviction of peasants from their land, the loss of their sources of income and most significantly, the creation of the proletariat. According to Marx, capitalism facilitates an exploitative relationship between the two major social classes, the owners of capital (the bourgeoisie) and the working class (the proletariat). Marx claimed that the profit derived from the capitalist production process was merely the difference between the value generated by the proletariat and the wage that they earned from the bourgeoisie. Therefore, according to Marxian conception, the proletariat generated all value as a result of its labour but had only a portion of that value returned it by the bourgeousing in the form of wages. Since the proletariat created surplus value, but the bourgeoisie enjoyed the fruits of the value, the bourgeoisie was effectively exploiting the proletariat on a consistent and ongoing basis.

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

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

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

In the meantime, Marx paints a picture of capitalism driven to ever more desperate, and ultimately irrational and futile attempts the stave off the inevitable. The intensity of

capitalist competition increases in precise proportion to the decline of the system as a whole. Technologies are introduced at a perish pace with resulting over production on commodities on the one hand and increasing unemployment on the other. The consequences of this" anarching of production" as Marx terms it, are periodic depressions in which all of the productive forces that had evolved up to that point are destroyed.

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

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

THEORY OF ALIENATION

Marx employed the term alienation to describe dehumanization and he devoted much theoretical effort in these younger years to analyze the nature of alienation in a capitalist system. His chief work on this subject is found in Marx's Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (also known as the Paris Manuscripts) which were written in 1844 but only posthumously published much later, in 1932. In the Manuscripts Marx discusses a cluster

of forms of alienation that centre on a central sense of 'alienation' which is virtually definitely of the capitalist economy. By alienation Marx means the separation of our specific human qualities, our "species being", as he termed it, into structures of domination. In a capitalist society or economy, work or labor itself becomes a commodity, something that is bought and sold on the open market. One result is the creation of the two principal classes of bourgeoisie- liberal, capitalist society: there is the bourgeoisie, which control the means of production and distribution in the society and in particular, have the power to buy labor. And there is the proletariat, composed of persons who have no share in the control of the means of production and distribution in the society and who are forced to sell their labour on the open market in order to sustain themselves and their families.

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

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

Given such extreme misery and alienation, particularly the alienation of consciousness itself, one may well wonder how Marx could assert the inevitable demise of capitalism.

Marx proceeds to claim that a consequence of the alienation of the activity of the labour is that the worker looks elsewhere to find a true expression of him or herself: "man (the worker) only feels himself freely active in his animal functions of eating, drinking, and procreating at most also in his dwelling and dress". This displacement of one's true human self into one's "animal" (biological) functions and into artificial and fairly trivial concerns interlocks with the sort of consumerism characteristic of capitalist economies.

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

CRITICAL APPRISAL OF MARXISM

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

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

Karl Popper in his "Open Society and its Enemies" have criticized Marxism along with Plato and Hegel. Popper was suspicious of Marx's scientific predictions, for scientific theory was

one that would not try to explain everything. Along with Plato and Hegel, Marx was seen as an enemy of the open society; Marx was seen as an enemy of the open society. Marxism claimed to have studied the laws of history, on the basis of which it advocated total, sweeping and radical changes. Not only was it impossible to have first-hand knowledge based on some set of laws that governed society and human individuals but Popper also rejected Marx's social engineering as dangerous, for it treated individuals as subservient to the interests of the whole. Popper rejected the historicism, holism and utopian social engineering of Marxism. In contrast, he advocated piecemeal social engineering, where change would be gradual and modest, allowing rectification of lapses and errors, for it was not possible to conceive of everything. Popper claimed that Marx's scientific socialism was wrong not only about society, but also about science. Popper wrote thus: "Marx misled cores of intelligent people by saying that historic method is the scientific way of approaching social problems. " Further, Marx made the economy or economic factors all important, ignoring factors like nationality, religion, friendship etc." As Karl Popper has rightly mentioned, Marx brought into the social science and historical science the very important idea that economic conditions are of great importance in the life of society..... There was nothing like serious economic history before Marx". Like Popper, Berlin attacked the historicism of Marx which he developed in his essay "Historical Inevitability".

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

Marx was wrong in ignoring the psychological aspects of politics. Though his is an explanation of the state in terms of force, nowhere he gives us any adequate treatment of the problem of power. Nowhere in his work is there the realisation of that men desire power for the satisfaction of their pride and self respect and that for some men power must

be regarded as an end in itself. One must go further and say that nowhere he shows any real appreciation of the defects in human nature.

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

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

V.I.LENIN (1870-1924)

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

a supreme conviction of the justice of this cause. Besides being one of the dogmatic disciples of Marx, Lenin is also regarded as one of the greatest political geniuses of modern history.

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

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

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

The important works of Lenin include *What Is to Be Done* (1902), *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916), *State and Revolution* (1917). According to Joseph Stalin, Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution. He

brought Marxism up to date in the latest stage of capitalism and by making use of his theory of imperialism.

THEORY OF IMPERIALISM

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

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

According to Lenin, imperialism is moribund capitalism, containing a number of contradictions which ultimately destroys capitalism itself .There is firstly the contradiction or antagonism between capital and labor. Capital exploits labour and brings the exploited workers to revolution. Secondly, there is contradiction between capital and labour. Capital exploits labour and brings the exploited workers to revolution. Secondly,

there is contradiction between various imperialist powers and industrial combines for new territories, new markets and sources of raw materials. Finally, there is also the contradiction between the colonial powers and the dependent colonial people which arouse revolutionary outlook and spirit among the latter as happened in India and other countries. Imperialism, thus, creates conditions favorable to the destruction of capitalism by promoting class and international conflicts and revolutionary outlook among the proletariat. Lenin's scientific analysis of the contradictions of capitalism as its last stage brought him round to the conclusion that imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution. The revolution of transition to socialism has now become a vital necessity.

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

DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM

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

Lenin's most important theoretical contribution to the theory of Marxism is the doctrine of professional revolutionary. Lenin drew a distinction between and organization of workers and organization of revolutionaries. The former must be essentially trade union in character, as wide as possible, and as public as political condition will allow. By contrast, the organization of revolutionaries must consist exclusively of professional revolutionaries, must be small, and "as secret as possible." Whereas Marx assumed that the working class would inevitably develop its class consciousness in the daily struggle for its economic

existence, Lenin had much less confidence in the ability of the workers to develop politically by their own effort and experience:" "Class political consciousness can be brought to the workers only from without, that is, only outside of the economic struggle, outside of the spheres of relations between workers and employers". Lenin did not care whether the professional revolutionaries destined to lead the proletariat were of working-class origin or not, as long as the professional revolutionary did his job well. But because of the difficulties of the work to be done, Lenin insisted that the professional revolutionary must be "no less professionally trained than the police", and, like the police, the organization of professional revolutionaries must be highly centralized and able to supervise and control the open organizations of workers that are legally permitted.

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

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

In turn, Lenin argued, the workers would have to pull along large elements of the peasantry in any revolutionary transformation of Russian society.

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

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

Theory of State and Revolution

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dictatorship of the Proletariat

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

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

Assessment

Lenin was a follower of Marx and was highly critical of revisionism of his day. He was, however, compelled by the circumstances to interpret Marxism in such a way as to merit the characterisation of his own breed of Marxism as "inverted Marxism" . Lenin's

assertion that revolution could be and should be precipitated by professional revolutionaries was against the Marxian dialectic process. His emphasis on the potency of revolutionary ideas and ideology went counter to Marx with whom ideas merely reflected but did not create material conditions. Lenin differed from Marx in his conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat. To Lenin, this meant the dictatorship of the communist party over the proletariat; to Marx it had meant role by a proletarian majority and not by a communist party minority.

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

MAO ZE DONG (1893-1976)

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

Mao was the son of a rich peasant who was intellectually restless by nature and was profoundly dissatisfied with Chinese society. After graduating from college in 1918 in Changsha, he became a librarian at Peking university where he founded a Marxist student circle. However, he left the job and returned to Changsha and became active in the communist party of China. He travelled to various parts of China which gave him a

firsthand impression about the exploitative conditions under which the Chinese peasantry was reeling at that time. By 1927 the relations between Kuo mintang (KMT) and the Communist Party of China (CPC) became so bitter that the KMT and the CPC, Mao was asked to organize a rebellion of Hunan peasants. During the course of this rebellion, Mao wrote his first major work - *Analysis of Chinese Society*. Here, he identified the various strata of Chinese peasantry - small marginal middle and the big peasant and the revolutionary potential of each of them. He highlighted the contradiction between the peasantry and feudal lords. He attempted the Harvest Uprising of peasants in 1928, but the uprising was crushed and Mao had fled along with his supporters to nearby mountains. From these mountains, Mao started guerrilla warfare tactics. By these tactics, CPC was able to capture various parts of South East China. Mao set up a number of peasant soviets in the captured areas. However, the KMT tried to crush these guerrilla attacks and encircled the areas where peasant soviets had been set up. Finally, the KMT armies drove out of the revolutionaries who took shelter in the north-west hills of China. This escape became famous as Mao's stay in the north-west was the most fruitful period for the CPC. It was here that Mao began an extensive study of Marxist philosophy. His well known pieces of work namely "on Practice" and 'On contradiction" were written during this period.

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

ON CONTRADICTION

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

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

PRINCIPAL CONTRADICTION.

In the long process of development of things there are specific stages and in each stage some contradictions are more powerful than the others. According to Mao, “one of them is necessarily the principal contradiction whose existence and development determines or influences the existence and development determines or influences the existence and development of other contradictions. “ Mao also insists that there is only one principal contradiction at every stage of the development of the process and when another stage emerges a new principal contradiction also emerges. He gives three major instances to explain this. In a capitalist society, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie form the principal contradiction society, the proletariat and bourgeoisie form the principal contradiction and the other contradictions like the one between the remnant feudal class and the bourgeoisie are non- principal . During a war of imperialist aggression the principal contradiction is between imperialism and the country which is attacked. In this situation all the classes except the traitors temporarily unite against the national enemy for the contradictions among them are non- principal. But there are instances where imperialism operates through the ruling classes of a country and the principal contradiction comes to

be the one between the masses on the one hand and the alliance of imperialists and the domestic ruling class on the other.

ANTAGONISTIC AND NON ANTAGONISTIC CONTRADICTIONS.

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

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

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

Mao's 1957 speech criticized two erroneous lines of thinking. First was the rightist view point within and outside the Communist Party of China (CPC) which thought that class

contradictions had disappeared with the socialist transformation which had taken place in the People's Republic of China (PRC). As against this, Mao emphasized the existence of numerous non antagonistic contradictions and also some continuing basis of antagonistic contradictions in the socialist society. The second view point which Mao criticized exaggerated the threat of counter revolution in China and showed excessive alarm at the Hungarian uprising in 1956. He pointed out that they underrated the achievements of long years of popular revolutionary struggle and the success in the suppression of counter revolutionaries in China. Between these two extremes Mao asked for clearly distinguishing between the antagonistic and non antagonistic contradictions and correctly handling them.

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

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

Role of Peasantry in Revolution

Mao tried to apply Marxism- Leninism in China with reasonable modifications and changes to keep pace with changes in the Chinese society and polity. Thus he modified Marxism Leninism by relying heavily on the peasantry's revolutionary potential. It should be noted that Marx has treated the peasantry with some degree of contempt. For the most part, peasantry for him was conservative and reactionary; it was no more than a bag of potatoes unable to make a revolution. Even Lenin had relied mainly on the proletariat in

the urban centers of Russia for mass insurrections and had not placed much faith in the peasantry's revolutionary potential. Mao's fundamental contribution, therefore, was to bring about a successful revolution in China mainly with the help of the peasantry's revolutionary potential. Mao's fundamental contribution therefore was to bring about a successful revolution in China mainly with the help of the peasantry. More than anything else, his revolutionary model became inspiration for several Afro-Asian peasant societies. Further, Mao in his Cultural Revolution phase drew some lessons from the course of post revolutionary reconstruction in the Soviet Union and warned against the emergence of new bourgeoisie class who were beneficiaries of the transitional period.

New Democracy

Mao raised that the peasantry in China was not strong enough to win the revolutionary struggle against imperialism and feudalism. Therefore, it was necessary to seek the help of the other classes of Chinese society. It was in this context that Mao emphasized the concept of a united front. It was seen as an alliance between different partners who had some common interest like opposition to imperialism. Its object would be to pursue the resolution of the principal contradiction. Such a united front strategy was employed by Mao by establishing the alliance of Chinese peasantry with the proletariat, the petty bourgeoisie and even the national bourgeoisie. It also intended the non-party elements among the Chinese intellectuals. The united front is a broad alliance of the Chinese people against Japanese imperialism and western powers.

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

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

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

In New Democracy, the supremacy of the communist party will remain fundamental. In its revolutionary struggle towards dictatorship, the party will act as a vanguard of the working class. The communist party is an organization of the working class which is filled with revolutionary fervor and zeal. The history of revolution everywhere proves that without the leadership of the working class, a revolution will fail, but with the leadership of the working class a revolution will be victorious. According to Mao, in an era of imperialism no other class in any country can lead any genuine revolution to victory.

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

Cultural Revolution

The period of the Great Leap Forward (GLF) from mid- 1958 till the end of 1960 saw both successes and setbacks for the Maoist line. The enthusiastic mass upsurge of 1958 confirmed the popularity of the new line. But severe economic difficulties had begun to appear by the end of 1958. The great leap strategy entailed significant changes in the political situation. It stripped considerable power from the central government bureaucracy and transferred it in many cases to local party cadres. And it introduced important new strains into Sino- Soviet relations. The 1959 -60 periods saw great

economic difficulties causing more modernization of the 1958 strategy. In 1959 the CPC experienced an intense inner party struggle with Defense Minister Pong Dehuai attacking the 1958 line and policies frontally.

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

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

The Cultural Revolution provided the form and the focus to the idea of continuing revolution. It established the need for revolutionary class struggle involving the masses to uphold proletarian line. The central committee circular of 16 May 1966 which launched an attack on the outline Report on the current Academic Discussion of the Group of five in charge of the Cultural Revolution, initiated the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR). The Eleventh Plenum of the Central Committee passed the 16-point decision concerning the GOCR on 8 August 1966 which laid down the theory, strategy, and policies of the GPCR. It explicitly links the new campaign to the Basic Line. This document declares that a new stage has been reached in socialist revolution. This stage can be described as the stage of ‘consolidation of the socialist system’. The document clearly identifies the focus of the new movement as the” work in the ideological sphere”. It quotes from Mao’s speech at the Tenth Plenum that “to overthrow a political power, it is always necessary, first of all to create public opinion, to do work in the ideological sphere’. This is true for the revolutionary class as well as for the counter - revolutionary

class. The Maoists believed that revisionists like Liu Shaoqi and Peng Zhen had used their high offices to support anti-proletarian ideas. Therefore, it was necessary to create a revolutionary public opinion to counter that. That is why the political report at the Ninth Congress described the GPCR as “great political revolution personally initiated and led by great leader chairman Mao under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a great revolution on the realm of superstructure”.

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

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

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

MODULE V – ANARCHISM

ANARCHISM

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

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

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

Origin and Development

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

He was the first to clearly too associate opposition to political authority with an attack on private property. He maintained that ordinary men act reasonably and justly when their

normal desires for self-expression and fair dealing have not been perverted by unfair economic conditions, maintained by the coercive intervention of the state. He admitted, however, that even if the most natural and equitable social relations were now restored, there would for a long period be some men whose conduct would require restraint. Godwin developed an extreme form of liberal rationalism that amounted to an argument for human perfectibility based on education and social conditioning. Though an individualist Godwin believed that human beings are capable of genuinely disinterested benevolence. The greater part of his theoretical work was devoted to an exposition of the social and moral ills created by public government and private property which he believed sanctions and sustains one another.

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

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

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

Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865) was probably the first to call himself an anarchist. Proudhon was a largely self-educated printer who was drawn into radical politics in Lyons before settling in Paris in 1847. As a member of the 1848 Constituent Assembly, Proudhon famously voted against the constitution because it was a constitution. He was

later imprisoned for three years. In Paris he at once came into close associations with radical socialists. Proudhon's best known work, *What Is Property?* (1840) attacked both traditional property rights and communism and argued instead of mutualism, a co-operative productive system geared towards need rather than profit and organized within self-governing communities.

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

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

Benjamin Tucker accepted for the most part the economic proposals of Proudhon and Greene and acknowledged Warren's influence in forming his general social doctrines. In

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

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

BAKUNIN (1814-1876)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

According to Bakunin, private property which is both the ground of existence and the consequence of the state creates physical and moral evils of all kinds to the millions of workers. It brings economic dependence, laborious toil, ignorance and social and spiritual immobility, for the few wealthy. It provides superfluous luxury and special opportunities for physical pleasure and artistic and intellectual enjoyment. Religion is an evil both because

it sanctions evil institutions and because it is incompatible with man's better nature. It is consciously used by the possessors of economic and political privilege to sanctify their unnatural superiority. It diverts man's interest and effort from important affairs in the actual world of humanity, develops his fancy superstition, and aborts his reason and insight. Religious faith should be displaced by science and knowledge. The fiction of future divine justice by the actuality of present human justice.

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

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

Bakunin did not maintain that the whole problem of human welfare would be solved by eliminating political authority and private property. It is true that he put emphasis upon the destructive phases of anarchism. But he had full appreciation of the social aspects of human life and recognized the need for a regular organization of human relations. Every advance in human evolution, he said, has come about through the sympathetic

collaboration of man with his fellows. Human freedom has no meaning apart from society. For freedom is not a merely negative concept, It denotes more than the mere absence of external restriction of one's faculties; it means the ability to act in response to the characteristic impulses of a rational being. The true liberty of a human individual postulates, on the other hand, an equal respect on his part for the freedom of others. According to Bakunin, liberty is not a matter of isolation, but of mutuality not of separation, but of combination; for every man, it is only the mirroring of his humanity in the consciousness of his brothers. Bakunin calls this the principle of 'solidarity' by virtue of which and man feels himself as fully free only when he sees about him others enjoying the same freedom. In place of state, therefore, Bakunin would establish a free society, from which all classes and all relations of authority have disappeared and in which every one without distinction of race, color, nationality or belief is permitted to labor and enjoy the fruits of his labor on equal terms. The basis of this free society will be contract and voluntary association, instead of law and compulsive allegiance. The new society will operate on these basic economic principles: society itself will own the land and will materials and instruments of production; it will permit them to be taken into possession by those person, acting individually or in freely formed associations who are willing to use them productively every individual will then be permitted to share freely in the enjoyment of the products as to extent of his needs subject only to the condition that he has to the best that he has, to the best of his ability, contributed his labours to the productive efforts. Local associations may combine into larger territorial combinations, provided that at every stage there is no compulsion about it. The abolition of the state will mean the end of political boundaries. There will be a free union of individuals into communes, of communes into province, of provinces into nations and finally of nations into the United States of Europe and later of the whole world. The associations will have a system of law that needs no penal sanctions, for it is made up of rules which the members perceive to be necessary in keeping society going.

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

PETER KROPOTKIN (1842-1921)

Peter Kropotkin was a Russian geographer and anarchist theorist. Kropotkin's writings are vivid and interesting and display a scientific temper as well as a breadth of sympathy. His doctrine of anarchism was imbued with the scientific spirit and based upon a theory of evolution that provided an alternative to Darwin's. By seeing mutual. Aid as the principal means of human and animal development he claimed to provide an empirical

basis for both anarchism and communism. Kropotkin's major works include *Mutual Aid* (1897) *Fields, Factories and workshops* (1901) and *the Conquest of Bread* (1906). The son of a noble family who first entered the service of Tsar Alexander-II Kropotkin encountered anarchist ideas while working in the Jura region on the French Swiss border. After imprisonment in St. Petersburg in 1874, he travelled widely in Europe returning to Russia after the 1917 Revolution.

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

Kropotkin placed distinctive emphasis upon two phases of this evolution. He contended that in both individual and social life natural evolution takes place not solely through a process of steady development but also, at times, through accelerated, abrupt, apparently disruptive transformations. In the normal course of the life of an individual, vital forces operate in an orderly manner. Likewise in social life there is a slow and steady progress from lower to higher forms of organization, but there are also quick and revolutionary movements forward. New ideas that appear naturally and that are necessary for the continued progress of mankind, attempt to come forth into the actual life of society but their action is sometimes blocked by the inertia of the ignorant and indifferent or by the perverted aims of those who have selfish interests in retaining old traditions and conditions.

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

According to Kropotkin, the hindrances to the progress of human society are the state, private property and religion. Religious authority, according to him, is the servant of

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

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

Kropotkin believed these facts to be true of all forms of state. The transformations of absolute monarchies into parliamentary governments have effected no change in the essential character of the state. A representative system based on universal suffrage is now unworkable. According to Kropotkin, the evil equality of private property is inherent in its essential character and manifest in its actual effect. Actual social conditions reveal the consequences of private property; among the masses - want and misery, millions unemployed, children of retarded growth, constant debts for the farmers. Historically the parasitic institutions of state and property entered together into the midst of the free

institution of our ancestors; and the whole reason for the existence of political authority today lies in its function of protecting property.

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

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

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

Although Kropotkin believed that the inevitable trend of social evolution was towards the anarchist goal, he did not believe that the goal could be reached through a wholly gradual and peaceful process. The evolution must culminate in a revolution. The revolution will be with first phase destructive and violent, existing governors must be deposed, prisons and forts demolished, the spirit of mutual aid revived. After the basic instruments of coercive authority are forcibly removed, the people will proceed to expropriate private property, peasants expelling landowners workers driving out factory owners, those having inadequate homes moving into dwellings that contain surplus space Then they must follow the work of a constructive reshaping of society. This will be through a purely voluntary procedure. No government no transitional dictatorship, will be required that would mean death to the revolution.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The doctrines of Bakunin and Kropotkin were spread among the working men of Europe through numerous journals, some of them ably edited; most of them very short lived. Some anarchists contend that violence is inadmissible even as a means of resistance or revolution. The most celebrated among recent advocate of anarchism was Count Leo Tolstoy, probably the most widely Russian of the later 19th century and one of the greatest literary figures of recent times. Tolstoy’s doctrine has been called Christian anarchism. He rejected many of the traditional dogmas of Christianity - particularly, the

trinity, the divinity of Christ, and personal immortality but he was thoroughly Christian in his outlook. Tolstoy described Christianity as a simple code of moral rules, offering the one adequate solution for the problems of human conduct. Both the state and private property are, in Tolstoy's theory incompatible with true Christianity. The state based on force and executes its will through armed men- police men and soldiers, trained to kill.

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

CRITICISMS

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