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**Plato—*The Republic*, Book I**

**Index**

S—Socrates \*inside an argument S refers not to Socrates, but to a generic subject.

C—Cephalus

P—Polemarchus

T—Thrasymachus

**Justice as the will of the majority**

Socrates is forced to stay by the majority which insists.

**Justice as Honesty (Socrates and Cephalus)**

C: Old age is happy for me since calm by nature (not attached to passions). Being rich helps one being just—since not so tempted to sin. *Justice is to speak the truth and pay your debt*

Also, good poor man=not happy, bad rich man=not happy, good rich man=happy. rich can be a good comforter. The rich man has no debts to the gods.

S: X asked S to hide p when sane. When insane, X asks S to give p back🡪S ought do it. If, S ought not, C’s definition is wrong.

C: I was wrong.

**Justice as Loyalty (Socrates and Polemarchus)**

P: Justice is: *Friends should help/not harm each other, enemies should be harmed/not helped*. Give each man what is proper to him.

For A(activity) what proper Q(quality) is given to S(subject)? In case of justice: *J(activity) gives G(quality) to F(subject)/gives E(quality) to e(subject)*.

S: Thus, one ought injure e. If injured e🡪deteriorating their nature🡪disabling their good=J🡪J against J🡪contradiction.

Also, justice, as defined above, is not good for much (in time of peace) it is good for stealing from e and give it to F (skilful player =better than J in obtaining p. When p not used, J is useful).

Also, Is J to do G to F when F is G/J to do E to e when e is E.

P: I was wrong!

**Justice as the interest of the stronger**

**Definition**

T: justice=(*nothing else than*) interest (of the) stronger.

S: Clarification of definition. It cannot be that what the stronger does (interest)=good for everyone.

T: Clarification: a)in each state “justice” is the interest of the government b) the government are always those in power🡪Justice is the interest of the powerful/stronger. By definition the stronger does not make mistake🡪always when c does what R wants, c follows the interests of R. (reply by T to S’s objection that a ruler can err and thus c not always follow his interest)

**Argument**

S: In any art (including the art of ruling), when defined in the strict sense, it is always about the object—what it does provide; never about the subject. (This is so since only when art p is wrong it needs help from art q or art p/or art p helps art p. Since any art is perfect, it never needs any help=cannot be its own interest)🡪A ruler is not about personal gain, but care for the people. (Art p is a ruler over object=subject z).

T: Justice is never about the object, the servants, but the rulers, fool Socrates. Just=the interest of the strong; unjust=one’s interests against the strong. The highest type of injustice=the unjust becomes itself the ruler, the strong. S who disobeys rules for S’s advantage is freer than just S. Perfect just S always gets less than perfect unjust S (which has everything).

S: T does not seem to distinguish between the art of pay/receiving pay and art h. Art of pay=giving pay to T for helping S. Art of receiving pay=T gains something for helping S.

Art h is that which T does to S. An art can benefit S even without pay, it just does not satisfy T. Since ruler works for others, ruler needs to be played (in honour, avarice, benefiting the people). Now, let’s see how injustice is more advantageous than justice…

T: Justice=foolish, not virtue. Injustice=wise and virtue.

S: However:

1. Fool=wants more than itself and the opposite . Wise=wants just more than the opposite. The just=wants more than the unjust, not more than itself. The unjust=wants more than the just and unjust🡪the unjust is fool and the just is wise. (wise=just, ignorance=injustice)

(why is it foolish to want more than itself?—A wise man can be wiser than an ignorant, by definition the wise=wise🡪wise cannot be wiser than wise)

1. The unjust is dysfunction=in relation to others (reaping people apart, conflict🡪need to cooperate) and in relation to self (leads to inner non-unity)🡪 Justice is the excellence of the soul + soul is ill without performing its excellence🡪injustice=ill=misery and justice=happiness + happiness more profitable than misery🡪**Conclusion:** less profitable than the just. T: ☹

**Overall Conclusions:**

Is not just about paying debts🡪but a proper attitude🡪justice cannot be about hurting people.

Justice can be only about its object, helping an object to not have a deficiency

Justice is about performing an art about the objects (subject)

Justice=order of the parts of the soul🡪order at society level🡪the state needs order which serves the citizen (the necessity of the state which defends citizens, however Authoritarian.

**Remarks about Justice**

Is not just about paying debts🡪but a proper attitude🡪justice cannot be about hurting people.

**My argument for justice of the week**

Justice is not the interest of the stronger=The philosopher is absorbed in ideas, not cares about self-serving. Justice is not the interest of the stronger because we are not the stronger. The week united win.

**Aristotle—*Nicomachean Ethics*, Book V**

**Q: What is justice?** Justice=what actions is it concerned with? =what type of means it is? =between what extremes is an intermediate?

C: Justice=the state of character which makes people disposed to do the just+ makes them act justly+ wish for what is just.

Injustice=disposition which makes people disposed to do the unjust + wish to do the unjust.

E: Various meanings of just and unjust:

Unjust: the lawless+ the unfair + concerned with goods of adversity and prosperity (goods for him, but which can be generally good or generally bad.) + directed towards oneself and maybe not even oneself. (injustice=vice fully).

Just=the lawful + the fair+ the acts which promote happiness for the political society+ directed towards oneself and others. (justice=virtue fully).

The law makes S do brave acts, temperate acts, good-tempered acts +other virtues and avoid bad acts—against virtues. (a good framed law and a bad framed law—the good law makes the interdiction of bad actions proper and following good actions proper).

Injustice qua injustice (unfair=a part; unlawful=the whole)

Injustice done out of appetite etc.=not qua injustice (fair) (unlawful) (whole)

Injustice done out of profit, honor, safety=qua injustice (unfair) (unlawful) (part)

Justice qua justice (lawful) (fair=part)

Justice as lawfulness=not qua justice. (not about fairness) (lawful) (whole)

Justice as lawfulness =qua justice. (fair) (lawful) (part)

**About justice as a part**

Particular justice=(A) distribution of honor or money (B) plays a rectifying part in transactions between man and man. (justice as a means between a loss=treated unjustly and a gain=acting unjust. Justice=equal share=proportion)

The just must be equal and an intermediate+ relative (for certain people).

Justice p by nature, or by custom.

(money as establishing justice=measure for equality) (justice in state between rulers and citizens done through respecting laws)

**Q: Sometimes acting unjust does not imply being unjust, when?**

C: If act p is unjust and done voluntarily, then S is unjust. If act p is unjust and done involuntarily, then S is not unjust. (involuntarily=out of ignorance or not in S’s power; voluntary acts=by choice—after deliberation, not by choice) (4 types of injuries in transaction—1) misadventure (not expected) 2) mistake (expected but unwanted target) 3) knowledge but not deliberation (passion) 4)from choice) (involuntary acts down out of ignorance are excusable; involuntary acts out of passion is excusable). (S is just if S acts justly by choice).

“Assuming that we have sufficiently defined the suffering and doing of injustice, it may be asked (1) whether the truth in expressed in Euripides’ paradoxical words:

*I slew my mother, that’s my tale in brief. Were you both willing, or unwilling both?*

Is it truly possible to be willingly treated unjustly, or is all suffering of injustice the contrary involuntary, as all unjust action is voluntary? And is all suffering of injustice of the latter kind or else all of the former”—85 reader

**All unjust action is voluntary?**

**All suffering from injustice is involuntary?**

S can involuntarily be treated justly.

S can voluntarily be treated justly.

S can voluntarily act justly.

S can involuntarily act justly.

S can voluntarily act unjust.

S can involuntarily act unjust.

S can involuntarily be treated unjust.

Can S voluntarily be treated unjust? Yes, if the definition of unjust does not include “not respecting S’s wishes”.

1) is the one which has less the unjust or the one which has the excess 2)is it possible to treat oneself unjustly?. The two questions are inter-related, for if the distributer acts unjustly (and not G with the excess) then S can treat oneself unjustly voluntarily? In case of virtuous people, which want to have less than their share🡪it cannot be about unjustly treating since S wants this (87)

**To know how to act just based on a certain state of character is not easy.**

To know how to do actions for achieving justice is not easy.

Some beings (Gods) cannot have too much share of the good things in themselves. Some humans have a certain share until which is good, afterwards is bad. For the incurably bad, any quantity of that which is good in itself is bad🡪justice is a human thing (88)

**Equity and Equitable and their relation to the just and the unjust**.

The equitable is good, it is different than the just and it is at the same time part of the just. In other words, equitably is not legal justice, it corrects legal justice. R: All law is universal but is impossible to make a universal statement about everything. (When laws do not work, decrees are needed) Equity=to take less than your share because you are equitable.

Q: Can a man treat himself unjustly?

C: no

E: S can be unjust towards the state through suicide, not himself. A man cannot unjustly treat himself🡪S cannot be unjust towards oneself.

Look 57-58.

**Hobbes Chapter 13 The natural condition of man (the state of nature)**

**Explaining the state of nature**

1. Premise: People are equal in body or strength.
2. Premise: There are limited goods on this world. When a) good x is not available for more than one b)S1 and S2 are equal 🡪 conflict.
3. Conclusion: People are in conflict

—This state of nature is war—not actual war but ‘bad weather’ since the possibility for conflict looms in the air.

**Causes of conflict:**

1. Competition—both S want the same shit
2. Distrust—Due to competition, people distrust each other🡪Normally good people strike first for protecting what they have.
3. Glory—Each person wants to be valued by others🡪when S can S will be violent against his enemies.

**How it is in the state of nature:**

No hard work.

No culture.

No technology

No knowledge

No literature

No idea of property

**No justice/injustice in the state of nature**

There is no common power🡪there is no law🡪there is no notion of justice and injustice🡪there is no right or wrong until the state is made. (the state can be made when people can decide on who to rule them.

**Passions pro the state (peace)**

Fear of death. Desire for comfortable work + hope to achieve this through hard work. Reason agrees on an advantageous peace treaty.

**Chapter 14—The first and second natural laws, and contracts**

**Definitions:**

**The RIGHT OF NATURE**, which writers commonly call *jus naturale*, is the liberty that each man has to make his own decisions about how to use his own power for the preserva- tion of his own nature

**The proper meaning of LIBERTY** is the absence of external obstacles.

**Natural Law**=is a command or general rule, discovered by reason, which forbids a man to •do anything that is destructive of his life or takes away his means for preserving his life, and forbids him to •omit anything by which he thinks his life can best be preserved.

Law=a command.

Right=the liberty to do as one chooses.

**The birth of the contract**

Law of Nature—seek peace through one’s own growth

Second Law of Nature—disactivate one’s rights when everybody does so for the greater good.

Ways of disactivating a right.

Through renunciation—the person S gives his rights to is not specific.

Through transfer—the person S gives his rights to is specific.

Contract=mutual transferring of a right.

Pact=S1 does his part and trusts that S2 will do his.

Gift=S1 does it for S2 without anything in return.

—there seems to be a kind of obligation to do one’s part in a contract/pact. If there is no superior power, the two camps can retreat when they hear a suspicion of the other camp not respecting the pact.

**Critique of Aristotle on Distributive Justice**

The equality of value of the things contracted for (as if it were an injustice to sell dearer than we buy); ·but this is a useless notion, because· the value of anything that is contracted for is measured by the desires of the contractors, and therefore what they are contented to give *is* the just value.

•And these same writers identify *distributive* justice with the distribution of equal benefit to men of equal merit (as if it were an injustice to give more to a man than he merits). ·This is wrong too, because· merit is rewarded only by grace and isn’t owed anything as a matter of justice. (The only exception to this is the kind of merit that goes with covenants—one party’s performance *merits* the performance of the other party—and this falls within the scope of commutative justice, not distributive.) So this distinction, understood in the usual manner, is not right. Using the term properly,

•*commutative* justice is the justice of a *contractor*—that is, doing what one has covenanted to do in buying and selling, hiring and letting to hire, lending and borrowing, exchanging, bartering, and other acts of contract.

•*distributive* justice is the justice of an *arbitrator* whose job it is to define what is just. Having been trusted by those who make him arbitrator, if he performs his trust he is said to *distribute* to every man his own. This is indeed just distribution, and it could (though improperly) be called ‘distributive justice’; but a more proper label is ‘equity’. That is also a law of nature, as I will show a little later.

As justice depends on a previous covenant, so GRATITUDE depends on a previous grace, that is to say, a previous free-gift.

**Laws of Nature**

First Law of Nature—seek peace through one’s own growth

Second Law of Nature—disactivate one’s rights when everybody does so for the greater good.

**Third law of nature:** Men should perform the covenants they make.

**Fourth law of nature:** A man who receives benefit from another out of mere grace should try to bring it about that the giver of the benefit doesn’t come to have reasonable cause to regret his good will.

**Fifth law of nature:** Every man should strive to

accommodate himself to the rest.

**Sixth law of nature:** A man ought to pardon the past offences of those who repent of their offences, want to be pardoned, and provide guarantees of good behaviour in the future.

**Seventh law of nature:** In revenge (that is, returning evil for evil), men should look not at the greatness of the past evil but at the greatness of the future good.

**Eighth law of nature:** No man should—by deed, word, facial expression or gesture—express hatred or contempt of someone else.

**Ninth law of nature:** Every man should acknowledge ·every· other as his equal by nature. The breach of this command is *pride*.

**Tenth law of nature:** At the entrance into conditions of peace, no man should insist that *he* retain some right which he is not content to be retained by every- one else.

**Eleventh law of nature:** If a man is trusted to judge between man and man, he should deal equally be- tween them.

**Twelfth law of nature:** Anything that can’t be divided should be enjoyed in common, if that is possible; and it should be enjoyed without limit if possible; and if there isn’t enough of it for that, those who have a right to it should have equal shares of it.

**Thirteenth law of nature:** If a thing that cannot be divided or enjoyed in common, a *lottery* should be set up to determine who is to have the entire right to the thing or (for an alternating use of it) who is to have it first.

**Fourteenth law of nature:** Things that can’t be enjoyed in common or divided ought to be judged to have been acquired *through a lottery* to the first possessor, or in some cases to the first-born.

**Fifteenth law of nature:** All men who mediate peace should be allowed safe conduct.

**Sixteenth law of nature:** When men have a controversy, they should submit their right to the judgment of an arbitrator.

**Seventeenth law of nature:** No man is a fit arbitrator in his own cause.

**Eighteenth law of nature:** No man ought to be accepted as an arbitrator in any case where it seems that he will get greater profit or honor or pleasure from the victory of one party than from the victory of the other.

**Nineteenth law of nature:** In a controversy of fact, the judge should not give more credence to one party than to the other; and so if there is no other evidence he must give credence to a third ·person as witness·, or to a third and fourth, or more;

—These laws start from the state of nature and lead to the necessity of a state. These are the most reasonable things a man would do in the state of nature. If people would follow each man would institute a state. The state is necessary for people to respect these. Covenants exist only in a state, since there is no force imposing that the parties to respect it. (Oaths have no value in increasing a covenant)

**Lock**

* Natural law=of reason and thus knowing that man is the result of a being beyond🡪one does not have the right to kill oneself; also since other people are equal people need to treat other equality, also people ought to be kind to another, self-preservation.
* When another person is a criminal or does an evil—it deserves to be killed or hurt as such for not threatening society again.
* There is no divine authority given to kings, all men are created equal by God and share the same earth.
* Present laws, in a state, are good because they represent intuition from the state of nature.
* The state of nature=of war=a lot of people live in the state of war, until people unite into a body there is no body politics formed, just a mass ruled by a kind.

**Rousseau—Social Contract Book I**

**About force:** (i) Force is physical, it does not have normative content. One obeys force out of prudence, not duty. (ii) Another force can make one this force states to be right as being wrong. From (i) and (ii)🡪Force cannot become a right (not even if imposed).

**About the state of nature:** In this state there are just relations between persons, not also between objects🡪war is impossible (the relations between people are two week)

**About Slavery:** Since **about force** is true🡪there exists no legitimate right to slavery, since: (i) the slave receives nothing in return for giving up his freedom (freedom has infinite value, surviving as a labourer is not a reward), (ii) there is no war in the state of nature to legitimise slavery.

**About the general will:** it is not the sum of individual wills; it is aiming towards the common good of the community. The general will is sovereign, owns all the land. Simultaneously, each man has the right to his/her land. A man/women is both citizen (subjugated to the general will) and sovereign (as a part of the general will). This does not mean that a man/women can give him/herself the laws in his/her own interest.

**State of Nature:** But this supposed right to kill the loser is clearly not an upshot of the state of war. Men are not *naturally* one another’s’ enemies. [The next sentence is expanded in ways that the ·small dots· convention can’t easily handle.] Any natural relations amongst them must exist when they are living in their primitive independence without any government or social structure; but at *that* time they have no inter-relations that are stable enough to constitute either the state of peace or the state of war. War is constituted by a relation between things, not between persons; and because the state of war can’t arise out of simple personal relations but only out of thing-relations, there can’t be a private war (a war of man against man) in the state of nature, where there is no ownership, or in the state of society, where everything is under the authority of the laws.

**Against Force as a right**: Force is a physical power; I don’t see what moral effect it can have. Giving way to force is something you have to do, not something you choose to do; ·or if you insist that choice comes into it·, it is at most an act of •prudence. In what sense can it be a •duty? To renounce your liberty🡪renounce your humanity🡪renounce everything🡪no proper exchange, illegitimate

**Communist Party Manifesto**

“Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master‡ and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes”

The new class struggle is simplified: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat. In the past there were more classes, but the same idea: conflict between oppressors (advantaged) and oppressed (disadvantaged).

The Birth of the Bourgeoisie

The modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange. He is the result of the industrial revolution, revolutions against the feudal limited mode of production. Communication, travelling, technology🡪more goods produced faster and through industry one man can own the production of a lot of things.

As the bourgeoisie won economical power🡪they won political power: the bourgeoisie started to cooperate with the monarchy against the nobles in France (in a period in which bourgeoisie manufacturing grew).

The bourgeoisie reduced all the sacred, religious, dimension of feudal authority to the nakedness of *money*, *interest*, *utility*.

Unlike past societies, the bourgeoisie need to constantly revolutionize their means of production and exchange for evolving. It is based on constant market. The old relations were constant (no so much competition).

The bourgeoisie force other nation to adopt their style, to produce faster and more🡪the bourgeoisie create a world in their image.

The problem with capitalism🡪crises due to overproduction and lack of proper payment to workers🡪eventually the destruction of capitalism (historical necessity of change)

The birth of the proletariat

But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons – the modern working class – the proletarians—creating the working class.

The worker loses his individual character, he works for a low wage since he is asked only to do small stuff (division of labor + advanced machinery). The misery of the worker increased if new machinery replaces his work or if he is asked to work more—alienation of the proletariat.

The conflict between classes begging

The proletariat revolt started: individually🡪collectively. Initially, the collective mass attacked not the capitalist conditions of production but against the instruments of production themselves—destroying tools, factories etc.

The bourgeoisie direct the proletariat against monarchy, not against them… the bourgeoisie remain in power for now. The proletariat becomes pourer as machinery equalize the jobs🡪and the wages of everybody🡪riots and protests through trade unions created by the proletariats.

The unique character of the proletariat

All the preceding classes that got the upper hand sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society at large to their conditions of appropriation. The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby also every other previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify; their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property.

All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole superincumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air.

Though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie.

The aim of Communism

The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working-class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.

The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.

The aim of Communism is abolition of private property, but not of private property as such, but of bourgeois property—which is based by ‘ownership’ and exploitation.

The relationship between Proletariat and Bourgeois

In bourgeois society capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality. The bourgeois gains capital while the proletariat just receives minimum resources🡪it is a type of property based on exploitation.

Replies to Objections Against Communism

No Property, no individuality=no bourgeois property and individuality.

No culture= no class culture, no bourgeois culture.

Without wage-labor—people would be lazy=in bourgeois society worker gains nothing and the capitalist does not work—people would not have ‘work for the capitalist’ if there is no ‘capitalism’—(tautology).

No family=no bourgeois family, family based on exploitation and profit.

No countries=the proletariat have no countries; they need to form their nation by overthrowing capitalism.

Women become common property=we mean that women are not individuals to be exploited by men, women are free to represent themselves.

The Communists will change all past thinking

But Communism abolishes eternal truths, it abolishes all religion, and all morality, instead of constituting them on a new basis; it therefore acts in contradiction to all past historical experience.” What does this accusation reduce itself to? The history of all past society has consisted in the development of class antagonisms, antagonisms that assumed different forms at different epochs.

Society Plan’s by the communists

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.  
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.  
3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.

4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.  
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.  
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.  
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste-lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.  
8. Equal liability of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.  
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of all the distinction between town and country by a more equable distribution of the

**Bentham—The Principle of Utility**

Two masters of man=pleasure/pain🡪from them alone S determines good/bad (tendency) + S does anything. If promotes pain🡪then bad. If promotes happiness🡪then good. (determine the chain of cause and effect)

* + A measure of government=conforms to utility iff it produces more happiness than it destroys.
  + Ought/right/wrong=have meaning only when referred to utility.
  + Utility cannot be proved, does not need proof, since is the basis of all normativity.
  + When S tries to disprove utility, S uses it🡪S can just show that it is used badly=misplaced.

**Definition**: The principle of utility=rational and lawful application of the above (for community + every measure of government). Utility=the property of p to lead to pleasure and to avoid pain. The interest of the community=the interest of sum of individuals. X is conformable to utility if it has the tendency to create more happiness than it destroys. S obeys utility=iff S respect the principle of utility.

**Proof:** Utility is the basis of all actions🡪cannot be and needless to be proved. S argues against Utility=S does not show that Utility is wrong, just that it is misplaced (S cannot not use utility). In practice, man does not always follow Utility, does not fully believe in Utility, however, he always tries to apply Utility.

If S still believes that Utility is wrong, let S ask himself these:

1. One questions utility…
2. Can one think of another principle than utility (and not be just caprice)?
3. If yes, then: Is ‘the approbation of the principle without influence of circumstances’ sufficient? A. Ought S’s sentiment be standard for all? B. Or any S’ sentiment can be standard for themselves?
4. If A, then it is not despotically?
5. If B, then are there not as many standards as people? Is what is right for S today also tomorrow/in another place? Besides ‘I like it/dislike it’ can this principle bring anything else to the table?
6. Based on what reflection is, in case B, applied the principle?
7. How S justifies his adoption of the new principle?
8. If one considers that there is another principle than utility, can one have a *motive* to act other than utility? If only utility is motive🡪the other principle is useless.
   1. If S adopts his/her principle until p, and after p he/she adopts Utility🡪establish p. *right* has no *meaning* if not *motive* for doing right x. *Ought* has *meaning* if utility. Philosophy of language=meaning of words.