

**1. Rhetoric:**

- ▶ In Plato's Gorgias, Socrates challenges three sophists on the nature of rhetoric, beginning with Gorgias who asserts that rhetoricians have the ability to persuade, and are concerned with matters of just and unjust, he also brags that rhetoricians do not even need knowledge to be successful in their persuasion. Socrates counters by stating that since rhetoricians do not need to know anything about their subject matter, they simply need to persuade those in attendance that they are more knowledgeable. And thus, they cannot be teachers of just and unjust for they have no knowledge of just and unjust, therefore, Socrates argues, that rhetoric is an attempt at producing pleasure, and thus is not a technical skill, but instead it is simply pandering.

**2. Demos:**

In Plato's Gorgias, Socrates asserts that the two loves of Calicles are the Athenian demos and a man named demos.

**3. Knack:**

- ▶ In Plato's Gorgias, Socrates argues that for the body and the soul there are two kinds of technical skills; those that please the soul or body, knacks, and those that are good for the soul or body, crafts. Socrates argues that knacks are things that some people are inherently better at than others, and thus is arguing that knacks cannot be transmitted to someone through instruction, you are either born with it or you are not. Socrates asserts that rhetoric is a knack, whereas justice is a craft because justice is good for the soul, while rhetoric on the other hand is simply attempts to please by telling people what they want to hear.

**4. Craft:**

- ▶ In Plato's Gorgias, Socrates argues that for the body and the soul there are two kinds of technical skills; those that please the soul or body, knacks, and those that are good for the soul or body, crafts. Socrates believes that crafts can only be gained through pursuit, and he makes this distinction by arguing that while medicine is good for the body, cooking simply pleases the body, and thus doctors have a craft, and cooks do not. That is because the doctor has real knowledge on how to improve the body, whereas cooks do not possess this knowledge, rather they are simply trying to please the body, which does not necessarily make it good. He equates this to the difference between rhetoric and justice, while justice is good for the soul, rhetoric on the other hand simply attempts to please by telling people what they want to hear.

**5. Natural Master:**

Aristotle

**6. Logos:**

Aristotle

### **7. Natural Slave:**

Aristotle infamously argues in Politics that there exists two types of people; those that rule by nature and those that are ruled by nature, giving the example of a household, he asserts that there is the rule of master over slave, husband over wife and father over children. Focusing on the rule of master over slave, Aristotle asserts that slavery is only just in instances when it is in the best interest of both parties, countering that enslavement by force is unjust. Although it seems counterintuitive to assert that a slave may benefit from their enslavement, Aristotle believed that those born slaves are better suited to be slaves, for they cannot ensure their own safety and wellbeing in a manner that their master can.

### **8. Political Partnership:**

Aristotle

### **9. Polity:**

- ▶ In Politics, Aristotle argues that a polity is a type of regime which combines elements of an oligarchy, which is the rule of the rich few, and a democracy, which is the rule of the poor multitude. Aristotle argues that both democracy and oligarchy are diverging regimes because the respective rulers rule with their own interests at heart, by contrast a polity exists to serve the common interest. Aristotle asserts that the middle class should rule because they are the mean between the rich and the poor, and thus are able to overcome the defects of them. Aristotle's examination of the polity forms part of the larger discussion surrounding both what the best regime is and how divergent regimes can be repaired.

### **10. Man is a Political Animal:**

- ▶ Aristotle argues in Politics that cities or polis exist by nature because it is through the city that we are able to achieve one of our ends as humans, which is to attain self-sufficiency. Furthermore, he asserts that only through participation in the polis can we attain excellence and acquire virtue. Thus, Aristotle famously asserts "that man is a political animal," because through speech we are able to determine what is good and bad, just and unjust and thus live in harmony in the polis.

### **11. Hereditary Principalities:**

- ▶ Machiavelli begins the Prince by arguing that all states are either republics or principalities, and further, that principalities are either hereditary or they are new. Machiavelli's view of a principality is similar to that of a monarchy, for the ruler is determined by bloodline. Furthermore, he argues that the hereditary principality is much easier to rule over than a new principality, for the prince must simply follow the precedent set by his ancestors, and his rule should be smooth. However, he asserts that the prince may lose his principality due to extraordinary circumstances, but he states they should have no trouble getting it back. That is

because hereditary princes are loved by their people, and at the first chance they get to replace a new ruler with the old, they will.

### **12. Well Used Cruelty:**

- ▶ Machiavelli, speaking to the reality of his time period, writes that cruelty can be either well used or badly used, that is to say, Machiavelli asserts the cruelty used well is carried out in a single stroke, and is done to protect oneself. By contrast, badly used cruelty may begin slowly, but rather than taper off, increases over time, which keeps the prince in a constant fear of betrayal. Furthermore, Machiavelli asserts that well used cruelty results in the greatest benefit possible to the subjects of a prince, because it allows for a powerful prince to take hold of the principality quickly and decisively. The issue of well used cruelty plays into Machiavelli's overarching argument about striking the proper balance between being feared and not being hated.

### **13. The Lion and The Fox:**

- ▶ In arguing why princes do not need to keep their promises, Machiavelli asserts that a good prince should know how to combat their enemies through either laws or force. He asserts that laws come naturally to humans, and force to beasts, thus he writes, a good prince should emulate both the lion and the fox, for the lion is able to frighten the wolf, while the fox is able to avoid traps. Machiavelli writes that simply being a lion is not enough, a good prince must know when to be deceitful when it is in their best interests, furthermore, they must recognize when they are being deceived, similar to how a fox recognizes a trap. Thus Machiavelli asserts, a good prince has no reason to keep their promises if it goes against their best interests, because he asserts their counterparts would do the same.

### **14. Armed Prophets:**

- ▶ Machiavelli's *The Prince* features a discussion on armed prophets, in which Machiavelli famously asserts that all armed prophets conquered and the unarmed failed. Machiavelli's usage of the word prophet to describe these leaders points to the fact that they were virtuous, and people of extraordinary personal qualities. He asserts that what gives these prophets power is the ability to persuade the masses to believe in their views, and thus are able to rule easily. However, the distinction between armed and unarmed prophets arises when people begin to doubt the prophets, for the armed prophet is able to use force to keep the doubters at bay, whereas the unarmed prophets does not use force, and they eventually succumb to their doubters.

### **15. Fortuna is a River:**

- ▶ Machiavelli argues in *The Prince* against the widely held belief at the time that worldly things are controlled in part by God and in part by fortune, instead, he asserts that free will exists, and formulates that fortune is arbiter of half our actions, and we control the other half.

Thus, he compares fortune to a river, arguing that when a river perpetually inundates surrounding areas, people build dikes and dams in the quiet times to prevent future inundation. Similarly, in times of good fortune, people must make preparations for a change in fortune. Machiavelli argues that to prepare for this one must be in tune with their surroundings, and thus must be able to change their nature so that it is more in tune with the present affairs.

### **16. Vainglory:**

- ▶ In Leviathan, Hobbes argues that seeking glory is a natural passion, that is to say that people are inherently prone to seeking glory for themselves. Hobbes establishes that this is therefore not a bad thing, because the goal of glory is to achieve safety, and in its essence, the attainment of glory gives one power, which can lead to safety. However, Hobbes asserts that vainglory is bad, because unlike pride or glory, it does not rest on past achievements or accomplishments, but rather on flattery. That is to say, Hobbes believes that people who are vainglorious do not have power, and thus do not have safety because their glory is not real. The implications of this argument are felt in Hobbes' state of nature, as the inherent desire for glory puts people in competition with one another in the state of nature.

### **17. Commodious Living:**

- ▶ In Leviathan, Hobbes asserts that the desire for commodious living inclines people to peace, however, he asserts that commodious living is not simply defined as living in safety or comfort, although it is required. Rather, he believes it to include the ability for people to chase after their goals or aspirations, that is to say, an environment where people can have goals, and the ability to chase after them without fear of violence. Hobbes believes that commodious living can only come about through cooperation, which in his state of nature is impossible, and thus commodious living can only exist when a strong government exists.

### **18. Powers Invisible: ch. 12**

- ▶ In Leviathan, Hobbes asserts that the fear of religion and superstition both eminent from fear of invisible powers, and thus argues that religion can be used for good, by subjugating its believers, but can also be used for bad, by making its believers irrational. This is why Hobbes argues that the most dangerous conflict that can exist in a commonwealth is conflict between the church and the state. From there, Hobbes is able to argue in favour of making the sovereign reign over the both the church and the commonwealth, to prevent it from making its believers irrational and putting the commonwealth in a state of conflict.

### **19. Commonwealth by Acquisition:**

#### **20. Property:**

- ▶ In his *Second Treatise of Government*, Locke asserts that nature belongs to everyone, and it was given to us by God to make use of, in support of our life and comfort. However, Locke asserts that that alone is not sufficient to make something someone's property, and thus he argues that the only property anyone inherently has, is their body and it follows from that the work of one's hands belong to them. To put it simply, Locke believes that by labouring over something, the fruit of that labour becomes theirs, because they have added something to it that nature could not, and thus it belongs to them. Locke, however, asserts that there must be conditions on how much someone can remove from nature, and thus asserts that nobody can take so much that it leaves not enough for the rest, or too much so that it goes to waste. Locke extends this definition of property to land, asserting that one can make land their own by mixing with it their labour, while the amount of land one owns is constrained by the fact that none of it can go to waste.

### **21. Civil Interests:**

- ▶ In his *Letter Concerning Toleration*, John Locke asserts that the main function of the commonwealth is solely to protect and promote the civil interests. That is because the only incentive people have to leave the state of nature is to have their civil interests protected, and they thus form a government to do just that. Locke defines the civil interests as life, liberty and possession, and believes that if something does not fall into any of those categories, the state has no right interfering. This is the intermediary conclusion he reaches in trying to argue against a governmental role in the church, because religion does not concern life, liberty or property, the government cannot legislate anything concerning religion.

### **22. Voluntary Society:**

- ▶ In his *Letter Concerning Toleration*, John Locke asserts that the church should be a voluntary society, that is, nobody should be required to join or maintain membership in any one church, they may be free to join and leave as they please. Locke's radical assertion that religion should be a voluntary society forms part of his larger argument in favour of religious toleration, and a key step in doing that was to argue against government intervention in religion. His goal in asserting that religious devotion should be a personal choice, he wanted to change the popular view that religion required that you convert nonbelievers by any means necessary.

### **23. Civil Magistrate:**

### **24. Arbitrary Power:**

- ▶ In his "*Second Treatise of Government*," John Locke argues that is an inherent human right to be free from arbitrary power, that is to say, that no government has the right to enslave, kill or seize property of its citizens. Locke advocates that the power that the government does have cannot be used arbitrarily, rather the government can act only when it is in the common

interest. Locke's absolute rejection of arbitrary power, that is the ability for the government to do as it pleases, forms the basis for his argument in favour of a limited government.

## 25. Legislative Power:

- ▶ John Locke's "Second Treatise of Government" presents his view on the best form of government, which he asserted would be responsible for the creation and execution of laws. However, he believed that these two functions should be handled by two separate entities; and thus the legislative power is the body responsible for the creation of laws. The legislative power is constrained by Locke's assertion that it act in a manner, and design laws, solely for the good of the people. Locke's legislative power is significant within his entire theory because he wanted to design a government that had the best interests of the people in mind, and he believed that in dividing the responsibilities of the government, it would prevent the government from acting unjustly.

**Part II: Essay Question =35%** You will be asked to write an essay on one of two topics. All essays will comparing thinkers Plato to Hobbes, Locke to Aristotle, etc. The questions will revolve around a particular theme, virtue for example. Essays should be written in proper format. Introduction, thesis, arguments, and conclusion.

1) While both attack the claims of traditional Christianity, Hobbes and Locke disagree on what we might call the separation of church and state. Explain why Hobbes maintains that the sovereign must oversee religion in the commonwealth and why Locke rejects this view.

Introduction: 100 words

Hobbes: 200 words

Locke: 200 words

Differences: 200 words

Conclusion: 50 words

Hobbes argues in Leviathan that religious government and civil government should be one single entity. Hobbes' main reason for asserting that church and state should be one body is because he viewed religion as a threat to the power of the civil government. He asserted that religion can be used either for good or bad, asserting that religion is simply the fear of an invisible power, and it results in the subjugation of its followers. Similarly, Hobbes believed that the fear of invisible powers also leads to belief in superstition, and thus can make its believers irrational. This, Hobbes believed could lead to rebellion, and undermine the government's role in the preservation of society, which is the main function of the government, which comes to exist in order to escape the state of nature. Hobbes describes the state of nature as a war of all against all, and in leaving the state of nature, people agree to give up some of their rights in order for the government to maintain its position in protecting society.

By contrast, in his Letter Concerning Toleration, John Locke argues in favour of establishing distinct roles and functions for the church and the state. Furthermore, Locke in his Second Treatise on Government argues in favour of a limited government, that is that the role of the government should be to protect the civil interests, which he defines as life, liberty and

property, and nothing more. Thus, Locke asserts that since the governing of religion does not fit into any of those categories, the government has no jurisdiction over religion, and writes that the government has no role in saving souls. Locke believed that the state could only coerce the actions of people, not their beliefs, because even if the state wanted to impose its beliefs on everyone, no amount of coercion could force someone to believe in something that they did not. Lastly, Locke asserts that since many princes had differing opinions on religion, it leads to the eventual exclusion of some from heaven simply based on where they were born. Thus, Locke asserts that religion should be a voluntary society, that is, that nobody should be required to practice one faith, rather religion should be a private choice made by each individual.

3) What is the difference between Plato's understanding of justice, and Hobbes'?

Introduction: 100

Plato's understanding of justice: 200

Hobbes' understanding of justice: 200

Contrast: 200

Conclusion: 50

Plato's understanding of justice is presented in the dialogue *Gorgias* through Socrates, who while in conversation with Polus begins with a discussion of power, in which Polus asserts that the ruler of a city has the most power in that city for they can do as they please. Socrates responds to this assertion by presenting an analogy of a sick person taking medicine, saying that they do not wish to be taking medicine, but rather wish to be healthy, and thus are taking the medicine as a means to an end. Similarly, he asserts, rulers do not act as they please, but rather they undertake actions that they believe to be best for the city. Socrates then uses this analogy to explain justice, as he asserts that those that act unjustly do not do so because they want to, but rather as a means to an end. By asserting this, Socrates is in essence asserting that people do not want to do bad, but rather are driven to do bad. From here, he asserts that injustice is to the soul as disease is to the body, one slowly rots the body, while the other rots the soul. This is why Socrates asserts that it is better to be treated unjustly than to act unjustly, and why it is better to act unjustly and be punished rather than to escape punishment. Because over time, the soul will become rotted, and thus will lead to the unjust person becoming unhappy. Socrates asserts that through punishment, one can heal the soul.

Hobbes' understanding of justice follows from his examination of human nature, wherein he presents an extremely pessimistic view of human nature, and as a result, argues that justice can only exist when there is a strong common authority responsible for the creation and execution of laws. To begin, Hobbes believes that to act unjustly means that you have broken a law or covenant that you have previously agreed to, and conversely, to act justly is to perform your duty, with respect to the law or covenant. Furthermore, Hobbes asserts that humans are inherently competitive, distrustful and in pursuit of glory, and they place their self preservation above all else. From this it is clear that Hobbes does not believe that humans are inherently good, or in pursuit of acting in a just manner. It is for this reason that Hobbes believes that justice

requires a strong common authority, for it alone will be responsible for the creation of the laws, and the execution of said laws. Thus for Hobbes, the sole motivation to act justly is the fear of the consequences of acting unjustly.

### **Part III: Essay Question = 35%**

Again, you will be asked to write an essay on one of two topics. All essays will compare thinkers. Plato to Hobbes, Locke to Aristotle, etc. Essays should be written in proper format. Introduction, thesis, arguments, and conclusion.

2) While Aristotle provides an account of the “best regime,” he also argues that the power to establish this regime is out of human hands and instead relies on chance. Moderns such as Machiavelli and Hobbes, while offering a less utopian teaching and admitting to potential difficulties, still argue that the power to complete their political projects is within human hands. On what basis do they make this claim and what are the consequences of rejecting the utopian teaching of the ancients?

Hobbes argues that the completion of political projects, more specifically the establishment of a strong common authority is possible because doing so is in the best interests of all people. He asserts that the creation of said government is the result of people wanting to leave the state of nature, which he describes as a war of all against all.

The consequences of Machiavelli and Hobbes’ argument is that if the power to establish the best regime is possible, their citizenry will come to expect it.

3) While both Machiavelli and Hobbes critique classical political philosophy, they do so for different reasons. In your opinion, what is the decisive difference between the teachings of Hobbes and Machiavelli.

Introduction: 100

Machiavelli’s critique: 200

Hobbes’ critique: 200

Main Difference: 200

Conclusion: 50

Machiavelli, unlike the ancients, was a political realist, that is, rather than write about how a ruler ought to rule, Machiavelli attempts to show how a ruler can rule successfully in the political climate that existed in his time. Furthermore, Machiavelli was a consequentialist, that is, he believed that the actions of a prince should not be judged as either moral or immoral based on the

means they use to attain their goals, but rather, their actions should be judged on whether the end they wish to attain is worthwhile, and if they achieve their goal. Thus for Machiavelli, the prince should not concern himself with being just or unjust, good or bad, but instead should concern themselves with maintaining their power at all costs. For Machiavelli, unlike the ancients, the sole purpose of the political ruler is to maintain their power, and thus differs from the ancients view that the job of the ruler ought to be to make his citizens better. Thus, a prince has the right to crush any rebellion in his commonwealth, and by any means necessary, for it poses a threat to his reign, and his sole purpose is to maintain their power. This fact also acts as a deterrent to anyone who wished to rebel, for they would be almost certainly open themselves up to punishment, and would think twice before going against the prince.

Hobbes, similar to Machiavelli, derives his theory based on the experiences he endured during his lifetime, and thus rather than present a utopian government similar to the ancients, presents one that maintains social stability and security. Thus, the sole purpose of the political ruler is to enforce the social contract, that is the contract created by the populace and the government in order to escape the state of nature. Hobbes argues that in order for the populace to accept giving up some rights, the government must ensure their safety and stability, and thus makes it the main function of the government.

The key distinction between Hobbes and Machiavelli is the reasoning behind why people would accept being subjugated under a ruler. Hobbes, for instance, believed that the populace would accept the common authority for the simple reason that they feared the state of nature, and the only way to prevent a return to the state of nature is by accepting the rule of leviathan. Whereas Machiavelli believed that the fear of the prince is what drove people to subjugate themselves, for they feared the consequences that they would open themselves up to if they revolted. Although both governments remain in place through fear, the distinction lies in the fact that for Hobbes it is a fear of the alternative, whereas for Machiavelli it is the fear of the ruler. And both differ from the ancients, who assert that the acceptance of subjugation stems from the fact that the populace believed their leaders would make them better.