

3. When people share things, there is more quarrelling, because shared ownership destroys privacy
4. Communism destroys charity – someone else will provide for others.
5. If parts are not happy, the whole can't be happy

Book I – purpose of the political community, answer #2:

- State of political community is the highest form of existence.
- We reach our highest degree of fulfillment not as an individual/family/village, but as part of a state or political community.
- Discusses how states arose from various other forms of existence from the family
- Idea of how family is headed by the eldest male... they are originally all created kinship wise; people are related to each other. What differentiates the state and family is lack of consanguinity. When you're not related to everyone, there's a state. But we need to learn how to care about those who are not blood related to them... Aristotle says that rather than throw out the most powerful tie = family, why don't we expand that and get the best of both.
- Plato says, "forget about blood ties" it's not an efficient idea. Aristotle says "Wait, the most important thing is to care about others. Instead of saying stop caring about your family, take those good emotions and project it onto your whole community." You do that through the practice of creating a political organization. By working politically with others, you gain more appreciation for others.
- Aristotle is very inclusive, Plato is exclusive. Aristotle says even the masses have a role in the state. Plato only cares about the best.
- Talks a little bit about the concept of slavery: some people aren't capable of being their own masters. (page 75) there are some people who simply can't live on their own, and because they are a slave by nature, should be your slave and you take them into your hands and care for them while they're your slave. These are people who are incapable of independent living.

Book III

- How does the polis make people better?
- People can live together for many reasons, but that doesn't make a state. A state is when people have a good life together.
- Defense and exchange don't make a state. But to develop ourselves and to reach our level of human potential and to allow us to care for people who are not our blood ties.

Question #3 – difference between good and bad constitutions, and what the six forms of government are.

Song – The Hollies, He ain't Heavy, He's my Brother (1969)

Class division:

Good: what's good for everyone in the political system kingship, aristocracy, polity

Bad: what's good for me? tyranny, oligarchy, democracy

- Collect tax?

If middle class is large, it will lead to **factions** = you're more focused on your selfish interests than you are on the good of the good of your community. Rich and poor are faction groups.

- Entrepreneurial class is more concerned about the welfare of society, because they sell to everybody; their market is to everybody. (It's like a businessman-wants to make as much money as possible so need to be open to all groups, sell to everybody)
- If country is doing well and the rich *and* poor are involved, then the middle class are doing better. Poor just want money, rich just wants to keep what they have. Only middle class is concerned, because rich are able to withstand a bad economy so they aren't fully concerned.
- That's another reason he's so enamored with middle class; their interests are aligned with the people
- Focus of political theorists: who cares most about people? If rulers' interest is to be good to community, country will do well. If not, then country will likely suffer.

Things that protect government against threats:

1. (page 93) Education: educate people according to that form of government. If you want an oligarchy, teach them with that. He uses the words: "**spirit of the constitution**" = educate according to the spirit of the constitution. If you grow up in a monarchy, your duty is to obey, and you're taught why it's important to listen to the ruler.
2. (page 90) breaking the law in small ways is worse than breaking the law in major ways because you don't realize it's negatively affecting something when you break it small. **Enforce all laws equally**
3. if people stay in government for long time, they have vested interest leads to bad results... need to have **term limits** on people's service, to prevent them from co-opting government in their own interests
4. (pg 91): "invent terrors and bring distant dangers near" after 9/11, patriotism was high. You feel a need for security. So they need promote the people's dependence on government for security. – if you invent terrors, the people become afraid of it, and then they are 'glad' the government is helping them. – you're making people respect the government
5. if there's a depression and almost nobody has enough money to vote, that's not good. Similarly, if there's inflation which is also bad. You need to make sure you use economic rules to restrict the franchise. He's essentially talking about: "updating laws to reflect economic conditions" if you're not good at changing things to reflect what's going on, you're going to go through a crises.
6. Disperse rather than concentrate honors. Make more people feel honored than rather than a few- it prevents people from becoming rivals
7. (pg 92): separation of powers: checks and balances so they can check each other. A lot of madison's ideas came from Aristotle.

Augustine's principal contribution: idea of history. Ancient histories saw it as a cycle. But Augustine believed in the idea of progress, we're ultimately getting better and learning more. Old forms of government are being supplanted by better ideas.

Instead of history being a cycle, it was progress.

During this time there's a tremendous linkage between religious and political leads.

Ban on clerical marriage was created to prevent people's estates from leaving the church, because under law at the time you could not change inherits. Church's estates would be dissipated if priests had children. That's how they came up the idea of celibacy.

That's one of the reasons the church became so powerful – because it owns more land than anybody in the US or NYC. They kept their land together.

Thomas Aquinas is largely known for the notion of **civil disobedience**: all laws must be consistent with god's law, you not only have a right but a duty to disobey laws that hurt the church.

What brought this all to an end: the Reformation.

When people began to ask questions about religion, which lead to questions in politics.

In reformation was questioning called the "divine right to rule" most leaders then claimed to have the right to rule from god's anointment, but people questioned god, so why do they have listen to the rules, so why listen to the ruler?

10.24.12

- First two writers were academics – Plato and Aristotle – equivalent of professors in ancient Greeks
- Machiavelli was actually involved in politics as well as in writing about it.
- Book that is written to some extent for posterity, but mainly as a handbook for what a ruler should do in the sixteenth century

Question #1:

- Plato discussed with Glaucon the perfect society. Machiavelli says it's better to write about the real truth than the imagination of it. People live so far from reality, but were so far away from that. He's writing about what people actually do, vs Plato who deals with things that are unrealistic.
- How do we know this passage refers to Plato if he doesn't say Plato's name?
- It's a waste of time and also harmful.
- Machiavelli is saying your perspective on politics should be that you can't think of perfection when you're thinking about politics. Because we don't live in a world of bests, we live in a world of the best attainable, not the rest theoretical. You have to learn not to act virtuously. Meaning, doing things the way you're supposed to do them will not necessarily make you successful. Sometimes you have to un-learn what society wants you to do/what they say is what you're supposed to do.
- Glaucon's position – you determine your own interest, way you get there: sometimes breaking society's rules, sometimes keeping it. Whatever works for your interests

the same rights too. You won't be harmed because you'll be in the same position as them. Idea of **mutual forbearance, or mutual surrendering of rights**. The only right you can never give up is the right to preserve yourself. No one can ever say "kill yourself."

State of Nature:

Page 129: key concept > if each person only stands for himself, it won't last very long. There's no time in the state of nature because you don't know if you'll be alive in the next day, hour, or minute. You can't plan in nature because you don't know. The state of nature (life without a government) is so chaotic, so people can't plan that way.

Time is the key concept. We live our lives by planning, but if we can't plan, there goes the purpose of our existence.

State of nature – life without a government, is **the absence of time**, no planning, no certainty. Difference between own and possess: own – you have a right to it, possess – you merely have it. Justice & Injustice do not exist in the state of nature, because you need laws.

Process by which people escape state of Nature and form the Leviathan:

Page 138

People only join together for security, against the enemy, this group is called the Leviathan = state/government. The people create a political unit, or Commonwealth = group of people. Leviathan is the state of government. Difference between American people and American government.

Now that everyone is gathered, they **choose** to give up their power to the leader/sovereign. By the **plurality of voices**. Whatever the majority votes, that is the answer. Their second decision is they create a leader.

Can the people really have a contract with their leader?

He gives them security, they give him power.

They agree not to get rid of him (page 140-141) they committed to him.

You can't grant power based on conditions/contracts. This is a donation of power to sovereign.

Because he can force us to obey, we can't do anything to him. Reason we can't hold him accountable because (141)

Sovereign cannot be obligated to people. If he was, they were in position of judging the sovereign, which brings us back to civil war. (This happened in England in 1669.)

Essentially, Hobbes' argument comes down to:

1. Preserve your life, seek peace
2. Absolute rule/obligation is necessary for peace
3. Therefore, you must obey the sovereign

Powers of the Ruler: this list is identical to Plato's Guardians

1. Rule of all
2. No limits on rulers' actions
3. Immunity from challenge
4. Censorships of speech and writing
5. Make laws
6. Judge all disputes

11.14.12

- ⇒ books 2 & 9, discussed why administrators had to fear because the rulers have complete control over them and subjects can threaten them to complain.
- ⇒ Rulers should fear because (A) they depend on administrators, (B) revolt through severe punishment, (C) successful coups

Letters 155, 158

Incredibly powerful person feeling unpowerful. Why? he feels like he's not in power, he has no control. His control/power is illusory it suddenly strikes him that he has no idea of what's going on, he just has letters.

How will it help him – he doesn't have control so punishes people who supposedly care about because that's his only way of power

Feels "below worthless scum of humankind" because he has realized that with all the riches in the world he can't get what he wants – myth of King Midas turned everything into gold but he couldn't eat gold so died of starvation

This king doesn't have the love. Nobody does anything he wants because they care about him, only because of fear. And ultimately he's powerless. With him there, why should they fear him if he's so far away. If they violate his commands, what can he do if he is far away?

Difference in our government because we have a respect for law. So Montesquieu is attacking Machiavelli's idea of fear is the best. Montesquieu says fear loses its power, and if all you have left and can rely on is fear, people won't obey. A ruler will realize that only when he is there and willing to do things himself does he have control, and he can't trust anyone (213) so he destroyed any communal feeling and created situation where people care only about themselves

Ultimately he's lonely. Doesn't have single friend in kingdom

Only people respond to his offer with / for money because there's something they can gain.

Pure commercial exchange, nobody actually cares about him – loneliness of despot.

Despotism is founded upon an eradication of ultimate communal ties. When you have despotic rule, there's no idea of society anymore.

Picture here, stunning. Because he is saying absolute rulers have no friends. They're lonely and just make everyone afraid of them.

Montesquieu is saying absolute power is not worth pursuing. It harms administrators, rulers and people. But he's addressing this to administrators mainly. His message is to French nobility. Saying Louis XIV lonely old man who thought he had everything he wanted but he really didn't. This is a hint to Louis XV and other administrators in the future.

Showing: despotism while superficially attractive ultimately leads people to despair. If that's the case, there goes the principal reason for why you should be despotic ruler.

c. Agency: h and L have theory

H: gov will automatically act for your good

L; they can violate ur right, so ur have right to kick them ou

Agency law: you give someone

Power of attorney is an act of agency. Meaning, someone who has power of attorney will do whatever is the interest of the person who gave you the power of attorney. Hobbes would say she can never take back the power. Lockian concept of agency – she can take it back if she realizes you're not using it in her good. Bec she retains the right terminate agency, to vote ppl out of office or remake gov

2. Laws must consist in **known and settled laws**

a. Laws must be announced in advance, and there has to be some idea of stability.

Concept is like *ex post facto* you cant make law that is retroactive.

3. Since gov's primary purpose to protect ppl's rights, ppl and representative must authorize in advance must authorize taxation (taking property) it can't do that under basic lockian const. Locke says they can only do it if there is authorization. "no taxation without representation" this was one of the big complaints made by American colonists.
4. **Non-delegation doctrine:** idea that legislative power must always be exercised by legislature. So it cant say to president or court "make up laws because we're too busy to do it" way this has been interpreted in modern age: if legislature gives court or president power to make rules, it must give them standards to go by, i.e.: to protect against hazardous food,

Question #6: How does Locke define executive power? How does this differ from federative power? What is prerogative and why is it so dangerous to individual liberties?

- Exec. in country
- Federative power: foreign relations
- We know legislature can make up laws that govern domestic affairs.
- Locke says you can't govern foreign affairs by law, (section 147, page 183)
- Foreign affairs involve activities that happen without state's prediction. You cant predict when bomb will go off by terrorist, that is executive. Executive acts on his own in foreign affairs, he represents state and has almost total discretion
- In domestic affairs, duty of executive is to enforce law so he is more tightly constrained
 - o **Judiciary power:** there is no independent power for Locke. It's part of same power of executive. Judges are part of exec, bec judges are part of executive. its not just police, judges and jailers are involved in criminal justice process.
 - o at time he wrote this was largely true bec of idea of judicial independence hasn't been accepted anywhere in world
 - o In colonies, judge make decision that judge or general didnt like, they could be fired or transferred random

three branches of gov and they have diff names and positions

Judicial independence: subject to chief executive. Subjects work for chief executives.

Executive power does have important components:

ideas were regarded by British monarchs were anathema – real threat to state so he was thrown into exile.

L would be hero, which gets us into next part. Situations in which people are justified in taking power back (second to last question)

When does government **rebel**?

1. Executive assumes legislative powers
 - a. They broke the constitution, and contract with people (L believes in contract with people and government,) because under Constitution, those two branches are separate.
 - b. English leaders didn't like what L was doing – criticizing monarchy on two occasions
 - i. Charles 1st dismissed parliament and ruled as autocrat. There was no legislature / parliament. This is the rebellion of king against people
 - ii. In 1680's when King James the 2nd dispensed with many laws and appointed to power whoever he wanted to, no those authorized by parliament.
 - iii. Locke would point to these and say the government broke constitution, so people can take power back and form new government.

2. When government violates the people's rights
 - a. Government is formed to protect peoples' rights when it fails to do so people are justified in rebelling
 - b. Thomas Jefferson stole that from John Locke and wrote it in the Declaration of Independence.

Locke is a hero in two countries because he justified both revolutions (two scenarios above)

3. When government fails to protect citizens
 - a. Hobbes would agree with this.
 - b. i.e.: William Orange invaded England in 1688, James the II ran away to France, to hang out and avoid the imminent attack. – he abdicated, and when parliament met next, they declared throne vacant.
 - c. Also, 1786 with Shay's Rebellion: bunch of farmers in Massachusetts didn't want their property foreclosed, got guns and occupied courthouses. There were no police, army was dismantled, army sent home. No one could protect court houses against these thugs – indication that the government failed its fundamental purpose, it couldn't put down the rebellion. And so we re-created our government, largely founded upon the English principles created in their new constitution in 1689.

Locke is remembered for 4 things

1. Concept of limited government
 - a. Theoretical limit, because rights of people come first, government protects rights, not just lives.
2. Impersonality of authority
 - a. Success of government was the structure, not necessarily *who was in charge*. he wasn't willing to "hold out for a hero" because structure of constitution would

protect the people

b. Hobbes was all about personalized authority.

3. Theory of Property

a. At first, sounds like he justifies unlimited acquisition (as long as you eat your peas and don't be a pig, you can gain as much land and good.) "work as hard as you can and turn your surplus into good." Carl Marx used L's writing in a different way. "if you die with property, you wasted it." Marx believed there was no thing as legitimate inheritance. If you don't use it, it goes to the people. So no one can become healthy if someone else is starving. Marx reads Locke of a different definition of property. This was the inspiration for communism

4. Morality is not identical to legality

a. There is nothing wrong with religion – it isn't a force for dissent with the government. People recognize they have spiritual and secular lives, they can deal with this dichotomy.

b. He accepted people lived two lives

Despite fact that Locke believed in separation of powers, recognized need for executive prerogative

- Executive emergency powers
- Still an area that is debatable
- Our Constitution is not as broad as Locke's ideas

MONTESQUIEU

- Persian letter made him famous, resigned job in government, and continued to work in his family wine business
- Enamored with England, so moved there for 2 years
- He did not actually write "Spirit of the Laws" because he had bad eye sight
- No work that embodies what our constitution is about, before this.
- Used words like "laws" in different forms – laws of god, sociology, politics, nature, etc. he accounted for them all
- We can only affect political laws, but there are many other laws that we can't change, so government must recognize other laws and create political system consistent with them so there is least friction
- Test of political order is efficiency.
- Page 218: purpose of laws is to recognize were part of universe that controls us. People might forget laws

Montesquieu's idea of preservation:

(218)

1. First law of nature: seek peace and don't fight,
 - a. Comes from diff place than Hobbes. From M, comes from weak place – State of Nature isn't conquest, it's fear. For H, it's conquest
 - b. Yes, we are equal and want peace, but no we are not out to kill anybody

(256) Source of inequality between men; how this lead to creation of state. Liberty is lost when you get property. As soon as you have property, you begin relationships –i.e. head of family, head of property. It creates obligations.

As property is necessary for people to find work – because it's not all free, that means we begin to develop 2 classes of people

1. Employers/masters
2. Employees/servants

This is unstable. Process of property → chaos that makes us need a political state. Effect of these relationships is inequality – some are wealthy and some are poor.

SON = equality

Society: inequality, based upon economic power.

When there is inequality, we have envy – poor wants to be like rich. So they attack property of wealthy (262) which leads to chaos.

- In order to deal with this, create **social contract**
- (263) rich tells poor: let's make deal that we won't hurt each other. The form it takes is going to protect people's rights: **Lockean concept**. It's not a Hobbesian concept. How can the same social contract free Lockeans but enslave Rousseauvians?
- Rousseau's – it doesn't help poor, because they don't have property. The social contract only protects property.
- 264 – poor thought it would help them, so they agreed. It's the idea of "we'll fix it, everyone keeps what they have" poor didn't realize this political institution would be bad for them
- it's absurd (265) for poor to agree to this, they gave away the only thing they had which was property.
- R says: it sounds good but you forgot about economics. H and L focus on protection of rights, but they forget about the fact that poor have to eat. These social contracts omit the necessities of life.

Introduction of economic criteria when it comes to moral government.

R: L and H's contracts are bad because it doesn't preserve your life, it only preserves your property. There's no duty for ruler to feed you. How you eat is not the sovereign's business – idea of conservatives these days.

Characteristics people produce by social contract: page 266. Society based upon appearance, which leads to:

- Mont: best way to run state is based on honor.
- R: pursuit of honor/looking good in eyes of others makes us all hypocrites. We are not true to ourselves anymore; we are prisoners of a state.

267: effect of inequality is two fold

1. Institutionalized starvation: poor are not being taken care of in state that focuses on property
2. Spiritual starvation: nobody is free to be himself; everyone has to be everyone else. Way

- Hobbes says it's the same thing – just someone who doesn't like it
- The first 3 forms (left) of government are ruling for GW, the second three (right) are for the corporate wills or government.

Q#13: How can the people retain their freedom and prevent usurpation and tyranny by government officials? Explain Rousseau's proposal for periodic constitutional conventions.

(III:12,13, 18

- Chapter 15: people need to be actively involved
- Active citizenry
- Responsibility people have – be very involved, can't be passive,
- Page 287: highlighted, must be constant civic vigilance.
- Procedure that can keep the government in accordance with the GW: (288) periodical assemblies to re-determine whether government is doing its job/whether anything needs fixing or changing. 2 questions that must be asked at these periodic elections:
 1. Does it please the sovereign to preserve the present form of government? i.e.: do we want to keep our constitution? (we have this in Article 5 of the constitution: if 2/3 of both houses of congress or 2/3 of state legislatures pass resolution calling for constitution convention, one must be called.) radical, but allows him to preserve argument that people choose government. Because if people don't actively reaffirm the constitution periodically, they won't really be free. We don't really do this!
 2. Does it please the people to leave its administration in the hands of those who are actually in charge of it? – this we do!

Q#14 What provision should the government make for emergency executive powers? What problem might this mechanism create? (VI:6)

Two scenarios this would happen:

1. put one person in charge, still enforcing the laws
2. elect a dictator

Modeling it on the procedure in ancient Rome – but not more than 6 months. People could pic dictatorial power.

His idea of emergency power differs from Locke's prerogative: prerogative: power to make orders where there are no laws and sometimes make laws against the current law. Its inherent in office, only limited by people/legislature otherwise the power will increase.

R doesn't believe in exec prerogative: because that's corporate will. No limits on a dictator.

L's prerogative is over time but limited.

Tall and narrow (Rousseau) vs. wide and fat (Locke)

His exec power emergency is for specific purpose... when purpose is served go back to regular power. He recognizes there is no sure way to do this. But if it's short the pressure will be to give it up quickly.

Hitler is an example of unlimited dictatorial power with no duration limit.

opinion is right and everyone claims to be right.

- Idea of leveling: now masses are pulling down those on top. Is it merely going to be destruction of everything achieved before, or will there be new excellence?
- If we tear down what used to be important, what are we putting in place?
 - o Idea of destroying Bagdad – destroying, it but what do we do now? same idea , didn't have answer for several years.
- Once get rid of aristocracy, need to create something. How to set up? Need guidelines.
- 299 – need to create new branch of studies called democracy studies “a new science of politics is needed for a new world.” We need to study demo as set of political institutions. Because someday it's coming here, and revolution will make it closer.
- What is he afraid of? Bad outcome? – (page 303) people, in attempt to be equal, will only think about self interest, so people on bottom will want to drag down people on top. They want equality more than liberty.
 - o Idea of Xenophon – would rather be poor and on welfare because people will just say
 - o T fears what Romney tried to talk about it during his campaign.
 - o He's worried about pulling down, without going back up.
- So poor can pull down rich, but something else that can happen, a possible good outcome:
- P 301: we could imagine good scenario, where people rationally obey law in which they make
- Which way we are going is up in the air
- Fear about Europe (p 302), since with the destruction of aristocracy, there's a lack of communal feeling. People don't care about each other anymore. Everyone is in it for themselves. He laments the loss of aristocratic values. It's from loss of hierarchical structure of society. in aristocratic society, everyone tied up in same thing. Those up in power are responsible for everyone else.
- T and Montesquieu were from same social class, and were both afraid of this. We are seeing their fears.
- There's a spectrum:

p301, radical democracy that works well-----chaotic demo p 303 that won't end up well. Europe can end up on any side of the spectrum.

- When T writes, Democracy is a bad word
- Those in France thought of Demo same way as people thought about communism in 1950s.
- And then he says “we are becoming democratic and we don't have a choice about this.”
- T was largely right. Since then, most countries have turned to democracies as their form of government.
- He said the USA is closer to the left of spectrum (radical demo) but not as good as it could be.
- He's inventing new type of politics. Now we have classes on this sentence that he said “a new science of government is needed for a new type of politics”

2. We didn't have industrialization. We were a small time country. He recognized that factories got bigger as factories imported. Workman becomes weaker, more limited, more dependent. Separation of employers and employees is destroying the worker and making the employer rich. We don't have a welfare state, this was a warning to friends of democracy.. if anything happens to democracy, is because of the exploitation of the worker. He preceded marks in this idea
3. Russia at this time was not a large participant in international affairs, it was a backward country... "there are now 2 great nations advancing to same goal. Both growing, advancing. One is America the other is Russia. Both different, paths never pass each other. But they both will hold destinies of world.... . He foresaw the Cold War.

KARL MARX

Marxism: less scary now than years ago. He was dominant philosophy of soviet bloc. Most his ideas are not original, you can see strong influences from plato, locke and rousseau. He put together ideas that existed, in a new way to create a theory. he tried to do 4 economics what tocq did for politics.

T talked about the world making people more equal, and had more opportunity to participate in politics and we would be world dominated by democratic countries. Marx tapped into what he saw about industrial revolution – idea that world was becoming unequal economically when it was becoming more equal in political participation.

Idea that things are getting worse and worse

Song of Billy Joel. People saw their futures or future of their children.. lost hope.

Same type of frustrations that Marx wrote about and why he appealed to working man in Europe.

Marx worked for newspapers. Wrote for many of them, including NY Herald Tribune.

- Shared with Locke that all value comes from mixing labor with objects and nature that are otherwise useless, (labor theory of value) and money facilitates trade..
- Shares with R that protection of property rights is only important for rich because they're the only who have property. Poor don't benefit. He latched onto R's argument about how rich coopted the poor into social contract that protects property.
- Protection of property for all, which meant really protection for few that participated in the class system that dominated all economic systems
- The class conflicts between rich and poor – employers and employees, that he saw as engine between all political change in the world

Forces is based on what we control. If we only own labor, we are the employer (2)

Relations of production are relations of master servant. (3)

Add relations to forces of production, you get mode of production

Forces + relations = mode of production. (4) This is the base of society.

Economic system determines the political system. Our economic system determined by companies who make things. Base of society is who is in control economically. Economics comes before politics. (4)

Base of society determines the superstructure: (5) law, politics, religion. Dependent on economic system