

he strong for the oppression of the weak. In the other case, it may arise out of a combination of the weak to protect themselves from the tyranny of the strong.

Thus, according to the Sophists, the state has an artificial or a conventional basis founded upon self-interest. Men are by nature non-social and the state is based upon individualistic foundation. In a fundamental sense, the Sophists may be regarded as the originators of the Social Contract Theory and may be said to have anticipated Machiavelli, Hegel and Treitschke in so far as they separated public politics from private ethics.

Socrates (469—399 B.C.). The practical consequences of the teaching of the Sophists were directly opposed to all the ideas which were inherent and implicit in the ideal of the Greek city-state. Hence to counteract the subversive dogmas inculcated by the Sophists, came into the field of political controversy a conservative thinker who by means of his superb dialectic exposed the falsity of the dogmas of the Sophists. The thinker was the ever memorable Socrates.

Socrates was profoundly pained to see that there was something wrong in his native city Athens. His searching eyes and meditative mind discovered that the malady under which his city was suffering was lack of knowledge of the good and the useful. True to his belief he was anxious to find the cure. He discovered that knowledge and virtue were identical and vice was synonymous with ignorance. His conception of knowledge and virtue is closely related to his conception of right and wrong. A person whose knowledge is perfect will not do any wrong. According to him, a just man is he who knows what is just. From this it follows that a just man cannot do any unjust thing, for his knowledge of what is just prevents him from doing the unjust thing. "Virtue is knowledge" is the great Socratic dictum. According to Socrates, bereft of knowledge, one cannot do right. Conversely, one cannot do any wrong if what is right is known to him. In order to make men virtuous, it is therefore necessary to make quite clear to them what is good. Virtue arises through instruction and all virtue consists in knowledge.

In sharp contrast to the doctrine of the Sophists, Socrates taught that the state was a natural institution, that law was sacred and immutable, that might was always limited by right, that society was more important than the individual, and that government was a high public duty and as such it required the services of the wisest and best in the political community.

The doctrine of Socrates, viz., 'knowledge is virtue', when applied to the field of practical politics, implies that only those who know shall rule. Or in other words, he advocated rule by an aristocracy of intelligence and objected to the extreme democratic methods in Athens, namely, filling of offices by lot. The system left room for the rule of ignorance. This spirit also prompted him to object to the rule of Athens by the Ecclesia consisting of tailors, carpenters and cobblers who were ignorant of the meaning of a true policy.

Socrates flourished when Athens had reached the highest stage of her democratic ideals. His teachings were misunderstood by the extreme democrats as anti-democratic and he was indicted and condemned to death.

Socrates took no pains for writing anything for the posterity nor did he build any superstructure of theory, except in so far as he had attempted a classification of states into Good and Bad. But he taught one great lesson,

namely, 'Politics is a matter of thought and Government a concern of the wise, and as such anybody and everybody should not be allowed to participate in the work of the government.' In these days of democracy, we may not see eye to eye with Socrates but still we must admit that popular legislation does not always ensure the enactment of laws conducive to the interest of the community as a whole.

The advent of Socrates had an important bearing on Greek political thought in view of the fact that the future progress of Greek political thought was to follow the lines laid down by Socrates. Plato was in every sense the true disciple of Socrates who developed and elaborated dogmas of his master. Aristotle also built upon the foundation laid down by Plato. The origin of two other political creeds of Athens, namely, Epicurianism and Stoicism, may also be traced to the teachings of Socrates.

SECTION III

Plato (427—347 B.C.). Plato or Aristocles was born about 427 B.C. He was an aristocrat by birth and trained as an athlete and soldier who actually saw service in three battles during the Peloponnesian war. He studied science and poetry during the interval of the wars and at the age of twenty he met Socrates under whom he studied for eight years. He left Athens in utter disgust and indignation when his master suffered death at the hands of the fanatical Athenian democracy. For twelve years he remained in exile and devoted himself to enlarge his knowledge about world and man. Later on, he returned to Athens where he founded his famous academy and taught and wrote for the rest of his long life.

As we have already seen that Socrates wrote nothing but he was fortunate in gathering round him many worthy disciples, two of whom preserved the way of his life and the record of his most notable dialogues. We are indebted to Xenophon for his biography and to Plato for his superb conversations. But we must remember that in recording the incomparable dialogues of his master, Plato, the pupil, was no less original than Socrates, the great master.

Political Philosophy of Plato. Plato was sorely grieved and indignant when his great master Socrates suffered death at the hands of the ignorant democracy of Athens. He was therefore prompted by an intense desire to espouse the cause for which his master had to die. He was determined to record and develop the doctrines of Socrates which embodied the following fundamental principles. First, the supreme end of human existence is virtue; secondly, virtue is identical with knowledge, and thirdly, intellect, the organ of knowledge, is the main factor in man. These three principles he applied to politics in the three dialogues known as the *Republic*, the *Statesman* and the *Laws*.

The Republic. The Republic is not only the greatest work of Plato but also one of the greatest of all the books in the world's literature. The one great aim and object of Plato in writing this book was to combat Sophism and incidentally to criticise the then Greek government which had condemned his master.

In the Republic, Plato describes the Ideal State—the state as it ought to be rather than the state as it is.

As to the origin of the state, Plato says that mutual assistance and division of labour lie at the root of social organisation. The diversity of human needs and the necessity for satisfying them make it imperative on man to seek the help of others. Such a mutually dependent society must necessarily consist of three classes of citizens; namely, the producers for the sustenance of the people, the warriors for the security of the population and territory of the state and finally, the Guardians, i.e., the Rulers for regulating the welfare of the entire community. In the Republic, Plato gives a philosophical basis to the state and as such, the state is conceived in terms of the human soul. The state, according to Plato, is the image of the fulness of man's mind. The state thus being an image of the human soul, the parts of which the state is made up should correspond to those of the human soul. The human soul, according to Plato, consists of three parts, namely, Reason, Spirit and Appetite. The state of Plato being an image of the human soul embraces three classes of citizens, — the Guardians, the Warriors and the Producers corresponding to the three elements of the human soul, namely, reason, spirit and appetite. A just man is he in whom spirit and appetite are subordinated to the element reason. The ideal state, according to Plato, is that state which is ruled by philosophers, i.e., a state in which soldiers and producers are in subordination to the guardian class.

Plato's Communism. Plato holds that as private property and family relationship lie at the root of all social evils, neither is to have any recognition in his ideal state. The fundamental unity and harmony of the ideal state be preserved at all costs and with this end in view, ^{Plato} man his due". But both private property and family life. In order man his due, his capacity and without being distracted by motives of self while what is due from the individual and family ties, Plato makes ^{the} performance of his allotted duty which he is will have no private according to his capacity and training.

to meet ^{dealing formally with subject.} the **Theory of Education.** The Republic of Plato is not only a treatise and ^{political} Science or Jurisprudence but it is one of the finest treatise on education that ever was written. According to Plato, the stability and strength of a state lie in its educational system which, more than anything else, contributes to the harmonious development of a man's ^{personality} making him fit for taking his place in the life of the community. Education is the only means by which the rulers of the ideal state can properly regulate the mutual relation between the citizens for the purpose of producing harmony and co-operation in place of discord and dissension. He holds the view that if individual character is improved by proper education and training, laws become unnecessary. The great aim of education is formation of character and this, he says, can be done by the proper cultivation of the qualities of human head and heart. The ultimate function of the state is ^{pedagogic} and as such it cannot be left to private hands. Hence Plato attaches the greatest importance to education and advocates a system of state-directed education to be administered by Magistrates.

As the stability and strength of Plato's ideal state are bound up with the education of its citizens, Plato draws up his scheme of education with utmost care. He divides his scheme of education into two parts or stages, first, primary stage of education up to the age of twenty and second, higher stage of education for magistrates and soldiers above the age of twenty.

Plato's scheme of elementary education was intended for the reformation of the then Athenian system of education. His curriculum was split up into two

therefore not only the first communist but also the first feminist and first eugenis^t. In some respects, he was far more advanced than the modern Russian Communists who have not been able to abolish private property completely far less to abolish family life.

Aristotle's Criticism. The communistic features of Plato's ideal state were subjected to a searching criticism by no less a person than his own pupil, the great Aristotle. Aristotle criticises Plato in both the aspects of communism, namely, community of property and community of wives and children. But in criticising Plato's community of property, Aristotle made a fundamental mistake. Aristotle assumed that Plato had advocated a system of common property which Plato actually did not. What Plato advocated in his Republic was not common possession but the common use by the Guardians of a part of the produce paid to them by the Producers. Aristotle's line of criticism of Plato's community of property may therefore be regarded as a criticism of modern socialism too.

The principles of his criticism against common property may be summarised as follows.

First, common property fails to stimulate individual exertion and economy of efforts. This difficulty was experienced in Russia during the initial period of the introduction of compulsory collective farming.

Secondly, common property fosters dissensions as there is no correspondence

rendered and reward received. and indignation. Property destroys the sense of pleasure arising out of Athenian democracy. It is not an incentive to work. to enlarge his knowledge about what is best. where he founded his famous academy. virtues of charity and liberality, for long life.

As we have already seen that Socrates wrote nothing life on the following in gathering round him many worthy disciples, two of whom by the abolition of his life and the record of his most notable dialogues. We are to Aristotle Xenophon for his biography and to Plato for his superb conversations. In must remember that in recording the incomparable dialogues of his master, the pupil, was no less original than Socrates, the great master.

Political Philosophy of Plato. Plato was sorely grieved and indignant when his great master Socrates suffered death at the hands of the ignorant democracy of Athens. He was therefore prompted by an intense desire to espouse the cause for which his master had to die. He was determined to record and develop the doctrines of Socrates which embodied the following fundamental principles. First, the supreme end of human existence is virtue; secondly, virtue is identical with knowledge, and thirdly, intellect, the organ of knowledge, is the main factor in man. These three principles he applied to politics in the three dialogues known as the *Republic*, the *Statesman* and the *Laws*.

The Republic. The Republic is not only the greatest work of Plato but also one of the greatest of all the books in the world's literature. The one great aim and object of Plato in writing this book was to combat Sophism and incidentally to criticise the then Greek government which had condemned his master.

In the Republic, Plato describes the Ideal State—the state as it ought to be rather than the state as it is.

prevents him from doing an act out of a sense of duty. Socially, justice means that disposition on the part of a group of persons which makes them refrain from doing an act which is likely to interfere with the legitimate rights of the other classes. So both from the personal and social points of view, justice involves self-restraint. According to Plato, justice is the bond which holds a society together. Justice consists in the harmonious union of the individuals of a society when each individual does his work in the station of life in accordance with his natural fitness and his training. From the social point of view, justice implies a social principle according to which a particular class of a society performs its work in that social plane to which it is called upon by its fitness and training. Personally justice means the harmonious combination and development of the three different elements of the human soul namely, reason, spirit and appetite so that there may not be any disproportionate growth of one element at the expense of the other. Socially, justice means an equal balance between the three different classes in a state, namely, guardians, soldiers and producers so that all of them may develop in their own way and yet promote the end of the state by their harmonious co-operation. According to Plato, justice therefore implies self-restraint, autonomy, non-interference, and functional specialisation. A just man is he who performs the function allotted to him in accordance with his natural and acquired fitness, yet keeps an internal harmony by giving other aspects of his nature free scope for development. In the same way, a just or an ideal state is that in which a particular class performs its allotted function but remains in harmony with the rest.

Thus, according to Plato, justice means "giving every man his due". But it should be borne in mind that in giving every man his due, his capacity and training should be taken into consideration while what is due from the individual should be judged by the honest performance of his allotted duty which he is called upon to do according to his capacity and training.

Plato's Theory of Education. The Republic of Plato is not only a *dealing formally with subject* treatise on Political Science or Jurisprudence but it is one of the finest treatise on education that ever was written. According to Plato, the stability and strength of a state lie in its educational system which, more than anything else, contributes to the harmonious development of a man's *personality* making him fit for taking his place in the life of the community. Education is the only means by which the rulers of the ideal state can properly regulate the mutual relation between the citizens for the purpose of producing harmony and co-operation in place of discord and dissension. He holds the view that if individual character is improved by proper education and training, laws become unnecessary. The great aim of education is formation of character and this, he says, can be done by the proper cultivation of the qualities of human head and heart. The ultimate function of the state is *pedagogic* and as such it cannot be left to private hands. Hence Plato attaches the greatest importance to education and advocates a system of state-directed education to be administered by Magistrates.

As the stability and strength of Plato's ideal state are bound up with the education of its citizens, Plato draws up his scheme of education with utmost care. He divides his scheme of education into two parts or stages, *first*, primary stage of education up to the age of twenty and *second*, higher stage of education for magistrates and soldiers above the age of twenty.

Plato's scheme of elementary education was intended for the reformation of the then Athenian system of education. His curriculum was split up into two

parts, namely, physical training and mental or intellectual training. His scheme therefore represents a blend of both the Spartan and the Athenian systems of education. His elementary education is confined to the study of poetry and literature minus the vulgar elements in them. The contents of his scheme of higher education to be imparted to selected youths between the ages 20 and 35 are philosophy, mathematics and astronomy. According to Plato, it is the study of philosophy which alone can produce a precise idea of good in the minds of men. So he says, "unless it shall come to pass that philosophers are kings or that those who are now called kings and potentates be imbued with a sufficient measure of philosophy,—that is to say, unless political power and philosophy be united, there will be no cessation of ills for states."

Plato prescribes different forms of training not only for men of different ages, but also for the different classes of the state according to their propensity and function. The producers are to receive only technical training; the warriors are trained in gymnastics and the liberal arts up to the age of twenty. But the guardians' education continues beyond that age to a course of science and philosophy up to the age of 35. On completion of this course, the guardians will be required to participate in practical administrative function for the next fifteen years after which they will be elevated to the rank of magistracy.

The Statesman. A discussion of Plato's first book 'The Republic, shows that in it he describes the state purely from an ideal point of view—the state as it should be. But gradually with the advance of his age and acquaintance with the realities of life, he perceived that 'he had pitched his political harmony in too high a key.' Accordingly, in his second treatise—the Statesman and still more in his third book the Laws, we find a gradual modification of his idealism. In the Statesman, therefore, he retains the ideal point of view but descends lower in the scale of possibilities and formulates schemes which are workable among imperfect men. In the Statesman, Plato recognises the rule of the 'philosopher king' as the best practicable government which is administered according to law.

The Statesman is a short dialogue of Plato in which he seeks to find out the ethical and intellectual characteristics of a true ruler. In this dialogue, he attempts a classification of government on (1) the basis of the number of persons exercising authority and on (2) the relation of the Government to law. His classification is as follows :

	<i>Subject to law</i>	<i>Unrestrained by law</i>
The rule of one	Royalty	Tyranny
The rule of few	Aristocracy	Oligarchy
The rule of many	Democracy	Democracy

Royal monarchy and Aristocracy he recognises as superior to all other forms. Democracy comes next in order of merit but oligarchy and tyranny he regards as the worst forms of government. The ideal form of government, he declares, is one which is ruled by an all-wise man free from the prescription of either positive law or instruction. Then he proceeds to discuss the characteristics of such a ruler and the manner in which his authority should be exercised. Although the qualification of a ruler is prescribed as possession of knowledge, the character of the knowledge insisted upon is not however of so high a standard as in the Republic.

The Laws. In the third book namely, the Laws, Plato gives up his idealism altogether and describes the state as it works among imperfect men. For the purpose of improving the political life of man, Plato formulates a code of rules on the basis of which he seeks to regulate the life of man. The communistic features of society which are so marked in the Republic are conspicuous by their total absence in the Laws. Marriage and family are allowed along with private property. The only restriction imposed upon the possession of property is that the state should see that land is equally divided among the citizens. To prevent inequality, Plato classifies the people into four categories but not on the basis of intellectual qualification but on wealth. The first class possesses only the equal allotment of land which is guaranteed to every citizen as the "limit of poverty". The other three classes are determined by the possession of wealth to the amount of two, three and four times the value of the share of land and property owned by any citizen over and above the fourfold limit is liable to confiscation by the government.

With regard to Government, Plato tries in the Laws to establish a mean between monarchy and democracy, between authority and liberty—a Government on the basis of friendship,—a Government which is "the rule of law over..... willing subjects and not a rule of compulsion".

Principal administrative function is entrusted to a body of 37 chosen members called guardians of laws. These guardians must be of 50 years of age and will retire at the age of 70. Military officials are also elected primarily by the guardians. Provision is also made for an administrative council of 360 and also for a General Assembly of the citizens. The judicial organisation is made in such a way that all citizens may have a voice in the administration of justice.

Influence of Plato. The political philosophy of Plato exerted a tremendous influence not only upon later Greek political thought but also upon mediaeval and modern political thought. Aristotle may be said to be the intellectual child of Plato. It has been said about Aristotle and perhaps rightly that he differs from Plato more in the method of treatment than in the substance of his thoughts. Most of the thoughts in Aristotle, such as, origin of the state, the concept of the Ideal State, the theory of education and of revolution, classification of states, etc., are Platonic in their origin.

The influence of Plato on later political thought is discernible from the period of the Renaissance to the present day. Cicero, the Roman philosopher and more strongly St. Augustine were profoundly influenced by the writings of Plato. The sixteenth century Utopians, more specially, Sir Thomas Moore, show unmistakable traces of Platonism in their thoughts and ideas. From them the Platonic tradition passed on to Rousseau, Kant, Hegel and Fichte who in their turn moulded the political thought of the nineteenth century English Idealists T. H. Green, Bradley and others. It is said that "In Hegel political philosophy seems to have come in complete circle back to Plato". The moral significance of the state, its organic unity and educational functions, and above all, its sovereignty and supremacy of authority over the individual are the legacies of modern political thought from Plato. Plato is in a sense the ancestor of almost all modern 'isms'.

SECTION IV

Aristotle (384—322 B.C.). Aristotle was born in the city of Stagira. His father who was physician to the King of Macedon brought him to Athens at the age of seventeen. He joined the Platonic Academy at Athens and studied under

the great master for about twenty years. While at the academy, he gave proof of his future greatness. His originality and creative genius were of such a high order that he is still regarded as the father of modern political thought. His range of study extended to every field of knowledge. After the death of Plato, he left Athens and travelled for some years in different lands and during this period he served for some years as the tutor to Macedonian King Philip's 'war-like' son who later on became famous in history as Alexander the Great. In 355 B.C. he returned to Athens, started a new academy of philosophy and taught there till the end of his life.

The "Politics" of Aristotle. The *Politics* of Aristotle is not a systematic work rather it is regarded by many scholars as a compilation of his lectures recorded by his disciples at different times. The *Politics* of Aristotle lacks the literary grace and excellence we find in the *Republic* of Plato nor does it possess the high moral tone characteristic of Plato's *Republic*.

The book begins with a strong condemnation of Platonic doctrine of communism and asserts that the institutions of family and private property are the bases of the state. He then traces the origin of the state through the village community to its culmination in the self-sufficing city-state. Lastly, he proceeds to discuss the different forms of property of which slaves are a form defined as animate instruments of action conducive to life.

Aristotle's Theory of the Origin of the State. Aristotle is perhaps the first writer who sought to give a systematic account of the origin of the state on a logical and scientific basis. In formulating his theory about the origin of the state, he starts from the very beginning of human society.

The two ultimate elements upon which human society stands are first the relation between husband and wife and secondly, between master and slave. Male and female live together for the procreation of children so that the race may continue. Master and slave live together for mutual benefit and safety. These two primary relations constitute the family or the household which is the first step towards the formation of the state. The household is a small but a natural formation aiming at meeting the immediate needs of the day, its members being the "sharers of the same table"

The next step in the formation of the state is the village which is a federation of the simplest association of several households. As the village is bigger and more complex in its organisation, it aims at something more than ephemeral purposes.

The third or the final stage in the progress of association is the federation of villages into a city-state. As the state is the highest form of association, its purpose is also the highest. It aims at the highest good, i.e., promotion of a good life. The family and the village are incomplete forms of association. The growth which began with the family passes through the stage of village and culminates with the state and as such the state is the highest form of human association and as such it aims at the highest good—not merely for ephemeral purposes nor for more than ephemeral purposes but for complete and self-sufficient life. In it man for the first time becomes independent and perfect. All his wants, material and moral, are fully satisfied as a member of the state.

After giving his views on the origin of the state, Aristotle proceeds to prove the naturalness of the state, i.e., the state is a natural institution—it is a product of nature and not the creation of man. Aristotle proves his proposition with the help of three logical arguments,

First, he says 'what each thing is when fully developed we call its Nature. A growth when fully developed, i.e., when the process of growth after passing through different but natural forms of growth reaches the end of the process of growth, it attains its fullest development and so the concluding stage of development is in conformity with the process of growth and hence the final stage of growth is called natural. In this sense, a ripe fruit is more natural than a bud, flower or green fruit inasmuch as a bud or a flower or a green fruit represents an incomplete form of growth. The process which begins with budding ends with the formation of ripe fruit and hence ripe fruit is more natural than green fruit. Similarly an old man is more natural than a child or a youth or an adult because old age is the culmination of the process of development of human life. In the same way, Aristotle argues that the state is a product of nature inasmuch as the process of development which began with the family reaches its end when fully developed, i.e., when the family develops into a state which is the complete form of the family. Aristotle says that if the earlier forms are natural, the end is also natural because it is the completed form of the earlier ones.

His second set of argument in support of his view is that nature always works for the best. Other associations like the family or the village aims at some good no doubt but the state being the highest form of association aims at the highest good. In it man becomes fully developed and therefore the state is the best form of association and what is best is the product of nature. The state being the best is a product of nature.

Thirdly, Aristotle argues that nature makes nothing in vain. There is a purpose behind every creation of nature. Nature has endowed man with the faculty of speech and reasoning which birds and animals lack. This proves that Nature destined man for a social and ultimately a political life. As it is nature which destined man for a social and political life which is possible only within and not outside the state, the state cannot but be a creation of nature.

Aristotle traces the origin of the state to its root, namely, the family. In this sense, his view is on a line with that of Sri Henry Main who attributed the origin of the state to the expansion of the family: Aristotle's view is, on the other hand, in conflict with the views of the Social contract writers who characterise the state as an artificial creation by man. The emphasis given by Aristotle on the moral end of the state is also conspicuous by its absence in subsequent writings on the subject.

Economic Theory of Aristotle. Aristotle introduces his discussion on Economics with reference to the state which is composed of households. The households require certain instruments for its proper management and the art of finance is one such instrument. The management of the household or domestic economy requires acquisition of wealth. The methods of acquisition of wealth for domestic economy include the art of finance.

Aristotle defines 'wealth' as a number or bundle of instruments suited to the requirements of a household or a state. Aristotle's definition of wealth reveals two characteristics of wealth, namely, that it is a means and as it is a means it is limited in the sense that endless acquisition of this means is not necessary or desirable. The whole of Aristotle's economic teaching is pinpointed on this particular characteristic that being a means wealth must be limited in amount. He goes so far as to assert that the science which deals with wealth

as defined above is natural or legitimate. This is the only natural form of the art of finance or acquisition of wealth. All other forms are condemned as unnatural.

The natural form of acquisition of wealth includes all the processes and methods by which man acquires the different kinds of food which constitute the characteristics of different ways of life, such as that of the nomad, hunter, the agriculturist, fisherman, etc.

Another mode of acquisition of wealth which Aristotle grudgingly characterises as natural is the acquisition of wealth by exchange through barter economy. The difference between the two modes is that the former mode directly satisfies human wants whereas the latter only indirectly. The common feature of both the modes lies in the fact that the commodity acquired irrespective of its mode is used as a commodity. Acquisition of wealth by exchange through barter is necessary when man passes out of the family stage to a more developed form of society. Exchange is natural because it equalises by making available to both of the men a sufficiency of both of the commodities.

Aristotle also mentions a perverted or bad form of acquisition which he calls unnatural. It arose at a later date with the invention of money which was intended originally to be used as a means of exchange and not for gain. The unnatural kind differs from the natural modes of acquisition in this that whereas the natural modes acquire commodities for direct satisfaction of want or acquire indirectly through barter for the same purpose the unnatural mode helps men to acquire wealth to make a gain. Wealth ceases to be a means and limited in amount when it is acquired by unnatural mode. Unnatural finance includes such occupations as retail trade, usury, commerce, etc. Wood-cutting and mining are placed by Aristotle intermediate between the natural and the unnatural inasmuch as they depend upon the products of the earth but they do not yield anything.

Economic thought, in Aristotle, we find only in a rudimentary form. The vastness and complexities of economic activities of modern society were absent in his time thus leaving little scope for the formulation of economic theories and laws. The absence of capital-labour problem, narrow limits within which trade and commerce used to be carried on and the non-existence of exchange institutions are some of the facts which explain the meagreness of economic teaching in Aristotle. Besides this, the end of the state, according to Aristotle, was a good life and good life was incompatible with the pursuit of acquisition of unlimited amount of wealth. He admits that wealth is necessary for human happiness but he warns that wealth exists for man—it is an instrument and as such its pursuit should be controlled and made subservient to the higher interests of life. But we today want more wealth for even distribution among all classes of people in the state because we have no slave class in our society. We need more wealth for using a part of the produced wealth as capital for the purpose of further production and for stimulating capital formation. Interest which he condemned too severely, must be paid. Aristotle was a philosopher of the city-state. He could not anticipate the vastness and complexities of modern social life.

Aristotle's Theory of Slavery. The Greeks in Aristotle's time found nothing wrong in the institution of slavery. The institution was an integral part of the Greek social order although here and there a few isolated writers condemned

it as barbarous and opposed to the principle of equality inherent in natural law. Aristotle's view on slavery was intermediate between these two extreme views, namely, retention of slavery and abolition of slavery. Aristotle was both a defender and a reformer of slavery and for this dual position of Aristotle that his views on slavery deserve careful consideration.

True it is that Aristotle defended slavery but not exactly in the form in which it existed in his time. He distinguishes between two kinds of slavery, namely, slavery by nature and slavery by law.

Natural slavery is defended by Aristotle on two grounds. *First*, he says that slavery is required by the needs of human society. Just as every art requires its own proper instruments, similarly the household art must have its instruments which are living instruments, namely, slaves. Aristotle holds the view that in a community there must be a number of workers and these are the property of their masters.

Secondly, Aristotle defends the institution on the basis of the great natural distinction that exists between man and man. There are men who are fit only for manual work and do nothing but serve. Others are born with natural gifts of talent and these are born to rule. The universal principle of nature is rule and subjection and in conformity with this universal principle those are better fitted to command and direct, i.e., those who possess intellectual capacity become masters and those who represent physical strength only become slaves. Just as the soul rules over the body, the male over the female, so also the master rules over the slave. This combination of intellectual and physical strength is essential for the successful management of the household.

Aristotle speaks of intellectual superiority in justification of slavery of his time but in all cases of slavery, the master may not be necessarily superior in intellect to the slave. He meets this contention by saying that where the practice of making prisoners of war slaves is prevalent, the prisoners of war in spite of their intellectual superiority may be treated as slaves by convention.

Here Aristotle speaks like a true Greek who was a firm believer in the inherent superiority of the Hellenic race to all other non-Hellenic people whom they regarded as barbarians. We are rather shocked to find that Aristotle in spite of his greatness could not overcome the narrow outlook of the Greeks and so the supposed superiority of the Greeks was used as a defence for the institution of slavery.

But if Aristotle is to be condemned for his defence of slavery, he also deserves our praise and gratitude for his proposal for the reform of slavery. His heart goes out in sympathy towards the sufferings of the slaves and as a man, he proposes a number of measures for the improvement of the lot of the slaves.

Aristotle defends only the natural kind of slavery where the master is really intellectually superior to the slave and that also for the benefit of both the parties. He also proposes to limit the number of slaves to be fixed by the requirements of the state. He suggests that hopes of liberation should be held out to the slaves. The bitterness of feeling between the two should be removed by creating a common interest between the master and the slave. He even suggests that the master and the slave should be on friendly terms with each other. Thus Aristotle wants to retain slavery in a form in which it is divested of many of its evil features. The universal principle of slavery as upheld by the ordinary Greek public opinion is tempered by reason and a feeling of compassion for the slave. Thus the defender of slavery is Aristotle the Greek, the reformer is Aristotle the man.

it is in the deliberative that sovereignty resides. A full citizen is therefore one who has a share in the exercise of the sovereign power of the state. Membership of the Athenian *Ecclesia* comprising all the genuine Athenians over the age of twenty was made the basis of Aristotle's citizenship.

Criticism. It has been said that Aristotle's conception of citizenship is more intensive but less extensive. A critical examination of the above statement will help us to understand not only the implications of Aristotle's conception but also its line of demarcation from the modern conception.

His conception of citizenship is more intensive in the sense that citizenship, according to Aristotle, has a deeper significance far more than the membership of a modern state. It means active participation in the sovereign authority of the state and for that the citizens must possess requisite qualifications. The capacity to rule and to obey in turn constitutes the essence of citizenship. The citizens of Aristotle must possess ample leisure to enable them to pursue state functions ungrudgingly. The modern state has no such exacting conception of citizenship. The modern state does not demand from citizens any active service. Modern citizenship implies allegiance and obedience to the state and casual exercise of the right to vote which is also not compulsory. The citizens, according to Aristotle, must be active partners of the state whereas we think that citizens or at least the greater majority of them may be passive partners of the state.

But Aristotle's conception of citizenship is defective in one essential aspect. Citizenship which was a function—almost a profession was confined to a small leisured class of men who lived on the sweat of slave-labour. Citizenship means participation in judicial and deliberative functions which in its turn require both ability and leisure. As the slaves, the agriculturists and the mechanics possess neither leisure nor ability because of the nature of their professions, they are placed outside the category of citizens. They are, according to Aristotle, not essential parts of the state but merely conditions necessary for the existence of the state. The political class consisting of the magistrates and administrators constitutes the citizen body.

Thus Aristotle's citizenship was democratic more in its outward show than in its substance. It was democratic in relation to the leisured political class only but it was aristocratic in relation to the total population of the state. The modern state does not make any such invidious distinction between man and man. Like a pyramid, the modern state has the broadest basis in which all are included. The modern state recognises the fact that one man is politically as good as another and therefore no person should suffer any disability by reason of his birth, colour, creed or vocation of life.

Aristotle's Theory of the Classification of Constitutions. 'A constitution', says Aristotle, 'is the arrangement in a state of all the offices of administration and specially of that office which is supreme over all; viz., the office of Government, for, the Government is everywhere the supreme authority in the state and the Government is *par excellence* the constitution'.

Closely following Plato, Aristotle attempts at an analytic and elaborate classification of actual states. *First*, he classifies them ethically into true states whose aim is virtue and false states which pursue lower aims, such as, power or riches. Then he divides them teleologically into normal states and perverted states, the former seeking the good of the citizens as a whole, the latter abusing

Criticism. Aristotle's theory of slavery in spite of its reformatory leanings makes little appeal to a modern man who lives in an age when the principle of equality of man has taken a firm root in all spheres of life. The admission of slavery by Aristotle gets rid of some of the economic problems with which a particular society is confronted. The modern problem is how to adjust the relation between labour and capital, how to improve the conditions of the working classes. But this problem is reduced to a subordinate position if we admit that there must always be a class of slaves who belong wholly to their masters.

The admission of slavery by Aristotle has vitiated his whole conception of the state. Aristotelian state is a sort of an aristocratic state of wise politicians and administrators in which the bulk of the population comprising the whole of the manual labourers have no share in the government and as such are placed outside the role of citizenship. A state which exists to promote the interests of the few but which neglects the interests of the many, cannot in the long run be a stable and prosperous state.

Aristotle's attitude towards slavery may be assailed from another point of view. His defence of slavery implies that there is no scope for the improvement of the position of this class of people. A slave is incapable of being elevated to the rank of a man in the true sense of the term. Such an idea is fatal to the modern conception of an all-round social improvement which aims at including all in its scope.

The truth is that in defending the institution of slavery, Aristotle was limited by the facts and ideas of his age. According to the Greeks, the end of the state is a life of virtue and this Aristotle thinks is quite incompatible with the drudgery involved in manual labour. Therefore there must always be a class of slaves to bear the burden of this drudgery. Again his attitude towards slavery may be explained in another way. He is a conservative thinker and his conservatism prompts him not to make any far-reaching change in the existing social order but to retain as much of it as possible. It is for this reason that he opposes Plato's scheme of communism which involves sweeping changes. Slavery was an integral part of Greek social order and as such it should be retained, if possible by amending it but not altogether sweeping it away. The fact that men could have rights in virtue of being men did not occur to Aristotle.

Aristotle's Theory of Citizenship. In Book III of his *Politics*, Aristotle attempts at an analytic definition of the state in which the individual citizens appear as component parts. He then proceeds to eliminate the non-citizen class from the citizens with reference to the qualifications necessary for citizenship. He is of the opinion that neither residence nor participation in legal rights makes man a citizen, for, a foreigner may be in possession of either or both the qualifications. The essence of citizenship, according to Aristotle, lies not in residence nor in enjoyment of privileges but in the performance of certain functions. He defines a citizen as one who participates in those offices which are held for an indeterminate period and he regards this definition as the most suitable definition as it is applicable to the largest number of citizens. This definition of a citizen is followed by a definition of the state which is a body of men sharing in deliberative and judicial office and adequate in number for a functions as the most important functions of the state, he regards participation in these two functions of the state as the true criterion of citizenship. Of the two functions, he attaches greater importance to the deliberative function because

it is in the deliberative that sovereignty resides. A full citizen is therefore one who has a share in the exercise of the sovereign power of the state. Membership of the Athenian *Ecclesia* comprising all the genuine Athenians over the age of twenty was made the basis of Aristotle's citizenship.

Criticism. It has been said that Aristotle's conception of citizenship is more intensive but less extensive. A critical examination of the above statement will help us to understand not only the implications of Aristotle's conception but also its line of demarcation from the modern conception.

His conception of citizenship is more intensive in the sense that citizenship, according to Aristotle, has a deeper significance far more than the membership of a modern state. It means active participation in the sovereign authority of the state and for that the citizens must possess requisite qualifications. The capacity to rule and to obey in turn constitutes the essence of citizenship. The citizens of Aristotle must possess ample leisure to enable them to pursue state functions ungrudgingly. The modern state has no such exacting conception of citizenship. The modern state does not demand from citizens any active service. Modern citizenship implies allegiance and obedience to the state and casual exercise of the right to vote which is also not compulsory. The citizens, according to Aristotle, must be active partners of the state whereas we think that citizens or at least the greater majority of them may be passive partners of the state.

But Aristotle's conception of citizenship is defective in one essential aspect. Citizenship which was a function—almost a profession was confined to a small leisured class of men who lived on the sweat of slave-labour. Citizenship means participation in judicial and deliberative functions which in its turn require both ability and leisure. As the slaves, the agriculturists and the mechanics possess neither leisure nor ability because of the nature of their professions, they are placed outside the category of citizens. They are, according to Aristotle, not essential parts of the state but merely conditions necessary for the existence of the state. The political class consisting of the magistrates and administrators constitutes the citizen body.

Thus Aristotle's citizenship was democratic more in its outward show than in its substance. It was democratic in relation to the leisured political class only but it was aristocratic in relation to the total population of the state. The modern state does not make any such invidious distinction between man and man. Like a pyramid, the modern state has the broadest basis in which all are included. The modern state recognises the fact that one man is politically as good as another and therefore no person should suffer any disability by reason of his birth, colour, creed or vocation of life.

Aristotle's Theory of the Classification of Constitutions. 'A constitution', says Aristotle, 'is the arrangement in a state of all the offices of administration and specially of that office which is supreme over all; viz., the office of Government, for, the Government is everywhere the supreme authority in the state and the Government is *par excellence* the constitution'.

Closely following Plato, Aristotle attempts at an analytic and elaborate classification of actual states. *First*, he classifies them ethically into true states whose aim is virtue and false states which pursue lower aims, such as, power or riches. Then he divides them teleologically into normal states and perverted states, the former seeking the good of the citizens as a whole, the latter abusing

their power in promoting the interests of a particular class. Then he subdivides them according to the number of persons exercising sovereign power.

Aristotle's classification takes the following forms in its normal and perverted aspects.

	Normal	Perverted
Rule of one	Monarchy	Tyranny
Rule of few	Aristocracy	Oligarchy
Rule of many	Polity	Democracy

In explaining the above forms, the true end of the state should be kept in view. The end of the state being an ethical one, namely, perfection of all its members, the true form of government is one which pursues this end. Thus when sovereign powers is vested in one its true or normal form is *monarchy*, but monarchy degenerates into *tyranny* as soon as it gives up its moral ideal and seeks its own interest. Thus tyranny is the corrupt or perverted form of monarchy—perverted not in form but in its ideal. When sovereignty is vested in the few in its pure form, it is *aristocracy* but aristocracy degenerates into *oligarchy* when it pursues a wrong end, namely, promotion of the interest of the few. When sovereign power is exercised by the whole people for the common good, it is called *Polity* but when it deviates from its ideal of common good, it becomes corrupt and is called *Democracy*.

Apart from the above classification, Aristotle also speaks of another principle on the basis of which states may be classified. This is the principle of wealth. As the rich are few in a state, the rule by the wealthy implies rule by the few which is called oligarchy. The many in a state are poor and as such the rule of the many implies rule by the poor majority. Therefore the difference between oligarchy and democracy lies in the difference between wealth and poverty and not in the number of persons exercising sovereignty. Pure democracy is a form of government when it is conducted by the people simply on the basis of liberty only. The government is oligarchy when it is based on wealth. Again when it is based on virtue only it is aristocratic and when wealth and liberty combine to form the bases of the state, it becomes Polity. Aristocracy may be pure or mixed in its form. Pure aristocracy is based on virtue while mixed aristocracy is that form of government which is conducted by men who have virtue, wealth and liberty.

Criticism. The above Aristotelian classification has been criticised on the following grounds :

In the *first* place, it is said that the classification is mechanical and quantitative whereas it should have been spiritual and qualitative.

Secondly, his classification has been the cause of much confusion because it does not make any clear-cut distinction between the forms of state and forms of government.

Thirdly, his classification is criticised as being defective inasmuch as it is not exhaustive. It does not cover states having a mixed form nor does it explain modern forms of government, such as Unitary and Federal, Parliamentary and Presidential.

Lastly, it is very difficult to classify modern states on the Aristotelian basis of seat of sovereignty as sovereignty in modern times is seldom vested in one or the few.

Whatever defects the Aristotelian classification may have, it is not entirely valueless to us today. Barker says that we do not distinguish states today on moral grounds as the moral meaning of the state is not so clear to us as it was to Aristotle. Yet the category of end is still pursued to classify states whenever states are classed as war-states, culture-states, law-states or commerce-states. And we distinguish between free countries where the common weal is pursued by the government and despotically governed countries where the interests of the ruler predominate in a way somewhat analogous to Aristotle's distinction between constitutional government which rules in an unselfish spirit for the good of its subjects and despotic government which rules in a selfish spirit for the good of the ruler.

Aristotle's Theory of Democracy. Aristotle defines democracy as a polity in which the poor are supreme, being a majority. In order to determine the varieties of polity; 'Aristotle first ascertains all the constituent parts of the state, for, the varieties of state depend upon the combination of the nine parts into which Aristotle divides the population of the state. After analysing the nine parts (Classes) of the state, Aristotle concludes that the two main parts of the state are the rich and the poor and he finally formulates the theory that there are two polities only, viz., Oligarchy and Democracy.

According to Aristotle, there are five species of democracy. Equality is the basis of the first form of democracy in which laws are made in such a manner that all become placed on an equal basis. Liberty and equality which are the foundation of democracy will within the easy reach of all if all persons have an equal share in government and equal economic position in life. Such a government which is conducted by the opinion of the majority will be called democratic.

The *second* type of democracy is based on a low property qualification. Any person having the required amount of property has a share in the government but he will be deprived of his rights when he loses his property.

The *third* form of democracy is characterised by the supremacy of law and in it all citizens unless barred by disabilities have a share.

The *fourth* category admits all to the offices of the state provided they are citizens of the state.

The *fifth* form is the extreme form in which the opinion of the multitude rather than the existing laws are supreme. This is a form of democracy created by the influence of demagogues. Strictly speaking, it is not a constitutional government as the laws made by the multitude take precedence over existing laws.

Democracy is based on the twin principle of liberty and equality. Liberty implies that in a democracy, all have the right to rule and to be ruled in turn. According to Aristotle, liberty means that every man should live as he likes, for, not to live as a man likes is the characteristic of a slave. Liberty in this sense implies the claim of men to rule and to be ruled in turn.

Again in a democracy, every citizen must have equality. Democratic justice consists in the application of numerical and not proportionate equality. In a democracy, therefore, the majority must be supreme. From this it follows that as the number of the poor in a state is the largest, the poor will have more power than the rich.

Aristotle's Theory of Revolution and its Cure. Aristotle dwells at great length upon his masterly analysis of the causes of sedition and revolution in a

state. He first discusses the causes of revolution in general. Then he proceeds to discuss the causes of revolutions in particular polities, namely, democracies, oligarchies and aristocracies. In fact, the discussion on revolution turns out to be a discussion on sedition whether the latter materialises into open revolt or not.

Aristotle attributes the causes of revolution to three things. They are inequality and injustice in the political system, the prospect of an advantage and the seizing of some occasion. Of these the last one is of the utmost importance. In a democracy, revolution is caused by the molestation of the few rich by the penniless many. In an oligarchy, the cause of revolution is the oppression of the masses as well as the division among the richer classes. In an aristocracy, the great inequality of wealth, the ambition of some powerful individual and self-aggrandisement on the part of the nobles create rebellion.

According to Aristotle, revolutions may take various forms. A revolution may be a complete revolution which may cause a complete change of polity. A revolution of a moderate type causes change in the holders of power without affecting the nature of the polity. *Lastly*, a revolution may bring about a partial change in the polity, say, in one single department of the polity.

Having discussed the causes of revolutions. Aristotle proceeds to describe the cures which are applicable to all constitutions or in other words, the methods of preserving constitutions. The most effective method of preservation, according to Aristotle, lies in removing the causes of injustice of the constitution. For this, it is necessary that the constitution must be based on the consent of all the members of the state or at least on the consent of the majority. *Secondly*, the aims of the constitution should be pursued with moderation and extreme methods should always be avoided. *Thirdly*, adequate measures should be adopted so that the offices of the state may not be used as sources of profit. *Lastly*, the citizens of the state should be given such a training that they become loyal to the ideals pursued by the state, or in other words, the interests of the individual and those of the state should be identical.

In a democracy, Aristotle suggests, revolutions may be avoided by the adoption of a more liberal and sympathetic policy towards the wealthy. In an oligarchy, the cause of revolution may be removed by preventing the wealthy class from exploiting and hurting the political sense of the masses. If the masses are eligible to honourable posts of the masses. If the masses are eligible to honourable posts of the state, they will cease to grumble. Aristotle concludes his discussion on the preservatives of constitutions by laying the greatest importance upon the rule of the middle class. According to him, stability and prosperity are to be found in a state where extremes of wealth and poverty are unknown, i.e., in a state which is ruled by the middle class.

Criticism. A critical probe into the causes of revolution as laid down by Aristotle reveals a serious limitation of his discussion on revolution. In enquiring into the causes of revolutions, Aristotle attaches all importance to political injustice and political inequality but he completely loses sight of the economic forces that are equally responsible for civil disturbances. The fact that revolutions may be caused by hunger and starvation does not occur to Aristotle. Aristotle's theory of revolution therefore cannot explain the Russian revolution at all. The French revolution, it can only partially explain. Aristotle is also not conscious of the fact that a subject people may revolt against imperialistic domination as the Indians revolted against British rule in India and the Indonesians against the Dutch imperialism. Aristotle is not also cognizant of the fact that revolutions

may occur as much from without as from within the country. Another noticeable feature of Aristotle's theory of revolution is that he regards any change in the constitution as a revolution.

Aristotle's theory also suffers from another serious limitation. Aristotle is suspicious of any change in the constitution without probing into the causes lying behind such change. He fails to appreciate that revolutions are not always motivated by desire for wealth or power but there may be disinterested motives behind a revolution. A revolution may bring about a wholesome change in society by ensuring better living and better peace.

His middle class theory is also untenable and is not supported by historical facts. In France, it was the middle class which was responsible for the revolution; in Russia, it was the middle class which caused the greatest instability in the social frame-work and "was destroyed in the storm that came".

Aristotle's Theory of Education. As in his other theories, so also in his theory of education, Aristotle was profoundly influenced by Plato. Both of them attach a great importance to education and recommend a uniform system of compulsory education to be administered by the state.

Education, according to Aristotle, is a system of training—physical as well as intellectual—which makes a citizen fit for taking his proper place in the life of the community. The system of education should be conceived in such a way that it may serve the purpose of the state. The perfection of the whole depends upon the perfection of the parts and as such the citizens who form the component parts of the state should be moulded in such a way as will suit the form of Government under which citizens live. Hence Aristotle emphasised the supreme importance of state-directed education.

Education, according to Aristotle, must follow the order of nature of human development. It should begin with the body and end with the intellect. Physical growth should receive chief attention in infancy with liberal provision for the nourishment of the body. Up to the age of five children should not learn but only play. The youth should be free from vile and vulgar stories and objects. After childhood, they should be trained in mild gymnastics. Beauty, grace and symmetry of body should be the principal objects of gymnastic. This will be followed by intellectual education. Reading, writing and drawing should be taught for their utility and music for recreation. In his scheme of education, music is given an important place but the youth is strictly forbidden to play upon musical instruments as it involves manual labour and as such unworthy of the Greeks. Then there is to be a severe course of gymnastics after which a higher course of intellectual culture leading finally to the study of moral philosophy. After the completion of education, men should marry at the age of 37 and women at 18. The physical condition of the married couple is to be regulated by legislators. Thus it appears that Aristotle's scheme of education is almost as idealistic as that of Plato in the *Republic*. It seeks to create an alert mind in an alert body, to combine the Spartan system with the Athenian model.

Criticism. The difference between Aristotle's system of education and the modern system is that under Aristotle's system neither the child nor the family has any voice in choosing the course of education that the child is to receive. Under a uniform system of compulsory education controlled by the state, there is little scope for the development of a child's genius in a special direction. The modern state gives a free scope to all its citizens to receive such education as a citizen likes according to his natural aptitude.

Again the modern age is an age of specialisation. A youthful learner may specialise in any branch of knowledge. He has full freedom of choice in this respect provided he has aptitude for that branch of knowledge. But under a uniform system of education for all as prescribed both by Plato and Aristotle, there is hardly any scope for specialisation in a particular branch of knowledge.

There is a three-fold aim of Aristotle's system of education, namely, political, moral and aesthetic. The greatest emphasis is on the moral value of education which builds up and improves character, or in other words, formation of character rather than acquisition of knowledge is the aim of Aristotle's scheme of education. But we in modern times use education more as a means of acquiring knowledge rather than as a character-forming agency. But the difference is not very fundamental as it is only a shifting of emphasis.

Aristotle's Theory of the Location of Supreme Power in the State. The question of the location of sovereignty was no less acute and controversial in Aristotle's time as it is today. Aristotle in his discussion analyses the implications of the problem from different points of view and thoroughly examines the pros and cons of each of the alternatives which occur to his mind. His discussion on the subject as a whole may be said to be a masterly analysis of the problem though the conclusion he arrived at is not accepted *in toto*.

Aristotle begins his discussion by asking the question,—who should rule—who are to have the supreme power in the state? He answers the question in the following way. Supreme power may reside in (i) the masses, or (ii) the rich, (iii) the nobility, or (iv) the virtuous, or (v) an individual of pre-eminent merit, or (vi) a tyrant. After suggesting the above alternative abodes of the supreme power in the state, Aristotle proceeds to discuss the difficulties and the disagreeable consequences that are likely to follow if supreme power is vested in any one of the above alternative cases. As for example, he points out that if the masses are supreme in a state then this supremacy of the masses is likely to lead to spoliation of the rich by the poor, i.e., of the minority by the majority. In the same way, he points out that in case supreme power is vested in the rich who are generally the minority in a state, this state of things will result in the spoliation of the masses who constitute the majority in a state by the few rich. Similarly, the investment of the nobility with supreme power is likely to exclude the rest of the citizens from the honours of the state resulting in great dissatisfaction among those who are deprived of their legitimate rights. If, on the other hand, one man of pre-eminent virtue become the exclusive holder of supreme power in the state, everybody else being excluded from power will feel dishonoured. Tyranny, he regards, as the worst of all the alternatives and leaves it out of his discussion. Aristotle then attempts to solve the problem of location of sovereignty in another way. He seeks to solve the problem by making law supreme in a state instead of making one individual or number of individuals supreme. But at the same time, it occurs to him that laws may not be perfect. They may have an oligarchical or a democratic bias and in that case the rule of law is very likely to involve disagreeable consequences.

Aristotle deals with this complicated problem in an effective way and comes to the conclusion that "the principle that the multitude ought to be supreme rather than the few best is capable of a satisfactory explanation. For the many,

of whom each is an ordinary person, when they meet together may very likely be better than the few good if regarded not individually but collectively'.

What Aristotle means to say in justifications of his theory of rule by the multitude is that each individual possesses some virtue and prudence and the aggregate of virtue and wisdom of all individuals put together is certainly superior to the wisdom of any single man however pre-eminent he may be in virtue.

Likewise Aristotle applies other tests to prove the claims of the multitude to power in the state. He argues in the same line that the individual wealth of a particular person may be far less than that of a wealthy man but the collective wealth of the masses far exceeds that of the wealthy class. In the same way, if capacity to rule is taken to be a criterion of distribution of power, in that case also, it is possible that the aggregate capacity for government by the masses is generally greater than that of an individual or class of them.

It is necessary to note in this connection that in asserting the supremacy of the multitude, Aristotle assumes that the many referred to in his discussion are not to be taken as a pack of 'dumb driven cattle' but have attained a certain standard of morality.

Thus Aristotle vests the multitude with the supreme power in the state. As a true disciple of Plato and Socrates, Aristotle has however little respect for and confidence in the extreme democracy of Athens. He is conscious of the fact that it is as much dangerous to make the multitude supreme in a state as it is not to make them supreme. He therefore limits the power of the multitude only to the exercise of deliberative and judicial functions and not to be extended to the exercise of executive functions. And even the exercise of these powers, namely, election and scrutiny of official actions, is subject to the ultimate supremacy of law—a law laid down either by a Lycargus or by a Solon. Thus with regard to Aristotle's theory of popular sovereignty, it may be said that what he gives with his one hand he takes away with the other.

The Hellenic and the Universal in Aristotle. Aristotle was, so great a thinker and writer that we find in him two Aristotles—Aristotle, the Greek and Aristotle, the man. Although his historical researches went far beyond the confines of the Hellas, yet he could not overcome the influence of the time and place when and where he lived, thought and wrote.

Aristotle speaks as a Greek when he (i) asserts the superiority of the Greeks over the Non-Greeks. (ii) He is a Greek when he characterises the city-state as the highest form of political organisation. (iii) As a Greek he justified the inherent necessity of slavery as the basis of social and political organisation. (iv) As a Greek he discovered an incompatibility between bread-earning pursuits and other moral and intellectual pursuits and this varity was made the basis of justification of slavery. These are some of the purely Hellenic elements in Aristotle. But if we dive deeper into his writings we find a series of principles which have an abiding interest and are features of political science even today.

Some of the universal elements in Aristotle may be summed up as follows :

- (1) Aristotle laid great stress on the ultimate problem of politics, namely, balancing and reconciliation of liberty and authority. Without voluntary submission of the ruled to the ruler a stable government is impossible.

To him, life in subjection to constitution is not to be regarded as slavery but as highest welfare. This is a modern view of the relationship between liberty and authority.

- (2) Aristotle is refreshingly modern when he says that public opinion and customary laws have great influence on the constitution and he is more modern than a modern politician when he unhesitatingly speaks out that the opinion of the masses are preferable to that of the expert.
- (3) Aristotle's division of governmental functions into the deliberative, the executive and the judicial gave birth to the modern theory of division and separation of powers.
- (4) Modern idea of political checks and balances is a product of Aristotle's theory of the golden mean. Aristotle's doctrine that stability and prosperity are to be found most where extremes of wealth and poverty are unknown and the middle class rules.
- (5) The distinction between state and government was clear to him the former consisting of the whole body of citizens the latter participating in sovereignty.
- (6) Aristotle also points out that the end of the state is not to extend its dominion or to enrich its people but to widen knowledge, to promote virtue and to secure justice. Here he attaches a moral meaning to the state which is now regarded as the basis of the welfare state.
- (7) His criticism of Plato's doctrine of communism may well be directed against modern communism as well.

Epicureans

Epicurus, founder of Epicurianism, was born in the island of Samos and at the age of eighteen moved to Athens where he joined the Platonic Academy twenty-five years after Plato's death and one year after the abrupt end of Alexander's meteoric career.

So the Epicureans were post aristotelians as such they realised the fact that the day of the autonomous city-state was over, that politics could not be the sole occupation of every good citizen, that harmony between the state and the individual had been irrevocably lost and that public affairs could no longer provide proper sphere of good life.

Epicureans found little to accept from Platonic philosophy and so fell back on the main currents of the Sophistic thought. They taught that self was the sum of human interest and being so the only aim of life was nothing but pleasure. They looked upon the state as an artificial creation based on contract. According to them, contract was binding in so far as it was useful as an agreement among individuals in order that they might be secure against violence and injustice. The form of government was a matter of indifference to them provided it ensured peace and order. Epicureanism which inculcated a doctrine of supreme indifference to state affairs arose after the conquest of Greece by Alexander and then by Rome. Epicureanism in course of time degenerated into gross moral corruption repudiating all social duties.

Stoics

Zeno, born in Cyprus, but made Athens his home, was the founder of this school. The **Stoics** like the Epicureans also discovered that the day of the city-

state was over and that politics could no longer provide a career for every good citizen.

The Stoics conceived the nature as the embodiment of supreme universal law. They believed that justice was immanent in nature—a form of universal reason and as such fixed and immutable. Life in conformity with this universal law was the ideal life. It was stoicism which brought into prominence the doctrine of natural law and cosmopolitanism. To them the whole human race was a single indivisible unit. They emphasised the essential equality of men. The Stoic ideals of brotherhood of man and of universal law influenced the formation of the jusgentium, the body of rules which subsequently developed into international law applicable to all nations, liberty, equality and fraternity the watchwords of the French Revolution reflect the stoic doctrines of equality and brotherhood.

SUMMARY

Political philosophy had its rise in ancient Greece in the sense that the Greeks were the first among the ancient people to treat politics as an independent science and to make experimentation on the various forms of government especially democracy. The Greeks developed their political ideas and institutions in a peculiar environment, namely, the *Polis*—city-state comprising a very small area of a few square miles and inhabited by a few thousand of citizens varying between 2,500 and 20,000 together with their women, attendants and slaves—the latter having no share in the affairs of the city-state. Citizenship was thus confined to a small leisured class and the city was the hub of all the activities of the citizens. Pythagoras, a natural philosopher of Greece, interpreted his philosophy in terms of mathematics. He defined political justice as a number. The Sophists who flourished in the 5th Century B.C. were the first systematic writers on political philosophy. They were materialists out and out as is evident from their teachings. They taught the conventional and contractual origin of the state, regarded law as the expression of superior will and inculcated that might was the sole basis of right. To counteract the subversive dogmas of the sophists, Socrates (469—399 B.C.) came into the field of political controversy. He endeavoured to prove the falsity of the sophistic dogmas by preaching that the state had a natural origin, that might was always limited by right, that society was more important than individual and that government being a high public duty should be the business of only the best and the wisest. The core of Socratic philosophy is that virtue is the supreme end of human life, that virtue is inseparable from knowledge and that intellect, the organ of knowledge, is the all-important factor of man. Socrates was condemned to death for his anti-democratic teaching. The unfinished mission of Socrates was taken up by his worthy disciple. Plato (427-347 B.C.) who was determined to combat the ideas of the sophists and to criticise and condemn the contemporary political systems in Greece. Plato's political philosophy is recorded in three of his dialogues, namely, the *Republic*, the *Statesman* and the *Laws*. The *Republic* is, in every sense, Plato's greatest work in which he described the state purely from the ideal point of view, in the second book, he retains the ideal point of view but discusses some practical problems but in the *Laws*, he gives up his idealism altogether and discusses only practical problems. According to Plato, the individual attains perfection only within the state and as such the state has a priority of claim over the allegiance and obedience of its citizens. A just man is he who takes his proper place in the life of the community. A well-ordered state, according to Plato, consists of three classes of citizens, viz., the guardians, the warriors and the producers. In order that the first two classes may be entirely at the service of the state without being distracted by motives of private interest, Plato urges that they will have no family life and no private property. They will live upon contributions made by the producers and the relation between sexes will be determined by a

class of magistrates who will arrange for temporary marriages for the production of the best offspring. This is Plato's Communism in the *Republic* and this was severely criticised by his great disciple Aristotle. Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) was the spiritual child of his master Plato. Though he emphatically repudiated Plato's Communism, most of his ideas were Platonic in origin. Quite unlike Plato, Aristotle discussed all problems from a practical and matter-of-fact point of view. His *Politics* reveals a master mind with encyclopedic knowledge rare even in modern times. His account of the origin and elaborate and exhaustive classification of states, his theory of education and revolution still remain unsurpassed and modern political scientists turn back to Aristotle for clues to the solution of many modern problems.

In Aristotle, we find two elements namely, the Hellenic, i.e., purely Greek or ideal elements, such as, the superiority of the Greeks over the Non-Greeks, the inevitability of slavery along with broad and universal elements like the importance of the influence of public opinion on the constitution and the distinction between state and government.

There arose two other political doctrines, namely, Epicurianism and Stoicism after the fall of the city-state, the ideal of which could no longer provide a career to the post-Aristotelian and post-Alexandrian citizen.

QUESTIONS

1. Discuss the trend of early political thoughts of the Greeks.
2. Discuss the political and social structure of Sparta and Athens. Assess in this connection their contribution to the development of Greek political philosophy.
3. Who were the Sophists, and what was their influence upon Greek political thought? (Gauhati, 1964)
4. Discuss Plato's Communism. How far does it compare with modern communism?
5. "Plato's teachings in the *Republic* and the *Laws* are inconsistent". Critically examine the statement.
6. Examine critically Plato's theory of education, (Gauhati, 1965)
7. How far is it true to say that Aristotle was the 'intellectual child of Plato'? Give reasons for your answer.
8. Discuss Aristotle's theory of slavery. (Gauhati, 1964, '65)
9. Describe after Aristotle the causes of sedition and the forms of revolutions.
10. Discuss the main features of Aristotle's theory of Education and its place in the state, indicating the extent to which it differs from modern theories on the subject.
11. State and examine Plato's ideal state. (Gauhati, 1964)
12. Discuss Aristotle's conception of citizenship and contrast it with the modern conception thereof.
13. Mention after Aristotle the different forms of democracy as also the means of their preservation.
14. Discuss the classification of constitutions as given by Plato and Aristotle. (Gauhati, 1965)
15. Do you agree with the view that Plato's concept of Justice is a search for ensuring a harmonious social order? Give reasons for your answer. (C.U. Hon, 1985)
16. Critically examine Aristotle's views on the origin and nature of the State. (C.U. Hon, 1985)