

 **QUESTION**

Question I. Comment on Locke's idea of legislative supremacy

 **FLOW SNAPSHOT**

Introduction 1 → state of nature inconveniences → settled law / security of life, liberty, property → community first, government later

Introduction 2 → society prior to government → government derivative / trust-based → legislature supreme while government subsists

Body Flow → majority rule after society → legislative supreme within government → executive / federative subordinate → law over will → public good / natural law / consent / property limits → no arbitrary decrees / no taking without consent / no transfer of law-making power

Critical / Opposite View → where is sovereignty located? community / legislature / mixed constitution? → natural law and popular right remain the final check

Conclusion 1 → legislative supremacy = supremacy of law-making in a limited constitutional state

Conclusion 2 → legislature highest in government; people remain final judge when trust is broken

John Locke makes **legislative supremacy** the heart of civil government. Men leave the **state of nature** to secure **life, liberty, and property** through settled law. They first form a community and then create government.

So, government is derivative, not original. After society is formed, **majority rule** operates. Hence, while government subsists, *“the legislative is the supreme power”*. The **executive and federative powers** are subordinate to it.

This is rule through law, not kingly will. But it is never unlimited. The legislature exists for the **public good** and preservation of property in the wide sense of life, liberty, and estate. Locke says, *“The Law of Nature stands as an Eternal Rule to all Men, Legislators as well as others”*. So the legislature cannot govern by arbitrary decrees, cannot take property without consent, and *“the legislative cannot transfer the power of making laws to any other hands”*.

Still, the legislature is not an uncontrolled sovereign. Society is prior to government. When trust is broken, *“the community perpetually retains a supreme power of saving themselves”* against rulers who attack liberty and property.

According to **Peter Laslett**, the language of trust means governors are limited to the good of the governed. According to **Charles Edwin Vaughan** and **Ernest Barker**, Locke’s doctrine of sovereignty appears unclear.

According to **George H. Sabine**, authority in Locke works at several levels. The deeper point is clear: Locke places legislation under **natural law, consent, and constitutional restraint**.

Locke's legislative supremacy is the supremacy of law-making within a limited state. The legislature is highest inside government, but not above natural law or the people's right to remove a broken trust.

QUOTES

- **John Locke**, in *Two Treatises of Government*, §150: "In all cases, whilst the government subsists, the legislative is the supreme power."
- **Alex Tuckness**, in "Locke's Political Philosophy": "When Locke says that the legislative is supreme over the executive, he is not saying that parliament is supreme over the king."
- **Ernest Barker**, in the Introduction to *Social Contract*: "Locke has no clear view of the nature or residence of sovereignty."
- **John T. Scott**, in "The Sovereignless State and Locke's Language of Obligation": "Rather than define the state in terms of a single sovereign authority, Locke constructs a sovereignless commonwealth with several coexisting claimants to supreme authority."

DISCUSSION VIDEO

In the discussion video, you will find:

A closer explanation of three linked ideas: legislative supremacy inside government, fiduciary limits on law-making, and the people's residual authority when trust breaks. The discussion goes beyond the written answer by showing why Locke cannot be read either as a defender of unlimited legislative power or as a theorist of one undivided sovereign.

QUESTION

Question 2. Comment on **Aristotle's** defence of the rule of law.

FLOW SNAPSHOT

Introduction 1 → politics as master art / polis for good life → common good → law above private will.

Introduction 2 → break from philosopher-king / distrust of unrestrained wisdom → law, not the ruler, as final guide.

Body Flow → law = reason without desire → ruler vulnerable to passion / bias / self-interest → settled law + accumulated wisdom > single judgement → justice/common interest/stability → office, deliberation, citizenship under law → best possible constitutional order, not perfect-man rule.

Critical / Opposite View → rare exceptional man / law's universality misses hard cases / exclusionary polis.

Conclusion 1 → anti-arbitrary power / impersonal law binds office.

Conclusion 2 → narrow ancient setting / early root of constitutional rule.

MODEL ANSWER

According to **Aristotle**, politics is a master science because the state exists for the good life, not mere life. Within that moral purpose, **rule of law** becomes necessary. He does not trust unrestrained personal wisdom. His defence of law is therefore ethical, practical and constitutional, and it marks a clear move away from **Plato**'s philosopher king.

According to **Aristotle**, law is fairer and less arbitrary than personal rule because it is not driven by personal feeling. Law and reason have the same purpose. Both guide right action. Hence he says, "Law is a reason without passion". This is the core of his defence.

A ruler, however wise, remains open to passion, bias and self-interest. Law, by contrast, expresses settled reason. It also carries the collective wisdom of ages, which is superior to the judgement of even the wisest individual ruler. That is why **rule of law** is superior to rule by personal wisdom.

This defence also grows out of **Aristotle**'s wider view of justice and stability. He links politics with the common interest and holds that "When perfected, man is the best of animals, but when separated from law and justice, he is the worst of all".

According to **Aristotle**, no form of government remains stable without checks on power, because power and virtue cannot safely coexist without restraint. Therefore, public office, deliberation and citizenship must work under law. His best practicable order is not the rule of a perfect man, but a constitutional order where power is limited.

His position is also realistic. Even if law can be rigid or silent in some situations, he still prefers it in the spirit of the **golden mean**. One should not sacrifice the good for the sake of the best.

Plato himself moved closer to this view in *The Laws*. **Aristotle's** defence of law thus becomes one of the earliest foundations of **constitutionalism**. This **rule of law** still worked within a small and exclusionary polis. But his central claim remains strong: power must be bound by impersonal law, not trusted to personal virtue alone.

🔍 QUOTES

• **Aristotle**, in *Politics*: “He who bids the law rule may be deemed to bid God and Reason alone rule.”

• **Christoph Horn**, in *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*: “Aristotle justifies the rule of law by pointing out its rationality, stability, and impartiality.”

• **Pierre Pellegrin**, in *The Oxford Handbook of Aristotle*: “Importantly, Aristotle’s exclusion of many human beings from the political sphere becomes even clearer with the existence of what he calls ‘slaves by nature.’”

• **Jeremy Waldron**, in *“The Rule of Law”*: “The heritage of argument about the Rule of Law begins with Aristotle.”

📺 DISCUSSION VIDEO

In the discussion video, you will find: The three linked ideas: the contrast between law and the exceptional ruler, law as rational and educative order, and equity as **Aristotle's** answer to the limit of general rules.

QUESTION

Question . Discuss the relation between education and justice in **Plato's** ideal state.

FLOW SNAPSHOT

Introduction 1 → dikaiosyne / moral order, not mere law → each nature does its own work → justice needs right formation.

Introduction 2 → virtue = knowledge → state as soul writ large → education links reason, spirit, appetite to political order.

Body Flow → public / compulsory / state-directed education → identify dominant element in each soul → assign ruler / auxiliary / producer role → early music-poetry-gymnastics shape character → higher mathematics-dialectic-public service prepare philosopher-rulers → justice = specialisation + non-interference + harmony.

Critical / Opposite View → guardian communism protects rulers from appetite / private interest → but producers stay politically marginal, mobility is narrow, unity can become over-rigid.

Conclusion 1 → justice is the end / education the chief means.

Conclusion 2 → soul turned from opinion to knowledge → harmonious citizenry → harmonious state.

In **Plato**, education and justice are inseparable. Justice in **The Republic** is not mere obedience to law. It is **dikaioisyne**, a moral order in which each person does the work suited to natural aptitude, and no class interferes with another.

Ernest Barker writes, "Justice is, for Plato, at once a part of human virtue and the bond which joins men together in the states". According to **George H. Sabine**, justice is the bond which holds society together.

Following **Socrates**, **Plato** holds that virtue is knowledge. Therefore, a just state can arise only through right education.

Education is public, compulsory, and state-controlled. It is meant to discover the spiritual qualities of the soul, mould character, and build the ideal state. The state is the individual writ large. Reason, spirit, and appetite in the soul appear as rulers, auxiliaries, and producers in the state. Education identifies the dominant element in each soul and trains it accordingly. Hence it becomes the practical instrument of **functional specialisation, non-interference**, and harmony. According to **G. R. F. Ferrari**, justice is doing one's part, and a just city is arranged so that each person does his part.

The scheme is a gradual filtration. Early training shapes manners, stories, music, and character. Then come gymnastics, science, poetry, and military discipline. At higher stages, selected men and women study mathematics, astronomy, logic, and dialectics, followed by practical training in public affairs up to philosopher-rule. Combining **Spartan discipline** with **Athenian intellectual cultivation**, this system turns the soul from opinion to knowledge and finally towards the **Idea of Good**. **George H. Sabine** says, "Plato's plan ... is therefore, for a state-controlled system of compulsory

education” . According to **George Klosko**, Platonic education is primarily a moulding of souls, and according to **Richard Lewis Nettleship**, it offers a formula for dividing work and achieving harmonious cooperation.

Once education creates this just spirit, **communism of property and family** among guardians protects it against corruption by appetite. But the scheme is rigid. It neglects the producing class, limits mobility, and gives great power to the educated guardian class. According to **Ernest Barker**, **Plato’s** ideal state is a consequence of his system of education. Thus, in **Plato’s** ideal state, justice is the end and education is the chief means.

🔗 QUOTES

- **Plato, *The Republic***: “Education is not what some people proclaim it to be... Like putting sight into eyes which were blind.” This is the cleanest line for showing that education, for **Plato**, is reorientation of the soul, not information transfer.
- **George Klosko, *The Development of Plato’s Political Theory***: “Platonic education is primarily a moulding of souls.”
- **Aristotle, *Politics***: “there is a point at which a state may attain such a degree of unity as to be no longer a state.” This is the strongest short critic line against **Plato’s** over-centralised unity.
- **Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies***: “Arrest all political change! Change is evil, rest divine”. This is a sharp modern critical line for discussing the authoritarian tendency in **Plato’s** educational state.

📺 DISCUSSION VIDEO

In the discussion video, you will find: Justice as ordered harmony, education as the turning of the soul, and guardian communism as a device against corruption. You will understand why **Plato’s** ideal attracts both admiration for its moral seriousness and criticism for its rigidity.

QUESTION

Question . Discuss **Machiavelli's** notion of **virtu** and examine its relation to **fortuna**.

FLOW SNAPSHOT

Introduction 1 → virtu doesn't mean moral goodness / political excellence / acquisition + preservation of the state / action in the real world.

Introduction 2 → chance, instability, upheaval / fortuna not total fate / human agency survives / virtu as the answer to contingency.

Body Flow → boldness + shrewdness + adaptability → law/force, lion/fox → success + state preservation over moral purity → fortuna as flood/chance/destruction → timing, force, change of method → from prince to republic / liberty, virtue, corruption.

Critical / Opposite View → private virtue vs public necessity / two moral codes / unease over ethics and politics.

Conclusion 1 → fortune remains strong / prepared intelligence + adaptive action can limit its damage.

Conclusion 2 → princely skill widens into civic virtue / laws + anti-corruption sustain liberty in republics.

Machiavelli does not consider **virtu** as moral goodness. In his realist view of politics, it means functional excellence in statecraft. It is the quality by which a prince acquires power, preserves the state, and deals with changing situations. That is why it differs sharply from **Aristotle's** moral virtue and **Socrates'** fixed ethics.

Machiavelli links **virtu** with boldness, shrewdness, adaptability, and mastery in the use of power. A ruler is virtuous when he can use virtues and vices, law and force, lion and fox, as the situation requires. According to **Quentin Skinner**, **virtu** is the capacity to shape circumstances rather than be shaped by them. So **Niccolo Machiavelli** judges the ruler by success and state preservation, not by complete goodness.

Its meaning becomes clearer in relation to **fortuna**. **Fortuna** appears as a source of good and evil, but mainly of misery, disaster, and blind destruction. It works like floods and other forces of nature. **Machiavelli** therefore says that it is "better to be adventurous than cautious, because Fortune is a woman and lets herself be mastered by the bold". **Fortuna** may shape events, but it does not remove human agency. It tests whether the prince has courage, timing, and the will to act.

Hence, virtue is preparation to fight **fortuna**. It is the ability to read the moment, change conduct from good to evil if required, and act with force when caution will fail. The later discussion does not confine **virtù** to the prince alone. According to **J. G. A. Pocock**, republics too require collective **virtù** to resist corruption. According to **Maurizio Viroli**, civic laws direct this energy towards common liberty. According to **Isaiah Berlin**, this reveals a clash between morality and political necessity.

***Machiavelli's** virtue is practical mastery in a world partly ruled by chance. Its full meaning lies in its relation with **fortuna**: fortune remains powerful, but bold intelligence and political skill can limit its damage and turn events towards state preservation.*

🔍 QUOTES

- **Quentin Skinner**: *“the requisite quality of moral flexibility in a prince.”* Strong for defining virtue as adaptive statecraft, not moral goodness.
- **Maurizio Viroli**, in his introduction to *The Prince*: *“what counts as a vice can be redescribed as a virtue, if the necessity to achieve the security of the state so requires.”* Useful for the necessity argument.
- **Isaiah Berlin**, in the lecture later revised as *The Originality of Machiavelli*: *“There are two worlds, that of private virtue and that of public organisation.”* Best used for the criticism that **Machiavelli** opens a gap between ethics and politics.
- **J. G. A. Pocock**, in *The Machiavellian Moment*: *“liberty, virtue and corruption, rather than the location of authority, were its prime concerns.”* Useful when extending virtue from the prince to the republic.

📺 DISCUSSION VIDEO

In the discussion video, you will find: The discussion around virtue as political capacity, fortuna as contingency that can be limited but not removed, and the republican extension of virtue through institutions, law, and anti-corruption thinking. The discussion clarifies why scholars divide between reading **Machiavelli** as a theorist of civic liberty and reading him as the thinker who exposed a deep conflict between morality and political necessity.

QUESTION

Question . Explain **Locke's** doctrine of consent and show why government is only a fiduciary trust.

FLOW SNAPSHOT

Introduction 1 → state of nature / natural law / free-equal-independent persons / rights insecure in practice → civil society by consent.

Introduction 2 → against divine right / no subjection without consent → legitimacy from choice, not birth or conquest.

Body Flow → unanimous formation of community → majority acts for the whole → limited delegation to make / execute / judge law → express + tacit consent → taxation through representatives.

Critical / Opposite View → tacit consent looks thin / residence-travel-inheritance may not show real choice / legitimacy claim exposed to critique.

Conclusion 1 → commonwealth before government → government gets delegated power for public good / preservation of property.

Conclusion 2 → breach of trust / arbitrary rule / taxation without consent / transfer of legislative power → government dissolves, society persists, authority returns to the people.

MODEL ANSWER

According to **John Locke**, political obligation rests on consent, not divine right. His starting point is a state of nature governed by natural law, where men are free, equal, and possess natural rights to life, liberty, and property.

People enter civil society because this condition lacks settled law, an impartial judge, and sure execution. Consent, therefore, is the moral basis of civil authority. According to **John Locke**, “no one can be put out of this Estate ... and subjected to political power of another without his own consent”.

Consent works in two stages. First, individuals unanimously agree to form a community. Second, that community creates government. After society is formed, majority rule operates. According to **John Locke**, they surrender only the powers to make, execute, and judge law; natural rights remain with the people.

According to **Jeremy Waldron**, consent appears in three interlinked contexts: 1) agreement to form the community 2) majority agreement to set up institutions, and 3) consent to taxation, directly or through representatives. According to **John Locke**, express consent is basic to founding, while tacit consent appears in residence, travel, and inheritance. According to **John Dunn**, consent is necessary for legitimacy, but not sufficient to justify every particular act of authority.

According to **John Locke**, government is “only a fiduciary power to act for certain ends”. It is a trust because society is prior to government. The people first create a commonwealth, and then appoint legislative, executive, and federative powers. Government is not a party to the original compact

and has no original power of its own. It receives delegated authority for the public good and for the preservation of property in the broad sense of life, liberty, and estate. According to **Peter Laslett**, the language of trust shows that governors are limited by the end of government, which is the good of the governed.

According to **John Locke**, even the legislature remains under natural law. It cannot rule by arbitrary decrees, take property without consent, or transfer law-making power to other hands. If rulers break this trust, government may be dissolved, but society continues and may create another government. **Locke's** doctrine of consent, therefore, makes government a trustee, not a master.

🔍 QUOTES

• **John Locke**, *Two Treatises of Government*, §149: “the legislative being only a fiduciary power to act for certain ends.”

• **Peter Laslett**, Introduction to *Two Treatises of Government*: “the relation between government and governed is not contractual, for a trust is not a contract.”

• **Jeremy Waldron**, *The Dignity of Legislation*: “So the original consent does a great deal of work in the argument for majority-decision.”

• **David Hume**, *Of the Original Contract*: “such an implied consent can only have place where a man imagines that the matter depends on his choice.”

DISCUSSION VIDEO

In the discussion video, you will find: Explanation of how consent creates the community, how majority rule follows from that act, and why government comes only afterward as a delegated trust. The discussion also takes up the problem of tacit consent and the breach-of-trust point behind dissolution, so the structure of **Locke's** argument becomes much clearer.

QUESTION

Question . Discuss **Aristotle's** theory of citizenship. How far is it compatible with modern democratic citizenship?

FLOW SNAPSHOT

Introduction 1 → polis as natural / highest community → good life, not mere life → man as political animal → citizenship as participation, not residence/descent

Introduction 2 → politics tied to ethics → citizen as moral-public role → deliberation, judgment, virtue, civic training

Body Flow → citizen = share in deliberative/judicial office → rule + obey in turn → good citizen / good man link but not full identity in every regime → leisure / education / property / experience → civic virtue + constitution + law

Critical / Opposite View → participatory core still useful; but modern democratic citizenship rests on equal status, wider inclusion, representation, scale, plurality → Aristotle's exclusions and proportional equality sharply limit compatibility

Conclusion 1 → not fully compatible in extent / remains relevant in spirit: participation + common good over passive legalism

Conclusion 2 → modern democracy keeps civic virtue, deliberation, rule of law; rejects slavery, patriarchy, narrow citizen body, small homogeneous polis

According to **Aristotle**, citizenship grows out of his teleological view of the state. The polis is the highest natural community and exists “for the sake of a good life, and not for the sake of life only”. Since man is by nature a political animal, citizenship is not fixed by mere residence, descent, race or the possession of rights. It is a bond created by intimacy and participation in public affairs.

A citizen is one who shares in deliberative and judicial office. Politics and ethics are closely related, so citizenship is a moral and public role. For **Aristotle**, the citizen must have leisure, property, education and experience. He must be able to rule and be ruled. A good citizen lives in harmony with the constitution, receives civic education, and has moral virtue.

A good citizen is close to the good man because both require cooperation, tolerance and self-control. As **Nicomachean Ethics** says, politics seeks “the attainment of a good and honourable life of the members of the community”. According to **William Ebenstein**, **Aristotle’s** citizen is the economically independent gentleman with enough education and leisure for active citizenship.

This theory is only partly compatible with modern democratic citizenship. It remains important because it treats citizenship as duty and participation, not merely as a formal status. His stress on civic virtue, education, deliberation, rule of law, and the need to rule and be ruled still fits democratic life.

But the difference is greater. **Aristotle** excludes women, slaves, workers, tradesmen, children, the elderly and aliens. Property and leisure become the basis of citizenship. His defence of natural inequality, patriarchy and

slavery narrows the citizen body. His wider idea of equality is proportionate, not universal. His polis is also small and homogeneous, unlike modern large and plural societies.

Aristotle is not fully compatible with modern democratic citizenship in extent. But he remains relevant because he shows that citizenship without real participation and commitment to the common good is only a formal status.

🔗 QUOTES

- **Quentin Skinner:** “The understanding of citizenship in active and participative terms presupposes public service.”
- **T. H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class*:** “Citizenship is a status bestowed on all those who are full members of a community.”
- **Benjamin Constant:** “The aim of the ancients was the sharing of social power among the citizens of the same fatherland.”

📺 DISCUSSION VIDEO

In the discussion video, you will find: Aristotle’s teleological view of the polis, his idea of the citizen as an office-holder formed through virtue and education, and the precise limits of his fit with modern democratic citizenship. The discussion also clarifies why his stress on participation still remains valuable even after modern democracy rejects his exclusions, hierarchy, and narrow social base.

QUESTION

Question . Critically examine the apparent tension between princely power in *The Prince* and republican liberty in the *Discourses*.

FLOW SNAPSHOT

Introduction 1 → apparent contradiction / prince for emergency order / republic for free civic order

Introduction 2 → founding / reform / rescue of a corrupt state → preservation of a law-bound free order

Body Flow → The Prince / force-craft-fear in danger → Discourses / Roman liberty-laws-citizens → shared concern: state security, stability, greatness, people's welfare → prince as emergency founder, republic as durable order

Critical / Opposite View → real inconsistency charge / despot + free people hard to reconcile / republican liberty itself tied to conflict, discipline, expansion

Conclusion 1 → tension in form / unity in purpose → princely power for rescue, republican liberty for permanence

Conclusion 2 → monarchy as transitory remedy / republic as fuller and steadier freedom

Machiavelli seems to defend two opposite forms of rule. **The Prince** supports concentrated power in a corrupt and dangerous setting. It accepts force, craft, fear, and exceptional authority for the preservation of the state.

The Discourses praise Roman liberty, citizen participation, strong laws, and the political judgement of an uncorrupted people. **Sabine** says, “His judgement was swayed by two admirations—for the resourceful despot and for the free, self-governing people—which were not consistent”.

Read together, the two works are less contradictory than they first appear. Their common concern is the security, stability, and greatness of the state, and finally the welfare of the people. According to **Sabine**, **Machiavelli** had “one theory for revolution and another for government”. This means princely power belongs mainly to the moment of founding, reforming, or saving a corrupt state.

According to **Quentin Skinner**, **Machiavelli**’s departure from conventional morality is allowed only as a matter of last resort. According to **Benedetto Croce**, both works show a pragmatist and realist concerned with a strong state, not a simple defender of despotism.

The Discourses express **Machiavelli**’s more durable preference. Government is more stable when it is shared by many. Even monarchy, for him, should be regulated by law. He values election, liberty of discussion, legal order, and the strength of an independent people. The Roman model shows that conflict between the *Grandi* and the *Popolo* can be turned into civic strength. Even in **The Prince**, the ruler is told to restrain the nobles and handle the people with care, even siding with the masses if necessary.

Humanism links both works: princely force restores order, but republican liberty protects freedom more fully. In this sense, monarchy is a transitory phase, while republic is the final goal. The tension, then, is real in form but not in purpose. Princely power is the solution for corruption and disorder; republican liberty is the higher and more permanent political order.

🔗 QUOTES

- **George H. Sabine**, in *A History of Political Theory*: “His judgment was swayed by two admirations—for the resourceful despot and for the free, self-governing people—which were not consistent.” This is a good line for stating the apparent contradiction.
- **Quentin Skinner**, in his introduction to *The Prince*: “princes must learn how to make a virtue out of necessity.”
- **Niccolò Machiavelli**, in the *Discourses*: “it is in this conflict that all laws favourable to freedom have their origin.” This is the core republican line for the Roman argument on liberty and institutionalised conflict.
- **Jean-Jacques Rousseau**, in *The Social Contract*: “He professed to teach kings; but it was the people he really taught. His Prince is the book of Republicans.” This is the important quote that tries to reconcile the two works.

📺 DISCUSSION VIDEO

In the discussion video, you will find: The clear distinction between founding power and ordinary government, a clear reading of liberty through law and social conflict, and a balanced way to connect the two books without denying their conflict. The discussion goes beyond the written answer by showing why corruption, necessity, and class conflict matter so much in Machiavelli’s thought. It also brings the main scholarly disagreement into surface.