

UNIVERSITE DE YAOUNDE I

CENTRE DE RECHERCHE DE
FORMATION DOCTORALE EN
SCIENCES HUMAINES, SOCIAL ET
EDUCATIVES

UNITE DE RECHERCHE ET DE
FORMATION DOCTORALE EN SCIENCES
HUMAINES ET SOCIALES



UNIVERSITY OF YAOUNDE I

POST-GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR
SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL
SCIENCES

DOCTORAL RESEARCH UNIT
FOR SOCIAL SCIENCES

***THE QUESTION OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE
AND VIOLENCE, IN THE LIGHT
OF HANNAH ARENDT'S POLITICAL THOUGHT.***

*A thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Doctorate
Degree (Ph.D.) in Philosophy*

SPECIALIZATION:
ETHICS AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

BY
ISIDORE KPA KOM
Holder of Master's Degree in Philosophy



JURY

Quality	Name/Surname	Grade	University
President:	Mbele Charles Romain	Pr.	University of Yaounde I
Rapporteur:	Kenmogne Emile	Pr.	University of Yaounde I
Member:	Oumarou Mazadou	Pr.	University of Yaounde I
Member:	Valentine Banfegha Ngalim	MC	University of Bamenda
Member:	Owono Zambo Nathalie Noel	MC	University of Yaounde I

JULY 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
RESUME.....	vii
GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	1

PART ONE

PART ONE	19
Background to the Conception of Civil Disobedience and Violence	
Chapter One: Origin of the Civil Society	21
1.1 Thomas Hobbes Social Contract Theory.....	22
1.2 John Locke’s Idea of The Civil Society.....	33
1.3 Jean Jacques Rousseau’s version of the Social Contract.....	46
Chapter Two: Precursors to the Notion of Civil Disobedience in the Society	51
2.1 Henry David Thoreau and the notion of non-cooperation through boycotts	52
2.2 Mahatma Gandhi and the conception of non-violence resistance	57
2.3 Martin Luther King Jr. In his prescription of passive resistance	64
Chapter Three: The Notion of Civil Disobedience and Violence in Hannah Arendt’s Political Thought	72
3.1 Bad Governance, Civil Disobedience and Violence	72
3.2 Civil Disobedience as an Agent of Political Change	78

3.3 Violence As Inheritance Of Lawlessness.....	87
---	----

PART TWO:

Arendt Thought on Politics and Violence	115
--	-----

Chapter Four: Power and authority as legitimate instruments of states organisation	117
---	-----

Hannah Arendt 1904-1969

4.1 The Critique of Totalitarianism.....	125
--	-----

4.2 The States Monopoly Of Violence.....	126
--	-----

4.3 The Justification of Legitimate Revolutions	139
---	-----

Chapter Five: Economic Conflicts as the Basis of Revolution	169
--	-----

5.1 Class Struggle as the Foundation For Revolution.....	169
--	-----

5.2 The Desire for Material as the root cause of Revolutions.....	180
---	-----

5.3 The Instinct for Domination and Competition.....	189
--	-----

Chapter Six: The Clash of Interest in The State	193
--	-----

6. 1: Incompatibility of Rights in the State.....	194
---	-----

6.2 Political Degeneration of the State (The Organic View of the State)	207
---	-----

6.3 Property Rights and Revolution.....	211
---	-----

PART THREE:

Critical Evaluation and Perspectives	218
---	-----

Chapter Seven: Contractarian Critique of Arendt Views	219
--	-----

7.1 The Hobbesian Version of the Social Contract.....	220
---	-----

7.2 John Locke's Notion.....	234
------------------------------	-----

7.3 Rousseau Notion of Positive Liberty.....	243
Chapter 8: Critique of Arendt Totalitarianism and Legitimate Monopoly of Power by the State	253
8.1 States and Security Systems as Major Causes of Civil Disobedience and Violence ...	253
8.2 The Entanglement of Society into Violence and Revolutions	266
8.3 The Quest for Self Determination as one The Beginning of Violence and Revolutions in Africa	278
Chapter 9: Perspectives.....	282
9.1 Education of the Mass as a Moral Armament	282
9.2 The Law as Mitigation	298
9.3 Good Governance as Panacea.....	307
General Conclusion	321
Index	335
Bibliography	345

TO

Those who live in the pursuit of Truth
as the basis for justice and peace in the society.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

My sincere gratitude to my supervisor **Professor Emile KENGMONGE**, who did not only supervise but accompanied me throughout for the realization of this work. I also express my heartfelt gratitude to the entire philosophy family especially the philosophy department of the University of Yaoundé I and those whose work I exploited.

In fact, the critical views of Dr. Nde Paul Ade, Dr. Kum Thomas, Dr. Christian Winkar and Dr. Noum Elias are highly appreciated especially their constructive criticisms and contribution towards the realization of this work.

To those whose names are not mentioned a very big thank you for your moral, spiritual, intellectual and material support.

ABSTRACT

This thesis is out to examine the question of civil disobedience and violence in Hannah Arendt political thought, its impact in any human grouping in the contemporal society. That is how the society came together before the birth and rapid growth of human tyrannical actions towards others, It causes and how it manifest in our present world of advanced science and technology. However, we have realized that the world community seems to be fast running into chaos, disorder and revolutions in a complex and diverse forms, most especially, the disastrous increase in crimes in the streets caused by these phenomena, sometimes because of some government's inability to function in order, thereby arming some citizens to resist and inherit lawlessness, violence and terrorism in order to disagree and discredit government actions and the rights of their states. To come out of this oblivion and reduce civil disobedience and violence to its nearest minimal, we suggest relevant and quality moral education of the mass, citizens' obedient to their laws, strong institutions, good governance and collective security. This will go a long way to re-establish the rights of the states, tranquillity equality and justice will prevail for peaceful co-existence and cohesion.

KEY WORDS:

Hannah Arendt, Civil disobedience, violence, political thought, education, governance.

RESUME

L'intention de cette thèse est d'examiner la désobéissance civile et la violence dans la pensée politique de Hannah Arendt, son impact dans chaque groupement humain dans la société contemporaine. Voilà, comment la société s'est regroupée avant l'avènement et le développement rapide des actions tyranniques humaines envers d'autres, ses causes et ses manifestations dans notre monde actuel des sciences et de la technologie avancée. Cependant, nous avons constaté que la communauté mondiale semble rapidement se retrouver dans le chaos, le désordre et les révolutions sous une forme complexe et diverse surtout, la croissance désastreuse de la criminalité dans les rues causée par ces phénomènes, parfois à cause de l'incapacité de certains gouvernements et fonctionner dans la droiture, armant ainsi quelques citoyens pour résister et hériter le désordre, la violence et le terrorisme dans l'intention de refuser et discréditer l'action gouvernementale et les droits de leurs Etats. Pour sortir de ces ténèbres et réduire considérablement la désobéissance civile et la violence, nous suggérons une éducation morale et de qualité pertinente des masses populaires, des citoyens obéissants à leurs lois, leurs institutions fortes, leur bonne gouvernance et la sécurité collective. Ceci contribuera à ré-instituer les droits des Etats, la tranquillité, l'égalité et la justice va prévaloir pour un vivre ensemble paisible et la cohésion.

Mots Clés : Hannah Arendt, Désobéissance Civile, Violence, Politique, Education, gouvernance.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

AIM OF THE STUDY

This work is focused on the importance of living together peacefully by citizens of a given community or society, that is, peaceful co-existence, promoting moral education of the masses and above all improving on the citizens moral relations towards the law as well as facilitating intercultural dialogue. This peaceful co-existence is imperative given that an individual cannot live happily and peacefully in the society alone. He or she therefore needs the collaboration of others as Aristotle¹ clearly states in his book '*The Politics*'; that man by nature is a political animal and this therefore portrays his inability to protect, maintain order, justice or even be happy when confronted with the forces of nature and inhuman practices, since an individual cannot have all his needs and interest protected by his or herself. It is therefore a call for concern for citizens to come together with others and put aside their differences to form a community or society of consent for everyone to live in.

In this regards, we can be able to provide equally to all members of our society something lacking such as, security or protection established for their collective interest and other social benefits or needs. It should be noted that, man by nature is egoistic and discriminative. That is why the quest or struggle for power, economic supremacy, poor quality education and lack of respect for state laws, has in most societies destabilized the governments because of the conflicting interests leading to crises within the nation or republic.

Consequently, a government with strong institutions should necessarily be established by the citizens who agreed to come together and unanimously institute rules and regulations that will shape their ways of life in their established institutions giving full rights and respects to citizens and the authorities put in place by them, return, guarantees order, justice and human happiness and of course is the goal of every individual as a member of a community.

It is therefore important to note that any responsible government which wants to downplay and minimise or avoid civil unrest must ensure that it performs its basic functions of coordinating, overseeing, ordering security or defence function as well as the welfare of its citizens without any abuses because when the general interest or common good is at risk or not respected, then chaos is bound to arise in that community. That is why utilitarian thinkers like Jeremy Bentham, John

¹Aristotle, *The Politics*, translated by B. Jowett, New York et al Doubleday, 1905, p.66.

Stuart Mill holds that, the standard of all morality is the utility that people obtain from their actions in order to promote the general happiness or interest and the state is the principal agent in securing this general happiness or interest and the citizens are therefore obliged to obey its laws as essential condition for achieving general happiness.

However, in the restricted sense of it, Aristotle states that “man is a political animal” by political animal not understanding, Aristotle means to say that man is a social being whose existence is necessarily bound up with social organizations and according to Aristotle, man, by nature cannot live alone but only in a society and not only in the basic society of the family but in the larger organization and protection of the political organization and protection of the political society. As he stated that “He who is unable to live in the society or who has no need because he is sufficient for himself, must either be a beast or a god”²

In this regards, the aim of this work is therefore to ensure that, most states in the world especially African and Cameroon in particular must put in place a good government, good educational system, good laws and strong institutions as exemplary agents for it citizens to follow. This is to say that, a responsible citizen can only be well equipped in a responsible government for a common interest and common good even though it is difficult but not impossible to reduce or even put an end to these ancient cultures of civil disobedience and violence in our societies.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WORK

The question of civil disobedience and violence in the light of Hannah Arendt’s political thought is a well reflected theme as one ponders on the disastrous increase in crimes and security in the societies and its far reaching insight as expressed by the evil of modern government and tyrannies which have actually undermined any iota of faith to the laws of the societies.

These phenomena of civil disobedience and violence in the readings of Hannah Arendt are very effective in securing desirable changes in the laws of the societies as stated in her book *Crises of the Republic*. These reflections are also being provoked by the events and debates in the recent years which is been predicted as an era where civil disobedience, violence and insecurity are more on the rise and gaining more grounds and glories. However, the technical development of the

²Opt. cit. p. 66.

implements of violence has now reached a point where no political goal can conceivably correspond to their destructive potential or justify their actual use in armed conflict which is their common denominator. Even the international community's or bodies have lost much of the effectiveness and nearly all their glamour due to the complexity of this obvious insanity.

In this regard, Hannah Arendt stated that the relationship between civil disobedience and violence is that, civil disobedience which most often begins after demands for reforms fails with strikes, streets protest and demonstrations before it total defiance to state authorities and institutions which is more of a mental and psychological violence and when not properly managed and controlled by the powers that be, always escalates into full scale violence from psychological to physical, where properties and loss of lives may be the regrettable outcome.

So therefore, the question of civil disobedience and violence in the reflection of Hannah Arendt's thought is clearly seen in our today's societies, which need more attention than ever before due to its complex nature and it varies from one society to another³.

It is equally true that civil disobedience and violence is an ancient culture which has taken diverse and complex forms today, for instance, a case in point is the famous ancient Greek thinker Socrates (470-399 BC). According to him disobedience meant first of all respect of the law. Socrates is therefore credited for having introduced the notion of willingness on the part of the resister to accept the penalty or consequences of his acts in civil disobedience.

In Plato's *Apology*⁴, as cited by Arendt in *Crises of the Republic*, he clearly stated that, if the courts offer to acquit him on the condition that he should stop teaching and practicing philosophy, he will reject the offer and he will not hesitate to tell the judges of the court that "*men of Athens,*

I honour and love you, but I shall obey God, rather than you, and while I have life and strength, I shall never cease from the practice and teaching of philosophy; teaching anyone whom I meet...." Socrates generally espouses the idea that, the only type of life worth living is a life committed to the search for truth and obedience. Although, he has deep respect for the laws of the states, he however, acknowledges one aspect in which the claims of the state are void. This is by

³ Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt brace and Co-Sandiego, New York, 1972. PP. 51, 105.

⁴ Ibid, pp. 58, 59.

the use of conscience. He supports the idea that the state should not force someone to act unjustly; Socrates therefore prefers to suffer evil and not to do evil.

It is also interesting to know that the legal system in some societies is one of the causes of civil disobedience and violence inspired this reflection due to the disastrous increase in crime in the streets and defiance of state laws and institutions. More to that, a lot of evidence or proofs that have carefully organized campaigns of civil disobedience and violence which are very effective in securing changes in their law (contract).

Hannah Arendt contented that, the literature on the subject relies to a large extent on two famous men in prison (Socrates, in Athens and Thoreau, in Concord). That their conduct is the joy of jurists because it seems to prove that disobedience to the law can be justified only if the law breaker is willing and even eager to accept punishment for his act”

This is not so to many citizens because we cannot think that any tolerance that jurists feel towards the disobeyer is dependent on his /her willingness to accept whatever punishment the law impose⁵. However, its plausibility in these countries which seems to be greatly strengthened by some serious oddities of their laws through which some individuals are encouraged or in some sense obliged to establish a significant legal right through personal act of civil disobedience and violence this alone has actually given way to unholy marriage of morality and legality, conscience and the law of the land.

In this vain, the main difficulties of the jurists is in constructing a compatibility of civil disobedience and violence with the legal system of the country⁶. This also point to the fact that the system of the law which are distinct or different from each other legal system has found a non fictitious visible place for that “higher law” on which “in one form or jurisprudence keeps insisting. This actually needs some ingenuity to defend this; because some of these laws has been tolerated for a very long time without any obstacle or impediment, meanwhile civil disobeyers and others who volunteered for demonstration duty is steadily increasing, in fact this is cause by the law and the basic contract of that society.

⁵ Ibid, pp. 58, 59, Op cit.

⁶Ibid, pp.51-54.

Whatever the actually causes of this period of crises, the present confusion and growing bitterness of our debate are also caused by the failure to understand the true character of the phenomenon.

The phenomenon (civil disobedience and violence) bears no analogy because it is not manifested by an individual. He/she can only function as a member of a group. This is really on account that, when it is practice by an individual he/she is look upon as “an eccentric more interesting to be observes than to suppress”.

Hannah actually supported that “significant civil disobedience⁷, therefore, will be practice and manifest by a number of people who have a community of interest”. This work is therefore pertinent in that, it will enable us cope or escape from these phenomena (disobedience and violence) in our communities.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Johanna Hannah Arendt was a German born American political theorist on the 14th October 1906 into a secular family of German Jews in Linden, today a part of Hanover, she grew up in Konigsberg and her family was thoroughly assimilated and this assimilation has a deep philosophical meaning in her life⁸.

Arendt defines her Jewish identity negatively after experiencing anti-Semitism as an adult. Worse of all when she came in contact with Rahel (Varnhagen), a Prussian hostess who desperately wanted to be assimilate into German culture only to be rejected because she was a born Jewish.

After completing her high school studies in 1924, she enrolled at the University of Marburg, where she spent a year studying philosophy. After a year at Marburg, Arendt spent a semester at Freiburg University, attending lectures of Edmund Husserl. In 1926, she moved to the University of Heidelberg, where in 1929, she completed her doctorate thesis under Karl Jaspers. Her thesis was “on the concept of love in the thought of Saint Augustine, attempt at a philosophical interpretation”

⁷ Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*. P.55

⁸Ibid, pp 1-3.

As a Jew in Nazi Germany Arendt was being discriminated against. She researched on anti-Semitism for some time before being arrested and briefly imprisoned by the Gestapo in 1933. Again, in 1933 Arendt left Germany for Geneva, where she worked for some time at the League of Nations. While in Paris, France, she worked to help Jewish refugees. In 1937, she was stripped of her German citizenship. By May 1940 after the German invasion of France, Arendt was interned as an "enemy alien" but she managed to escape before the Germans reached the area.

More so, Arendt left France in 1941 travelling through Portugal to the United States with others. They relied on visas, illegally issued by the American diplomat Hiram Bingham, who assisted about 2500 Jewish refugees in this way. Another American humanitarian Varian Fry paid for her travel and helped her obtain the visa when Hannah Arendt arrived in America; she became active in the German-Jewish community she even went as far as writing some columns for the German language Jewish newspaper 'Aufbau'. By 1944 Arendt became the director of research for the commission of European Jewish culture reconstruction and in that capacity she was free to travel to Europe after the war.

It is also important to note that, apart from being a critic and political theorist, she was also more of a humanitarian as seen during the Second World War, she worked for youth Aliyah, a Zionist organization that saved thousands of children from the Holocaust and settled them in the British mandate of Palestine. During this period, she also became a close friend to Karl Jasper developing a deep intellectual friendship with him who then enabled her to begin corresponding with the American author Mary McCarthy.

God being merciful enough, Hannah Arendt became a naturalized citizen of the United States in 1950. She then began serving as a visiting scholar at the University of Notre Dame, University of California, Berkeley, Princeton University and Northwestern University. By 1959 she was recognized and named the first female lecturer at Princeton, she also taught at the new school in Manhattan where she taught as a university professor from 1967 till her death in 1975.

In 1961 while covering the trial of Adolf Eichmann in Jerusalem, Arendt wrote to Jaspers a letter that Kirsch described as reflecting as:

“pure racism”⁹ towards Sephardic Jews from the Middle East and Ashkenazi Jews from Eastern Europe, she wrote. on top, the judges, the best German Jewery, Below them the prosecuting attorneys, Galician’s, but still Europeans everything is organized by a police force that gives me the creeps speaks only Hebrew and look Arabic. Some downright brutal types among them, they would obey any order and outside the doors the oriental mob as if one were in Istanbul or some other half”.

Although she remained a Zionist both during and after World War II she made it clear that she favoured the creation of a Jewish Arab, federated state in Palestine, rather than a purely Jewish state. She believed that this was a way to address Jewish statelessness and to avoid the pitfalls of nationalism. She was then elected a fellow of American academy of Arts and sciences in 1962 and a member of the American Academy of arts and letters in 1964. It is really interesting to note that, her eighteen books and numerous articles, on topics ranging from totalitarianism to epistemology had a lasting influence on political theory she is widely considered as one of the most important political philosopher of the twentieth century and Hannah Arendt’s thought are still clear as they manifest in our today’s societies. Regrettably Arendt died in New York City on 4th December 1975 at the age of 69 of heart attack.

MOTIVATION

What motivated me to this author, Hannah Arendt, is because of the pertinent of her works which are quite contemporal and her unique qualities, courageous attitude and writings. This is so because all her thoughts and works are clearly seen in our societies today especially in Africa, she actually charm me with her courage by going through hell in her country of origin where she was discriminated upon and deprived from making a living, yet , she did not stop the pursuit of the truth as a real philosopher.

Especially in 1937, when she became stateless as she was tripped of her nationality, but she did not stop her humanitarians work of helping the Jews refugees. It is also important to note that, Arendt writings are good enough to be studied as it enable us to be pre-emptive and pro-active in our societies today. She was very courageous and famous of criticizing human rightsactivities in her book *“The Origin of Totalitarianism*, Arendt was very critical of political rights but rather

⁹ Ibid. op. cit. pp. 2, 13.

supported a national or civil conception rights. Human right or the right of man as is best known, are universal inalienable, and possessed simply by being human, paradoxically civil right is possessed by simply belonging to a political society which most often are still citizens.

It is interesting to note that human rights are most commonly abuse all over the world especially in African states. Arendt first of all argues that “human right is ineffectual and illusory because their enforcement is that “ since there is no political authority above that of sovereign nations, states governments, have incentive to respect human rights when such policies conflicts with national interest”. These are some of the reasons why civil disobedience, violence and chaos arise in our societies today.

This can also be seen in Africa where there are minorities groups when their interest conflicts with that of the sovereignty, that of the state is paramount and this group of people always fall back to their human right thereby provoking civil disobedience, violence terrorism and revolutions within the societies

It is quite motivational to choose such an author whose writing of yesterday is just as if she was there today. For instance, in one of her publications: “*On Violence*”. She made it clear that there is a difference between violence and power though violence is an extreme manifestation of power, the concepts are quite antithetical. Power comes from the collective¹⁰ will and does not need violence to achieve any of it goals since voluntary compliance take place. But this is absence in totalitarian states today. And when a government start losing it legitimacy, violence become an artificial means towards the same end and is therefore found, only in the absence of power.

These political thoughts of Hannah Arendt are quite immense and very important to be studied so as to enable us take measure for a better future.

However, Arendt political thoughts are quite charming especially when she was courageous to publish her first book on the *Origin of totalitarianism* in 1951 by examining the roots of Communism in Nazi, a society which, she was discriminated against. This novel form of

¹⁰ Ibid, pp 2, 13.

government “*totalitarianism*”¹¹ as she contended was very different from other forms of tyranny because it applied terror to subjugate mass populations rather than just political adversaries.

This is exactly what African states are doing to weaken citizens and other political thinkers and at times any person or group of people who want to oppose are looked upon as political enemy or enemies of the state, by so doing, the government then applies its forces and other mechanisms and at times qualifying these group of people as terrorists and anti laws are always enacted to subjugate the mass, should there be any uprising. This single act alone always fuels grievances and to an extent which often spark up an atmosphere of civil unrest.

It is true and normal that human life always evolves within societies; the social part of human nature, political life has been intentionally realized in only a few societies as a space for individuals to achieve freedom. Most importantly in some totalitarian states human freedom cannot be realized. This is what is actually fuelling chaos all over the world especially in African societies and states. However, Hannah Arendt is an ideal model an author to study her writings so as to be able to learn and solve our today’s problems in our modern states and societies.

To imagine that Arendt was living, decade ahead of her time would be only partially true since most of what she addresses were current issues as well as universal questions and principles of fair play, social justice and peace for all people at all times, in fact it was her unique audacity, her condour, her heroism, deliberateness of expression and severe judgment, criticism and condemnation of evil, tyranny and totalitarianism as anathemas of the societies. She was of course a woman of her day as well as a prophetess with clear vision of the future.

DEFINITION AND CLARIFICATION OF CONCEPTS

Questions

Some philosophers over the years have been concerned with looking at questions as part of logic and language among which include Thomas Stell in his book *The Logic of Questions and Answers*, Lauri Karhunen, *The Syntax and Semantics of Questions*, Jonathan Ginsburg, *The Semantics of Interrogatives* and Joako Hintikka *Interrogator Model of Inquiry*, respectively. This alone reveals an unambiguous emphasis on the logical and linguistic analysis of questions as Limburg stated,

¹¹ Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, the World Publishing Company, Cleveland and New York, p. 465.

“That a question is a property of propositions, that property which specifies what it is to be an exhaustive answer”. In other words, questions have been seen mainly as linguistic expressions mostly propositions and are largely defined in terms of their answers. According to Dixon R.M.W in his book *A New Approach to English Grammar, on Semantics Principles*¹² he defined a question as an *interrogative expression often used to test knowledge or an interrogative sentence or clause*¹³. This interrogative query is meant to inquire or address a person in order to gain information or searching for facts or truth. In this light and in our work we shall be concern with the questions of civil disobedience and violence in our societies, today in Hannah Arendt political thought examine it roots manifestation and how to eliminate the social ills in our communities, for instance, these question that was evoked in spring 1970 in the Bar Association in the city of New York “is the law dead”?

If civil disobedience is here to stay as many have come to believe, the question of its compatibility with the law.

- To the question how shall we ever be able to extricate ourselves from the obvious insanity of this?
- Was Hobbes not right when he said, covenants without the sword are but words?
- Can student’s movement and education be radicalized especially nonviolent demonstration?¹⁴

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

Civil disobedience which is an ancient practice is more on the rise in our today’s society. Hannah Arendt in her book *Crises of the Republic* contented that, it is the defiance and violation of the law, institution and state authorities¹⁵. In other words she meant that civil disobedience is refusing to obey a law, a regulation or a power judged unjust in a peaceful manner. Civil disobedience is therefore a form of resistance without violence. In this regard, civil disobedience works as a way of publicly and peacefully showing disagreement. Nowadays, it is one of the concern risks the world is facing. History account that the origin of civil disobedience is from

¹² Dixon R.M.W, *A New Approach to English Grammar, on semantic principles*, New York, 1991, P5.

¹³ Question, Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/question PP 1-5.

¹⁴ Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, New York 1970, pp.82, 107 120

¹⁵Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, pp. 54-57.

ancient Greece some of which are even spiritual disobedience especially when Christians refuse to comply with the laws of men in the name of the divine law ever since Christians have made a clear difference between the law of men and the law of God and his commands. More to this, Christian beliefs are opposed to killing as seen when they opposed the Roman laws of killing. This demonstrates how some Christians began refusing to fight and carry out their military services or to bear arms, this refusal cost them their lives. This explains why the theologian Thomas Aquinas proceeded further to legitimize disobedience to human laws by asserting that it *is better to obey God than men*. (Acts 5:29). He stated that divine laws are natural laws based on the universal immutable principles and are contrary to the laws of the society. It is up to the human law to submit to this natural law.

However, the term civil disobedience was coined by Henry David Thoreau in the 1848 essay to describe his refusal to pay the state poll tax. Complimented by the American government to prosecute a war in Mexico and to enforce slave laws many American citizens yielded to this law without reluctance which angered Henry David Thoreau. For his part, he spent a night in jail for his protest and refusing to obey the law by not paying his poll tax. This has been identifying as an act of disobedience and a lot of people who protest have also been treated in their societies sometimes as its enemies.

Throughout history, acts of civil disobedience have helped to force a reassessment and re-evaluation of the society's moral parameters. For instance, the Boston Tea party, the resistance to British rule in India led by Gandhi, the United States of America civil rights movement led by Martin Luther King, Rosa Parks and others, the resistance to apartheid in South Africa, students sit in against the war in Mexico just to mention a few.

In this height, some of the features of civil disobedience are:

- Conscientiousness, which shows the seriousness, sincerity and moral conviction with which civil disobeyers breach the law. Their breach of law is demanded of them not only by self-respect and moral consistency but also by their perception at the interest of their society. To this effect they draw attention of laws or policies that they believe require reassessment or rejection.
- Communication: disobeying the law is also when citizens seek not only to convey their disapproval and condemnation of a certain law or policy but also to draw public attention

to this particular issue and thereby to instigate a change in law or policy. That is why John Rawls in his book *The Theory of Justice*¹⁶ (1971) stated that civil disobedience is only over committed in public openly and with fair notice to legal authorities in the society which he consider a nearly just society.

- Non-violence: this is really controversial argument on civil disobedience like publicity non-violence which is said diminishes the negative effects of violating the law which John Rawls clearly stated that violent acts are likely to injure which are incomparable with civil disobedience as a way to address. In democratic communities, civil disobedience as such is not a crime if disobedient is punished by the law. It is because they recognized offenses committed such as blocking the road or disturbing the peace or trespassing or damaging properties etc... So therefore, if judges are convinced as they sometime are either not to punish a disobedient or to punish them differently from others who violate the laws, it must be on the basis of some features or characteristics of their actions which distinguish it from the acts of ordinary offenders.

VIOLENCE

Violence according to the *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy* by Simon Blackburn (1994) is action that injures or destroys that to which it is applied. In this regard, structural violence is that which is inherent situation whose intentionally or unintentionally results in injury and disruption, and to which. The actors of the situation are indifferent. This therefore means that violence is injury done to that which is entitled to respect or it is seen as a highly excited action whether physical or moral medics has identify violence as a significant public health problem which to the world health organization “ is the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person or against a group of community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury death, psychological harm, mal development or deprivation”.

In this view, Hannah Arendt in her famous book *Crises of the Republic*, 1972, stated that, “Violence is phenomenon in its own rights which to her is nothing more than the most flagrant manifestation of power”. All politics she says is a struggle for power and the ultimate kind of power is violence¹⁷.

¹⁶ John Rawls, *The Theory of Justice and Peace*, New York, 1971, p. 366.

¹⁷Hannah Arendt *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace and Company San Diego, New York London, 1972. p. 134.

This Arendtian definition is not too distant from that of Max Weber which to him is the rule of men over men based on the means of legitimate that is allegedly legitimate violence. In the same vein, Engels sees violence as the acceleration of economic growth or development, the emphasis is on political or economic continuity on the continuity of a process that remains determined by what preceded violent action from these definitions and clarification especially that of Engels and Arendt are more focus on power and economic reasons which are the bed rock of violence as Engels further stated that, where ever the power structure of a country contradicts its economic development It is political power with its means of violence that suffers defeat. This therefore implies that it is a maxim that a military resolution in discord with the deeper cultural sources of national power cannot be stable.

On this issue the characteristics or feature of violence are diverse and complex like self-directed violence which include suicidal action and forms of self-harm. The term fatal suicidal behaviour” is often used for suicidal acts that results to death collective violence which is identify as the instrumental use of violence by people who identify themselves as members of a group against other group or set off individuals in order to achieve political economic or social objectives. This includes war, terrorism and violent political conflict between or within states.

Youth violence, Around the globe age is an important risk factor for becoming both a victim or a perpetrator of violence with young male being the most expose and vulnerable to this risk. The world health organization defines youth violence as “homicide and non-fatal attacks perpetrated by or against a person age 10-29 years¹⁸.

Arm conflict, this is often use with regards to war given some legal complexities surrounding definitions of war and the changing nature of violent and political conflict. Terrorism, this is one of the controversial debate around the world as it relate to threat of violence against civilians and the state, or symbols to create fear and achieve political economic, religious or ideological goals. These are few among others as domestic violence, sexual violence, gender, genocide and work place violence etc.

¹⁸ World Health Assembly Resolution, WHA 49.25. Prevention of violence: A public Health priority. Forty-ninth World Health Assembly, 1996, Geneva: WHO 1996.

In other words according to P. Pojman in his book *Global political philosophy*, 2003, states that, “*politics is the art or process of using words to organize people into groups, to create institutions that further our interest, to invent rules of behaviour that embody our values and can guide our actions*”¹⁹.

While political philosophy is the attempt to provide a rational structure for our rules, to make sense of politics, that is to critically assess and justify institutions and governmental system. These were exactly Hannah Arendt political thoughts.²⁰

POLITICS AND POLITICAL THOUGHTS OF HANNAH ARENDT

Arendt political thought, inculcate into people’s minds certain prescriptions, the citizen should conform or revolt, should fight for their rights and freedoms or simply submit themselves to abuses, this of course are the basis of the ever changing political dispensation and dynamism of any human grouping. This implies that she raises questions about state’s legitimate authority over its members and about social values, such as, justice, education, security among others.

In this regard, she suggested that, the establishment of civil disobedience among our political institutions might be the best possible remedy for this ultimate failure at judicial review. The first step would be to obtain the same recognition for the civil-disobedient minorities that is accorded the numerous special-interest group in the country, and to deal with civil disobedient groups in the same way as with pressure groups, which, through their representatives, that is registered lobbyists are permitted to influence and assist by means of persuasion qualified opinion and the numbers of their constituents. These minorities of opinion would thus be able to establish themselves as a power that is not only seen from afar during demonstrations and other dramatizations at their view point, but is always present and to be reckoned with in the daily business of government.

The next step would be to admit publicly that the Amendment neither in language nor in spirit covers the rights of association as it is actually practiced in the country, this precious privileged whose exercise has in fact been incorporated with the manners and customs of the people for century. If there is anything that urgently required in new constitutional amendment and is worth all the trouble that goes with it, it is certainly this otherwise as she reiterated, civil disobedience is

¹⁹ Simon Blackburn, *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*, Oxford New York, Oxford University press 1994, p.394.

²⁰ *ibid*, pp.111, 134, 135.

bound to arise, and to an extent violence, that is when the normal channel of change is no longer accessible violence comes in as solution to redress their concerns²¹.

According to James Wilford Garner²², professor of political science at the University of Illinois in his book *Introduction of Political Science: a treatise on the origin in the nature, functions and organization of the state; contented that* “The term politics” employed by many writers is open to objection that it possesses several meanings and when use without qualification or discrimination leads to confusion if not misunderstanding”

According to popular usage it is a term for both science and art that is; it is employed to denote both the systematic study of phenomenon of the affairs both state. That is why Hannah Arendt sees it as governance or management. This therefore implies that, the task of her political thought was to study in their fundamental relations the public powers to examine the conditions under which they manifest themselves, their end and their effect to investigate the state in its inner nature.

In general ways, its fundamental problems include first an investigation of the common ends of society and the formulation of fundamental principles of state life. More to this, an inquiry into the nature, history and forms of political institution and so far possible laws of political growth and development

TRUST OF THE ARGUMENT

This work is therefore, to examine Arendt notion of civil disobedience and violence as well as thought in politics, by suggestion, good governance, as well as citizen obedient towards to law and institutions of their state. This of course will enable us guard against the enemies of the states and overcome the insanity resulting from civil disobedience and violence.

This is because the fallen standard of morality and the rise of immorality are due to poor educational training in the societies. It is well stated in Cameroon that when you want to go for any competitive exams, you should have at least four Ordinary level papers and two Advanced

²¹ Arendt Crises of the Republic, p 101.

²² James Wilford Garner, *Introduction to Political Science: A Treatise on the origin in Nature, functions and Organization of the States*, American Book Company, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago, P. 86.

level papers excluding Religious studies respectively. Meanwhile the church which is a moral authority and religious studies is one among other to shape the morals and behaviour of citizens, so rejecting it is rejecting morality, Ethics and deontology. Then the society is left to be managed by immoral persons who in turns will campaign for civil disobedience and violence, and then they can be better qualify as enemies of the states.

In addition, such societies will enact laws for their interest at the detriment of the citizens, at this level, civil unrest becomes unavoidable and of the defiance of state institutions and the laws. The security of the state also becomes porous due to lack of patriotism and poor knowledge about moral values, more importantly, if strong institutions are not also put in place, such a community will rather produce strong states men with no integrity rather than institution which is dangerous in the society. So it is batter to step up with moral education at all sectors to better equip citizens on what is right from that which is wrong. It is important to note that when citizens are well educated on moral values, it becomes easier for them to respect the laws of their societies, the right of the state and if the state cannot also educate it citizens morally, then the state is an enemy to itself.

In this regard, it is imperative for the state to identify what to do to the citizens so as to guard against immorality like civil unrest and the defiance of the state's institutions. Living in any human community, requires abiding to certain basic rules of conduct. The rules may come from the custom of everybody living in that community and be unconsciously absorbed by each individual as he grew there. The rules may also come from the law code work out by members of the community since man is an intelligent being the rules must be made known to him.

So a law can therefore, be seen to mean the rule of action which society or the government body of the community established in order to regulate the action and activities of its citizens. It is in this light that famous scholastic Thinker Thomas Aquinas stated that: *the law is an ordinance of reasons for the common good promulgated by those who has care for the community*²³. From this, one can depict that the law must be morally binding to all citizens and reasonable in content, community serving in purpose, knowable in manifestations and authoritative in sources. This

²³Ibid, P.19.

therefore means that the law is a rule by which the state or society prescribes certain behaviour to its citizens.

It's Regrettable that these rules often contradict the natural desire of some citizens and are not respected by many of them, while others obey by compulsion. The state does compel its citizens by imposing certain sanctions (Punishment) which serve to bring their desire harmony with the prescribed laws because the law is a moral guide.

In this light, any state with good Quality education, good laws, collective security and strong institution will certainly produce good citizens who will respect state institutions. Otherwise, the life of the state will be endangered. For instance, any community or individual who attempt to jeopardize the unity and national territory in anyway whatsoever is an enemy of the state as contented by Dani Noni Lantum that:

“If anyone gain to himself so much of the public wealth unduly is an enemy of the state, and if our public servant at any level charge with the duty to serve the public or citizens and he/she instead becomes arrogant haughty, insolent and uses delay tactics in other to do for a private fee is an enemy of the state”²⁴.

Those medical practitioners in a case of emergency who refuses to come to help immediately a patient in last agony until a fee is paid which the patient cannot afford is an enemy of the state. Moreso, those teachers who are to educate the learners are more preoccupied with money making and neglect the intellectuals and moral up bring of their learners are enemies of the state because he/she wants to move from school to another to gain more ease leaving his learners untaught. Thereby ruining the future of the commonwealth let him/her not only is an enemy of the state but anathema. Any law-enforcing officer carry out arbitrary arrest before an investigation is made and lock up his/her victim without a magistrate is equally an enemy and if the state also allow those who embezzle billions to go scout free while trifle theft are imprisoned, tortured and jailed for years without trial according to the law, then the state is an enemy to itself and worse of all the ideology that promotes tribesmen as the principal customers of public office are also enemies of the state.

²⁴ Dani Noni Lantum: Bernard Nsokika Fonlon: *An Intellectual in Politics*, Maguette composition et montage: Pentagone Yaounde, 1992, PP.43, 44, 45.

This problem can only be identify by a good states with quality moral education to it citizens to know the enemy of the state and bring them to other for the smooth functioning of the community or still provide a sound and rigorous education to its citizens because it is the function of the state to do so providing a scheme of life for it citizens to follow, otherwise the state will fail from it function and will then be a birth place for civil disobedience and the general crisis of the republic.

This is also because those with economic means who want power can easily erode power by organizing the mass against the state due to the inability of the state to function in order as their educational system is not up to the task, citizens unemployed, dictatorship and monologue instead of dialogue. Individual human being has the natural disposition to co-exist in the universe by relating with other members that make up the wider community. By so doing, the problem of self-insufficiency is partly resolve. The first ethics evolved by mankind was concerned with the relationship between individuals how they can leave in their communities without problems.

As the world evolved, later accretion included the society, making possible the relationship of individuals and the society. Cohesion and harmony only prevails when individuals try as much as possible to relate with others respecting the laws of nature. Human relation in the state of nature was characterized by tension, chaos disorder, and war of each against all. Thomas Hobbes contends that with the integration of the society other evolutions of human tyranny actions arise such as civil disobedience and violence. In fact, the theory of the origin of society and the weaknesses in education and the laws, institutions etc. gives room for such revolution; this is to say that it arms the individuals with both moral and political powers to resists the excessive ambitions of rulers or orders in the society, which we must overcome these phenomena with good governance.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The problem is that of insecurity and lawlessness as one ponders on the disastrous increase in crimes in the society due to the quest for power, economy supremacy, development and a better living conditions urges one to reflect upon these ills in our societies specially the question of civil disobedience and violence in our today's societies, however the question that was evoked in spring 1970 in the Bar Association in the city of New York was is the law dead? This was because of the increasing crimes in the streets and it effects, which campaigned for civil disobedience and

violence and were also very effective in securing changes in the law. In response to this question for a brighter outlook, one of the citizens propose the citizen's moral relation to the law in a society of consent²⁵.

In addition, who has ever doubted that the violated dream of violence that the oppressed dream at least once a day of setting themselves upm the oppressor's place, that the poor dream of the possessions of the rich, the persecuted of exchanging the role of the many for that of the hunter and the last of the kingdom where, the last shall be the first and the first the last?

But the question remains why so many preachers of violence?

When education is under attacked, Arendt further reiterated, can student's movement and rebellion be further radicalized seriously wherever police and police brutality intervened in essentially nonviolent demonstrations?

The answer to it many well decide whether or not the institutions of liberty will prove flexible enough to survive the onslaught of change with one civil war and revolutions. This evoke adequate education good laws and in all good governance.²⁶

In this regard, these questions therefore urges one go further by raising the following concerns or questions: Can quality and relevant moral education of the mass put an end to civil disobedience? Can citizen's obedience towards their laws put an end to civil unrest in our societies? Can collective security, good governance and strong institutions put an end to civil disobedience and violence?

METHODOLOGY AND PLAN

To realize this work, an analytical approach shall be use to interpret and analyse the conception and birth of civil state before the emergence of civil disobedience and violence in the society. In this regard, this work shall comprised of three parts, which shall equally be sub-divided into nine chapters.

²⁵ Hannah Arendt: *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace & Company, SanDiego, New York, 1972, p. 51.

²⁶ Ibid, pp 123,120, 82.

Part one, shall examine the pre-arendtian conception of the civil disobedience and violence as well as precursors to the creation of the civil state that is the origin of the civil society with regards to the contractuaries like Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean Jacque Rousseau. The views of ancient thinkers on civil disobedience before Arendt like Hennerly Thoreau, Citindhi and Martin Lutter King Junior shall also be employ before Arendt notion of civil disobedience and violence as inspired by the above

Part two, shall examine Arendt thought on politics and violence, that is power an authority as legitimate instruments of the state, the monopoly on violence, economic conflict as the basis of revolution as well as the clash of interest between citizens and the state, with regards to Arendt, Karl Marx, Hegel among others.

Part three, shall therefore comprises of critical evaluation and perspectives, that is contractarian as well as contemporal critics on Arendt's views, this way Arendt's notion of totalitarianism shall be criticise as well as security system and the entagalment of society into violence and revolutions, the quest for self determination among others. In the light of the contractuaries like Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau as well as contemporal Africans critics like Nkrumah, Walter Rodney, Achille Mbembe among others, in all my contributions and proposals on the notion of civil disobedience and violence which are, education of the mass as a moral armament, the law as mitigation as well as good governance.

PART ONE

BACKGROUND TO THE CONCEPTION OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

It is important to note that, the society originated from the limitations and inability of man to achieve all his objectives due to the egoistic or selfish nature of mankind. Human beings by nature always have the desire to attain political, economic or social aspects of life. Due to this, man enters into a contract with others in their society either voluntarily or involuntarily and by this, they are condemned by necessity to abide to the principles or norms of their community. This is so because; this social contract as stated by Jean Jacque Rousseau ensures a collective strength or force which guarantees peace, freedom, and human happiness. However, the evolution of civil disobedience and violence only come to exist when some parties or stakeholders of the society do not fulfil their functions and in this regard, when demands for dialogue and peaceful means are exploited and fail to redress the concerns of the members of these communities. Civil disobedience and violence therefore become unavoidable as the wish and aspirations of the citizens or group of persons are not attained.

CHAPTER ONE

ORIGIN TO THE CIVIL SOCIETY

Individual human beings have the natural disposition to co-exist in the universe by relating with other members that make up the wider community. By so doing, the problem of self-insufficiency is partly resolved. The first ethics evoked by mankind was concerned with the relationship between individuals. As the world evolved, later accretions included the society, making possible the relationship of individuals and the society. Cohesion and harmony only prevail when individuals try as much as possible to relate with others respecting the laws of nature. Human relation in the state of nature was characterized by tension, chaos, disorder, and war of each against all. Thomas Hobbes contends that with the integration at the society other evolutions of human tyranny action arise such as civil disobedience and violence. In fact, the theory of the origin of the society gives room for such revolution this is to say that, it arms the individuals with both moral and political powers to resist the excessive ambitions of rulers.

Civil disobedience and violence are some strategies among several attempts to account for the citizen's submission to the laws of the state. Social contract is the term applied to the political theories of the most famous and influential thinkers of the period ranging from the mid-seventeenth century to the mid-eighteenth century and actually represented by Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), John Locke (1632-1704) and Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778). These main proponents insisted that the society originated in a contract or agreement; an agreement to which each individual consented and so removed himself from the state of nature. This helped to set in place a regime of government under law of impartially administered justice and civic morality. These three advocates of social contract also emphasized contract as an explanation of the nature and even the origin of civil society.

According to Hannah Arendt in *Crisis of the Republic*, 1972, she contended that the contractarian theory of Civil disobedience is the origin of not only society, but also government. She also pointed out that: "*A distinction has often been made between pre-political contract model, approximately termed 'Contract of society' and a governmental contract or what we might call contract of submission.*"²⁷

For the "Contract of society", persons contract with each other to join together in society, while in the "contract of submission" persons agree to set up a state and are thereby obligated to obey its laws. In this way, the theory of contract is an attempt to justify political obligation. The fundamental interrogation of this chapter will be to inquire why persons should obey the law of the state at all. The analysis is based on the school of the social contract which includes Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau.

²⁷Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace & Company, San Diego, New York, 1972

1.1 Thomas Hobbes's Social Contract Theory

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) in the *Leviathan* (1651), describes the relations between the citizen and the sovereign. He uses the theory of social contract to explain society and the basis of a man's obligation within the society. Thomas Hobbes' main concern was to explain the emergence of society. He wanted to discover the origin of civil society. For this purpose, he invents the picture of a natural pre-social person. He uses the device of the state of nature which would in turn enhance the idea of civil society. Thomas Hobbes also bases political obligation on the anti-social nature of human beings. Moreover, he describes a state of nature from the psychological nature of human being, that is, a deduction from the consideration of the nature of human being and his passions.

Thomas Hobbes realised that the state of nature is the condition of human being before there was any civil society. In this state, all human beings are considered as being equal in bodily and mental capacities in the sense that an individual's deficiency in one respect can be rewarded by other qualities. This natural equality produces in human beings equal hopes of attaining their ends. For Hobbes, all persons in the state of nature tirelessly go after whatever acts they think will secure their safety. With regard to this, every person's wish is that others should value them as they value themselves. Human beings, therefore, constantly quarrel with others. That is the beginning of civil disobedience and violence. Hobbes identifies three principal sources: " ...First, competition; secondly, differences (that is, mistrust); thirdly, glory."²⁸

In his state of nature, survival is the basic pre-occupation of every one. More so, everyone is dominated by fear, the fear of violent death due to insecurity. In brief, Hobbes presents the state of nature as one in which human beings are moving constantly against each other like bodies in motion. He uses a psychological theory of human development to explain the behaviour of human beings in the state of nature. According to him, human beings in the state of nature are attracted to whatever they think will help them to survive. They also hate whatever they judge to be a threat to them. People in this primitive state are therefore, egoistic in that they are concerned chiefly about their own survival and identify goodness with their own interest.

In this state of nature it would appear that there is no obligation for people to respect each other. In short, there is no morality in the traditional sense of goodness and justice. This is to say that there is no moral distinction. The notions of right and wrong have no place. There is also no common power, no law, no private property but common property. Since there is no common power, every individual depends on his strength and his reasoning for his own security. The absence of a collective security, according to Hobbes, makes civilization difficult, impossible but he is noted to have stated that:

²⁸ Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* quoted by Frederick Copleston, in *History of Philosophy*, New York et al, Doubleday, 1985, Book Two, Vol. V, P.31.

*In such condition there is no place for industry, because the fruit thereof is uncertain and consequently no culture of the earth, no commodious building... no account of time, no letters, no society... continual fear and danger of violent death and life of man solitary, poor, nasty and short.*²⁹

Therefore, one can deduct from the above quotation that until such a time that people shall come to live together under a common power, they are still in a state of war with one another. If people are to survive, then such degree of affairs in the state of nature cannot continue forever. Individuals come to realize that the only means to survive these conflicts of the state of nature is to abandon all their efforts to satisfy their egoistic practices. According to Hobbes, the development of society appears to be the unique means to achieve peace, which is also the foundation to civil disobedience since all cannot be satisfied with laws of the society to attain happiness. In his regard, it is the human being's passion that brings about the state of natural war. But the fears of death, the desire of such things are a necessity to a better life and the hopes of attaining his goals push human beings to seek peace. Though passion is at the origin of civil disobedience, violence and war, some passions however induce individuals to seek peace. For Hobbes, these are the laws of nature. Indeed, they are the minimal Principle's that human beings must agree to observe if they are to constitute a society that will really protect them against the dangers of the state of the nature. He defined a law of nature as: "The dictate of right reason, conversant about those things which are either about to be done or omitted for the constant preservation of life and member...."³⁰

Hobbes often refers to this law of nature as a general will founded by reason in order to preserve peace. For him, the possibility for human beings progress from the state of nature is made possible by the law of nature. This law of nature states the conditions for relations preservation and its rational pursuit leads human being's to form a commonwealth and a stable government. Generally, if individuals wish to survive in the state of nature, then they must observe these laws of nature as the rules of behaviour. Hobbes formulates nineteen of such rules, but only three are considered here. According to Hobbes, the fundamental law of nature holds that: "Every person

²⁹ Ibid, p. 31-32.

³⁰ T. HOBBS, 'Philosophical Element of true Citizen' (1889), quoted by Frederick Copleston, in *History of Philosophy*, op. cit, p. 34.

must endeavour to peace, in as much as he has hopes of achieving it; and when he cannot obtain it, that he may seek and use all helps and advantages of war”³¹.

The second rule is gotten from the fundamental law which states that a person cannot lay down the right to defend his own right because he cannot be stronger. The third rule stipulates that people should perform their covenants or agreement made.³² He considers this law very instrumental, for, without it, covenants are in vain and remain empty words. The state of war persists in situations where covenants made are not respected. Hobbes considers the third law to be the bed rock or root of justice. In the sense that where there has been no covenant or agreement, no action can be said to be unjust. A legal order therefore, comes into being only when the sovereign has been put into place.

The question arises here as to whether these natural laws are binding on individuals. Do citizens have any obligation to obey them? “According to Hobbes these laws are to say they bind in act, not always”³³. Summarily, Hobbes’ notion of the state of nature is a deduction of the consideration of the nature of a human being and his passions. His approach depends upon a psychological theory about the nature of human beings. According to him, the human being is by nature selfish and egoistic. They are motivated by selfish desires which require satisfaction, if they are to be happy. The state of nature for him is hypothetical, historical and non-universal. In other words, the state of nature in his opinion was never universal all over the world. The natural state of war is a historical fact in many places as can be seen in America where the savages still live in a brutish manner. The state of nature represents what will be obtained were it not for the foundation of a commonwealth which can only be achieved in a covenant when we abandon our natural rights to the sovereignty

According to Hobbes, a human being always seeks self-preservation and protection but he/she is unable to attain this end in the natural condition of civil disobedience, violence and war. As a result, it is necessary to have a common power backed by force and able to punish or sanction. This implies that many individuals should confer all their powers and strengths upon one person or upon an assembly of persons. In other words, these individuals must appoint one person or an

³¹T. HOBBS ‘Leviathan’ (1651), quoted by Samuel Enoch Stumpf, in *philosophy: History and problems*, New York et al, Graw Hill, 1989, P35.

³² Ibid. Op. cit, P. 32.

³³ Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, quoted by Frederick Copleston, *History of Philosophy*, op.cit, p.37.

assembly or group of persons to represent them. When this is done, they will form a real unity in one person as Plato asserted that “the state is an individual writ large”, a person Hobbes describes as one whose actions are considered as presenting the actions of all the people. Human Beings simply enter into a contract to form an association or an artificial person. Such a contract, for Hobbes, involves the mutual transfer of rights in which one of the contractors may deliver the things contracted on his part, and leave the others to perform their part at some determinate time and in the meantime be trusted. Anyone who fails to perform his function be sanctioned by the law for tempering justice with interest. Hobbes estimated that this transfer of power is:

... is more than consent, or concord, it is a real unity of them all, in one and the same person made by covenant of every man with every man in such a manner as if every man should say to every man “I authorized and give up my rights of governing myself to this man, on this condition that thou give up thy right to him and authorize all his actions in like manner. This done, the multitude so united in one person is called a commonwealth, in Latin Civitas. This is the generation of that Leviathan or rather, to speak more reverently of that mortal god to which we owe under the Immortal God our peace and defence³⁴.

For Hobbes, the contract is not made between the sovereign and the citizens, Individuals simply hand over their rights to govern themselves to the sovereign. In this way, the sovereign has absolute powers to govern and is in no way responsible to the citizens. As a result, no breach of the covenant is possible by the sovereign since he is not a party to the contract with the citizens. On the establishment of the society, the parties become subject of the sovereign. According to him, the society is instituted for a specific purpose that is, the peaceful security of all those who are parties in the social pact. In this view, one covenant suffices for the society and government to come into existence together.

Thomas Hobbes’ contracts oblige the people to a permanent membership in a political society whose first task is to put in place a sovereign. Such a sovereign is empowered by the society to enact laws, settle conflicts and so on. Once the sovereign has been put in place, the citizens owe him absolute obedience. The effect of the contract is to make the sovereign the representative of the citizens’ will. The sovereign disposes of the entire force of society for affecting his will and

³⁴ Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, quoted by Tangwa Godfred, in « *The Contractarian Theory of Political Obligation*, A course essay in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of MA Degree in Philosophy, University of Ife Nigeria. 1979, pp.8-9.

the citizens' under the sovereign; the individual enjoys such rights as the sovereign wills him to have.

Thomas Hobbes believed that, the best form of power to the sovereign is the centralized one and favoured a monarchy. In addition, he considered such a sovereign power to be indivisible and irrevocable. Once divided, the sovereign power becomes individual judgments. Anarchy and violence is the logical consequence of individual judgment. According to him, the only way to overcome anarchy is to make a single body out of the several bodies of citizens, (arms of government). This single body is the sovereign, therefore, acts on behalf of the citizens. Hobbes concludes that resistance or disobedience to the sovereign by the citizen is illogical for many reasons. First, because it will result in resistance to oneself, secondly, to resist is to revert to independent judgment which is tantamount to a return to the state of anarchy violence and civil unrest. This means that individuals submit themselves to sovereign power either for fear of violent death or of one another in the state of nature. Hobbes' theory of covenant is in part to show the rational character of subjection to the sovereign.

In this view, we must act wisely in our dealings with others in the society because to Hobbes, people in all societies want self-presentation, glory and power. This egoistic and irrational nature of man is the foundation of civil disobedience and violence as he contended that "The war of all against all", in which their lives are solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short". This always creates conflict since rational and irrationality interacts in complex ways. Sometimes people desire power over others for its own sake. In this dilemma breaking the law or covenant of the state of nature when other schools of thought have done first, is taking that kind of risk. Such an individual then needs help and understanding of another school of thought to come to his or her rescue and protection. He or she must either join a non-state defence cooperative or help from a state. And if contrary to his opinion and expectations, his unreliability is found out, she or he cannot reasonably expect to be received into any such union. He or she will be depending on other people making a mistake about their own interest, and it is not prudent to do so when the stakes are that high.

So therefore, it is better to respect the rights of sovereigns by institution³⁵ because when an assembly enact a law for the common good of all citizens are condemned by necessity to obey

³⁵Thomas Hobbes., *The Leviathan*, Hackett Publishing company, Inc Indianapolis, Cambridge, 1994, p. 110.

even if it is against individual will. Since the will of the majority is more than that of an individual, the being must therefore respect the general will and commonwealth most especially the institutions in a given society or community must be respected by all because these institutions are more than the individuals and can only be dissolved in an assembly collectively.

However, even though every human being has a right to his or her opinion, the right of the sovereign must be upheld to avoid going back to the state of nature and that is why it is believed that for those in power, there should enact and promulgate laws of general interest and just for theirs, so much so that, those who in any way break the covenant be punish accordingly. And if any person or group of persons pretended their disobedience to their sovereign a new covenant must be imposed to the power that be for adoption and if otherwise it will be unjust.

“Hobbes believes that no man can without injustice protest against the institutions of the sovereign declared by the major part because to him the sovereign’s actions cannot be justly accused by the subject. The sovereign function with the consent of the other members which overall individuals will voluntarily joined the congregation of them that were assembled, he sufficiently declared thereby his will to stand to what the major part should ordain and so therefore if he refuse to stand thereto, or make protestation against any of their decrees, he does contrary to his covenant and therefore unjustly”³⁶. This is to say that very citizen who belongs to an institution is also a stakeholder and author of his or her actions and judgements of the sovereign civil disobedience and violence can only prevail when the subjects disregard and break the covenant or the laws of heir institutions and the authorities in power must not also adulterate the laws or covenant for their private gain or interest.

Hobbes is credited for laying emphasis on the natural condition of mankind, because to him, nature had made it possible for men to be equal in their faculties of body and mind. Even though some individuals sometimes manifest stronger than others or are of quicker minds than others yet when is reconciled together the difference between man to man is not taken into consideration as one man can take upon claim to himself any gain to which another man may not pretend. Because the strength of the body, the weakest has strength enough to defeat or eliminate, that is; an agreement that they must act together for the common course and for the protection of

³⁶Ibid. P. 112

a common interest from this equality or ability emanates equality of hope in the attainment of our ends. He contended that “if any two men desire the same thing, which nevertheless they cannot both enjoy, they become enemies; and in the way to their end, which is principally their own conservation and sometimes their detection only endeavour to destroy or subdue one another”.³⁷ This is to say that the contract of the society is abused. To this effect, when an individual is no longer afraid because of group support against another individual or group, he or she then takes a comfortable position to unite with other forces to either dispose and deprive the other not only of fruit of their labour, but also of their lives and liberty and by so doing the lives of people are endangered.

In this regard, people gain pleasure when there is no force or power that is able to overtake them. For every person believes that his or her companion should value him at the same level that he or she upon oneself and in all aspect or understanding, and naturally always endeavours, as fast as he dares will be tantamount to destroy each other. In Hobbes view, in the nature of man we find three principal causes of quarrel which are: competition; and glory. This is to say that, competition make people to invade for ‘gong’, glory for safety and reputation respectively. This means that competition use violence to be masters over the others, while glory is to defend them and lastly for triples, as words, a smile, a different, opinion and any other sign of underline, either direct towards and individual or by reflection in their kind, friends, nation, profession or their names. This indicate that such a society or community during this period exist without a common power to keep them all under control. They are in a situation of war and such war is of everyman against everyman, for war is not only in a battle, or the act of fighting, but also in a tract of time where the will to contend by battle is sufficiently known. However, whatsoever is the outcome in the period of war whereby citizens live without protection or security to their strength and discoveries, man then becomes an enemy to a fellow man and in such a society, there is no place for industry because the fruits is uncertain as contended by Hobbes that “To this war of everyman against everyman, there is also consequent: that nothing can be unjust,³⁸ the notion of right and wrong, justice and injustice, have here no place. Where there is no common power, there is no law; where there is no law, no injustice,³⁹ force and fraud are in war, the two cardinal virtues, justice and injustice are

³⁷T. Hobbes., *The Leviathan*, Hackett publishing company, pp75, 76.

³⁸Ibid. pp, 77, 78.

³⁹Ibid

none of the faculties neither of the body nor of the mind. If there were, they might be in a man that he alone in the world, as well as his senses and passion. They are qualities that relate to men in society not in solitude. It is consequent also to the same condition that there be no property, no dominion, no mine and thing distinct, but only that to be everyman's that he can get and for so long that he can keep it. And his much for the ill condition, which man by mere nature is actually placed in, though with a possibility to come out of it, consisting partly in passion, partly in reason.

Thomas Hobbes also gained much glory when he stipulated the laws and contracts in the society which he considered natural laws to cope and ease the understanding of his contemporaries and subsequent generations. These natural laws or contracts are inalienable and man by nature is pre-disposed to for his or her right and liberty, which a person must have to use his or her power for the preservation of his or her own nature. This is to say that, he or she has the freedom to defend his life and liberty which is understood that it is the absence of external impediments and when attacked he or she has the right by alienation to use his or her power left to him according his judgement and reason which shall dictate to him⁴⁰. So therefore, the law of nature is that general rule found out by reason which is forbidden to do that which is destructive of his or her life or take away the means of preserving his life. This Hobbesian views and the contract is for human preservation. But unfortunately man life is always endanger by other members in the society, contrary to Hobbes who think that naturally, everyman has a right to everything because the fundamental law of nature seek peace. With the breach of the respect of the natural law and contract it then lay the foundation for violence and the condition of war of everyone against everyone whereby everyone is govern by his own reason and there is absolutely no way in which he may stop at for preserving his own life against his enemies. It follows that:

It is a percept or general rule of reason that everyman ought to endeavour peace as far as he has hope of obtaining and when he cannot obtain it, that he may seek and use all helps and advantages of war. Hobbes.

The first law therefore to Hobbes is the natural law from God and the second is the contract that is the natural contract in way of peace which in more cases is the transfer of power. When the pact of covenant is endeavour, power is surrender to another for collective peace in the society. In this

⁴⁰Ibid. pp, 80, 94, 110, 112.

regard, there shall be justice of manners and justice of action as well as cumulative and distributive justice.

From this perspective, individual members in the contracted society will be protected by the covenant and properties secured. This is because the main objective or the social pact is for security or commonwealth for their own preservation, which is the wish and natural passion of men in their perspective societies or communities as the popular dictum says; doing to others as we would be done to, because all members in the a given community seek equity, justice, peace and modesty.

It is important to note that, the right of individual ends where that of the state or sovereign begins. This is so because the covenant of the commonwealth which people generally agreed is in the sovereign as an institution to guarantee security and the preservation of the natural right of individuals against their enemies. That is why Thomas Hobbes believes that “No man can without injustice protest against the institution of the sovereign declared by the major part”.⁴¹ This is to say that, the will of the majority is more than that of an individual in the community or society, reason why to Hobbes, the sovereign’s actions cannot be justly accused by the subject because the pact or covenant which he or she entered in condemned him to yield to the rules of the sovereign without reluctance. This is so because the contract obliges him to do so and if any modification, it should be in the assembly and plenary for all parties in the society to agree on significantly, the emergence of the civil laws in the societies as a result of the commonwealth or common interest, which is understood as the laws that men are therefore bound to observe because there are members but of a common wealth⁴². This is because their understanding of certain laws belongs to them who preach the practice of their laws in their various communities or sovereignties. This mean that the law manifest the general will and it is reasonable in it source and authoritative in nature and must be people oriented that is why Hobbes consider the civil laws as “those rules which the commonwealth had commanded him (by word, writing or other sufficient sign of the will) to make use of for the distinction of right and wrong, that is to say that, of what is contrary, and what is not contrary to the rule”. This means that, the laws of the commonwealth are from the sovereign power of the society bound to them all and not from the subject to the civil law.

⁴¹Thomas Hobbes, *The Leviathan*, Hackett publishing company, Inc. Indianapolis/ Cambridge, 1994. pp 80, 94, 110, 112.

⁴²Ibid. pp. 72, 74, 78.

It should be noted that, the law of nature and the civil law contain each other and are of equal rank and virtues. This implies that they are not different kinds of law but different parts of law, where by one is written and the other unwritten, that is the natural law is ordained by God and is not written and manifests itself from divine principles to oblige people to obey, while civil law is written or documented to address some actions, practices and guarantee human liberty without injury, to this effect, people or citizens in their respective societies are condemned by necessity to yield to the general will without any reluctance because everything is for the commonwealth. This way people cannot enjoy the civil and uncivil law at the same time. The law can only be considered as a law when it is from the legislator or assembly agreed by them all.

Civil disobedience and violence are considered as crime when citizens violate the general will because crime consists in committing that which the law forbids or violating that which prohibits it is looked upon as a sin in the society and a defect of human understanding as a result of ignorance. Even though ignorance of the civil laws of a given society are not sufficiently made open or declared, and if the law is not clear enough and a citizen goes against he or she may be excused, but the ignorance of the state or sovereign law may not be excused because he or she had to take note on the law and power that protected them before then. Hobbes⁴³ believes that “Nothing can be made a crime by law made after the fact because if the facts are against the law of nature, the law was before the fact and a positive law cannot be obligatory. But when the law that forbids a fact is yet he that doth the fact is liable to the penalty ordained after in case no lesser penalty were made known before, neither by writing nor example for the reason immediately alleged.

This of course implies that, there should not be a misinterpretation of the law, be it the civil or natural law, because when the law is wrongly interpreted to suit a particular context in the society, the interpreter then is qualified enough to be called a false teacher misinterpreting the law. This is commonly found in our contemporary era where laws are being poorly interpreted to favour a group of people or to suit a particular context making civil disobedience and violence unavoidable.

However, it is important to note that, all these laws: civil laws, natural laws and laws of the sovereign are geared to attainment of human liberty where happiness is guaranteed in the society.

⁴³Ibid. pp,190, 191, 193.

This signifies that the covenant, pact or contract into which one enters in any given civil society is to safeguard freedom, liberty and properties among several others. This liberty is considered by Hobbes⁴⁴ as the absence of opposition (by opposition, he meant external impediments of motion) and can be applied no less to rational and inanimate creatures than to rational. More to that a free man is he that in those things which by his strengths and he is able to do is not hindered to what he has a will to. It should be noted that this liberty or freedom doesn't mean that we should injure others, but the absence of constrain and external influence, this liberty of citizens or subjects is clearly stated on the covenant geared towards the commonwealth.

More so, this liberty or freedom of people in a given society is consistent with the unlimited powers of the state or sovereignty because it is the only place where human beings or subjects can achieve liberty. Added to this, the sovereign or state is the only essential condition and place where the covenant and contract can be realised. This is so because it acts on the interest of sovereign due to its multiple functions on the interest of its subjects.

However, the liberty and freedom of the subject can only be measured how well-behaved a citizen or subject respects the laws or the sovereign. When these subjects apply their intellectual virtues, it is measured positively as a value to be inculcated, this because if all things are equal to all men, nothing would be prized. This intellectual virtue is understood as such abilities of the mind as men praise or appreciate, value and desire should be on themselves which is most commonly under good faith. That is why all subjects or citizens in any given civil society must be prudent in whatever action to take so as to avoid any defect.

In this light, all men desire honour, worth and dignity and thus must preserve it by securing his or herself in the civil society through a contract. This so because the greatest of human power is that which is compounded of powers of most men, united by consent in one person, natural or civil. This is to uphold ones dignity and reputation from any aggression and when a people value is injured civil disobedience or violence is likely to occur. After Hobbes, John Locke extends the theory of social contract to include two contracts; one to organize society and another to form government. He is a chief opponent of Hobbes.

⁴⁴Ibid. pp, 136, 137.

1.2 John Locke's Notion of the Civil Society

John Locke, (1632-1704), exposed his ideas in his book: *The Second Treatise of civil Government* (1690). He begins this treatise with a historical account of the origin of government or the state. Indeed, he actually investigated into the origin and structure of civil society. Locke also appeals to the law of nature. For Locke, the natural law meant a universal obligatory moral law enacted and promulgated by human reason as it reflects on the Supreme Being (God) and His rights, on human being's relations to God and on the fundamental equality of all human beings as rational creatures. For him, this natural law defined people's rights and duties in the state of nature.

Locke started with the idea of the state of nature, he claims that all human beings are naturally in the state of nature and remain so till they enter into a contract in a political society. Locke considers the state of nature as a state of affairs in which men are naturally in perfect freedom. This means that individuals therein have uncontrollable liberty to dispose of their possessions or persons as they think necessary. However, they have no liberty to destroy themselves and others.

According to him, the state of nature is also a state of equality wherein all powers and jurisdictions are reciprocal. Human beings are equal in duties, ranks and faculties. Also, Locke's state of nature is not marked by war. It is one in which individuals live peacefully and even possess private property. Human beings at this level are naturally sociable, they sometimes work for the good of others and associate with others. Locke also felt that a human being is governed by the law of nature, which teaches every one not to harm another in his life or property. This law of nature enables each person to be positively recognized as a person by virtue of his/her status as a creature.

This natural law, for him, also implies natural rights with corresponding duties. Amongst these rights, he emphasizes the right to private property. Locke uses this idea of property to effect the passage of man from the state of nature to civil society. He argues that an individual has the duty and right to preserve him/herself; he/she also has a right to those things which are required for this purpose. Private ownership in his view is a person's labour. Since a person's labour in the state of nature is his/her own, whatever he/she transforms from this original condition becomes his/hers. There is, however, a limit to the amount of property that any individual can accumulate. He claims that no person should be entitled to acquire as much as he likes to the detriment of the others. Property must be shared according to needs. This property refers to the fruits of the earth which are given to us for use and enjoyment. It must be shared in such a way that everyone gets just: "*as much as. ..one can make use of to any advantage of life before it gets bad, so much he may by his labour fix a property in: whatever is beyond this is more than his share and belongs to others.*"⁴⁵

⁴⁵John Locke. *The Second Treatise of Civil Government*, quoted by Frederick Copleston, in *History of Philosophy*,

Locke also holds that a person has a right to inherit the father's property. Also for him, in a state of nature, every individual is his/her own proper judge and executioner of the law of nature. Everyone has the executive power of the law and, therefore, has the right to punish. Locke differentiates between a state of nature and a natural state of war. In what he describes is a situation of the war of each against all. Human being in this natural state of war is dominated by fear and wars. However, the lack of a common judge is the underlying factor of a state of nature. Although, a state of nature is peaceful for Locke, nevertheless, it could become a state of war under certain conditions. This is possible whenever a group of persons or some individuals attempt to gain control over others by force. A state of war is instituted between the person who seeks to dominate and those whom he attempts to dominate. Locke does not consider the state of nature as an ideal condition. Individuals in this state are not contented with the prevailing conditions and will always seek to leave it. The state of nature, for Locke, is a condition in which every person is his own proper judge, and there is therefore no common authority. Human beings sometimes find difficulties to apply the law of nature. The civil society comes into existence because of man's inability to preserve their liberty as commented by Frederick Copleston as he asserted that:

Although men, considered in the state of nature, are independent of one another, it is difficult for them to preserve their liberties and rights in actual practice. For from the fact that in the state of nature all are bound in conscience to obey a common moral law, it does not follow that all actually obey this law. From the fact that all enjoy equal rights and are morally bound to respect the rights of others, it does not follow that all actually respect the rights of others. It is in man's interest, therefore, to form an organized society for the more effectual preservation of their liberties and rights.⁴⁶

Humanity, notwithstanding all the privileges of the state of nature, is quickly driven into a civil society. This society only begins with a social contract. Locke says:

Men being, as has been said, by nature free, equal and independent, no one can be put out of this estate and subjected to the political power of another without his own consent. The only way whereby any one divest himself of his natural liberty, and put on the bonds with other men to join and unite into community for their comfortable, safe and peaceable living one amongst another... Thus, that which begins and actually constitute any political society is nothing but the consent of any number of free men capable of a majority to unite and incorporate into such a society. And this is that, and only which did or could give beginning to any lawful government in the world.⁴⁷

New York et al Doubleday, 1985, p,131

⁴⁶ *ibid*, p, 131

⁴⁷ John Locke, *The Second Treatise of Civil Government*, p, 11-12.

This act puts human beings out of the state of nature into a society, by setting up a common judge with authority to determine all the controversies and redresses the injuries that may happen to any member of the society. It also sets down what punishment shall be meted on the several transgressions committed amongst its members. Individuals always give up when they join together to form a political system. According to Locke, human beings actually give up their legislative and executive powers in the form in which they belong to them in the state of nature. By doing so, they authorize the society or rather the legislature to make such laws that are required for the common good. He also felt that by surrendering their powers to the society, the freedom of the citizens of the society is guaranteed. According to him, this guarantee is justifiable only if it is in the consent of those who are incorporated, or rather of those who incorporate themselves into political society and subject themselves to government. He also argues that individuals surrender their powers to a political society in order to enjoy their liberties more securely. For “...no rational creature can be supposed to change this condition with an intention to be worse”.⁴⁸

This contract or agreement also involves the submission of the consent of the individual to the majority of the community. The purpose of an organised society according to Locke is to protect properties. He asserted: “*The great and chief end of men uniting into sovereign and putting themselves under government is the preservation of property*”⁴⁹Property, for him, is the general name for lives, liberties and estates. In his view, it is from property that political rights are obtained.

John Locke’s conception of contract assumes the individual as having a permanent obligation to obey the legislature. In the state, the legislature is the supreme power and is exercised by elected representatives. Precisely, it lies in the hands of the majority of the people. By a second contract, the people also set up a government. This government is trusted with a definite task, and is under an obligation to fulfil its trust. According to him, trust is only to act for the public good. Locke also insisted on the needs for the division of powers in the society to ensure that those who administer the laws do not make them. For as he argues:

*They may exempt themselves from obedience to laws they make, and suit the law, both in its making and execution to their own private advantage and thereby come to have a distinct interest from the rest of the community.*⁵⁰

Locke holds that in a mixed government of legislative, executive and federative branches, the legislative is supreme but not absolute. He asserted:

There can be but one supreme power which is the legislative to which all the others are and must be subordinate, yet the legislative being only fiduciary power to act from certain ends, there remains still in the people

⁴⁸ John Locke, ‘*The Second Treatise of Civil Government* in Frederick Copleston, *History of philosophy* op.cit, p, 134.

⁴⁹ Ibid, p, 133.

⁵⁰ Ibid, p, 137.

*a supreme power to remove or alter the legislature when they find the legislature act contrary to the trust reposed in them.*⁵¹

This executive according to him must govern only by enacted and promulgated laws from the legislative. These are laws which are made for the good of the people. It must also not make changes without the consent of the people. Moreover, it is not entitled to transfer the power of making laws to any person or body not entrusted by the people with this power.

On the other hand, the executive is appointed by the people. This is to say that when individuals leave the state of nature they give up their powers of punishment to an executive branch. This executive has no authority of its own and cannot claim obedience except it is enforcing the law of the society. It can be removed or replaced by the people immediately it is felt that it has violated the limits given to it. However, for Locke, the executive can dismiss the legislative. Finally, the federative power, for him, makes war, peace and treaties with foreign nations.

John Locke never agreed with the view that people transfer their rights to the sovereign. According to him, the citizen's right to rebellion is retained, though such rebellion is justified only when the government is dissolved, or overthrown by an external enemy. This can also be possible when there has been a change in the legislature. He advocated a restrained revolution for the restoration of balance of power in the Republic. His process of government as a whole emphasized the hypothetical process of human development from the state of nature to civil society.

Social contract, for Locke, is a historical fact. However, no examples have been found of individuals meeting together in the state of nature to form a political society. His political theory allows for two contracts: By the first contract, or what could be termed the "contract of society" man becomes a member of a definite political society. This obliges him to accept the decisions of the majority of the members of this newly formed civil society. Through the second contract, or the "governmental contract" members agree to carry out the activities of the government. He argues that since society is formed by a different social contract, it cannot be overthrown by the decision of the sovereign. It can only be dissolved by agreement of its members.

Within the hints of the natural law, citizens may choose to institute whatever form or system of ruler ship, what matters most is that, power is in the hands of the people as they can decide to eradicate it or factor in some changes. This therefore implies that, the covenant or contract is between the citizens and not the rulers and the people. Rulers are servants like any other person in the civil society. Locke⁵² therefore significantly divides in the following ways: The rule of one, few or many monarchy, autocracy or democracy or preferably a mixed form of government.

⁵¹ Ibid, p, 40.

⁵² John Locke, *The Two Treaties of Government*, Orion Publishing Group, London, 1993, pp, XXXII, XXVII.

This means that any society has its form of government that is best to them as legislated by the assembly for the commonwealth which can be an instrument in the hands of the rulers to govern in their respective society. However, Locke was really in favour of absolute monarchy. This is what he qualifies as the spirit of power because he valued wisdom and prudence in rulers, for instance, in case of extreme emergence which requires a quick decision taking the ruler may decide instead of parliament or assembly sitting which means that not everything can be anticipated by law.

However, the right to resistance which is civil disobedience by citizens is acceptable when it is peacefully demonstrated, especially when the ruler does not apply prudence and wisdom in decision taking. It is just as patriotic to resist internal as external aggression. The word terrorism today is usually applied only to violence against the state by dissatisfied citizens. Locke reminds us that the state sometimes sponsor terrorism against their citizens. Locke is also credited to have declared that⁵³ “we are all by nature free and equal to be in a condition of freedom and equality, prior to government, is to be in the state of nature. It is not unsocial conditions for people are naturally drawn together into families and communities. It is a circumstance in which people acquire property and engage in commerce. It is not as it was for Hobbes, a brutish condition, though it is an unstable one. In order to preserve our lives, liberties and estates, we choose to come out of the state of nature and enter into the civil society by an act of consent known as the social contract, usually referred to by Locke as a “compact”.

More so, it is only when the compact state by Locke is violated that the civil society start experiencing violence that is why in our contemporal era, most civil uprising is recurrent, either provoke by brain damage persons in the society or either by some authorities of the state either directly or indirectly which urges people to into the state of war or enormity and destruction whereby properties and estates are destroyed even human lives.

However, man by nature wants to have total liberty and freedom from any existing force without any restrain and not to be control by any other authority of man but only the law of nature. This is because the human nature and conditions look upon the legislative authority as a dictator and cannot abide to it because they consider it as slavery to the legislative authority except that

⁵³Ibid, p, XXIII.

which is instituted by consent for a common interest or commonwealth. This liberty to man seems for one to as he or she desires and not to be tied by law. To this effect freedom of men in a government system is to have a rule to live by which is common to everyone of that society or community even though this freedom or liberty in a government of consent, to them it should not equally deprive them of their natural freedom and liberty even if enacted and promulgated by a legislative.

This freedom entails that arbitrary power is so necessary to and closely join with man's preservation that he or she cannot separate with it because if men do not have power of his or her own life cannot for any reason surrender his own life to another or put his life under arbitrary power of another. This is so because nobody gives more power than he has. This is so because anytime he or she finds difficulties as a slave to another then he becomes absolute in preserving his or her own self and value that is resisting the will of the master which often than not always spark up an atmosphere of chaos in the societies. This explains why John Locke contented that "This is perfect condition of slavery, which is nothing also but the state of war continued between a lawful conqueror and a captive⁵⁴.for if once compact enter between them, and make on the other, the state of war and slavery ceases as long as the compact endures. For as has been said, no man can by agreement pass over to another that which he hath not in himself, a power over his own life.

Significantly, this freedom and liberty of men in their societies or communities is synonymous to the one he qualifies as "of paternal power." This is so because to him the sovereign or state exist as a matter of consent and of commonwealth for the protection and preservation of their values as existing humans in any human grouping. That is, the state acts as parent to its citizens through an institutional government just as the parent over their children which most often than not, the father over the children often gain and claim more glories as if the mother had no share in it, whereby if we visit reason over assumption, we shall realise that, she has an equal title and right. That is why for Locke, it will be more reasonable to called it parental power because whatever law of nature and right of generation on the children it must equally binds them without

⁵⁴Ibid. op cit, pp, 125, 126.

distinction as he holds that “children honour thy father and mother” as a law of nature because god joined them together and command children to be obedience to them⁵⁵.

This to Locke was not properly examine deeper, because men will keep on doing the same mistakes about parental power which however may be considered as absolute power which seems appropriate to most fathers. This therefore seems to have little or no regards to freedom and liberty of children from their parents especially, when the power and authority of the fatherhood seems to be blond or a little too distant from the mother. This is the restricted sense as it is the respect of monarchy which they derive their government from a single person only was not placed in one, but two persons jointly. This of course is the issue of liberty and freedom as well as paternal power is the foundation of inequality in the societies as well as the civil society or human grouping.

This therefore implies that, children are not born in this full state of equality, though they are born to it. Their parents have some powers over them when they come into existence in the world; after sometime one will realise that this bond of subjection or contract of submission, when they grew up sometimes eliminate, reduce or eradicate it totally as a matter of individual opinion and freedom. This is so because at birth they are weak as infants, but age and reason develop as they grew up and then loosen up the jurisdiction and power and authority of the parent they formerly yielded without reluctant. Even in the state, when citizens disobey their government in which they grew in, is because they find in them some reasons to as a matter of opinion and liberty as the gain age and wisdom. In this light Locke stated very freely that: “Adam was created a perfect man, his body and mind in full possession or their strength and reason, and so was capable from the first instant of his being to provide for his own support and preservation, and govern his action according to the dictates of the law of reason which god had implanted in him.”⁵⁶ The world is peopled with his descendants who are all born infants, weak and helpless without knowledge or understanding. But to supply the defects of this imperfect state, till the improvement of growth and age had removed them. Adam and Eve, and other them all parents were by the law of nature, under an obligation to preserve, nourish and educate the children, they had begotten, not as their own workmanship, but the workmanship of their own maker, the Almighty, to whom they were to be accountable for them”.

⁵⁵Ibid, p 140.

⁵⁶Ibid. pp, 141, 142.

This means that the law that was to govern Adam was the same law that was to govern all his posterity, the law of reason. This is therefore, the foundation or bedrock of civil disobedience, for if we were to respect on the law of nature, we should have gone back to the state of nature but since we are to respect both the law of nature as well as the laws of the civil societies. We are therefore condemn by necessity to experience civil disobedience and violence as opinions and peoples aspiration are different and complex in any given society or human grouping.

However, if these children had another gate-way into the world, which is different from birth, which make them ignorant and without any use of reason, they will not be under the civil society law. For nobody can be under a law which is not promulgated to him and this law been promulgated or made know by reason only, he or she is not yet at the age of reason cannot be said to be under this law. This means that, Adam children being not presently as soon as born under this law of reason were not presently free because the law must be made known before any punishment is required.

This of course means that when as a child man is ignorant about both the natural and civil law because the child's age does not permit or guarantee such a person to reason well. But he or she virtually becomes of age then such a person can reason and is accountable for his or her actions because of his capacity of knowing that law. It therefore means that man by nature is not totally free, because as a child one experiences the heavy hand and guide of the parents with all power and authority over the children as prescribed in the law of nature even in the Bible both old and new testament. That is the covenant and compact of submission. Same thing applies to the state whereby citizens are being control by the state mechanism and any act of disrespect is considered as disobeying the parent or civil disobedience from citizens when they become of age. That is the liberators become the oppressors in their own societies. It should be noted that God has made human beings not to be isolated but must belong to a political or civil society, he or she is therefore given the necessary understanding and a system of communication to drive his or her ideas across to one another in the society or otherwise for peaceful cohabitation. It is therefore important to note that, the first society was between husband and wife and subsequently, children, that is; parent and children relationships and latter on the master and servant came to be added to make up one big family and gradually to a political or civil society which man is condemn by necessity to belong; even though conjugal society is a voluntary agreement between man and woman.

However, the society between parents and children and the distinct rights and powers belonging respectively to them, just as master and servant relationship with different conditions given that a freeman makes himself a servant to another by serving his or her master in exchange for wages or salary that he or she receives. Despite the fact that there is a common relationship between the servant and the master but have some distinction and disciplinary rules to follow. This is to say that the respect and power given to the master is temporal, and limits the power of the master in the control which binds them. This alone is little distance from a slave who is like a capture and is therefore subjected to the total and absolute dominion and arbitrary power of the masters; they got no liberties, freedom or even properties.

It should be noted that, when the master abuses the contract of the servant or otherwise in other to have total control of the servant in the civil society, then civil disobedience or violence will be unavailable because their contract binds them to the master and servant relationship and nothing else. It is in this view that John Locke contented that “man being born as has been proved with a title to perfect freedom and uncontrolled enjoyment of all the rights and privileges of the law of nature, equally with any other man, or number of men in the world, hath by nature a power, not only preserve his property, that is, his life, liberty and estate, against the injuries and attempts of other men, but to judge of and punish the breaches of that law in others as he is persuaded the offense deserves, even with death itself, in crimes where the harmonious of the fact, in his opinion required it. But because no political society can be, nor subsists without having in itself the power to preserve the property and in order thereunto punish the offences of all those of that society; there and there only is political society where everyone of the members hath quitted this natural power, resigned it up into the hands of the community in all cases that excluded him not from appealing for protection to the law established by it.

Thus, all private judgement of every particular member being excluded, the community comes to be umpired, by settled standing rules indifferent and the same to all parties and by men having authority from the community, for the execution of those rules, decides all the differences that may happen between any member of that society, concerning any matter of right; and punishes those offences which any member hath committed against the society, with such penalties as the law has established. Whereby it is easy to discern who are, and who are not in political society together. Those who are united in one body and have a common established law and judicature to

appeal to, with authority to decide controversies between them, and punish offenders, were in civil society one with another, but those who have no such common appeal, I meant on earth, are still in the state of nature each being where there is other, judge for himself and executioner; which is, as I have before showed it, the perfect state of nature”⁵⁷.

Significantly, this means that man can never be free or have autonomy over himself because either the law of nature brings man under contempt or the civil law prohibits certain human actions insofar as he or she is a member of a political society. This therefore attests to the fact that absolute monarchy as a system of government is of course not a good one because the power and authority exerted by the ruler will be inconsistent with the civil society and so cannot really be a good form of government in a political civil society. This is because the chief aim of the civil society is to put an end to the state of nature and all its inconveniences whereby human beings are judged over their own issues by setting up recognised authorities in the societies to be respected by all even when sanctions or discipline because it is for the commonwealth.

That is to say that, all human beings must consent with others to unite as one in any government politics, by this he or she is therefore obliged to put he or herself under the obligation of everyone in that society, that is, to submit or subject to the will of the majority as a matter of necessity for the common good and common interest, otherwise the covenant, compact or agreement which incorporate each other in the society will collapse and when this happens civil disobedience or violence will prevail as well as relative peace will remain just in the mercy of an accident.

This so because if man is left free without any ties or constrain as a rule to shape and regulate their actions, then the society will progress backward into the state of nature which we are struggling to eradicate and promote globalisation as a matter of urgency for a common interest. For Locke concluded that: “for if the consent of the majority shall not in reason be received as the act of the whole: and conclude every individual; nothing but the consent of every individual can make anything to be the act of the whole: but such a consent is next impossible ever to be had, if we consider the infirmities of health and convocation of business, which in a number, though much

⁵⁷Ibid. pp, 153, 156, 158.

less than that of a commonwealth, will necessary keep many away from the public assembly⁵⁸. To which if we add the variety of opinions, and contract of interest, which unavoidably happens in all collections of men, the coming into society upon such terms, would be only like Cato's coming into the theatre, only to go out again. Such a constitution as this would make the mighty leviathan of a shorter duration, than the feeblest creatures; and not left it outlast the day it was born in: which cannot be supposed, till we can think that rational creatures should be desire and constitute societies only to be dissolved for where the majority cannot conclude the rest, there they cannot act as one body and consequently will be immediately dissolved again.

This therefore implies that, any person or individual who is out of the state of nature must necessarily understand and give up or surrender his power into a community for peaceful co-existence and the end in which it was intended⁵⁹. That is the commonwealth otherwise chaos is unavoidable in such societies because all rational beings must endeavour at their earliest and fastest convenience join the civil society as the only political and civil society where their wish an aspiration can be attain and estates, properties and even their lives protected by other members that make up the wider society. Given that we are much stronger when together and an individual can resist the force of a majority of people in the community.

This therefore means that, the legislative and executive powers of the commonwealth are paramount in any political society because they guide and direct how the force of the commonwealth shall be employed to preserve their community and its people. And since these rules of compact which are being executed and there is a continuation might be sporadic and made in a little time. This implies that there is every reason for the legislative to always be in existence. This is so because, there is temptation of other members in the society who possess the ability to executive them. By this they may exclude themselves from the obedience of the laws they make and suit the law both in making and executing for their interest which is terrible in any society.

So with the presence of the legislative, they shall be constant checks and balances for the commonwealth to avoid excesses from overzealous members who work for a private gain instead of the commonwealth, common good or common interest. This is exactly what John Locke

⁵⁸John Locke, *The Two Treatises of Civil Government*, Orion publishing group, Orion house, upper St. Martin's Lane, London 1994, p 159.

⁵⁹Ibid, pp, 164, 165.

contented that: “But because the laws, that are at once and in a short time made, have a constant and lasting force, and need a perpetual execution, or an attendance there unto: therefore its necessary there should be a power always in being, which should see to the execution of the laws that are made, and remain in force. And thus, the legislative and executive powers come often to be separated.”⁶⁰

To this effect, Locke was therefore suggesting that, there should be the separation of power from both the legislative, executive and otherwise, else the amalgamation of power will lead to an abuse of power as he who has the right and power to enact laws and execute them. He or she will certainly make laws that will be for his private gain and of course in such a society civil disobedience is rampant because there is also a national power that which every individual has; a common good.

This is to say that, the whole community is a body of one in respect of the law of nature and the civil law so any injury onto one is likely to attract public attention. In this regard, the power of war and peace, league and alliances is a common denomination because the problem of one member is the problem of others who share the same views. Therefore, any transaction with all persons and communities without the commonwealth may be called federative because the commonwealth is acting on its own nature for the preservation of the community. That is why it is always put in supreme power which is the legislative which the power forces and powers are subordinated to as he stated that:

“In all cases, whilst the government subsists, the legislative is the supreme power, for what can give laws to another, must needs the superior to him and since the legislative is no otherwise legislative or the society, but by the right it has to make laws for all the parts and for every member of the society, prescribing rules to their actions and giving power of execution, where they are transgressed, the legislative must needs be the supreme and all other powers in any members or parts of the society, derived from and subordinate to it.”⁶¹

⁶⁰Ibid, p, 188.

⁶¹Ibid, pp, 190.

This means that the supremacy of the legislative is to enact and promulgate laws for the executive members to execute without bias. In this regard, the power of the legislative over other arms of government is different from tyranny which is the exercise of power beyond right which nobody can have a right to a little distance from usurpation which is the exercise of power which others have a right to⁶². So, tyranny is making use of the power one has in his interest. That is, when rulers govern for their interest without regards to the wishes and aspirations of their subjects, that is to say that, he or she cares less about the preservation of properties, lives and peace in the society, but focuses more for the satisfaction of his or her greedy ambition. Then the society is condemned by necessity to experience uprising and civil unrest.

Therefore, the use of commonwealth power and legislative power is good. But controversies only arise when those in charge of making laws do it to their own favour or participate in executing them, this will then be considered as abuse of power, whereby the society risks, retrogressing to the barbaric state of nature which is loose and rather campaign for revolutions, civil disobedience and violence for the redress of people's concerns or the dissolution of the system in a government.

More so, the aim of the civil society was to bring people together for the preservation of their lives and properties, but when the system cannot longer unite the people for the commonwealth, there is absolute need for the dissolution of that society, because whenever the society is dissolved, the government in that society cannot remain. Those who always conquer may cut up such a system and scattered the people from depending on the civil society for protection, by this there will be total confusion. It should be noted that most of these dissolution are always within because when the legislative altered, destructions and death follows; because the reasons of being in unity is to have one will; the legislative which when declared and established by the majority, this organ becomes in charge of keeping and maintaining peace. That will of the multitude and anyone who tempered with this laws may face the discipline of the commonwealth.

Any the laws that were put in place can no longer but be put into execution because the power that enacted the law can no longer be trusted and the system of that because the governors

⁶²Ibid, pp, 216.

have neglected their duties of working for the commonwealth which is dangerous govern that when a society or government is dissolve due to disagreement of their agreement in which the contracted society exists, then it becomes difficult for new system to be put in place due to some differences and the complexity of the society⁶³.

The political and civil society is therefore the only place where people can obtain relative freedom, peace and protection of properties, and it should therefore be jealously preserved with some exaggerated concern for her commonwealth, common interest and peace in any human grouping or society. The will of the multitude or majority is taken into consideration in that society, to guarantee peace co-existence and globalisation.

1.3 Jean Jacques Rousseau's version of the social contract

With regards to Jean Jacques Rousseau (1717-1778) in the *Social Contract*, he endeavours to explain the process of human beings from the state of nature to the civil state. The various conditions of his famous book can be reduced to a single statement: "The total surrender of each individual with all his rights to the whole community". It also includes the establishment of the absolute supremacy of the state over all its citizens. He attempts the question as to why a person has to obey the laws of his government. He founded political obligation on man's extra-social nature. According to him, the human being is a social being who lives in society. In a similar way as his predecessors, he compared a natural person in the state of nature with a person as a citizen of a political society. Rousseau begins his famous book, *Social Contract* with the following problematic:

*Man is born free and everywhere he is in chains. One thinks of himself the master of the others, and still remains a greater slave than they. How did this change come about? I do not know what can make legitimate? This question I think can answer.*⁶⁴

Jean Jacques Rousseau, first of all, indicated the basic state of nature in which all persons are free. He stated the conditions of the state of nature in his *Discourse On the Origin and*

⁶³Ibid, p, 22.

⁶⁴ J. J. ROUSSEAU, « Social Contract » quoted by Frederick Copleston, in *History of Philosophy*, New York et al Doubleday, 1985, p, 81.

Foundation of the Inequality' of Humanity (1758). According to him, this state of nature is a state of ignorance and simplicity. In this state of affairs, the human being lives entirely for himself and depends entirely on nature. In this state, we find human being: "Satisfying his hunger at the first oak and shaking his thirst at the first brook finding his bed at the foot of the tree which afforded him a repast...".⁶⁵

Such persons, according to Rousseau, will be physically strong and not afraid of animals or any attack. His main concern will be to seek self-protection. A human being in this state is governed first by immediate wants, by instincts and feelings. He is equally neither happy in this primitive state without industry nor home. A human being is therefore, seen as void of social life. Nevertheless, this does not mean that man in this primitive state is wicked. He argues that though the human being has no moral qualities, he cannot be said to be wicked. In other words, though the human being has no idea of goodness in the state of nature, it should not be interpreted as meaning that under this context, he/she is certainly not good. Moreover, despite the fact that there is no clear moral distinction between injustice and justice, one should not be pushed to conclude that he is certainly violent and ruthless. Generally, the human being in the state of nature is good even if he cannot be called good in the strict moral sense.

The persons in the state of nature, according to Rousseau, are equal. There only exists a natural or physical inequality that consists in the inequality of natural gifts and talents. He thinks that inequality is established by nature, but it is rendered permanent and illegitimate by the introduction of private property and law. This introduction of property brings about untold evils into the society. Rousseau emphasised on private property to discuss the transition of human being from the state of nature to the political society.

According to him, the advent of civil society is as a result of the introduction of private property. When this is established, equality disappears; moral distinction between justice and injustice becomes clear. This results in human being's departure from the state of primitive simplicity. The establishment of property brought about insecurity and other evils. According to

⁶⁵ J. J. Rousseau, *Discourse On the Origin and Foundation of the Inequality of Mankind* (1758), quoted by Frederick Copleston, in *History of Philosophy. Op. cit*, p 68.

him, the emergence of this civil society is to secure the liberty of the members. The state of nature for him is hypothetical and conditional; one calculated to explain the nature of things rather than to accept their actual origin. According to Rousseau social contract come into existence. When the obstacles to preserve human being's liberty in the state of nature become greater than their resources for maintaining themselves in this state. At this point, individuals will desire to leave this state of nature for a civil society. Through their consents, they will unite together to form a political society. He stated the essence of the social contract thus:

“Where shall we find a form of association which will defend and protect with the whole common force the person and the property of each associate, and by which every person while uniting with all shall obey himself, and remain as free as before?” Such is the fundamental problem of which the social contract gives the solution... The articles of the social contract will, when clearly understood be reducible to this single point: the total alienation of each associate and all his rights to the whole community... If therefore, we exclude from the social compact all that is not essential, we find it reduced to the following terms: Each of us places in common his person and all his power under the supreme direction of the general will and as one body we all receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole. From that moment, instead of as many separate persons as there are contracting parties, this act of association produces a moral and collective body....⁶⁶

In Rousseau's contention, the social contract is the main factor that underlines any political society. It helps to overcome the lawlessness of the absolute and assures liberty because every individual voluntarily adjusts his conduct to harmonize with the legitimate freedom of others. People gain and lose when they join together to form civil society in that individuals lose their natural liberty and unlimited right to everything. They gain civil liberty and a property right in whatever they have in the civil society. According to Rousseau, the social contract immediately creates a moral and collective body. It is called the state when it is considered as active and a power when it is compared with other similar bodies. Its members are called collectively the people as sharing in the sovereign power, and subjects as being under the laws of a state. He also considered the sovereign the whole body of the people legislating as source of law. Law, at this juncture, represents the will, and the exercise of the general will is what he calls sovereignty. For him, this

⁶⁶ Ibid, pp, 10-12.

sovereignty cannot be transferred, and cannot be divided into various powers. The sovereignty is simply the supreme power in any state to which all other powers are subordinated. He simply stated that, the people are sovereign, and they are capable of revoking all the fundamental laws of the state. This also includes the social contract itself. There is nothing in the state that people cannot do.

For Rousseau, when an individual enters the contract, he abandons all of his rights including his property to the community. This is done with the clear understanding that he is, henceforth, to enjoy only such rights as the general will of the community vouchsafes to him. He is also to perform all duties that the general will imposes on him. Rousseau's contract is not permanent and cannot be changed. For him, the general will must only legislate laws that are general in application and general in purpose and interest. When a citizen finds himself in the presence of a law that does not meet these requirements, the contract becomes violated and its obligation collapses.

In all, Rousseau wanted to show that the change from the state of nature to that of an organized society was not a substitution of slavery for freedom, for sake of mere security. He is concerned with the benefits that individuals acquire from civil society. He showed that individuals acquire a higher order of liberty in civil society than the one they enjoyed in the state of nature. He stressed much on the actual agreement between the contracting parties that creates the moral entity. He, however, laid less emphasis on the government.

CHAPTER TWO

PRECURSORS TO THE NOTION OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE IN THE SOCIETY

In our societies, all members have the obligation to obey laws. This submission to the law encourages the citizens to recognize and accept the legitimacy of the constitution and other just institutions. This obedience to the law, in turn, makes the citizens to be able to meet up with even unjust laws and policies of the government and not to deny the government's institutions by wrong means so long as the current injustice is not blatantly clear and proven. In this notion of obedience to the law, the citizens should never endeavour to exploit the mistakes of the institutions of the society in order to advance their own interests. Contrarily, the citizens should accept and learn how to cope with the weaknesses of these institutions. The citizens should be able to understand human limitations.

However, in a normal society if any law or policy is made and is wrong, obviously unjust or represents a manifest abuse of trust and power, then the general duty to tolerate human imperfections collapses. A citizen under this situation of gross and visible injustice has not only a right but also a duty to disobey the unjust laws. This should be done with the sole aim of upholding only the just schemes of the society. Such a disregard of law is termed "*civil disobedience*," provided it is based on the principle of non-violence. This means that citizens peacefully protest the unjust laws without intimidation, be it moral or physical; in short, without any trace of violence.

In this regard, the problem of civil disobedience is simply a discussion of the citizen's relation to law in a democratic society. It could be defined as: "*a public, non-violent, conscientious yet political act contrary to law usually done with the aim of bringing about a change in the laws or policies of the government*". Civil disobedience is a response from those citizens who worry over government wrongs. It arises as a problem only in what Hannah Arendt calls "*a nearly just society*," that is, one that is democratic, well ordered in most parts; but in which, nevertheless, some serious violations still take place. It occurs whenever a significant number of citizens have become convinced that their grievances will no longer be heard or acted upon. It can also be brought about by a government that is about to change its policy and has embarked upon, and persists in modes of actions whose legality and constitutionality are highly questionable.

At this juncture we shall examine briefly the philosophical background of the concept of civil disobedience and violence. This background knowledge constitutes the basis of Hannah's theory of civil disobedience, and demonstrates how it differs from other forms of political resistance. The main object of this section is to illustrate that the phenomenon of civil disobedience is centred on the principle of non-violence.

The concern on the concept of civil disobedience relies to a large extent on a famous man in prison: Henry David Thoreau in Concord (United States of America). His conducts seem to prove that disobedience to law can only be justified if the lawbreaker is willing, and even eager to accept punishment for his act. H. D. Thoreau in particular, is credited for having formed the core of the modern argument for civil disobedience. The most recent philosophy on this concept is much in common with the early writings. Hanna Arendt's theory of civil disobedience is a synthesis and deduction of the conceptions of some great thinkers like Henry David Thoreau and the world's famous practitioners - Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr.

2.1 David Henry Thoreau and the notion of non-co-operation through boycotts

According to the American philosopher, Henry David Thoreau (1817-1862), civil disobedience is an aspect of non-co-operation through boycotts. In his essay, *On the Duty of Civil Disobedience* (1848), he explains the idea that an individual should not obey a government that implements policies with which one disagrees. This, according to him, implies that a citizen should voluntarily stand publicly to oppose such policies. At the same time, the citizen should be ready to accept the consequences of his actions. Nowadays, Thoreau's expression, "to disobey the government," could be interpreted as acts of law breaking designed to bring about public attention to laws of questionable morality and legitimacy. He is credited for having introduced the notion of boycott in civil disobedience. This also includes the principle of non-co-operation with an evil system. In his own view, this non-co-operation embodies the withdrawal of support both in person and property from the government. In general, he recommends that the citizens should break the law that rather intends to make them agents of injustice to one another.

Henry David Thoreau equally looks at the relationship between liberty and majority rule. He opposes all forms of government; he is really a violent anarchist. He never believes, moreover, in the principle of majority-rule in decision-making (democracy). Thoreau is opposed to majority

rule, which is considered as the best principle in decision making because in his opinion, majority rule is not fair and morally correct. If it is practiced in democracy, it is because the majority rule simply lies in the hands of a majority of the people, who are physically the strongest. It is not fair to the minority of the people. Thoreau concludes that majority rule is a weak expression of the desire that liberty should prevail, for liberty can never prevail through the majority. He/she should be in charge of his/her liberty. He stated that the majority is always bound to be unjust, and, consequently, any government in which the majority tends to dominate in all domains cannot be just. The worst of this is that Thoreau sees nothing good in any government as a whole. He detests all forms of government. This is what he will say concerning his best form of government:

I heartily accept the motto — “that government is best which governs least” and I should like to see it acted ...more rapidly and systematically carried out, it finally amounts to this, which I also believe - “That government is best which governs not at all,” and When individuals are prepared for it, that will be the kind of government they will have.⁶⁷

Thoreau is an anarchist due to the fact that he sees little virtue in the action of the majority or the masses. This also means that government by majority, as defined by the concept of democracy, has no assurance of wisdom or morality. In short, he stated that there is a lack of wisdom in democracy. Despite this, Thoreau does not consider democracy as the worst political regime. For him, democracy is the most tolerant form of government that can permit civil disobedience as a tactic of political dealings.

Thoreau contents that morality is a matter of conscience. Conscience should guide every moral man and no moral person should adjust to injustice. Moreover, no moral human being should be forced to do that which is not approved by his conscience. He interrogated:

Must a citizen ever for a moment, or in the fewest degrees, resign his conscience to the legislators? Why has every man a conscience then? I think that we should be men and subjects afterward. It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the

⁶⁷ H. D. Thoreau, *On the Duty of Civil Disobedience*, quoted by Lawrence J. R. Herson, in *Politics of Ideas*, Homewood/Illinois. The Dorsey Press, 1984, p, 125.

*law so much as for the right. The only obligation that I have as a right to assume is to do at any time what I think right.*⁶⁸

In the most recent trends, Thoreau approves violence as an inevitable means to achieve social justice. In his opinion, there are always many circumstances during manifestations that call for violent reactions. According to him, one may not want to be violent but could be pushed to violence. In brief, Thoreau put his theory into practice of civil disobedience on a more or less individual basis. The idea of boycott, derived mostly from the principle of non-co-operation with the government, is from him. He is basically the pioneers of the philosophical argument for civil disobedience. He inspired two world famous practitioners of civil disobedience – Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr.

Thoreau's concept of civil disobedience which violence is part could be traced to the nineteenth century. A school of thought elaborated a denunciation of the United States government - on the ground of its violation, through slavery, of man's natural right "to his own body" and the fruits "*of-his-own labour*" - into a condemnation of all government as based essentially on violence. Several men preached "*non-resistance*" in the form of a refusal to take any part in government or to countenance the use of force either in support of or against it⁶⁹. According to Coker, Henry David Thoreau believed in man's natural impulse to goodness and in his perfectibility, under the guidance of his free and reasonable will. In Thoreau, perhaps, lies the fullest appeal to individuality and nonconformity in a civilization which was increasingly giving way to orthodoxy and social compulsion. He argued for the supremacy, under all conditions, of conscience over the law⁷⁰. He believed and demonstrated by example that, if government, responding to expediency or majority pressures, infringes upon the fundamental freedom of the individual or the minority, the remedy is nonviolent, or pacific, resistance.

He was only incidentally interested in politics. However, like many of his Concord friends in America he became greatly disturbed over the slavery issue. Opposed to slavery, he became more confused over the course of politics which led to war with Mexico in 1848. His protest against

⁶⁸ H. D. Thoreau, '*On the Duty of Civil Disobedience*, quoted by John J. Ansbro, in *Martin Luther King Jr.* Maryknoll/ New York, Orbis Books, 1982, p,114.

⁶⁹ F. W. Coker, *Recent Political Thought*, New York, (1934), as quoted by Hannah Arendt in *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1972, p,196.

⁷⁰*Ibid*, P, 198.

these two evils is found in "Civil Disobedience," probably his most important political writing. In this work, he stated his case for refusal of moral men to obey the edicts of the state.

According to Alan P. Grimes, in his *American Political Thought*, Thoreau was not, as he is sometimes considered to be, an anarchist. He did not wish to abolish government even though he did advocate resistance to what he believed to be bad government. He wished to eliminate force as an instrument of government. But to do this he realized the prior necessity of eliminating those conditions which made the use of force necessary. He wished to help prepare man for that happy society in which each man would be fully governed by his own will and not that of another; governed by that conscience which would operate equally and effectively in all men. This was, perhaps, utopian. He looked forward to the time in which all men would be virtuous; but, for the present, reform of character and reform of government rather than its abolition held the consequential priorities⁷¹. Hence he stated that "*unlike those who call themselves no-government men, I ask for, not at once no government, but at once a better government*"⁷².

The achievements of the country, which were so often attributed to the government, were, according to Thoreau, due to the character of the American people, whose achievements might have been greater still if the government had not interfered. "*For government is an expedient by which men would fain succeed in letting one another alone; and, as has been said, when it is most expedient, the governed are most let alone by it.*"⁷³ The good society, as Thoreau saw it, was one in which each man might go his own way according to the dictates of a universal conscience without any hindrance from any external power.

For him, conscience rather than Statute was the important standard of behaviour for government founded on expediency was frequently given to inexpedient actions. The fact that a statute had the sanction of the majority of the community behind it did not make that statute a just one. The sanction behind majority rule was force of numbers, and sheer power had no correlation with justice. "*It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the law,*" he believed, "*so much as for the right. The only obligation which I have a right to assume is to do at any time what I think is*

⁷¹ A. P. Grimes, *American Political Thought*, New York, Amazon books review, 1955 as quoted by Hannah Arendt, Harcourt Brace companies, New York, 1972,p.206.

⁷² Thoreau, *Op, cit*, p.136

⁷³ *Ibid*, p, 136.

right”⁷⁴.

In Thoreau's opinion, nothing should stand in the way of a man's acting in accordance with the compulsions of his own conscience. No considerations of social position, no considerations of life or property, not even the national existence of a State, should stand in the way of the dictates of morality. Referring specifically to what he considered the current abuses, Thoreau declared, "This people must cease to hold slaves, and to make war on Mexico, though it cost them their existence as a people."⁷⁵

In an effort to abolish slavery and end the war with Mexico, Thoreau proposed his technique for political action. He called upon the men of Massachusetts to throw their whole weight, and not merely their vote, in favour of eradication of these two evils. A vote was merely the expression of a desire for a given course of action and thus was a relatively ineffectual political device unless one were in the majority* But since rightfulness was the important factor, the technique had to be one which the virtuous few could use in spite of and against the less conscientious many. This technique by which the right could bring the wrong into line, the few control the many, he called "*civil disobedience*." It amounted to the non-support of the government. It was, he admitted, a form of rebellion, but it was also a passive sort of revolution. It included refusal to pay taxes, jail-going or refusal of any support whatever to the government, for in an unjust state the only place for a just man is in jail. Superior morality would thus overcome superior number.

*I know this well, that if one thousand, if one hundred, if ten men whom I could name,—if ten honest men only,—aye, if one honest man, in this state of Massachusetts, ceasing to hold slaves, were actually to withdraw from this co-partnership, and be locked up in the county jail, therefore, it would be the end of slavery in America.*⁷⁶

At first glancing this political technique might seem unrealistic and based on an over estimation of the place of morality in politics, or it might seem that a prisoner's influence on the state is negligible. But Thoreau answered that "*truth is stronger than error*"⁷⁷. Yet, it would seem

⁷⁴ Ibid, p, 137.

⁷⁵ Grimes, *op. cit*, p, 209.

⁷⁶ Thoreau, *op. cit*, p, 137.

⁷⁷ Grimes, *op. cit*, p, 210.

that Thoreau looked beyond the lone martyr suffering imprisonment because of moral indignation. He envisaged a wider scope of civil disobedience, with more participants included⁷⁸. For the solitary imprisonment of a single righteous person might be followed by the non-participation, and perhaps imprisonment of all just men.

2.2 Mahatma Gandhi and the conception of Non-violence Resistance

The core feature of civil disobedience for Gandhi (1869-1948) is a principle of non-violence. His main slogan for civil disobedience was non-violent non-co-operation. Gandhi uses two major concepts to explain his philosophy of non-violence - *Satyagraha* and *ahimsa*. Both concepts are rooted deep in Indian philosophy. However, Gandhi transforms their original Hindu meanings through the influence of personal experience and non-Indian sources such as John Ruskin, Leon Tolstoy, Henry David Thoreau, Jesus Christ and his sermon on the mountain.

His *Satyagraha* is literally translated as 'holding unto the truth'. This has been called the 'Truth- Force.' In his view, God and the truth were synonymous, so Truth-Force was also soul-Force. What is it all about? According to Gandhi, the Truth-Force is the efforts of the individuals to improve upon the social conditions of the society through the use of non-violent methods, rather than violence. According to him, the basis of non-violence is the Truth or God. Gandhi is also influenced by the Christian tradition. He believes that the consequence of the belief in Truth-force is the great amount of suffering that one will undergo. *Satyagrahi*, as he would prefer to say it this way, in pursuit of the Truth-ends would have to endure and must always be ready to face this task. The test of one's relative understanding of Truth as well as his strength and courage in his commitment to it would be manifested in his willingness to undergo personal suffering. In fact, Gandhi proves that it is only through suffering without fear, hatred nor retaliation that the non-violent resister would be able to appeal to the conscience and hearts of the opponents.

Gandhi also uses the notion of '*ahimsa*' to explain his philosophy of social action. He equated *ahimsa* with love. Etymologically, it simply means non-harm and in-offensiveness. It also signifies the determination to renounce the will to kill or to damage, and to reject the inner violent will of the spirit. The principle of *ahimsa* urges one to be objective when applying rules. The non-

⁷⁸ Thoreau, op, cit, p,138.

violent resisters must not be biased; they should be able to apply the same rules to their opponents as well as their friends. *Ahimsa* also requires one to seek a means of reforming an evil system, and this should be by actively opposing the system. It never permits a toleration of an evil system. *Ahimsa* requires one not to tolerate, but to actively oppose an unjust system by means of non-co-operation and non-violence.

Gandhi applies his philosophy and ethics of *Satyagraha* and *ahimsa* in basically two types of social action: non-co-operation and civil disobedience. In non-co-operation, he advocates and practices the withdrawal of participation in the ordinary and expected activities of the British Government which had obviously become corrupt and unjust. In his view, non-co-operation could be subtle, legal and illegal. When it is illegal, it is now referred to as civil disobedience. Though Gandhi identifies civil disobedience with illegal acts, most of his civil rights campaigns in India were legal; and were mostly based on the principle of non-co-operation. Nevertheless, he recognizes that mass civil disobedience in most circumstances is necessary. These are the circumstances in which the law is blatantly unjust or extremely violated that any further negotiations with the authority in power would not even improve the situation. Mass civil disobedience, therefore, is the last resort to redress the situation.

According to Gandhi, non-co-operation does involve the withdrawal of support from the government. It embodies:

*The boycott of British exports, schools, courts, jobs and honours the withdrawal from all forms of government services such as the civil service, the police, and the armed forces, the refusal to use such commercial services as banking and insurance, the withdrawal of labour, and the destruction of foreign cloth. . .*⁷⁹

The principle of non-co-operation also encouraged people to emigrate from the jurisdiction of a certain authority or area where injustice greatly prevailed. In his view, non-co-operation is only a means to an end. The end is that of making an unjust political system to become just. In other words, non-co-operation aims at correcting the wrongs of an unjust political regime. Co-operation is only prescribed when the government is just.

⁷⁹ M. Gandhi, 'Nonviolent Resistance' (1961). quoted by Ervin Smith, in *The Ethics of Martin Luther King Jr.* Leviston/Queenston, The Edwin Mellen Press, 1981, p.7.

The second and most important form of non-violent resistance for Gandhi was civil disobedience. Here, he was greatly influenced by Henry David Thoreau, though he differs from him in method of approach. Gandhi found civil disobedience to be valid only when it is practiced non-violently. It is simply a rebellion without the elements of violence. Indeed, he takes it for: *“The open and public breaking of any immoral statutory’ law in which one is willing to suffer the penalty including imprisonment and even death.”*⁸⁰ From this definition, it is clear that, for Gandhi, there exists a remarkable difference between non-co-operation and civil disobedience. He identifies non-co-operation with legal exercise of action, and civil disobedience as action that is illegal but morally upright. Civil disobedience, for Gandhi, was a stronger action of resistance than non-co-operation. This means that more caution and care must be taken in its use. Those who volunteer to practice in this movement must be trained in methods and meanings of non-violence, how to abstain from violence, how to control crowd and restore order. They must make a pledge that includes or indicates their willingness to suffer cheerfully the consequences of their actions. In addition, they must, first of all, attempt by means of public inquiry to understand not only their own grievances but their opponent’s case as well. Therefore, they must try to negotiate with the opponent with a’ twofold purpose: to appeal to his conscience and to arouse the sense of justice of the general public. Gandhi really felt that civil disobedience needs a higher degree of commitment and self-discipline. It should, therefore, be practiced only by a selected few and only as a last resort when all other attempts to political settlements have failed.

Mahatma Gandhi also distinguishes between individual and mass civil disobedience. In his view, individual civil disobedience can be exercised at any time and would be only weak because it is done at the wish of the individual resister. Mass civil disobedience of the masses on the other hand, is not spontaneous. It cannot be carelessly entered into and it has the seed of provoking massive and unnecessary violence. Despite the inevitable occurrence of violence during mass civil disobedience, Gandhi reminds us that the goal of this non-violent resistant movement is not destruction, but peace through the unveiling of the truth. Given the unavoidable place of violence during non-violent resistant movements, one may be right to say that civil disobedience only leads to disorder. He thinks that, only criminal disobedience characterized by devilish offenses can lead to anarchy. He argues that actors of civil disobedience are friends of the

⁸⁰Ibid, p, 108.

institutions of the state and, therefore, they cannot react in such a way as to destroy the state. The civil resisters aim is only to reform the institutions and not to destroy them. He says: “*The civil disobeyer is actually a friend of the state, he is calling [civil disobedience] to its true end which is justice. It is only the unjust laws that he breaks. Even then, he breaks them openly and with the willingness to suffer the penalty.*”⁸¹ Gandhi thinks that it is only by suffering that the civil resister seeks the progress of his country. He says that suffering seems to be an indispensable condition for progress. For, as he puts it: “No country has ever progress without going through the process of suffering. A mother suffers so that her child may live ... life comes out of death ...”⁸²

The non-violent civil resister who is actually a patriot or a friend of the state cannot be likened to a violent resister. According to him, the civil resister does not provoke violence; he simply forces into the open the conflict that already existed. In other words, he only helps to expose the accumulated grievances against a political regime. Moreover, the context of civil disobedience can be external or internal. In Gandhi concept, when it is internal, it becomes imperative that the resister should be enlightened about its methods of application, and be willing to suffer for its good ends. If it is external, the resister must make sure that the law contested must be clearly immoral. In addition, the potentiality for violence must be kept at minimum.

Mahatma Gandhi also thinks that it is difficult to separate civil disobedience from violence. He concedes that there is always a risk of outbreak of violence during demonstrations of civil disobedience. Despite this risk of an outbreak of violence, the main intention of civil disobedience remains that of converting its opponents, to change their understanding and sense of justice so that they would at least whole heartedly join the resisters to seek reconciliation. Such a settlement would be truly amicable and satisfying to both sides. This, in turn, would lead the parties into a more secure, creative, happy and truthful relationship.

Any demonstration of civil disobedience often needs to be justified. A question arises as to who is to determine whether the prevailing unjust circumstances necessitate an appeal to civil disobedience. Gandhi takes this for a matter of conscience. He thinks that every individual endowed with a conscience has a right to determine the truth of the justification of civil

⁸¹ Ibid, Op, cit, p, 101.

⁸² M. Gandhi, *Non Violent Resistance*, quoted by John J. Ambrose, in *Martin Luther King Jr., op. cit*, p.7.

disobedience. In addition, this requires no moral or intellectual equipment for such an understanding is required.

From Gandhi, his method of non-violence could be retained as fundamental in the doctrine of civil disobedience. It has come today to be recognized as an indispensable element in the non-violent resistance. Indeed, it is one of the most potent weapons available to an oppressed people struggling for freedom and dignity. In all, Gandhi launched a revolution unique in its method, which was aimed at achieving Indian independence. Through the method known as *Satyagraha* "Truth force", Gandhi employed mass civil disobedience, nonviolence, passive resistance and boycotts. Gandhi was able to release the power hidden within the Indian people, and he turned weakness into strength; for example, he accepted his people's passivity, and from it, he constructed a movement of non-cooperation in which passivity and endurance were turned into energy and strength.

Historically, the British-granted a Constitution to India in 1919, the apostles of swaraj found new inspiration in a new leader, Mohandas Gandhi, who became known as Mahatma or "Holy Man" who preached a strange gospel derived from Henry David Thoreau, Tolstoi, Jesus of Nazareth and others. His message came to this: love your enemies, resist not evil, use force, opposed your oppressors with nonviolent civil disobedience. Physical force is effective, according to Gandhi, only against those who oppose it with physical force of a lesser nature. Against those who meet it with nonviolent resistance, if they are numbered in millions and dedicated to a cause, force is helpless⁸³. Gandhi cheerfully went in and out of jail, fasting and praying and advising his followers to boycott British goods, returns to the spinning wheel and village handicrafts, practice asceticism, evade taxes, disobey laws and submit meekly but proudly to beating, jail or death.

In India, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, experiments (as Gandhi called them) which had been first undertaken in South Africa were extended beyond the individual protest. Later experiments conducted during the struggle for Indian independence carried mass action beyond the confining limits of civil disobedience. Out of these emerged a new technique which Gandhi called Satyagraha. Satyagraha, which was a way of life to Gandhi, is a word coined during the movement of Indian resistance in South Africa to the Asiatic Law Amendment Ordinance

⁸³ M. Gandhi, "*I Still Believe in Nonviolence*," *Colliers*, June 26, 1943, p. 17.

introduced into the *Transvaal Legislative Council in 1906*» Gandhi explained that he first called the movement “*passive resistance*,” but as the struggle continued he became aware that “*some new principle had to come into being*.” He then came upon the word “*sadagraha*,” meaning “*firmness in a good cause*.”

I liked the word, but it did not fully represent the whole idea I wished it to connote. I therefore corrected it to *Satyagraha*. *Truth (Satya) implies love mid firmness (Agraha) engenders and therefore serves as a synonym for force. I thus began to call the Indian Movement 'Satyagraha,' that is to say, the force which is born of Truth and Love or Nonviolence, and gave up the use of the phrase 'passive resistance.'*⁸⁴

Satyagraha embraced the method and the essential philosophy of civil disobedience, but through its application and refinement it became a technique for social and political change which transcended the substantial limitations of the earlier concept, Gandhi’s method became something more than a method of resistance to particular legal norms. It became an instrument of struggle for positive objectives and for fundamental change...a technique more widely used than understood and one which still called for testing in the field of social and political action. When, in 1948, Mahatma Gandhi died by an assassin's bullet, the “experiments in truth,” which he had begun, remained far from complete.

It is evident, by the nature of the movement, that Gandhi’s philosophy was built on the good that he believed to be inherent in the nature of man. His tactics were successful in that he achieved the ends which he sought. He recognized that *Satyagraha* (soul-force) had an indeterminate possibility for social progress.

One of the most potent legacies Gandhi left behind in India was the technique of nonviolence through *ahimsa*. It is important at this point to try to understand the origin of this technique and how it works. The word *ahimsa* expresses an ancient Hindu, Jain, and Buddhist ethical precept. The negative prefix “a” pins “*himsa*” loosely meaning “injury” make up the word which is usually translated as nonviolence. Yet, *ahimsa* is more than a negative notion. As is characteristic of Hindu and Buddhist terminology, the negative wording implies Rich which

⁸⁴ Ibid, p, 12.

remains unexpressed. The full force of ahimsa, explicitly stated, means "action based on the refusal to do harm,"⁸⁵ *Ahimsa*, then, means renunciation of the will to kill or to damage, Gandhi refined the meanings:

*Ahimsa is not the crude thing it has been made to appear. Not to hurt any living thing, is no doubt a part of ahimsa. But it is its least expression. The principle of ahimsa is hurt by evil thought, by undue haste, by lying, by hatred, by wishing ill to anybody.*⁸⁶

*I accept the interpretation of ahimsa, namely that it is not merely a negative state of harmlessness but it is a positive state of love, of doing good even to the evil-doer. But it does not mean helping the evil doer to continue the wrong or tolerating it by passive acquiescence. On the contrary, love, the active state of ahimsa, requires you to resist the wrong doer by dissociating yourself from him even though it may offend him or injure him physically.*⁸⁷

Expressed differently, non-violence means that if one individual attacks another with physical violence and the victim hits back, the violent response gives the attacker a certain reassurance and moral support. It shows that the victim's scale of moral values in regard to violence as a mode of settling questions is the same as that of the attacker. A mere display of either or anger by the victim is sufficient to have this effect. It makes the attacker sure of his choice of methods, of his knowledge of human nature and hence of his opponent, the attacker's morale is sustained, his sense of values is vindicated. His confidence in his general trend of dealing with his opponent is reassured. On the other hand, suppose the assailant attacks, with physical violence, a different sort of person. The attitude of this new opponent is fearless, calm, steady, and because of a different belief, training *or* experience, he has much self-control. He does not respond to the attacker's violence with counter-violence. Instead, he accepts the blows with good-tempered reasoning, stating his belief as to the truth of the matter in dispute, asking for an examination of both sides of the dispute, and stating his readiness to abide by truth. He offers resistance but only in moral terms. He states his readiness to prove his sincerity by his own suffering rather than by imposing suffering on the assailant, through violence. He accepts blow after blow, showing no signs of fear or shrinking or resentment, keeping steadily good-humoured and kindly in look of eye, tone of voice,

⁸⁵ Ibid, Op, cit, p, 23.

⁸⁶ M. Gandhi, *Young India* (New York, 1924), p, 31.

⁸⁷ Ibid, p, 33.

and postures of body and arms. To violence, he poses nonviolent resistance⁸⁸.

As to the outcome of a struggle waged by nonviolence, it is well to understand one point thoroughly. The aim of nonviolence is not to injure, or crush and humiliate the opponent, or to “*break his will*” as in a violent fight. The aim of the resister is to convert the opponent, to change his understanding and his sense of values so that he will join in wholeheartedly with the resister in seeking a settlement truly amicable and truly satisfying to both sides. The nonviolent resister seeks a solution under which both parties can have complete self-respect and mutual respect; a settlement that will implement the new desires and full energies of both parties. The nonviolent resister seeks to help the violent attacker to re-establish his moral balance on a level higher and more secure than that from which he first launched his violent attack. The method withdraws a mistaken support not in order to harm the opponent but to help both parties into a more secure, creative, happy and truthful relationship.

2.3 Martin Luther King Jr. in his prescription of passive resistance

According to Martin Luther King Jr. (1929 -1968), civil disobedience is based on the features of non-violence and cooperation. He demonstrates that violence likely sets in when the manifestations of civil disobedience are not benefiting the expected results. King Jr. perceives his philosophy of non-violent resistance as Christianity in action. According to him, his ultimate Civil Right Movement is to create a beloved community; a community that would be based on love. Such a community would reject any law that tends to reduce and maltreat an individual and dirty his/her dignity. He asserts that his own nonviolent protests are towards the evil forces at work, and not against the persons who are involved in the administration of the system. He had a problem with the system and not the individuals. His non-violent resistance involved both active and aggressive struggles with the purpose of surprising the opponents with new methods, thereby causing them to alter their moral values. King Jr.’s official slogan for civil disobedience was “justice without violence.”

King Jr.’s philosophy of non-violence is derived from a Hebraic Christian tradition coupled with the Gandhian concept of Satyagraha. Truth-Force. He considers non-violence as a

⁸⁸ Ibid, Op, cit, p, 36.

powerful weapon that could enable one to absorb violence while struggling on with his demonstration. Non-violence, according to Martin Luther King Jr., depends on moral and spiritual forces. At the heart of his non-violence was redemptive love, love which was intended to rescue opponents from an evil system, and make them to become friends. By love, he means an understanding and goodwill towards all men and this love is what is really wanted in civil disobedience. Martin Luther therefore, suggested that his followers should love indeed: “loving enough to abstain from evil, and understanding enough to transform an enemy into a friend.” Love, moreover, in his opinion includes deep interest and concern in people. This needs one to have profound knowledge of the real possibilities of human nature. King Jr. is certainly inspired by Gandhi who had earlier called for an overflowing love for all Gandhi was convinced that this type of love would achieve reconciliation and convert the opponent.

Martin Luther King Jr. also believes in the possibility of converting a person who was earlier considered as an opponent into a friend. Martin Luther Jr. consider human nature as necessarily good and many of the wrongs people do are due to their being victims of their own intellectual and spiritual circumstances. He was certainly influenced by the Socratic conception of the cause of evil. Socrates really maintains that if an individual truly knows the moral good he will do it. Moral evil, therefore, is due to ignorance. For King Jr., non-violent actions are intended to arouse the conscience of the opponents, and to make them to become aware and conscious of the moral good. At the heart of this conviction is the believe that people would always choose good and avoid evil, but this choice should really be clear. This should be clear enough to enable people to understand why they have to choose good and avoid evil.

It is important to note that Martin Luther King Jr. talks about confronting an evil system in the same manner as Thoreau. However, his own form of protest is not as revolutionary as Thoreau's. King Jr. Protest was intended to secure voting rights, and he had confidence in the powers of the political system for the promotion of individual freedom. Hence, he is not wholeheartedly opposed to the actions of the government. On the contrary, he calls for an enlarged role of government in the lives of the individuals. He also urges people to co-operate with the political system. He wanted an extensive voters' registration policy to assist citizens to become more involved actively in the political system. In this way, he also differs with Gandhi in ultimate purpose and method.

According to King Jr., there comes a time when it is necessary that a moral person should disobey a law that is judged by his conscience to be exaggeratedly unjust. In *The Letter from Birmingham Jail* (1963), Martin Luther King Jr. advocates obedience to law, especially just laws. Nevertheless, he also stated that one also has a moral responsibility to disobey unjust laws. He considers unjust laws as no laws at all, a law that is out of harmony with the moral law. From a purely moral point of view, he refers to an unjust law as one in which the minority are compelled to observe a code, which is not binding on the majority'. This could also be a code in which the minority did not take part in its making, but is compelled to obey it. Under these circumstances, the citizen has no alternative other than to disobey the law.

Though, one has a moral duty to obey just laws, one equally has a right to oppose unjust laws. In a democratic society, citizens are most often brought to confront more instances of injustice than justice. He cautions that when he is confronted with open injustice: "First of all, dialogue and negotiate in attempt to change the law. If it fails, then engage in non-violent direct action. This will create such a crisis and promote or facilitate tension that a community that has constantly refused to negotiate, is forced to confront the issue." Moreover, if the issue is also dramatized, it would no longer be neglected. He says that such dramatization does not mean violence. He completely rejects violent resistance, first of all, because it would hardly be successful. If it is employed by a minority' against a majority, it is doomed from the start because the majority, well-armed, would easily suppress it. Violence as a means to achieve social justice is both impractical and immoral. Martin Luther King Jr. declares that violence is:

Impractical because it is a descending spiral ending in destruction for all... It is immoral because it seeks to humiliate the opponent rather than to win his understanding. It seeks to annihilate rather than to convert. Violence is immoral because it thrives on hatred rather than love. It destroys community and makes brotherhood impossible. It leaves society in monologue rather than dialogue. Violence ends by defeating itself. It creates bitterness in the survivors and brutality in the destroyers⁸⁹

Martin Luther King Jr. considers his movement as being spiritual in nature, and for this reason, incompatible with violence. In general, he informs us that social conflicts cannot be solved

⁸⁹ M. Luther King Jr., "Stride Towards Freedom", quoted by John J. Ambros, in *Martin Luther King Jr.* op.cit., p. 232.

by violence. He also thinks that violent rebellion will hardly find sympathy from the population and even from the majority of the dissenters themselves. He cautions his followers to face violence if possible, but not to return violence. This is because, as he argues, darkness cannot drive away darkness, only light can do that. The dissenters should also respect those who oppose them. He believes that this would enable the opponents to achieve a new understanding of human relations. Amongst the various means to cut off the chain of evil and hatred, King Jr., asserts that love remains the greatest. This love, as well, is instrumental in the process of reconciliation. Martin Luther King Jr. holds that;

Compassion and non-violence enable the resisters to understand the points of view of their opponents; this would also make them to be able to assess themselves. For from their own view, we may see the basic weaknesses of our own conditions and if we are mature we may learn and grow, and profit from the wisdom of the brothers who are called opposition.⁹⁰

The hidden power of love is that it gradually transforms enemies into friends. According to King Jr., this method of non-violence is a gradual process. It does not immediately change the minds of the opponents but:

It first does something to the hearts and souls of those committed to it. It gives them new self-respect; it calls up the resources of strength and courage that they did not know. Finally, it teaches the opponent and so stirs his conscience that reconciliation becomes a reality⁹¹.

The goal of a non-violent protest is to make injustice to become clearly visible and substantial. The resisters must be ready to endure, and it is through their sufferings that the opponent is able to see his injustice. The method of non-violence simply strikes the conscience of the silent majority. King Jr., like Gandhi, objects to the idea that nonviolence means mere submission to the will of the oppressor. On the contrary, non-violence is active and provocative. It requires courage, for the non-violent warrior is ever ready to die but not to kill.

Martin Luther also makes a distinction between civil and uncivil disobedience. In his opinion, in civil disobedience, the civil resisters maintain the highest disrespect for the law, and

⁹⁰ The Words of Martin Luther King Jr., selected by Coretta Scott King, New York, New market Press, 1983, p, 74.

⁹¹ The words of Martin Luther King Jr. op.cit, p,78.

wilfully accept the penalty for breaking the law. Whereas, in uncivil disobedience the uncivil resisters reject and deny the law they consider being unjust or immoral. They are also unwilling to accept the penalty for breaking the law. The end result in this case is anarchy, violence and disrespect of law.

Martin Luther King Jr. derived most of his approach in civil disobedience from Gandhi. However, King Jr. never encouraged the voluntary closure of shops, resignation from political groups, usurping of government functions or non-payment of taxes. Some of these differences in their methods of approach stem from the fact that while Gandhi was seeking independence from a foreign system (the British people), King Jr. wanted to transform the political structures of the existing system. King Jr.'s attempt was to achieve a new structure that would enable all citizens to experience integration within the political system.

King Jr.'s method for success was the visible betterment of social and political conditions of the Black Americans. Indeed, there was no real great improvement, that is, there was an absence of concrete results towards the end of King Jr.'s life. This absence of concrete results led him to escalate his non-violence into militant action. He then called for greater militancy through massive civil disobedience that was geared towards blocking the proper functioning of the government, until justice was done. This was a tactic to push the government to action. But this instead amounted to violence and force rather than persuasion. Thus, it can be concluded from this evaluation that in the absence of a true and meaningful political change envisaged, violence is much likely to be entertained in the manifestation of civil disobedience.

Today, on the American scene, there is great internal strife. Not only are individuals being interrogated against their will by the national government, as pointed out by David Spits in his revealing article, "Democracy and the Problem of Civil Disobedience", but there exists a frightening and sometimes tragic discord in the social order. The great problem revolves around what Ronald J. Rousseve termed "*discord among brown and white*". In more harsh terminology, it is the sometimes bitter, sometimes brutal, and even deadly encounter between the white man and the black man. Out of this spiralling web of bitterness and hatred arose a fearless champion of freedom and human dignity, Martin Luther King, Jr. Hearing the deep rumble of discontent

beneath the surface of the people's troubled exterior appearances, and sensing the ripeness of the times, he launched his "crusade without violence." Dr. King's move closely resembles that of Mahatma Gandhi in his straggle with Great Britain in that his weapons include non-violence, love, people, money, organization, publicity and boycotts. Before an Institute on non-violence at Montgomery, Alabama, in 1956, he made the following ringing statements.

A great challenge that stands before us is that of entering the new age with understanding goodwill. This simply means that the Christian virtues of love, mercy and forgiveness should stand at the center of our lives. There is danger that those of us who have lived so long under the yoke of oppression, those of us who have been exploited and trampled over, those of us who have had to stand amid the tragic midnight of injustice and indignities will enter the new age with hate and bitterness, but if we retaliate with hatred and bitterness, the new age will be nothing but a duplication of the old age. We must blot out the hate and injustice of the old age with love and Justice of the new. This is why I believe so firmly in nonviolence. Violence never solves a problem. It only creates new and more complicated ones. If we succumb to the temptations of using violence in our struggle for Justice, unborn generations will be the recipients of a long and desolate night of bitterness, and our legacy to the future will be an endless reign of meaningless chaos.⁹²

In his remarkable book, *Stride Towards Freedom*, the Gandhi disciple and interpreter sought to clarify his position and define the terms "love" and Agape as used in his context. He listed three types of love which are *philla*, *eros* and agape. Agape is the term that is subjected to examination here. First of all, what is agape? The Greek language speaks of it as the highest level of love. According to Dr. King, *agape* means nothing sentimental or basically affectionate. It means understanding, redeeming goodwill for all men. It is an overflowing love which asks nothing in return. It is the love of God working in the lives of men. When one rises to love on the agape level, he loves men not because he likes them, not because their attitudes and ways appeal to him, but because God loves him. Here, one rises to the position of loving the person who does evil while hating the deed that the person does. With this type of love and understanding goodwill one will be able to stand among the radiant glow of the new age with dignity and discipline.⁹³

Agape, then, is disinterested love. It is love in which the individual seeks not his own good, but the good of his neighbour. *Agape* does not begin by discriminating between worthy and

⁹² M. Luther King Jr., *Facing the Challenge of a New Age*, Phylon, XVIII (December, 1957), p, 29.

⁹³ *Ibid*, *Stride towards Freedom* New York, market press, 1960, p, 104.

unworthy people, or any qualities people possess. It begins by loving others for their sake. It is an entirely “*neighbour-regarding*” concern for others, which discovers the neighbour in every person it meets. Therefore, agape makes no distinction between friend and enemy, it is directed toward both.

The phrase “*passive resistance*” often gives the false impression, according to Dr. King, that it is a sort of “*do-nothing*” method in which the resister quietly and passively accepts evil. But nothing is further from the truth. For, while the nonviolent resister is passive in the sense that he is not physically aggressive toward his opponent, his mind and emotions are always active, constantly seeking to persuade his opponent that he is wrong. The method is passive physically, but strongly active spiritually. It is not passive non-resistance to evil; it is active non-violent resistance to evil.

A second basic fact that characterizes nonviolence is that it does not seek to humiliate or defeat the opponent, but to win his friendship and understanding. A third characteristic of this method is that the attack is directed against forces of evil rather than against the person who happens to be doing the evil. It is evil that nonviolence seeks to defeat, not the persons who inflict evil. The fourth principle is the willingness to accept suffering without retaliation, to accept blows from the opponent without striking back.

Dr. Luther King believes that man is an end because he is a child of God. Man is not made for the state; the state is made for man. To deprive man of his freedom is to relegate him to the status of a thing, rather than elevate him to the status of a person. Man, according to Dr King in his *Stride Towards Freedom*, must never be treated as a means to the end of the state, but always as an end within himself.

The implications are clear that whenever the State attempts to use individuals as means, then the reply should be nonviolent or passive resistance. This brings in the idea of Just and unjust laws, and the difference between them, Dr, King sees a Just law as a law which squares with that which is right. Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Whereas that law which is out of harmony with that which is moral is a law which does not square with the moral law of the universe. It does not square with the law of God. For that 'reason it is unjust. Any law that degrades

the human personality is unjust law, according to Dr. King. A further reading shows that his interpretation of unjust law is a code that the majority inflicts on the minority that which is not binding on itself. Another thing that one can say is that an unjust law is, a code which the majority, inflicts upon the minority, which, that minority had no part in enacting or creating, because that minority had no right to vote in many instances, the legislative bodies that made these laws were not therefore democratically elected.

Just law, says Dr. King, is just the opposite of what has been noted concerning unjust law. A just law is a code that the majority, who happen to believe in that code, compel the minority, who does not believe in it, to follow, because it is willing to abide by the law. Therefore, the individuals who stand upon the basis of civil disobedience realize that they are following something that says that there are just laws and there are unjust laws. Dr. King does not call these individuals anarchists because, in his words:

They believe that there are laws which must be followed; they do not seek to defy law, they do not seek to evade the law. For many individuals who would call themselves segregationists and who would held on to segregation at any cost see« to defy the law; they seek to evade the law and their process can lead to anarchy. They seek in the final analysis to follow a way of uncivil disobedience, not civil disobedience. And I submit that the individual who disobeys the law, whose conscience tells him it is unjust and who is willing to accept the penalty by staying in jail until that law is altered, is expressing at that moment the very highest respect for law.

The nonviolent doctrine, in action, seeks to do a number of things»

(1) defeat the unjust system, rather than individuals who are caught in that system and misguided toward wrong; (2) make suffering a virtue; (3) build-up the amazing potential for goodness that is believed to be inherent in human nature; (4) revolt against negative peace (the presence of oppression with the absence of tension and (5) to achieve each of these virtuous things through love and self-suffering.

CHAPTER THREE

THE NOTION OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AND VIOLENCE IN HANNAH ARENDT'S POLITICAL THOUGHT

This chapter focuses on Hannah Arendt notion of civil disobedience and violence, because to her, the disastrous increase in crimes cause by the phenomenon. This period of crises and growing bitterness is as a result of the increase in street protest, demonstration some which are cause by a government inability to function in order due to bad laws, bad governance and the egoistic nature of some members in government, whose intention is to satisfy their selfish interest. This is the reason why most of them in such government tell lies, just to protect their interest forgetting to know that the same people or citizens cannot be deceived over and over.

However, this explain why there is an increase of civil disobedience, violence and revolutions across most states and government due to a totalitarian system, deception due to mistaken patriotism. These phenomena has actually accounted for the outstanding events and defiance of established institution and authorities within some states. It should be noted that, civil disobedience and violence is the disintegration of political systems that precedes revolutions which is the progressive erosion of a governmental authority to seek redress for certain concerns. In this regards when citizens doubt the credibility and legitimacy of a government due to its inability to function properly, one of the main strategies is civil disobedience and to an extent violence and revolution as in recent years across some states in the world and Africa in particular.

3.1 BAD GOVERNANCE, CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AND VIOLENCE

The notion of lies in politics can clearly be seen in Hannah Arendt reflections on the pentagon papers published in New York in June 1971. These Arentian reflection⁹⁴ actually reveals some secrets that where being documented and conceal especially the role of America in World War II and Indochina which they tell lies to different people and in different times. To this effect everyone that read the paper concluded that the basic intention was deception. Even those who wrote and published in the pentagon papers for the New York Times were guilty of such offensive. After some time the truth was reveal which completely turned into an abyss of which civil

⁹⁴Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, pp. 3, 4.

disobedience and violence was the regrettable outcome.

However, in most of our societies today exaggerated untruthfulness in politics is almost at the highest peak in government, because in most cases the government use its officials the radio, press and media houses to give their lies and deceptions the widest publicity forgetting to know that, the same people can't be deceive over and over. This is so because most government and its officials deliberately use falsehood as legitimate means to achieve their political ends since truthfulness is not part of their political virtues. This explains why some members of government in some African countries see lies as justifiable tools in political dealing. For instance, some of them when appointed in their respective positions always promises the best for their people, while in power they turn to have a little or no regards to their citizens whom they are accountable for. In this light, when their mandate is to be over, they begin to factor in new lies, for instance some legislators or parliamentarians. These are some of the issues that citizens always lost trust from their authorities and even their government, which is actually a gate way to civil disobediences, violence and revolutions.

This explains why Edmond Burke from the reflections on the revolution in France in 1790 stated that⁹⁵ *“solving a moral or political problem, he believes involves balancing various moral consideration, various kinds of good and evils-in the light of features of particular situation giving rise to it”*. In fact he stresses the complexity of real ethnical problems among which is lies.

This character of liars in human action seems more as an action or attitude of brain damage individuals. For these lies and deceivers they can conclude with imagined certainty that the sun is shining when actually there is heavy rainfall as Arendt contented that⁹⁶ let us remember that, the lie did not creep into politics by some accident of human sinfulness, moral outrage, for this reason alone, is not likely to make it disappear. The deliberate falsehood deals with contingent facts; that is, with matters that carry no inherent truth within themselves, no necessity to be as they are factual truths are never compelling truth. The historians knows how vulnerable is the whole texture of facts in which we spend our daily life; it is always in danger of being perforated by single lies or turn to shreds by the organised lying of groups, nations or classes, or denied and distorted, often

⁹⁵Daniel Boneval, *Today's Moral Issues*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 2006, P140.

⁹⁶Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, 6-9.

carefully covered up by reams of falsehoods or simply allowed to fall into oblivion. Facts needs testimony to be remembered and trustworthy witnesses to be established in order to find a secure dwelling place in the domain of human affairs. From this, it follows that no factual statement can ever be beyond doubt as secure and shielded against attack as, for instance, the statement that two and two make four.

This to Arendt thought means that, lies are more captivating and appealing to reasons than actual reality. This is because the liar is fully aware of what the audience are expecting to hear. This is really a huge temptation because lies are very easy to say since they hardly come in conflict with reason. In this light, civil disobedience and violence are more likely to occur when such lies and liars are expose by the texture of facts and the truth as can commonly be found in totalitarian government and their rulers who frighten confidence in the power of lies so as to adopt certain political issues in their interest, may be perhaps by changing facts and eradicating certain information to better fit their political agenda.

However⁹⁷, Hannah Arendt in the origin of totalitarian also stated that “the Dreyfus Affairs” which happened in France in 1894 was because of lies and deception given that the letter that was supposedly in Dreyfus handwriting, addressed to the German military attaché, Schwartzkoppen in July 1985 turn out that it was Esterhary who told the British journalists that he and not Dreyfus was the author which he forgot in Dreyfus handwriting on orders from colonel Sandherri his superior and formal chief let the counter espionage division. Few days later colonel Henry, another member of the same department confessed forgeries of several other pieces of the secret of Dreyfus dossier and committed suicide.

This of course permitted the court of appeal to order an investigation of the Dreyfus case. This alone revealed many secrets and lies, which also led to the annulment of the original sentence against Dreyfus in 1894. This is always very annoying and provoking to stir up the spirit of revolts and disobedience due to lies.

It is also important to note that the same people cannot be manipulated over and over but to her “the only person likely to be an ideal victim of complete manipulation is the president of the

⁹⁷Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, Meridian Books, the World Publishing Company, Cleveland and New York 1958, p,89.

Republic because of the immensity of his job, he must surround himself with advisers, national security manager who exercise their power chiefly by filtering the information that reaches the president and by interpreting the outside world for him”.

This implies that, the number one citizen and most powerful statesman is the only person whose choice and decisions can be predetermined. More so, those are also genius or gifted with the art of lying that we see in our daily lives are top civil servants and very high ranking military officers who always pride themselves problem solvers or solution providers are always taken from the universities and various think tanks. Some of them who are bless with the ability or game theories and systems analyses who in their mentalities are always ready and prepared to solve all societal or government problems as solutions providers. It is in this light that Arendt contented that.⁹⁸

The problem-solvers have been characterized as men of great confidence, who ‘seem rarely to doubt their ability to prevail’ and they worked together with the members of the military of whom ‘the history remarks that they were men accustomed to winning’. We should not forget that we owe it to the problem-solvers effort at impartial self-examination, rare among such people. That the actors attempts at hiding their role behind a screen of self-protective secrecy (at least until they have completed their memoirs-in our century the most deceitful genre of literature) were frustrated.

This is to say that to an extent due to human nature the moral qualities which deserve admiration cannot stop them speaking the truth at least once. Some of these think tank universities dooms as well as political analyse perhaps lied out of mistaken patriotism. These lies and deliberate deceitfulness are some of the reasons why civil disobedience and violence are more on the rise. This so because this mistaken patriotism is to protect the image of the state or their society in spite of their undoubted intelligence which they use their pens, papers and the media for reasons they understand most, as they pride themselves to be more rational or reasonable than others. Even when the reality is visible, they find formulas and persuasive language to convince the masses or their audience.

With their quest for power and love of theories the truth is always the watchdog as it is

⁹⁸Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, pp, 10, 11.

always appears when all manipulated opinions fails. This explains why Hegel holds that⁹⁹ philosophical contemplation has no other intention than to eliminate accidental. However, the common factors among these liars is their attempt to always get rid of that, which cannot also be done by theory of opinion manipulation because facts can never be remove from the world even when people believe in their lies. Arendt said that, “this can only be done through radical destruction as the case of the murderer who says that, Mrs Smith has died and then goes and kill her which of course always provoke civil disobedience and to an extend violence.

Similarly, one also find it with dismay that the united States of America actually is promoting segregation against their popular dictum of equality and human right, as seen with the treatment immigrants to America which also causes a lot of public demonstration. By 2005, it was estimated that, there were 11 million illegal aliens in the United States”, of which many of its citizens were convince that, the state has lost control over it frontiers and that these aliens were partially responsible for wage stagnation. This therefore urge the house of representative to approved a bill making it a felony to be in the country illegal and a crime to help an illegal immigrant. This declaration provokes popular demonstration by legal immigrants to illegal ones to requesting for their rights to remain in the country as citizens.

As a duty, a church group which sheltered and catered for some aliens denounced the proposed bill which was like the slave law in 1850, for making it a crime to help a suffering human being and vowed to resist it. As the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles, a city with highest number of immigrants rejected the law except that a fence was to be constructed between the United States of America (USA) and Mexico which was the main entrance of immigrants. Who is America lying? Archbishop Roger Mahoney called by God to help in the New York Times, March 22, 2006 stated that¹⁰⁰:

I have received a lot of criticism for stating last month that I would instruct the priests of my archdiocese to disobey a proposed law that would subject them as well as other church and humanitarian workers, to criminal penalties. The proposed border protection anti-terrorism and illegal immigration control bill, which was approved by the House of Representative in December and is expected to be taken up by the Senate next week would among other things

⁹⁹ Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace New York, 1972, pp, 12, 13.

¹⁰⁰Eric Fonner, *Voices or Freedom*, W.W. Norton & company, New York city, pp, 351-34.

subject to five years in prison anyone who “assists” an undocumented immigrant to remain in the United State”.

Some supports of the bill have even accused the church of encouraging illegal immigration and meddling in politics. But I stand by my statement; part of the mission of the Roman Catholic Church is to help people in need. It is our gospel mandate in which Christ instructs us to clothe the naked, feed the poor and welcome the stranger. Indeed the Catholic Church, through catholic charities agencies around the country, is one of the largest non-profit providers of social services in the nation, serving both citizens and immigrants.

Providing humanitarian assistance to those in needs should not be made a crime, as the house of bills decrees. As written, the proposed law is so broad that it would criminate even minor acts of mercy like offering a meal or administering first aid. Current law does not requires social service agencies to obtain evidence of legal status before rendering aid, nor should it. Denying aid to a fellow human being violates a law with a higher authority than congress- the law of God.

That does not mean that the Catholic Church encourages or support illegal immigration. Every day in our parishes, social service programs, hospitals and schools, we witness the baleful consequences of illegal immigration serves neither the migrant nor the common good. What the church supports is an overhand of the immigration system so that legal status and illegal immigration. Creating legal structures for migration protects not only those who migrate but also our nation, by giving the government the ability to better identify who is in the country as well as control who enters it.

Only comprehensive reform of the immigration system, embodied in the principles of another proposed in congress, the secure Americas and orderly immigration bill, will help solve our current immigration crisis. Enforcement only proposals like the Border Protection Act take the country in the opposite direction. Increasing penalties, building more detention centres and erecting walls along our border with Mexico, as the act provides, will only solve the problem.

The legislation will not deter migrants who are desperate to survive and support their families from seeking in the United States. It will only drive them further into the shadows, encourage the creation of more elaborate smuggling networks and cause hardship and suffering. I hope that the Senate will not take the same enforcement-only road as the House.

The unspoken truth of immigration debate is that at the same time our nation benefits economically. From the presence let undocumented workers, we turn a blind eye when are exploited by employers. They work in industries that are vital to our economy yet they have little legal protection and no opportunity to contribute fully to our nation. While we gladly accept their taxes and sweat, we do not acknowledge or upheld their basic labour right. At the same time, we scapegoat them for our social ills them for our social ills and label them as security threats and criminals to justify the passage of anti-immigrant bills.

This situation affects the dignity of millions of our fellow human beings and makes immigration ultimately, a moral and ethical issue. That is why the church is compelled to take a stand against harmful legislation and to work towards positive change.

It is my hope that one elected officials will understand this and enact immigration reform that respects our common humanity and reflects the values-fairness, composition and opportunity upon which our nation, a nation of immigrants was built. This entire discriminative attitude in most cases is the foundation for civil disobedience, violence and revolutions in our today's societies.

3.2 Civil disobedience as an agent of political change

In recent years, civil disobedience is too alarming as well as increase in crimes in our societies. These poor attitudes are because of the legal system which may not be an ordinance of reason promulgated by members of a given society for a common good but rather for the interest of a particular group of people. This may in one way or the other cause the citizens to lost faith in the laws of their land which they may instead campaign for civil disobedience which can be very effective in securing desirable changes in the laws of their land. It is in this light that Hannah Arendt holds that¹⁰¹,

It is plausibility in a country which seems to be greatly strengthened by some serious oddities of the law through which some individuals are encouraged or in some sense compelled to establish a significant legal right through personal act of civil disobedience.

¹⁰¹Hannah Arendt : *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt brace NewYork 1972, pp, 51,52.

On account of tribal nationalism, she stated that¹⁰² “just as continental imperialism sprang from the frustrated ambitions of citizens in some countries which did not get their share in the sudden expansion of the eighties, so tribalism appeared as the nationalism of those peoples who had not participated in national emancipation and had not achieved the sovereignty of a nation-state. Wherever the two frustrations were combined, as in multinational Austria-Hungary and Russia, the Pan-movement naturally found their most fertile soil. Moreover, since the dual monarchy harboured both Slavic and German irredentist nationalities, Pan-Slavism and Pan-Germanism concentrated from the beginning on its destruction and Austria-Hungary became the real centre of Pan-movements. Russia Pan-Slav claimed as early as 1870 that the best possible starting point for a Pan-Slav empire would be the disintegration of Austria, and Austrian Pan-Germans were so violently aggressive against their own government that even the Alldeutsche Verband in Germany complained frequently about the “exaggerations” of the Austrian brother movement. The German-conceived blueprint for economic union of central Europe under German leadership, along with all similar continental-empire projects of German Pan-Germans, change at once, once Austrian pan-Germans got hold of it, into a structure that would become “the centre of German life all over the earth and be allied with all other Germanic states”.

This is to say that, once a group of conscious individual do not find their interest protected as any other members of that society, they must conspire against such oddities to secure their interest. Whatever the actual causes of the period of turmoil which of course they are factual and political ones, has increase the confusion and growing bitterness of our debates to understand the true character of the phenomenon due to it complex and diverse nature whose strategies are similar but varies from one political community to the other as the number of civil disobedience or potential civil disobediences increase for demonstration. It is in this light that Roderick M. Chishdon in his book “Freedom and Action contented that the metaphysical problem of human might be summarized in the following ways¹⁰³: “Human beings are responsible agents; but this fact appears to conflict with a deterministic view of human action the view that every event that is involved in an act is caused by some other event, this appears that from normal situations of life civil disobedient may alter changes to other forms.

¹⁰²Hannah Arendt. *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, world publishing Company, Cleveland, New York 1958, pp, 227, 228.

¹⁰³Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic* New York 1972, p, 55.

Arendt supported this view when she holds that¹⁰⁴ “the trouble is that, the situation of the civil disobedient bears no analogy to either the simple reason that he exists as a single individual he can function and survive only as a member of a group. This is seldom admitted and even in these rare instances only marginally mentioned “a civil disobedience practice by a single individual is unlikely to have much effect. He will be regarded as an eccentric more interesting to observe than to suppress. Significantly civil disobedience, therefore, will be practiced by a number of people who have a community of interest”.

This is because the resources of any community belong to all its members. When some individual enact laws that will favour them to benefit these resources, or otherwise, then those cheated will see civil disobedience as the only weapon to change such attitude. Just as Jean Jacque Rousseau was right in his book philosophical entries as cited by Dale Jacquette when he said that¹⁰⁵ “the first man who having enclosed a pièce of ground, bethought himself of saying this is mine and found people simple enough to believe him, was the real founder of civil society. From how many crimes, wars and murders, from how many horrors and misfortunes might not be any one have saved mankind, by pulling up the strokes, or filling up the ditch, and crying to his fellow, “Beware of listening to this impostor; you are undone if you once forget that the fruits of the earth belong to us all, and the earth itself to nobody. But there is great probability that things had then already come to such a pitch that they could no longer continue as were; for the idea of property depends on many prior ideas, which could only be acquired successively, and cannot have been formed all at once in the human mind. Mankind must have made very considerable progress and acquired considerable knowledge and industry which they must also have transmitted and increased from age to age before they arrived at this last of the state of nature. Let us then go further back and endeavour to unify under a single point of view that slow succession of events and discoveries in the most natural order; civil disobedience only precede when some people in the civil society wants to take all the fruits of the earth which belong to all.

Disobedience to regulations and laws of a society presupposes a group action to protest against unjust ordinances and governmental policies or executive orders which do not meet up

¹⁰⁴Dale Jacquette, *Philosophical Entries, Classic and Contemporary Readings in Philosophy*, McGraw-Hill Companies, New York, 2001, p, 333.

¹⁰⁵Daniel Bonelvac, *Today’s moral issues*, the McGraw-Hill companies New York, 2006, p, 491.

with citizens expectations. Civil disobedience will then springs from an agreement with each other backed by a majority with a common opinion and conviction to disregard the law. Hannah Arendt exemplified the phenomena of civil disobedience with two famous men that is Socrates in Athens and David Henry Thoreau of concord¹⁰⁶.

As for Socrates who yielded to the demands of cheerful submission to punishment than the legal philosophical textbooks tell us Socrates during his trial never challenged the laws themselves but the miscarriage of justice, which he considered as the “accident” that has befallen him. This personal misfortune did not entitle him to “break his contract and agreements”. With the laws; his quarrel was not with the laws but with the judges. More so, Socrates pointed out to Crito who tried to convince him to escape and go to exile. At the time of the trial the laws of Athens offered him this choice but he rather gloried in being willing to die from the apology Socrates made us to understand that, he has the option desisting from his public examination of things, which doubtlessly spread uncertainty about established customs and beliefs and that again he had preferred death because “an unexamined life is not worth living”. He would have not honoured his words if he tried to escape, this would have confirm to the judges that their verdict was just. This is to say that Socrates did not wants to go against his moral principles and teaching despites the oddities of the judges, but preferred to respect the basic contract and agreement which binds him and the state.

For Thoreau, his case was more dramatic as he spent a night in jail for refusing to pay poll tax to a government that permitted slavery but he let his aunt pay it for him the next morning he was against the injustice of the laws themselves. He argued in his book the *duty of civil disobedience* that his case is not on the ground of a citizen moral relation to the law, but on the ground of individual conscience and conscience’s moral obligation.

It is not a man’s duty as a matter of course to devote himself to the eradication of any, even the most enormous, wrong; he may still properly have other concerns to engage him; but it is his duty at least, to wash his hand of it, and if he gives it no thought longer, not to give it practically his support.”¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶Ibid, p, 58.

¹⁰⁷Ibid, op, cit,p, 59.

To Arendt, Thoreau was right because he did not pretend that a man's washing his hands of it would make the world better or that a man has any obligation to do so. He "came into this world chiefly to make to this a good place to be but to live in it, be it good or bad". Indeed this is how we all came into the world-lucky if the world and the part of it we arrive in is a good place to live in at the time of our arrival, or at least a place where the wrongs committed are not "of such a nature that it requires you to be the agent of injustice to another" for only if this is the case "then I say break the law" and Thoreau was right. Individual conscience requires nothing more.

As can be seen in the right for civil liberties in America by 1921 that "free speech, there should be no control whatever in advance over what any person may say, the right to meet and to speak freely without permit should be unquestioned. There should be no prosecutors for the mere expression of opinion on matters of public concern, however radical, however violent. The expression of all opinions, however radical, should be encouraged by setting aside special places in streets or parks and in the use of public buildings, free of charge, for meetings of any sort¹⁰⁸". This decision among others was the first to be adopted by the national committee of liberties union on the issues in the United States.

This is so because, the conscience as any society is apolitical and people's opinion are equally worthy to be heard. This is explain why Arendt quoted Abraham Lincoln, an American statesman who was aware of the differences between his official duty and his person wish that all men everywhere could be free. In a nutshell, it is also reason that, at the level of individual morality, the problem of civil disobedience differ, consciences are always expressed in a purely subjectively manner for instance when Socrates and that it is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong" he clearly meant that it was better for him just as to be in disagreement with the multitudes than being one, to be disagreement with himself. So a good man can only be a good citizen only in a good state where there is freedom, where the wish an aspiration of the people can be taken into consideration¹⁰⁹.

That is the rule of law permits the transparency for democracy to prevail because even a group of people with diverse views and opinion, could solve successfully the problem of

¹⁰⁸Eric Foner, *Voices of Freedom*, W.W. Norton and Company, Inc. 2011, p,142.

¹⁰⁹Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, p, 60.

establishing a constitution because of their intelligent for peaceful co-existence without which the problem of over exercising power and authority over others by a privilege few members of the society will still nurse the foundation for chaos.

As Arendt holds that “our legal codes distinguish between crimes in which indictment is mandatory, because the community as a whole has been violated and offenses in which only doers and sufferers are involved, who may or may not want to sue”¹¹⁰. This implies therefore that for any society or community to live in total harmony and tranquillity, good laws must be enacted for a common good and must be respected by all the abiders and otherwise, if the basic social contract is not respected then civil disobedience or unrest must remain the regrettable outcome.

This explains why in both moral and legal matters, conscience is supposed to always present within us as though it was identical with consciousness. This way our ways of reasoning or even acting will depends on our social educational or intellectual standing which this reflections or thinking may alter certain decisions and bad laws in our communities.

Disobedience to the law is one of the most outstanding problems most government are facing today in our societies, indeed “the laws seems to have lost their power as Arendt contented that this defiance of establish norms in our communities is as a results of citizens doubt about the legitimacy of their government due to her inability to function in order which must often always leads to the disintegration of any political system which precedes revolutions and erosion of governmental authority which of course is a big threat and a rape of the judicial system because the law-enforcement agencies has failed.

This is so because some of these law-enforcement agencies always tempered justice with mercy and at time for the exchange of money for the law to be betrayed and jeopardise due to selfish interest and not for the commonwealth which is always a disaster to the societies or communities of which civil disobedience will then become an evasion of such obnoxious practices and poorly enacted laws for the interest of a privileged few who benefit from the negative game theory. This explains why Hannah freely stated that “since disobedience and defiance of authority are such a general mark of our time, it is tempting to view civil disobedience as a mere special

¹¹⁰ Ibid, p, 63.

case. From the jurists view point, the law is violated by the civil, no less than the criminal, disobedience and it is understandable that people, especially if they happen to be lawyers, should suspect that civil disobedience, precisely because it is exerted in public, is at the knot of the criminal variety-all evidence and arguments to the contrary notwithstanding, for evidence ‘to demonstrate that acts of civil disobedience lead to a propensity toward crime’ is not “insufficient’ but simply non-existence”¹¹¹.

This is because a common criminal and civil disobedient are very harmful and dangerous to political movements more precisely civil disobedience may be considered as an indication of a significant loss at the inevitable consequences of a disastrous erosion of the competency of law-enforcement agencies. It is in this light that Arendt emphasis that

“civil disobedience arises when a significant number of citizens have become convinced either that the normal channels of change no longer function, and grievances will not be heard or acted upon, or that, on the contrary, the government is about to change and has embarked upon and persists in modes of actions whose legality and constitutionality are open to grave doubts” and that is why civil disobedience is taking the laws into his own hands in open defiance which is totally in contrast with the criminal avoiding the public eye¹¹².

This disregards for law and legal institutions have become the characteristics of all movements from interested citizens who are being kept together by conviction of their holiness and action to advert negative laws which at one moment or the other civil disobedience and violence often prevails. This is so because certain laws must be change since they favour only a few or individual persons or group. To this effect Arendt stated that “if the parties had been bodies for the organisation of class interests, the movements became embodiments of ideologies. In other words, movements were “changed with philosophy” and claimed they set into motion the individualization of the moral universal within a collective”¹¹³. This inheritance of lawlessness is always a group, issue as some parliamentary system is seen as a distraction to the interested citizens because the laws enacted and promulgated only favour a few which some government are

¹¹¹Ibid, pp, 73, 74.

¹¹²Ibid, Op, cit, p, 74.

¹¹³Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, Meridian books, the World publishing Company Cleveland, New York 1951,p, 248.

governing by bureaucracy to avoid any clash with the multitude. This explain why Hannah Arendt further reiterated that

“Legally, government by bureaucracy is government by decree and this means that power, which in constitutional government only enforces the law, becomes the direct source of legislation. Decrees moreover remain anonymous (while laws can always be traced to specific men or assemblies), and therefore seems to flow from some over-all ruling power that needs no justification. Pobyedonostrev’s contempt for the “Snares” of the law was the external contempt of the administration for supposed lack of freedom of the legislator, who is hemmed in by principles and for the inaction of the executors of law, who are restricted by it interpretation. The bureaucrat who by merely administering decrees has the illusion of constant action, feels tremendously superior to these “impractical” people who are forever entangled in “legal niceties” and therefore stay outside the sphere of power which to him is the source of everything”¹¹⁴.

At this level the law becomes powerless because it is separated from its application, which always pave the way for civil disobedience and violence especially when the minorities feel cheated and threatened by the dominant majorities despite the number of this minorities their qualities and opinion are very important and they cannot be call rebels and traitors because civil disobedience is non-violent as she further stated that

“Of all means that civil disobedience may use in the course of persecution and dramatization of issues, the only one that can justify their being called “rebels” is the means of violence”¹¹⁵. To this effect, change is a constant flux in any society for the changes are for their interest. This therefore entails that if the laws or regulations are to be modified; it should be objective and upon consensus without any bias to any race or group of people be them of the minority. Arendt emphasised that “No civilizationthe man-made artefact to house successive generations – would ever have been possible without our framework of stability, to provide the wherein for the flux of change. Foremost among the stabilizing factors, more enduring than customs, manners and traditions are the legal systems that regulate our life in the world and our daily affairs with each other. This is the reason it is inevitable that law in a time of rapid change

¹¹⁴Ibid, pp, 243, 244.

¹¹⁵Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, p, 76.

will appear as “a restraining force, thus a negative influence in a world which admires positive action”.¹¹⁶

This does not also means that, there should be changes whenever some people think that there are not favoured or that the law should remain static because there benefit from it. Otherwise every rapid change suggests that,¹¹⁷ there is likelihood of a progressively expanding role for civil disobedience as she further articulated. It should be noted that, citizens moral obligation to obey the law is based on the fact that we are in a democracy were citizens has the right to vote. It is actually this voting right, free election and speech which is reasonable in a democracy that has come under attack. This is to say that nobody even the government have the monopoly of power because it is the citizen who trust power and delegate it to the authorities which can equally be revoked. Otherwise civil disobedience becomes the watch-dog for positive change.

To an extent even in representative government where the legislators being delegate on behalf of the electorate are partly the reasons for the current outstanding crises in our communities. This is because a handful of them has lost their course and focus overtime to the level that there represent nobody except their interest and party machines living out the interest of the commonwealth, which today is exactly the disease in which our societies suffers and of course the loss of faith in the laws of their communities thereby pushing citizens to withdraw their consent.

So when the promise of law are being rape popular uprising from citizens becomes normal as a people who equally deserve a better life and freedom within their societies Arendt was therefore right to established that “every organization of man’s capacity for making promises and keeping them.”¹¹⁸ This explain that, inasmuch as the citizens wants a good life, freedom and good laws, there should also keep the promise of respecting the basic contract of their society as well as the government, any effort to alter changes must be upon consensus in assemblies to avoid the danger of any tyranny disorder behold the voluntary association of citizens living under a particular legal system act just as inspired to act especially when provoke by some serious oddities of the law or constitution of their society.

¹¹⁶Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, New York, p, 79.

¹¹⁷Ibid,p, 8.n

¹¹⁸Ibid, op, cit, p, 92.

Consequently, Arendt also contented “civil disobedience are nothing but are latest voluntary association and that they are thus quite in tune with the oldest tradition of the country”¹¹⁹ This implies the citizens or minorities who feel uncomfortable with the oddities of the laws of their society from a numerical strength to diminish the moral power of the majority. This cooperation of citizens is to protect a common interest of the pressure group since freedom of association constitutional and fundamental right in any democratic institution or society; that is why she continued to emphasised that, *the capacity of cooperation for a common purpose, heretofore a monopolized instrument of power in the hands of the higher classes, is now a most formidable one in those of the lowest*¹²⁰.

This is to say that the danger of bad governance and bad laws are a gateway to any uprising like civil disobedience whereby the disintegration of a group of citizens from a political system becomes paramount or interesting groups associate voluntary to bring an end to negative practical or injustice, which government may lost control and power over its people.

Regrettably, most authorities in positions of power are fully aware of these yet manifest the same poor attitude, making civil disobedient a regular phenomena in our communities. It is true that, civil disobedience is an attitude of mind of anybody or people who find himself or themselves a misfit in their community. This defiance can be control by the power that is in any given society.

3.3 Violence as the Inheritance of Lawlessness

The poor legal system, bad governance and the disregard of citizens in some societies are the outstanding reasons why violence is becoming too frequent and rampant in some parts of the world. These phenomena couple with the huge appetite for power has make violence to be a self-determining factor which nowadays is becoming too complex and diverse in different societies and has become too rampant in such a way that has provoked one to believe that it is a common denominator almost everywhere in the world which is been predicted as an era were violence is more on the rise and its technical development has actually reached a level whereby no political

¹¹⁹Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, p, 96.

¹²⁰ Ibid, p,97.

system can actually correspond to destructive potentials.

One is tempted to conclude without bias that, this is actually a century of wars and revolutions in most part of the world. In fact a century of violence which even international bodies have lost much of its effectiveness and glories in coping with such a phenomena infringement or violence has proof to one that peace is no longer guarantee in the society especially when certain norms or laws are not respected. It should also be noted that, the rapid progress in technology and production of weapons are implements of violence. This revolution on technology is mostly mark in warfare and when use on human the end is always danger due to scientific development with the production of weapons in this random event and insanity of our time which can be considered as the basic foolishness of the time¹²¹.

Arendt pointed out that “under these circumstances there are indeed, few things that are more frightening than the steadily increasing prestige of scientifically minded brain trusted is the councils of government during the last decades. The trouble is not that they are cold-blooded enough to “think the unthinkable”, but that they do not think. Instead of indulging in such an old-fashioned, uncomputerisable activity, they reckon with the consequences of certain hypothetically assured constellations without, however, being able to test their hypotheses against actual occurrences. The legal flaw in these hypothetical construction of future events is always the same: what first appears as a hypotheses with or without its implied alternatives, according to the level of sophistication- turns immediately, usually after a few paragraphs, into a “fact” which then gives birth to a whole string of similar non-facts, with the results that the purely speculative character of the whole enterprise is forgotten. Needless to say, this is not science but pseudo-science, “the desperate attempt of the social and behavioural science”, in the words of Noam Chomsky”, to imitate the surface features of sciences that really have significant intellectual content. And the most obvious and most profound objection to this kind of strategic theory is not its limited usefulness but its danger, for it can lead us to believe we have an understanding of events and control over their flow which we do not have”.

This is to say that, the advancement of techno-science have made some countries to develop weapons of many kind for their protection if any uprising or when being attack. This rapid

¹²¹Ibid, p, 106.

progress in weapons has instead promoted violence because they sell them to different countries and at times when they are about to test the efficiency of their weapons like guns, booms, lives are been taken away. Worse of all, when this weapons falls in the hands of brain damage individuals or mischievous citizens they simply see it as an advantage, thereby increasing the rate of violence. More to that, just the fact that any country is keeping destructive weapons is enough reason to think that the government may be violent even against it citizens or otherwise; this explain why, when a government fails to meet up with her expectations some use intimidation methods to subjugate it citizens from any uprising, unfortunately, they are some citizens who might find different strategies to fight back for their interest, among such strategies may be terrorism or some may simply pick up arms against their government for their intention or interest to be achieve. This unpredictable happenings and random events was been condemned by Hannah Arendt qualify it irrelevance or the “dustbin of history”.

Dustbin indeed, instead of indulging to aspect of negotiation and dialogue violence becomes a solution. It is off course shameful as irrationality replaces rationality. Even though Arendt further articulated that “No one engage in thought about history and politics can remain unaware of the enormous role violence has always played in human affairs, and it is at first glance rather surprising that violence has been singled out to seldom for special consideration. In the last edition of the encyclopaedia of the social sciences “violence” does not even rate an entry, this shows to what extent violence and its arbitrariness were taken for granted or examine what is obvious to all. Those who saw nothing but violence in human affairs, convinced that, they were “always haphazard not serious not precise” (Renan) or that God was forever with the bigger battalions, had nothing more to say about either violence or history. Anybody looking for some kind of sense in the records of the past was almost bound to see violence as a marginal phenomenon”¹²².

Even today violence has taken diverse forms in homes, work places and even in streets and it is well understood that “wherever the power structure of a country contradicts its economic development, it is political power with it means of violence that will suffer defeat”, as Engles pointed out. The relations between violence and politics have become inapplicable because even

¹²²Ibid, p, 110.

when the first and second World Wars ended, the immediate outcome was not peace but cold war, which means that peace seems to be continuation of violence and wars which has actually leads to the development of techniques of warfare and diverse violence strategies.

This new scientific technologies in advance societies who are up in producing nuclear weapons can easily erode sources of any national power and has equally rendered less advance and poor countries vulnerable because of their inability to produce weapons due to less technology¹²³.

This uncomfortable evil is a complete paradox of the relationship between power and violence which has guaranteed the destruction of some societies as Arendt clearly stated that, “Power cannot be measured in terms of wealth, that an abundance of wealth may erode power, that riches are particularly dangerous to the power and well-being of republics – an insight that does not lose in validity because it has been forgotten, especially at a time when its truly has acquired a new dimension of validity by becoming applicable to the arsenal of violence as well.”¹²⁴

This arsenal of violence which is actually been accelerated by new technologies has coincided with bad governance and poor educational systems making people to make maximum use of these new technological weapons like machine guns and booms etc. this is what make Mao Tse-Tung to proclaimed that “power grow out of the barrel of a gun, in the same vein he regarded the state as an instrument of violence in the command of the ruling class.

All these conspiracies are not only useless but harmful to the societies because organised armed uprising remains the speciality of the republican forces while a few acts of individual terror are perpetrated by small groups of anarchists, which has actually make the phenomenon of violence to gain more glories aggravated by the weird suicide development of modern weapons and the skills and knowledge acquired in high schools and colleges about concentration and extermination of camps about genocide and torture and slaughter of civilians in war with modern military operations are no longer possible even restricted to conventional weapons as Arendt contented as if to conclude that only violence pays instead of divorce from such insanity and basic foolishness of our time which has become a global phenomenon that has equally coincided with

¹²³Ibid, p, 112.

¹²⁴Ibid, p, 113.

the clash of tangible group interests making human existence an unpredictable doom¹²⁵.

When Fanon stated that “hunger in dignity is preferable to bread eaten in slavery” he means that citizens in any country are beggars of peace but this very peace has been endangered by societal ills. One is tempted to doubt the education some people received with such rebellious attitude or it is simply ignorance and mobility of sentiment of people exposed to unprecedented events and developments without any means of handling them mentally and who curiously and uncontrollably sort into violence with a lot of emotions even though we are born perfectible but we shall never be perfect is true but trying as much as to divorce from violence, wars and revolutions seems to be a better option. Otherwise violence will continue from generation to generation as Arendt quoted Marx and Hegel that “Every old society harbours the seeds of its successors in the same way every living organism harbours the seeds of its offspring is indeed not only the most ingenious but also the only possible conceptual guarantee for the supernal continuity of progress in history; and since the motion of this progress is supposed to come about through the clashes of antagonistic forces, it is possible to interpret every “regress as a necessary but temporal setback”¹²⁶

Even though this inherited melancholy may differ from one era to the other but the spirit violence still remain even if the future of mankind is death it should be appropriate, that is, god’s appointed time.

In this vein it is arguable that human progress is unfair as late- comers are able to profit by the labours of their predecessors without paying the same price” which is quite analogical with Kant’s words when he proclaimed that “it will always remain bewildering... that the earlier generations seems to carry on their burdensome business only for the sake of the later, and that only the last should have the good fortune to dwell in the (complete) building”.¹²⁷

If this so happen that the inheritance of lawlessness and the spirit of violence should be eradicated for peace to prevail then the late-comers will dwell in a complete peaceful society and shall hand to the other generations a more peaceful community. This is because all these are human

¹²⁵Ibid, p, 116.

¹²⁶Ibid, p, 128.

¹²⁷Ibid, p, 129.

actions that can be control or avoided since human beings are responsible agent as Aristotle stated in his physics that “A staff moves a stone and is moved by a hand, which is moved by man” which he has determined or decided. We can equally determine or decide to change the world positively without discriminating on other members in our communities to avoid violence disorder and injustice because injustice committed to a people will certainly nurse the ambition of disorder violence e and terrorism. This explain why Pope John Paul II on the 15th August 1985 in the Cameroon’s presidential palace advice Cameroonians that “injustice committed by certain regimes concerning human rights or the legitimate demands of a section the population which is refused participation or common responsibilities beget revolt of regrettable violence; which justice could have fore held”.¹²⁸

This therefore means that whether as an individual or minority human rights must be respected and justice must be practice to guarantee peace stability and security in any community.

Pope John Paul II was equally right when in October 1995 during the United Nations 50th anniversary stated that “A pre-supposition of a nation’s right is certainly its right to exist; therefore no one – neither a state nor another nation nor an international organisation – is ever justified in asserting that an individual nation is not worthy of existence”.¹²⁹

This is to say that even bigger nations who always manifest dominion power of weaker and small nations to an extent that they provoke violence needs to be eradicated for peace to prevail. This implies that each community or nation equally has the right to exist and to be assimilated or absorbed by bigger and stronger nations who’s intention is always to exploit subjugate and suppress others which of course is a foundation for violence in some of our communities as well as the inheritance of lawlessness. This violence and inheritance of violence if not put to an end will beget more violence as the younger generations will surely copy the evil act to posterity and a near perfect guarantee to insecurity as such perpetrators will continue with their insecurity. Hannah Arendt was therefore right when she proposed that the question and phenomena of violence be raise in the political realm be cause to her the problem of violence still remains very obscure. This is because when observe the phenomenon of power we shall realise

¹²⁸Pope John Paul II, His advice in the Cameroon’s presidential palace, 15/08/1985.

¹²⁹Pope John Paul II, His words in the UN’s 50th anniversary, October 1995, 1985.

that; there is a compatibility among political theories from left to right to the effect that violence is nothing more than the most flagrant manifestation of power as she proceeded¹³⁰ “All politics is a struggle for; the ultimate kind of power is violence this Arentian view as also held by Marx Weber in his definition of the state as the rule of men over men based on the means of legitimate, that is allegedly legitimate, violence”, because Marx estimated that, the state is an instrument of oppression in the hands of the ruling class which really breeds violence and lawlessness to the helpless and courageous citizens to revolts¹³¹.

This therefore implies that, any form of government and its laws is the principal actor to determine the way its society functions. Arendt also contended that “for the forms of government under which men live have been very few; they were discovered early, classified by the Greeks and have been proved extraordinarily long-lived¹³². If we apply these findings, whose fundamental idea, despite many variations, did not change in the two and half thousand years that separated Plato from Kant, we are tempted at once to interpret totalitarianism as some modern form of tyranny that is a lawless government where power is wielded by one man. Arbitrary power, unrestricted by law, yielded in the interest of the ruler and hostile to the interest of the governed, on the one hand, fear of the ruler as the principle of action, and namely fear of the people by the ruler and fear of the ruler by the people, on the other hand. These have been the hallmarks of tyranny throughout our tradition.” All this therefore promotes and provokes the inheritance of lawlessness and violence.

Some thinkers do not believe that the body politics and its laws and institutions are merely coercive super structures, secondary manifestations of some underlying forces; for instance to Bertrand de Jouvenel in his book *Power is perhaps the most prestigious and anyway, the most interesting recent treatise on the subject*. To him “he writes, “Who contemplates the unfolding of ages of war presents itself as an activity of state which pertains to their essence”. This may prompt us to ask whether the end of warfare, then would mean the end of the states. Would the disappearance of violence in relationship between states spell the end of power?

The response seems to rely on our knowledge of power which is an instrument of rule, while

¹³⁰Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace Company, New York 1972, p, 134.

¹³¹Hannah Arendt : *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, Cleveland, New York, 1950, p, 232.

¹³²Ibid, p, 135.

rule owes its existence to the instinct of domination that is why Sartre after reading Jouvenel, stated that, “a man feels himself more of a man when he is imposing himself and making others the instrument of his will which gives incomparable pleasure”¹³³ which is quite synonymous to Voltaire who believe that power is making other act as I choose, “it is present wherever I have a chance to assert my own will against the resistance” which therefore means that violence act Compel the opponent to do as he wish. That is, the power of man over man”, the chief issue at this juncture is command or instruction and so there will be equally greater power from a gun that is why the order given by a gunman because power seems to grow out of the barrel of a gun.

This progress in technology with rapid production of war weapons as well as portable and legalise guns to certain individuals is one of the reasons why violence and the inheritance of lawlessness has become the growing debate and disturbing issue in our contemporal societies. This explain why “Passerin d’Entreves sees power as a kind of mitigated violence” as he qualified is an institutionalized force which is the flagrant manifestation of power.¹³⁴

Arendt further articulated that “in terms of our tradition of political thought, these definitions have much to recommend them. Not only do they compared the rise of sovereign European nation-State, whose earliest and still greatest spokesmen were Jean Bodin, in the sixteenth century France and Thomas Hobbes in the seventeenth century England; they also coincide with the terms used since Greek antiquity to define the forms of government as the rule of man of one or the few in monarchy and oligarchy of the best or the many in aristocracy and democracy. Today we ought to add the latest and perhaps most formidable form of such domination: bureaucracy or the rule of an intricate system of bureaus in which no men, neither one nor the best, few nor the many, can be held responsible and which could be properly called rule by Nobody, in accordance with traditional political thoughts, we identify tyranny as government that is not held to give account of itself, rule by nobody is clearly the most tyrannical of all, since there is no one left who even be ask to answer for what is being done. It is this state of affairs, making it impossible to localise responsibility and to identify the enemy. That is among the most potent causes of the current world wide rebellious unrest, its chaotic nature and its dangerous tendency

¹³³Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, New York, 1972, p, 137.

¹³⁴Ibid, pp, 137, 138.

to get out of control and to run amuck”.

This therefore means that this tyrannical and bad form of government can also provoke terrorismcivil disobedience and lawlessness as there will be general disorder, chaos and confusion on the responsibility of such insanity or oddities in our societies, living the interest and life of the citizens in danger. She proceeded to explain on the ideology and terror: A Novel Form of Government “that the means of total domination are not only more drastic but that totalitarianism differs essentially from other forms of political oppression known to use such as despotism, tyranny and dictatorship. Whenever it rose to power, it developed entirely new political institutions and destroyed all social, legal and political traditions of the country. No matter what the specifically national tradition or the particular spiritual sources of its ideology, totalitarianism government always transformed classes into masses, supplanted the party system, not by one-party dictatorship, but by mass movement, shifted the centre of power from the army to the police, and established a foreign policy openly directed towards world domination. Present totalitarian government have developed from one party systems; wherever these became truly totalitarian, they started to operate according to a system of values so radically different from all others, that none of our traditional legal, moral or common sense utilitarian categories could any longer help us to terms with, or judge or predict their course of action”.¹³⁵

However, this alone is enough reason why most revolutions in the world are to overcome such ideology of totalitarian government let alone terror especially when some brain damage individuals with the means of violence, they will simply embrace and welcome it so as to start manifesting some degree of lawlessness or establish some personal acts of violent in their communities and compelling people to yield to their demands.

In this light Hannah Arendt acknowledges the fact that it is an old establish religious tradition by compelling and commanding people to obey as she further stated that: “imperative conception law”. This concept was not invented by the “political realists” but was rather the result of a much earlier most automatic generation of God’s commandments, according to which “the simple relation of command and obedience” indeed sufficed to identify the essence of law. Finally, more modern scientific and philosophical conviction concerning man’s nature have further

¹³⁵Hannah Arendt,*The Origin of Totalitarianism*, World Publishing Company, Cleveland, 1958, p, 460.

strengthened these legal political traditions. The many recent discoveries of an in born instinct of domination and an innate aggressiveness in human animal were preceded by very similar philosophic statements. According to John Stuart Mill, “the first lesson of civilisation (s) that of obedience” and he speak of “the two states of the inclinations... one the desire to exercise power over others; the other disinclination to have power exercised over themselves. If we would trust our own experiences in these matters, we should know that the instinct of submission, an ardent desire to obey and be ruled by some strong man, is at least as prominent in human psychology as the will to power and politically, perhaps more relevant. The old adage “how fit he is to sway that so well obey”.

This therefore implies that as government exercise power and violence for individual to obey so too some individuals and citizens establishes personal legal right to disobey which is one of the root cause of violence and lawlessness. It is in this light that, the monstrous totalitarian rule which is far from human interest and it system has rather empowered one man who most often is quite prepared to sacrifice everybody’s vital immediate interests to his favour. This implies that such despotic rulers always goes against positive laws which are laws that respect human interest and co-habitation that is the reason why Arendt established that “At this point the fundamental difference between the totalitarian and all other concepts of law come to light. Totalitarian policy does not replace one set of laws with another, does not establish its own consensus lures, and does not create, by one revolution, a new form of legality. Its defiance of all, even its own positive laws implies it believes it can do without any consensus lures whatever, and still not resign itself to the tyrannical state of lawlessness, arbitrariness and fear. It can do without the consensus laws because it promises to release the fulfilment of law from all action and will of man; and it promises justice on earth because it claims to make mankind itself the embodiment of the law”.

This to an extent for a society or state to produce a strong man instead of strong institutions rather establishes the spirit of civil disobedience and violence. It goes without saying that when we talk of a constitution we are referring to the general will which manifest itself through the rule of law which is the concept of power and law whose main aim is not to command obedience of citizens. It is in this regard people in our contemporal society make up a government whereby the rule of law is actually in the hands of the people as they constitute the force or power backed by the majority will. This consensus an objective view may terminate the rule of man over man or

tyrannical rule of totalitarian system which is a government fit for slaves.

In good and well govern societies or communities when we talk of obedience we are referring to obedience to the law and not to men who are considered strongmen because even the strong men need the support of the law as it citizens has given their consent. This support to the law Arendt says that “such support is never unquestioning, and as far as reliability is concern it cannot match of violence can exact- the obedience every criminal can count on when he snatches my pocket book with the help of a gun”.¹³⁶

But rather, she was referring to the people’s support that lends power to the institutions of a country, and this support is but the continuation of the consent that brought the laws into existence to begin with under conditions of representative government the people supposed to rule those who govern them; when this ceases to exist violence and civil disobedience becomes an option. However, Madison was right when he says that all government rest on opinion and to says that majority rule is applicable on in democracy is a fantastic illusion because even the tyrant, the one who rules against all, needs helpers in the business of violence. That is why all political institutions are manifestation and materialization of power; without- which the system collapses as soon as the living power of the people ceases to uphold them. The strength and power of any government depends on numbers.

Arendt was therefore right when she made a clear cut dichotomy between power and violence in that “power always stands in need of numbers whereas violence up to a point can manage without them because it relies on implement” to which the extreme form of power is all against one and the extreme form of violence is one against all which is only possible with the use of instruments as she further reiterated. This is what one can better qualify as the inheritance of lawlessness¹³⁷.

It is in this regard that, she is tempted to yield without reluctance to the temptation of the political question which she thought so importance to make a clear distinction. These questions were: who ruled whom Power, strength, force, authority and violence? These sound quite synonymous but she differentiated them that: power correspond to the human ability not just to act

¹³⁶Hannah Arendt , *Crises of the Republic*, 1972, p, 140.

¹³⁷Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, New York, 1972.

but to act in concert. Power is never the property of an individual: it belongs to a group and remains in existence only so long as the group keeps together. When we say of somebody that he is “in power” we actually refer to his being empowered by a certain number of people to act in their name. The moment the group, from which the power originated to begin with (*potestas in populo*, without a people or group or group there is no power), disappears, “his power” also vanishes. In current usage, when we speak of a “powerful man” or a “powerful personality”, we already use the word “power” metaphorically; what we refer to without metaphor is “strength”.

Strength, unequivocally designates something in the singular, an individual entity; it is the property inherent in an object or person and belongs to its character, which may prove itself in relation to other things or persons, but is essentially independent of them. The strength of even of the strongest individual can always be overpowered by the many, which often will combine for no other purpose than to ruin strength precisely because of its peculiar independence. The almost instinctive hostility of the many toward the one has always, from Plato to Nietzsche, been ascribed to resentment, to the envy of the weak for the strong. It is in the nature of a group and its power to turn against independence, the property of individual strength.

Force, which we often use in daily speech as a synonym for violence, especially if violence serves as a means of coercion, should be reserved, in terminological language, for the “force of nature” or the “force of circumstances” that is, to indicate the energy released by physical or social movements.

Authority, relating to the most elusive of these phenomena and therefore, as a thing as personal authority, as, for instance, in the relation between parent and child, between teacher and pupil – or it can be vested in offices, as, for instance, in the Roman senate (*auctoritas in senatu*) or in the hierarchical offices of the church (la priest can grant valid absolution even though he is drunk). Its hallmark is unquestioning recognition by those who are asked to obey; neither coercion nor persuasion is needed. (A father can lose his authority either by beating his child or by starting to argue with him, that is, either by behaving to him like a tyrant or by treating him as an equal). To remain in authority requires respect for the person or the office. The greatest enemy of authority, therefore, is contempt, and the surest way to undermine it is laughter

Violence, finally, as a have said, is distinguished by its instrumental character.

Phenomenological, it is close to strength, since the implements of violence, like all other tools, are designed and used for the purpose of multiplying natural strength until, in the last stage of their development, they can substitute for it.

It is perhaps not superfluous to add that these distinctions, though by no means arbitrary, hardly ever correspond to watertight compartments in the real world, from which nevertheless they are drawn. Thus institutionalized power in organised communities often appears in the guise of authority, demanding instant, unquestioning recognition; no society could function without it. (A small, and still isolated, incident in New York shows what can happen if authentic authority in social relations has broken down to the point where it cannot work any longer even in its derivative, purely functional form. A minor mishap in the subway system – the doors on a train failed to operate – turned into a serious shutdown on the line lasting four hours and involving more than fifty thousand passengers, because when the transit authorities asked the passengers to leave the defective train, they simply refused.)¹³⁸ Moreover, nothing as we shall see, is in this perspective, there is nothing more common in our communities than the combination of violence and power which is mostly the business of a government compel and subject citizens to obey the institutions and laws of their societies. This explain why the chances of revolutions have significantly decreased in proportion to the increased destructive capacities of weapons at the unique disposition of government as Arendt contented that

*The fact is that the gap between state-owned means of violence and what people can master by themselves – from beer bottles to molotor cocktails and guns – has always been so enormous that technical improvements make hardly any difference. Text book instructions or “how to make a revolution from dissent to conspiracy from resistance to armed uprising, are all based on the mistaken notion that revolutions are “made”. In a contest of violence against violence the superiority of the government has always been absolute; but this superiority lasts only as long as the power structure of the government is intact – that is, as long as commands are obeyed and the army or police forces are prepared to use their weapons. When this is no longer the case, the situation changes abruptly”.*¹³⁹

Analogically, it is a point worthy to note that, Karl Marx was indeed right when he holds that “The natural law of the survival of the fittest is just as much a historical and could be used as

¹³⁸*New York Times*, January 4, 1969, pp. 1, 29.

¹³⁹Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, pp, 46, 47.

such by racism as his law of survival of the most progressive class.” His class struggle on the other hand, as the driving force of history is only the outward expression of the development of productive forces which in turn have their origin in the “labour power” of men. These labourers are those who struggle to survive as a right but when tempered upon, violence becomes unavoidable.¹⁴⁰

This is to say that where power is distinguished revolutions are possible but not necessary as Arendt stated that “we know of many instances when utterly important regimes were permitted to continue in existence for long periods of time –either because there was no one to test their strength and reveal their weaknesses or because they were lucky enough not to be engaged in war and suffer defeat. Disintegration often becomes manifest only in direct confrontation; and even then, when power is already in the street, some group of men prepared for such eventuality is need to pick it up and assume responsibility”.¹⁴¹

A case in point is the lawless nonviolence French students’ rebellion who reveals the weakness and vulnerability of the political system, which rapidly disintegrated before the astonished eyes of the young rebels. Unknowingly they had tested it to this effect, when this happens; it rather encourages the people to summon courage to overtake the system if the interests of the people are at stake. This therefore also explains that when they are no support from the masses, the individual will not have enough power to succeed in violence. This means that no matter how superior you are with violence but when confronted with ill equipped but well organised opponent they becomes helpless. This is commonly seen in guerrilla warfare, even though power is the chief philosophy and principle of all government but violence is indeed by its nature instrumental even though all are in pressure of their ends. Violence and lawlessness becomes a weapon for each and every one to pursue this end and safeguard he or her happiness in all violence come to play where power is being lost; so therefore violence is a self-defeating factor in it victory over power which is more clear and evidence than the use of terror to maintain domination.

Because to Arendt “Terror is not the same as violence, it is, rather the form of government

¹⁴⁰Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, 465.

¹⁴¹ Ibid, pp, 148, 150.

that comes into being when violence, having destroyed all power, does not abdicate but, on the contrary, remains in full control".¹⁴²

This is to say that totalitarian domination based on terror, and tyrannies dictatorship, established by violence, is that, the former turns not only against its enemies but against its friends and supporters as well, being afraid of all power, even the power of its friends. The climax of terror is reached when the police state begins to devour its own children, when yesterday executioners becomes today's victim and this is also the moment when power disappears entirely. That is violence appears when power is in jeopardy.

In the same vein she stated that "In the interpretation of totalitarianism all laws have become laws of movement; when the Nazis talk about the law of nature or when the Bolsheviks talk about the law of history, neither nature nor history is any longer the stabilizing source of authority for the actions of mortal men, they are movement in themselves".¹⁴³

These movements are established just to gain or achieve some ends, and when these ends contradict others then violence and lawlessness gain fertile grounds whereby human lives and properties are endangered which of course is a total ruin of the common wealth. Consequently to talk about the nature and causes of violence Arendt "considered it to be presumptuous at a moment when floods of foundation money are channelled into the various research projects of social scientists, when a deluge of books on the subject has already appeared, when eminent natural scientist – biologists, physiologists, ethnologists and zoologists – have joined in an all – out effort to solve the riddle of "aggressiveness" in human behaviour and even a brand – new sciences, called "polemology"¹⁴⁴ has emerged.

Unfortunately, all the effort of researchers and money channelled in to eradicate human aggressiveness and violence, some government especially totalitarian system has rather establish but propaganda as Hannah Arendt further contented that "it was recognised early and has frequently been asserted that in totalitarian countries propaganda and terror present two sides of the same coin. This however, is only partly true, wherever totalitarianism possesses absolute

¹⁴²Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, New York, 1972, pp, 72, 154.

¹⁴³Hannah Arendt, *Origin of Totalitarianism*, 1958, p, 463.

¹⁴⁴Ibid, p, 156.

controls. It replaces propaganda with indoctrination and uses violence not so much to frighten people (this is done only in the initial stages when political opposition still exists) as to realize constantly its ideological doctrines and its practical lies. Totalitarianism will not be satisfied to assert, in the face of contrary facts that unemployment does not exist; it will abolish unemployment benefits as part of its propaganda. Equally important is the fact that the refusal to acknowledge unemployment realized – albeit in a rather unexpected way – the old socialist doctrine: He who does not work shall not eat”.¹⁴⁵

This attitude of totalitarianism has left people in a dilemma and with the spirit of violence since men have the ability to cheat. It is observe that they have a violence behaviour which is more of a natural reaction of aggressiveness which is quite instinctual drive which can even be identify in household like in feeding and sexual instincts in the life process of individuals cause by compelling bodily needs and stimulants from others. This is to say that violence without provocation is natural as Arendt suggested.

By implication it means that man is more dangerous than other species of animals, because man by nature have an additional gift which animals do not have, that is, reasoning. But other animals who do not reason are far less violent than man, for instance, wolves do not kill their defeated enemy. This generous behaviour of wolves even places some irrational animals ahead of man with his cowardice violent reactions. This is adequately justified in Arendt conception that “men share all other properties with some species of the animal kingdom except that the additional of reason makes man a more dangerous beast. It is the use of reason that makes us dangerously “irrational”, because this reason is the property of an “aboriginal instinctual being”. The scientists know, of course that it is man the tool maker who has invented those long-range weapons that free him from the “natural” restraint we find to the animal kingdom, and that tool making is a highly complex mental activity. Hence science is called upon to cure us of the side effects of reason by manipulating and controlling our instincts, usually by finding harmless outlets for them after their “life- promoting function” has disappeared, the standard of behaviour is again derived from animal species. In which the function of the life instincts has not been destroyed the intervention of human reason.

¹⁴⁵Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, New York, 1972, p, 156.

It is also important to note that violence also emanate from irrational rage whereby human beings are dehumanized, tortured and to an extent starve. These same perpetrators who must often react with rage do not so same with some natural occurrence like incurable disease, earthquake or landslide among others. This rage mostly arise when our sense or injustice is offended and this reaction might not necessary be personal injury as the history of revolution account. For instance when those in position of power react negatively to public expectation, the underprivileged or common people associate with rage to react against these authorities.

Even though, Arendt suggested that, “to resort to violence when confronted with outrageous events or conditions is enormously tempting because of its inherent immediacy and swiftness. To act with deliberate speed goes against the grain of rage and violence, but this does not make them irrational. On the contrary, in private as well as public life there are situations in which the very swiftness of violent act may be the only appropriate remedy. The point is not that this permits us to let off steam –which indeed can be equally well, done by pounding the table or slamming the door. The point is that, under certain circumstances violence acting without argument or speed and without counting the consequences is the only way to set the scales of justice right again. Billy Budd, Striking dead the man who bore false witness against him, is the classical example.¹⁴⁶

In this light, this act whereby men take laws into their hands for justice’s sake, are in conflict with the constitutions or civilized communities is undeniable; this implies that when emotions push people to act with rage their action becomes irrational as if to agree with Sorel that “life is an unending contest”, and that violence is an element of life and a prerogative of the young.

In a nutshell, Arendt holds that “It is fashionable among white liberals to react to Negro grievances with the cry, “we are all guilty”, and black power has proved only too happy to take advantage of this “confession” to instigate an irrational “black rage”.¹⁴⁷ Where all are guilty, no one is; confessions of collective guilt are the best possible safeguard against the discovery of culprits, and the very magnitude of the crime the best excuse for doing nothing. In this particular instance, it is, in addition, a dangerous and obfuscating escalation of racism into some higher, less

¹⁴⁶ Ibid, p, 60.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, 1972, pp, 166, 162.

tangible conflict between collective innocence and collective guilt. “All white men are guilty” is not only dangerous nonsense but also racism in reverse, and it serve quite effectively to give the very real grievances and rational emotions of the Negro population an outlet into irrationality, an escape from reality”.

This implies that these emotions and rage that push people to act violently is more dangerous and continuous as this confessions may be hypercritical because it is not only injustice that the foundation to societal ills, but also most importantly hypocrisy as can be seen in the French Revolution, when Robespierre war on hypocrisy transform the “despotism of liberty” into the Reign of Terror- Arendt described hypocrisy as “the vice of all vices” and the desire for the truth and justice has rather push people into violence perhaps to tear the mask of hypocrisy from the face of the enemy, that is, to unmask him from manipulations that permit him to function without notice or violent means which paradoxically always provoke the fact that truth must prevails which of course always open the way to unavoidable violence in most societies. As Hannah Arendt further contented that “with violence, power is expansionist by nature; it “has an inner urge to grow”. It is creative because “the instinct of growth is proper to it”, violence and revolution are therefore directed against established powers. Fanon qualify it as “creative madness” even though it is quite antithetic to Corro Cruise O’Brien (in a debate on the legitimacy of violence in the theatre of ideas) who quoted William O’Brien that, “sometimes violence is the only way of ensuring a hearing for moderation”. To ask the impossible in order to obtain the possible is not only counterproductive;”¹⁴⁸

This therefore means that to him, violence is more of a weapon of reform than of revolution. This ideology only nurture the spirit of rebellion and violence in the minds of world citizens as it actions vehicle and communicate loudly through negative thoughts and actions. To those who glorify violence forgot to understand that violence pays but the problem or issue at stake is that, it pays indiscriminately because the means overwhelm the end, in his era which is predicted as that of too violent and if care is not taken we shall drive into an era of super civilized monkeys since most of this glorification of violence is cause by severe frustration of the faculty of action in the modern world.

¹⁴⁸Ibid, pp, 171- 180.

Furthermore, Arendt contented that, “the debate between those violent means to “restore law and order” and those who propose nonviolent reforms begins to sound ominously like a discussion between two physicians who debate the relative advantages of surgical as opposed to medical treatment of their patients. The sicker, the patient is supposed to be, the more likely the surgeon will have the last word. Moreover, so long as we talk in non-political biology terms, the glorifiers of violence can appeal to the undeniable fact that in the household of nature destruction and creation are two sides of the natural process, so that collective violent action, quite apart from its inherent attractions, may appear as natural a prerequisite for the collective life of mankind as the struggle for survival and violent death for continuing life in the animal kingdom.”¹⁴⁹

When these two conflicting ideologists don't come to a compromise the basic irreconcilability of interests is dangerously exposed and peace in the society remains in the mercy of an accident as tranquillity is being threatened by violent actions also progress in such communities becomes stagnant due to overwhelming violence since law and order has become a mere façade.

This explains why Arendt further articulated that “violence, being instrumental by nature is rational to the extent that it is effective in reaching the end that must justify it. And since when we act we never know any certainty the eventual consequences of what we are doing, violence can remain rational only if it pursues short term goals, violence does not promote, causes, neither history nor revolution, neither progress nor reaction; but it can serve to dramatize grievances and bring them to public attention”.¹⁵⁰

In the same vein she holds that, “the practice of violence, like all action, changes the world, but the most probable change is to a more violent world”, which is quite visible in our contemporary societies as to whether a group of people succeed in changing the laws or constitution of their communities, it will always be subjected to criticism by others and also subjected to more changes and when these numerous changes with other opinions, violence becomes the only weapon of instrument of change¹⁵¹.

This is to say that whatever the changes the administrative advantages and disadvantages

¹⁴⁹Ibid, pp, 172, 176.

¹⁵⁰Ibid, p, 176.

¹⁵¹Ibid, p, 182.

of centralization may be, its political result is always the same: monopolization of power causes the drying up or doing away all of authentic power sources in the country, as Arendt suggested. But this administration as she freely quoted Sorel's and Pareto's earlier denunciation of the system by stating that "the greater the bureaucratization of public life, the greater will be the attraction of violence in a fully developed bureaucracy there is nobody left with whom one can argue, to whom one can present grievances, on whom the pursuits of power can be exerted. Bureaucracy is the form of government in which everybody is deprived of political freedom, of the power to act; for the rule by nobody is not - rule and where all are equally powerless we have a tyranny without a tyrant".¹⁵²

This situation only changes when some groups or individuals take the laws into their hands to use violent force in order to bring other stakeholders under contempt. As she holds that "Again, we do not know these developments will lead us, but we know, or should know, that every decrease in power is an open invitation to violence. If only because those who hold power and feel it slipping from their hands, be they the government or be there the government, have always found it difficult to resist the temptation to substitute violence for it".¹⁵³

Similarly to Arendt's thought on civil disobedience and violence, along with being a superb politician was Franklin D. Roosevelt who was a master of political communication. Through his fireside chats, he used the new medium of radio to bring his message directly into Americans' living rooms, by passing the mostly pro-Republican press. Roosevelt worked to reclaim the word "freedom" from conservatives, and made it a rallying cry for the New Deal. Throughout the 1930s, he consistently linked freedom with economic security and identified economic inequality as its greatest enemy. In this excerpt from one of the fireside chats of 1934, Roosevelt directly challenges the idea that government intervention in the economy threatens American freedom. The older view of liberty, he insisted, served the needs only of "the privilege few." He would continue this argument during his campaign for re-election in 1936, when he triumphed with over 60 percent of the popular vote, civil disobedience and violence becomes unavoidable.

To those who say that our expenditures for public works and other means for recovery are

¹⁵²Ibid, p, 178.

¹⁵³Ibid, p, 184.

a waste that we cannot afford, I answer that no country, however rich, can afford the waste of its human resources. Demoralization caused by vast unemployment is our greatest extravagance. Morally, it is the greatest menace to our social order. Some people try to tell me that we must make up our minds that in the future we shall permanently have millions of unemployed just as other countries have had them for over a decade. What may be necessary for those countries is not my responsibility to determine. But as for this country, I stand or fall by my refusal to accept as a necessary condition of our future a permanent army of unemployed. On the contrary, we must make it a national principle that we will not tolerate a large army of unemployed and that we will arrange our national economy to end our present unemployment.... I do not want to think that it is the destiny of any American to remain permanently on relief rolls.

In our efforts for recovery we have avoided on the one hand, the theory that business should and must be taken into an all-embracing Government. We avoided, on the other hand, the equally untenable theory that it is an interference with liberty to offer reasonable help when private enterprise is in need of help. The course we have followed fits the American practice of government, a practice of taking action step by step, of regulating only to meet concrete needs, a practice of courageous recognition of change. I believe with Abraham Lincoln, that "The legitimate object of Government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities".

Liberty under which for many years a free people were being gradually regimented into the service of the privilege few. I prefer and I am sure you prefer that broader definition of liberty under which we are moving forward to greater freedom, to greater security for the average man than he has ever known before in the history of America. It is for this reason that Franklin D. Roosevelt suggests "Greater security for the average man" in 1934. This was indeed to eliminate the spirit of human violence so as to promote cohesion;¹⁵⁴ this address of Roosevelt was re-echoed by Samuel Rosenman, ed, public papers and addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt (13 vols. New York, 1938). Vol. 3 pp. 420 -22

¹⁵⁴Eric Foner, *The Voices of Freedom*. A documentary history, w. W. Norton and Company, Inc. New York, 2011, p, 173.

In all, one can conclude without any fear of contradiction that, advancement in technology, lawlessness and lies in politics as justifiable tools in political dealings are among the serious factors which pave the way for chaos, disorder and violence in the societies which is been look upon by perpetrators as legal means to stay in power through deception. In this regard a handful of such people most often, always promote tribal ideology and when a number of other citizens who do not belong in the favourite tribe find their interest not protected or when meritocracy is been replace by tribes and ethnicity, the inheritance of lawlessness to advert such scenario becomes unavoidable such that, lies, deception and tribal ideology can be reign with some degree of objectivity and common interest.

In this light, Arendt established that all the above mentioned are because of power tussle, that is, how they can use lies and deceptions to stay in power, which within a given period always campaign for civil disobedience and violence as she asserted that, again, we do not know, or should know, that every decease in power is an open invitation to violence – if only because those who hold power and feel shipping from their hands, be they the government or the governed, have always found it difficult to resist the temptation to substitute violence for it.¹⁵⁵ This implies that, they use violence, lies to hold on to power which is very dangerous as some citizens simply inherit lawlessness.

One can therefore understand that, our communities need guiding principles even though some individuals always abuse these principles, which is look upon as evil, as Arendt contented that, “it is indeed my opinion now that evil is never radical; that it is only extreme, and that it possesses neither depth nor any demonic dimension. It can overgrow and lay waste the whole world precisely because it spreads like a fungus on the surface. It is “thought defying; as I said, because thought tries to reach some depth, to go to the roots, and the moment it concern itself with evil, it is frustrated because there is nothing. That is its banality only the good has depth and can be radical”.¹⁵⁶

This thought as Arendt stated is the root of evil because when we think, we are tempted to act the we us which now becomes a school of thought in voluntary association to act in like manor

¹⁵⁵Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, New York, 1972, p, 184.

¹⁵⁶Jennifer Kentaro, *How love of truth led to Radical Good*, Universidad De Navarra, Pamplona, 2018, p, 13.

if our thoughts are positive, then the scenario is different as commonly seen in our society today damage by demonic action of other members in the society who by their political virtues provoke such actions and violence.

In this light no one can bear witness with defaulters who jeopardize the peace of its members as Arendt will always emphasize that; “there is no better witness, indeed, of this period when society had emancipated itself completely from public concerns, and when politics itself was becoming a part of social life. The victory of bourgeois values over the citizen’s sense of responsibility meant the decomposition of political issues into their dazzling, fascinating reflection in society, for he was involved in both of its most fashionable “vices”, which he, “the greatest witness of dejudized Judaism” interconnected in the darkest comparison which ever has been made on behalf of western Judaism” the “vice of Jewishness and the “vice” of homosexuality and which in their reflection and individual reconsideration became very much alike indeed”.¹⁵⁷

This emancipating society is because politics which has become part of social life seems to have lost its value and now is focused on its victory over its citizens which of course is the foundation to violence and revolutions among some of its least favoured citizens. This explains why Hannah Arendt further reiterated that: “It was Disraeli who had discovered that vice is but the corresponding reflection of crime in society. Human wickedness, if accepted by society, is changed from an act of will into an inherent, psychological quality which man cannot choose or reject but which is imposed upon him from without and which rues him as compulsively as the drug rules the addict. In its simulating crime and transforming it into vice, society denies all responsibility and establishes a world of fatalities in which men find themselves entangled. The moralities judgement as a crime of every departure from the norm, which fashionable circles used to consider narrow and philistine, if demonstrative of inferior psychological understanding, at least showed greater respect for human dignity. If crime is understood to be a kind of fatality, natural or economic, everybody will finally be suspected of some special predestination to it. Punishment is right to the criminal,” of which he is deprived if (in the words of Proust) judges assume and are more inclined to pardon murder in invests and treason in Jews for reasons derived from ... racial predestination”. It is an attraction to murder and treason which hides behind such perverted

¹⁵⁷Hannah Arendt. *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, p.80.

tolerance, for in a moment it can switch to a decision to liquidate not only all actual criminals but all who are racially predestined to commit certain crimes. Such changes take place whenever the legal and political machine is not separated from society so that social standards can penetrate into it and become political and legal rules. The seeming broadmindedness that equates crime and vice, it allowed to establish its own code of law, will invariably prove more cruel and inhuman than laws, no matter how severe, which respect and recognise man's independent responsibility for his behaviour"¹⁵⁸.

So when this vicious behaviour becomes a code of law, it corresponding is crime which in one way or the other attract public attention just as politic is part of social life for the common good, crimes becomes establish norms and way of life to brain damage individuals who put the society and other members into danger in Arendt political views.

Some of the outstanding and criminal actions are most often hatred by members of the society against others, just like the case of the Jews and their society in what misses Arendt consider as anti-Semitism as seen when she elaborated that: "The declining forces in the Jews fateful journey to the storm centre of events were without doubt political, but the reactions of society to anti-Semitism and the psychological reflections of the Jewish question in the individual had something to do with the specific cruelty, the organised and calculated assault upon every single individual of Jewish origin, that was already characteristics of anti-Semitism of the Dreyfus affair. This passion driven hunt of the "Jews in general", the Jews everywhere and nowhere" cannot be understood if one considers the history of anti-Semitism as an entity in itself, as a mere political movement. Social factors, unaccounted for in political or economic history, hidden under the surface of events, never perceived by historian and recorded only by the more penetrating and passionate force of poets or novelists (men whom society had driven into the desperate solitude and loneliness of the *apologia pro vita sua*) changed the course that mere political anti-Semitism would have taken if left to itself and which might have resulted in anti-Jewish legislation and even mass expulsion but hardly in wholesale extermination;"¹⁵⁹

This is to say that, the way or manner in which some citizens are treated in their society is

¹⁵⁸Ibid, p, 81.

¹⁵⁹Ibid, op Cit, p, 87.

the reason why they act the way they do. That is if they are treated well, then their actions will be positive and if otherwise, they are being hated and poorly treated, then they equally produce poor behaviour, which is tantamount to orchestrated violence and unrest in the society, which of course it is dangerous to any ambitious people with the hope of peaceful co-existence. More precisely what brought about this political thought of Arendt was because of the Jewish question in their society, provoked by the Nazi uprising and ideology, which was quite inhospitable and uncompromising as the Jews were being hated, discriminated some of the survivors were rendered homeless and their culture uprooted simply because they were Jews and all efforts were tailored toward the Jews extermination as they were being persecuted.

This political evil and demagoguery is still practiced today in some communities or societies as some individuals are always hunting to eliminate and eradicate other cultures and human race which is the root cause of civil disobedience and violence. This explains why Barry Goldwater on “Extremism in the defence of liberty” (1964) says that “The presidential campaign of 1964 was a milestone in the rebirth of American conservatism. For years earlier, the Republican candidate, Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona, had written *The Conscience of a Conservative*, which demanded a more aggressive conduct of the Cold War and warned against ‘internal’ dangers to freedom, especially the New Deal welfare state. In the Senate, Goldwater voted against the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Attacked as an extremist by Democrats and many moderate Republicans, Goldwater used his acceptance speech at the Republican national convention to outline his conservative vision and warn against the increased power of the national government. Toward the end, he made the explosive statement, ‘extremism in the defence of liberty is no vice.’”

Goldwater went down to a disastrous defeat. But his campaign aroused enthusiasm in the rapidly expanding suburbs of southern California and the South west. The funds that poured into the Goldwater campaign from the Sun Belt’s oilmen and aerospace entrepreneurs established a new financial base for conservatism. My fellow Republicans, our cause is too great for a man to feel worthy of it. Our task will be too great for any man, did he not have with him the hearts and the hands of this great Republican Party, and I promise you tonight that every fibre of my being is consecrated to our cause; that nothing shall be lacking from the struggle that can be brought to it by enthusiasm, by devotion and plain hard work. In this world, no person, no party, can guarantee anything, but what we can do, and we shall do is to deserve victory, and victory will be ours. The

good Lord raised this mighty Republic to be a home for the brave, and to flourish as the land of the free – not to cringe before the bullying of communism.

Now, my fellow Americans, the tide has been running against freedom. Our people have followed false prophets. We must and we shall return to proven ways – not because they are old, but because they are true. We must, and we shall, set the tides running again in the cause of freedom. And this Party, with its every action,, every word, every breath and every heartbeat has but a single resolve, and that is freedom – freedom made orderly for this Nation by our constitutional government, freedom under a government limited by the laws of nature and of nature's god; freedom – balanced so that order, lacking liberty, lacking order, will not become a slave of the prison cell; balanced so that liberty, lacking order, will not become the licence of the mob and the jungle.

Now, we Americans understand freedom. We have earned it, lived for it, and died for it, this nation and its people are freedom's model in a searching world, and we can be freedom's missionaries in a doubting world. But, ladies and gentlemen, first we must renew freedom's vision in our own hearts and in our own homes. During four futile years, the administration which we shall replace has distorted and lost that vision; it has talked and talked and talked the words of freedom.

Tonight there is violence in our street, corruption in our highest office, aimlessness among our youth, and anxiety among our elders and there is a virtual despair among the many who look beyond material success for the inner meaning of their lives. Where examples of morality should be set, the opposite is seen, small men, seeking great wealth or power, have too often and too long turned even the highest levels of public service into mere personal opportunity.

Now, certainly, simple honesty is not too much demand of men in government. We find most Republicans demands it from everyone; they demand it from everyone, no matter how exalted or protected his position might be. The growing menace in our country tonight, to personal safety, to life, top limb and property, in homes, in churches on the playgrounds, and places of business, particularly in our great cities, is the mounting concern, or should be, of every thoughtful citizen in the United States.

Security from domestic violence, no less than from foreign aggression, is the most elementary and fundamental purpose of any government and a government that cannot fulfil that purpose is one that can no longer command the loyalty of its citizens. History shows us demonstrates that nothing-nothing prepares the way for tyranny more than the failure of public offices to keep the streets safe from bullies and marauders.

Those who seek absolute power, even though they seek it to do what they regard as goods, are simply demanding the right to enforce their own version of heaven on earth. And let me remind you, they are the very ones who always create the most hellish tyrannies, absolute power does corrupt, and those who seek it must be suspects and must be opposed. Their mistaken course stems from false notions of equality, ladies and gentlemen, equality right understood, as our founding fathers understood it, leads to liberty and to the emancipation of creative differences. Wrongly understood, as it has been so tragically in our time, it leads first to conformity and then to despotism.

We republicans see in our constitutional form of government the great framework which assures the orderly but dynamic fulfilment of the whole man, and we see the whole man as the great reason for instituting orderly government in the first place.

We see, in private property and in economy based upon and fostering private property, the one way to make government a durable ally of the whole man, rather than his determined enemy. We see, in the sanctity of private property, only durable foundation for constitutional government in a free society. And beyond that we see, in cherished diversity of ways, diversity of thoughts, of motives and accomplishments, we do not seek to lead anyone's life for him opportunity to strive, with government performing only those needed and constitutionally-sanctioned tasks which cannot otherwise be performed.

We Republicans seek a government that attends to its inherent responsibilities of maintaining a stable monetary and fiscal climate, encouraging a free and a competitive economy and enforcing law and order.

The task of preserving and enlarging freedom at home and of safeguarding it from the forces of tyranny abroad is great enough to challenge all our resources and to refire all our strength.

Anyone who joins us in all sincerity, we welcome, those who do not care for our cause, we do not expect to enter our ranks in any case. Republicanism, so focused and so dedicated, not is made fuzzy and futile by unthinking and stupid labels.

I would remind you that extremism in the defence of liberty is no vice, and let me remind you also that moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue.

PART TWO

ARENDR'S THOUGHT ON POLITICS AND VIOLENCE

In every human grouping or community, people design norms and principles that govern their actions so as to avoid excesses of other members of that community. Even though some of these principles are often abused by some of its members or authorities who do or do not govern and implement the will of the masses. These political blunder always fashion in the mentality of chaos and disorder. By so doing, it opens the gate for violence, civil disobedience and revolutions to mention just a few of these ills and oddities in our inherited world.

The political philosophy of Hannah Arendt in public affairs is to examine some of the root causes of violence, terrorism and revolutions occasioned by the system of governance and the quest for power in the society which without bias falls in line with the views of other great thinkers like Karl Marx and Nicholo Machiavelli, Cheikh Anta Diop, Hegel among others.

To this effect, her political philosophy is a study of the ways and means or the principles according to which men try to achieve their ideas of the good society and the most acceptable form of social organisation and political conduct. It is concerned with analysis and critical examination of such concepts like liberty, equality, democracy, authority, sovereignty amongst others such as the foundation of the state, justification of civil disobedience the rule of law and the function of government. This chapter explains why Arendt understood politics as “a public debate by a community about meaningful aspects of their shared life”.¹⁶⁰

¹⁶⁰ Arendt, *The Review of Politics*, Cambridge University Press, 1939, p 403.

CHAPTER FOUR

POWER AND AUTHORITY AS LEGITIMATE INSTRUMENTS OF STATES ORGANISATION HANNAH ARENDT 1904-1969

4.1 THE CRITIQUE OF TOTALITARIANISM

All societies have the power to decide which authority take office to implement the wishes and aspirations of the people. In Arendt political views she contents that, “All politics is a struggle for powers; the ultimate kind of power is violence”.¹⁶¹ Even though politics is an ongoing activity of citizens coming together so as to exercise their political will. That is by deciding which authority should rule them and in which system of governance. This explains why she actually differentiated between power and authority in her own words “power corresponds to the human ability not just to act but to act in concert. Power is never a property of an individual. It belongs to a group and remains in existence only as long as the group keeps together. When we say of somebody that he is “in power” we actually refer to his being empowered by a certain number of people to act in their name. The moment the group, from which the power originated to begin with (potestas in populo, without a people or group there is no power), it disappears “his power” also vanishes”. While to her authority, relating to the most elusive of these phenomena and therefore as a term, most frequently abused can be vested in a person- there is such thing as personal authority, for instance, in the relation between parent and child, between teacher and pupil – or it can be vested in offices like in the Roman Senate or in the hierarchical offices of the church (a priest can grant valid absolution even though he is drunk). Its hallmark is unquestioning recognition by those who are asked to obey; neither coercion nor persuasion is needed (A father can lose his authority either by beating his child or by starting to argue with him, i.e. either by behaving to him like a tyrant or by treating him as an equal.) To remain in authority requires respect for the person or the office, the greatest enemy of authority therefore, is contempt and the surest way to undermine it is laughter”.¹⁶² And when these concepts are misappropriated, civil disobedience, violence and revolutions remain the hallmark of regrettable outcomes.

In this light the system of governance and the kind of authorities to manage the power and

¹⁶¹Ibid, p, 403.

¹⁶²Arendt H. Crises of the Republic, Harcourt brace and Company, San Diego, New York 1972, pp,143,144.

will of the people must be on consensus. Otherwise the society will be endangered by the quest for power.

The application of some political will requires power and authority by those in public offices and those charge with the day to day affairs of its members totalitarianism is one among several strategies of a given government to rule, this system is look upon as a centralise and dictatorial form of government which requires complete subservient to the state authority. This explain why Arendt criticised that “it will be a more serious mistake to forget, that the totalitarian regimes, so long as they are in power, and the totalitarian leaders, so long as they are alive, command and rest upon mass support” up to the end. Hitler’s rise to power was legal in terms of majority rule and neither he nor Stalin could have maintained the leadership of large populations, survived many interior and exterior crises, and braved the numerous dangers of relentless intra-party struggles if they had not had the confidence of the masses. Neither the Moscow trials nor the liquidation of the Rohm faction would have been possible if these masses had not supported Stalin and Hitler. The widespread belief that Hitler simply an agent of German industrialists and that Stalin was victorious in the succession struggle after Lenin’s death only through a sinister conspiracy are both legends which can be refuted by many facts but above all by the leaders indisputable popularity. Nor can their popularity be attributed to the victory of masterful and lying propaganda over ignorance and stupidity”.¹⁶³

These therefore implies that, the system focuses on the relationship between the individual members and the state, their government and those instruments of force (power, authority and the law) that are used in coercing them to obey or conform to the existing political order of their communities. As such, this political thought is a means by which the members or citizens of given society enriches their knowledge and thereby increases their awareness in and sensitivity to political ideas and trends. More to these, political ideas are the means by which we discover or rediscover the communal or national system in which we define our interests, values and beliefs and which we set out our purposes and aspirations so as to be able to make appropriate claims on others and on the institution of the system that we uphold. This is to say that without political ideas there will be no civic culture and without civic culture there will be no political society and0 without political society, the human society will be nothing than an animal jungle.

¹⁶³Hannah Arendt, *The, Origins of Totalitarianism*, the World Publishing Company, Cleveland and New York, 1958, p, 306.

This explains that, this political thought arm the citizens in a given community by providing them with the knowledge or civic culture in other for them to participate in the political life of their community without which the society may not escape civil uprising especially when those in power fail from their functions. Reason why Arendt lamented that “with the disappearance of the ancient city-state-Augustine seems to have been the last to know at least what it once meant to be a citizen- the term via active lost it specifically political meaning and denoted all kinds of active engagement in the things of the this world¹⁶⁴.

In addition, the political thought of Arendt inculcate into peoples’ minds certain prescriptions, the citizens should conform or revolt, should fight for their right and freedoms or simply submit themselves to abuses among others, this of course are the basis of the ever changing political dispensation and dynamism of any human political grouping. This is to say that every political organisation has its own institutions, ideology and innovation which are the watch words by which every citizen lives in a political to enable him or her to use his or her critical thought to situate himself within the political systems of his community.

This implies that political philosophy in Arendt thought raises questions about the state’s legitimate authority over its members and about social values such as justice. Example of such questions as stated by Donald Palmer includes:

“Can the idea of government be rationally justified or must all governments be rational? Do human have any political duties or social obligations, under what conditions? Are there such things as natural social rights? Can such rights be justifiably overridden as a form of punishment? Once more we notice that these questions are related to questions asked by political scientists and sometimes they overlap them- as in the question “Are some forms of government superior to others? But generally they are not identical to the questions asked by political scientists, the latter of which are basically empirical”.¹⁶⁵

All these questions are how human beings can co-exists. This is so because when people associate or come together they become more powerful in their action over a few individuals. This voluntary association for a common interest can likely cause a change in the laws or the decisions of authorities in that community which may lead to a classless society and the disintegration of

¹⁶⁴Jennifer Kentaro BYarugaba, *How love of truth led to radical Good*, Hannah Arendt’s Philosophical journey Plamphona, 2018, p, 82.

¹⁶⁵Donald Palmer, *Does the center hold?* The McGraw Hill Companies, New York, 2008, 2002, 1996, 1994, p, 21.

power from the authorities, rendering them powerless, and by so doing attracting violence, civil disobedience and revolutions as Arendt holds that “The attraction of evil and crime for the mob mentality is nothing new. It has always been true that the mob will greet” deeds of violence with the admiring remark: It may be mean but it is very clever.” the disturbing factor in the success of totalitarianism is rather the true selflessness of its adherents: ; it may be understandable, that Nazi or Bolshevik will not be shaken in his conviction by crimes against people who do not belong to the movement or are even hostile to it; but the amazing fact is that neither is he likely to waver when the monster begins to devour its own children and not even if he becomes a victim of persecution if he is framed and condemned, if he is purged from the party and sent to a forced – Labour or a concentration camp. On the contrary, to help in his own persecution and frame his own death sentence if only his status as a member of the movement is not touched. It would be naïve to consider this stubbornness of conviction which outlives all actual experiences and cancels all immediate self-interest a simple expression of fervent idealism. Idealism foolish or heroic, always spring from some individual decision and conviction and is subject to experience and argument. The fanaticism of totalitarian movement, contrary to all forms of idealism, breaks down the movement; the movement leaves its fanaticized followers in the lurch, killing in them any remaining conviction that might have survived the collapse of movement itself. But within the organisational framework of the movement, so long as it holds together, the fanatic members can be reached but neither experience nor argument: identifications with the movement and total conformation seem to have destroyed the very capacity for experience, even if it be as extreme as torture or the fear of death¹⁶⁶.

This means that, the action of a people depends on the political will and dispensation to voluntarily come together and suppress the ideologies of a certain class or authority. In this regard Jennifer Kentaro Byarugaba articulates Arendt political thought by stating that “The excellence of politics as human actions is something that Arendt elevated to such an extent that others have been forced to rethink and question its true essence. If the human condition indeed requires plurality and natality, it would follow that Arendt’s ideas are accorded a central role in politics. One of the ways in which she managed to reawaken the desire for it deeper understanding is described in her book, *The Human Condition*, where she gives a clear definition of action as differentiated from labour at work. These for her, are what constitute the *vita actions*, meaning the fundamental

¹⁶⁶Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, the World publishing company, 1955, p, 308.

conditions under which life on earth has been given to man. She then relates to politics but it is only action that goes on directly between men and which consequently requires the presence and society of other men. Thus as a result of its conditions of plurality Arendt links action to politics”.¹⁶⁷

She actually links to politics because every human being by nature lives in a political society and he or her action in that community matters because this action may spring from their conditions. What Hannah Arendt qualify as the human conditions and this Arentian views was further articulated and substantiated by Jennifer Kentaro B. in her Doctorate thesis at the university of Navarra (Universidad De Navarra). When she exhausted that “when Hannah Arendt tries to understand a concept, it is typical of her to go back to earlier times or to antiquity in order to trace the origin of its use. In this case, she goes back to Aristotle, she explains that he described one way of life which was devoted to the matters of the polis, in which excellence produces beautiful deeds. These deeds or actions refer to man’s action as a political being. To elaborate this a bit further, it is well to remember that men were seen as acting political beings and that their action is necessarily in the presence of others and so puts human action (praxis) with reference to politics on a pedestal way above the other human conditions. At a conference in Toronto held in November 1972, Arendt said, “Real political action comes out as a group act. She claims that action is the political activity par excellence” because action rooted in natality, has the task to provide for and preserve the world. This is similar to what was seen in love and Saint Augustine, where Arendt first mentions that man establishes himself in the world with action. As mentioned in chapter 1, the moment I act politically, I’m concerned with the world and the other form part of this world.”¹⁶⁸

Indeed misses Arendt, real political action comes out as a group act because an individual does not make up a society or community. Thoughtless of political act he or she must belong to any human grouping in any community which form a part of the world society and in such societies men act as a group with prescription and norms of that community which therefore means that, power and authority belong to a group and not to an individual. This alone means that Arendt was very right when in her publication, authority in the twentieth century, when she said that “I mentioned this strangest, but in other respects least interesting aspect of the problem of authority

¹⁶⁷Jennifer Kentaro B. *How Love of the World lead to radical good*, p, 79.

¹⁶⁸Hannah Arendt, *The Human condition*, quoted by Jennifer Kentaro Byarugaba in *How Love of Truth led to radical good*, Hannah Arendt’s philosophical journey, pamphona, 2018, pp, 80-81.

in our world only because it shows to what extremes the general decline of authority could go, even to the neglect of obvious natural necessities. For this indicates how very unlikely it is that we shall find in our century the rise of authentic authoritarian forms of government and hence how careful we must be lest we mistake tyrannical forms of government, which rule by order and decree, for authoritarian structures. Our century, it is true, has seen quite a number of new variations of tyranny and dictatorships among which we must count the fascist and early communist type of organisation and political content from authoritarian bodies as they differ from totalitarian domination. Unless we define authority without regard to its historical and verbal content and identify it with arbitrary orders and total abolition of freedom, that is, with political realities always thought to be its very opposites, we shall find it hard indeed to understand why not only journalists but even political scientists can speak of a “rise of authoritarian forms of government in the twentieth century”. The authentically authoritarian institution has managed to survive the onslaught of the modern age, the Catholic Church which of course has long ceased to be a body political property speaking.”¹⁶⁹

By this she therefore envisages that, it is not the form of government but also the authority in place who in one way or the other can instill the spirit of violence and revolution in the society. With regards to this if the authorities respect the will of the masses; no matter the type of government the people will be happy else that society is condemned by necessity to suffer unrest. This Arendtian political thought therefore entails that, any group which voluntarily associates to bring about a change in their social organisation can succeed contrary to the few individuals or authorities which are in power but cannot implement the political will of the people. This alone is enough reason to arm the citizens to resist the excessive ambition of the authorities, thereby putting into place the spirit of violence, revolutions and civil disobedience as seen in the Pan-movement and continental imperialism of Arendt when she stated, birth of the Pan-movements did not coincide with the birth of imperialism around 1870, Pan-Slavism had already outgrown the vague confused theories of the slavophiles and pan-German sentiment was current in Austria as early as the middle of the nineteenth century. They crystallized into movements, however and captured the imagination of broader strata only with the triumphant imperialist expansion of the Western

¹⁶⁹Hannah Arendt, *Authority in the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge University Press, source, The review of politics, vol. 18, No. 4 (Oct- 1956), pp, 403-417, published by Cambridge University Press for the University of Notre Dame du Lac on behalf of the review of politics, pp, 404, 405.

nations in the eighties. The central and Eastern European nations, which had no colonial possessions and little hope for overseas expansion, now decided that they “had the same right to expand as other great peoples and that if (they were) not granted this possibility overseas, (they would) be forced to do it in Europe;”. Pan-German and Pan-Slavs agreed that, living in “continental states” and being continental peoples”, they had to look for colonies on the continent to expand in geographic continuity from a centre of power, that against the idea of England. Expressed by the world I want to rule the sea (stands) the idea of Russia (Expressed) by the words: I went to rule the land; and that eventually the tremendous superiority of the land to the sea. The superior significance of land power to sea power would become apparent”.¹⁷⁰

This is to say that when these people form movements as agreed by the group, their action in politics becomes paramount to conquer power and have authority over others, and if any form of resistance from the others or counterparts, violence and revolutions becomes unavoidable. A case in point of the continental imperialism when western countries colonised and subjugated African countries to all forms of mal-treatment like slavery, oppression and eradication of their cultural heritage, left Africans with the spirit to resist and revolt against such malpractice. Even if these countries were acting like a group, the others like Africans in their continent out member them and revolted against the power and authority of the west. Just as some state authorities who often organised themselves against their citizens for their selfish interest because they have the power and authority to do so, thereby provoking the citizens to rebel against their government. On this account any political society comprises of those who rule and those who are ruled, by this human action of protecting ones interest and happiness always emanate as Arendt stated in the review of politics that,

“It seems that ours is the first century in which this argument no longer carries an overwhelming weight of plausibility and it announced its anti-authoritarian spirit nowhere more radically than when it promised the emancipation of youth as an oppressed class and called itself the ‘century of the child’. I cannot here follow the implication of this early self-interpretation which is manifold, nor am I now interested in the various schools of ‘progressive

¹⁷⁰Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, World Publishing Company, Cleveland, 1958, pp, 222,223.

education' where this principle found its realization. But it may be worth noting that the anti-authoritarian position has been driven to the extreme of education without authority only in the united states, the most egalitarian and the lest tradition-bound country of the west, where precisely the results of this radical experiment are now, more than any other single political or social factor, leading to a revolution of the very concept of authority. Neo-conservatism is primarily cultural and educational and not political or social in outlook; it appeals to a mood and concern which are direct results of the elimination of authority from the relationship between the young and old, teachers and pupils, parents and children".¹⁷¹

This is the same authoritative and power that, the state have over it subjects and when this power and authority vested on to the authorities is abused civil disobedience, violence and revolution becomes an option to gain or secure their interests. This is to say that the power and authority of the state over it citizens is essential but this power and authority can be challenged by it members when authorities govern for their interest or when the citizens are ignorant of government action and of course violence and revolution becomes the ideal model to redress their concerns.

Though Arendt in her book, *the authority in the twentieth century* made a distinction between authoritarian government and tyranny when she stated that; "Behind the liberal identification with totalitarianism and the concomitant inclination to see 'totalitarian' trends in every authoritarian limitation of freedom, lies an older confusion of authority with tyranny and of legitimate power with violence. The difference between tyranny and government has always been that the tyrant rules in accordance with his own will and interest, and even the most draconic authoritarian government is bound by laws. Its acts are tested by a code which either was not made by man at all, as in the case of the law of nature or God's commandments or the platonic ideas, or at least not by those actually in power. The source of authority in authoritarian government is always a force external and superior to its own power. It is always this source, this external force which transcends the political realm, from which the authorities derive their 'authority', that is,

¹⁷¹Hannah Arendt, *Authority in the Twentieth Century*, quoted by the Review of politics, Cambridge University Press, vol. 18, N°.4 (Oct., 1956), p, 404.

their legitimacy, and against which their power can be checked".¹⁷²

Without which violence, revolution and civil unrest must prevail as a battle for interest and survival. However, all states and government to promote human well-being and not disorder, disorder only come to them when there is abuse of power either from the ignorant citizens or the authorities in power within the nation. Thus explain Louis P. Pojman in his book, *Global political philosophy* substantiated that, nation's distinction to the concepts of the nation and the state as seen when he holds that "when we refer to a state, we mean a large anonymous body the members need not know each other personally, that creates and enforces laws over a geographical area. A nation, on the other hand, refers to the societal aspects, to the culture, and to the myths and history of the group. Nations, as communities, grow like trees, whereas states, as associations, are constructed like buildings. Typically states as artificial institutions are invented, whereas nations are neither created by our wills nor chosen, but are natural, primitive givens, base on shared history, beliefs, love and loyalty, constituting a vital part of our self-identity. One does not choose to be of German, French or English ancestry, with all that goes with that, rather one is chosen by the lottery of nature. One then finds one's identity constituted by these factors. The fate of our nation is our fate, though we may not suffer physically or economically from it defeat or loss of power. In the community or nation, particular loyalties are the dominant motif. We have a special obligation to specific people, to a common identifiable tradition, whereas the society takes on a more universal aspect and so applies impartially, without respect for class or status. Whoever meet the abstract requirements is a citizens, a member of the society whoever breaches the law suffers the penalty"¹⁷³.

This is so because the citizens and the authorities are being checked to avoid excesses and the danger of over power. In this regard, the state belongs to all it members and it system of governance is decided upon in a consensus with its members, even the authorities in power are chosen by the members for effective management of the system for a common good, reason why respect becomes mutual to everyone in that community.

4.2 The State Monopoly of Violence

This is one of the reasons why Hannah Arendt also cared much about the truth in her

¹⁷²Ibid, p, 406.

¹⁷³Louis P. Pojman, *Global Political Philosophy*, McGraw-Hill companies, New York, 2003, p, 4.

political views as see in political evil in a global age and between war and politics, Patrick Hayden and Patricia Owens established that “Hannah Arendt cared much facts, and so should we. In the Epilogue to her origins of totalitarianism, Arendt wrote that “freedom as well as survival may all depends on our success or failure to persuade the other part of the world (‘the soviet bloc) to recognised facts as they are and to come to terms with the factuality of the world as it is”. Theories of politics base on misapprehension fare no better than castles built on sand. Nonetheless, Arendt laid own political observations with more than her share of insupportably broad generalizations and falsifiable empirical claims, as David Cesarani and Sheri Bernam have argued. How should we deal with them? For those of us who admired Arendt, even her missteps can prove fruitful; even they (or perhaps especially they) prompt us to think what we are doing” as scholars, citizens and moral agents, wrestling with her apparent misstatements- Thinking with Arendt against Arendt (Seyla Behabibn, judgment and the moral foundations of politics in Arendt’s thoughts, ‘political theory February 1988 31 makes for fruitful political theory. Thundering against them, as a number of scholars such as Bernard Wasserstein recently have done, makes for a one-sided conversation. But ignoring them makes for its own kind of trouble”.¹⁷⁴

These facts elucidated by misses Arendt to establish that every human must strive for facts and truth as the basis for justice in the society because if all members of a given community respects the norms and principles that guide their actions, violence and revolutions will be ignore and minimize to it nearest minimal. In this vein when the authorities in power implement the political will of it member the civil disobedience will also be ignore, even the citizens, respect is mutual and the citizens must also respect their laws and authorities put by them to avoid anarchy in order to achieve their political goals.

This is because “political philosophy inquires into the meaning of political concepts and the justification of theories about the nature and purpose of government. It seeks to provide understanding regarding such questions as, why should I obey the laws of the state? How should the state be constituted? What is the justification of the state? What are the principal functions of the state? Should the state be national or international body? Should the nation-state be sovereign or we should create a cosmopolitan government transcending nationalism? These questions are

¹⁷⁴Hannah Arendt, *Review of Political Evil in a Global Age*, Hannah Arendt and International theory, by P. Hayden and between war and politics, International Relations and the thought of Hannah Arendt”, By P. Owens volume 8, issue 3, 2010 pp, 937,940.

not limited to individual citizens but to all its members as seen in the views of Louis P. Pojman¹⁷⁵.

So the relationship between the governors and the governed is mutual, that is the rulers and the ruled, their cordiality remains intact as long as each member respects the covenant or contract, a breach of this provides negative results as human actions will endanger others in the same community. Meanwhile all humans in the society are equal in their rights and political interests, that is why, Arendt stands out for the truth and fact as the basis of equality and justice in the society. This Arendtian view was properly examined by Jennifer Kentaro when she explains that “The wisdom and truth of this observation cannot be over emphasised. Only in this way, can Arendt’s action be properly understood in its political context. An analysis of the public space and the Polis in relation to plurality, natality consequently arises almost naturally. Those who formed part of the Polis were all men of equal standing. They came forth out of their private space to interact, mix and distinguish themselves from other similar men. It was the space in which they acted and had spectators who were themselves not actively engaged in speech or dialogue; as seen men distinguished themselves from their equals in this public space. Both the spectators and the speaker and or actors made use of public space to stand out from their equals.”¹⁷⁶ This is to say that, no matter the degree of inequality, still lays the foundation for equality and as such every citizen must be treated with fairness as a member of that community.

Despite all these analyses, power and authority is an instrument of the state and it has the monopoly on legitimate violence, and the ruler or citizens owes their loyalties to the state and the domination of the state through its apparatus and law enforcement agency because for Sartre “a man feels himself more of a man when he is imposing himself and making himself more of a man when he is imposing himself and making others the instruments of his will”, which gives him ‘incomparable pleasure’. So too the state as a sovereign is more apt when it exercises its autonomy over its subjects or citizens. In this regard, Arendt in *Crisis of the Republic* jealously cited Alexander Passeri in his book *The Notion of the State*, when he contended that “the power of the man over man”, to go back to Jouvénel, “to command and to be obeyed: without that, there is no power- with it no other attribute is needed for it to be the thing without which it cannot be: that essence is command. If the essence of power is effectiveness of command, then, there is greater

¹⁷⁵ Louis P. Pojman, *Global Political Philosophy*, McGraw-Hill companies, New York, 2003, p. 1.

¹⁷⁶ Hannah Arendt, *Human condition* quoted by Jennifer Kentaro Byarugaba, on how Love of the World led to radical good, Hannah Arendt Philosophical Journey. Pamplona, 2018, p. 93.

power than that which grows out of the barrel of the gun, and it would be difficult to say “in which way the order given by policeman is different from that given by a gunman”.¹⁷⁷

This power according to Passerin as elaborated by Arendt refers to “institutionalized force” which to her is based on coercion resistances in most of this power which at times always force citizens to practice terrorism, civil disobedience and violence as a means to express their political, religious and social grievances may be because the basic contract and promises taken by both authorities to and citizens is betrayed or tampered upon or simply been jeopardized by some authorities in power as Jennifer Kentaro cited Arendt *Crisis of the Republic* 1972, through her doctorate thesis that “The danger and the advantage inherent in all bodies politics that rely on contracts and treaties is that they, unlike those that rely on rule and sovereignty, leave the unpredictability of human affairs and the unreliability of men as they are, using them merely as the medium, as it were, into which certain islands of predictability are thrown and in which certain guideposts of reliability are erected. The moment promises lose their character as isolated island of certainty in an ocean of uncertainty, that is, when this faculty is misused to cover the whole ground of the future and to map out a patch secured in all directions, they lose their binding power and the whole enterprise becomes self-defeating.”¹⁷⁸

This is to say that we should keep binding and made keep promises, that when we agree and promise to do something, let’s keep the promise since most political actor’s belief in lies as virtues in their political dealing. Jennifer further put Arendt’s view that “In so far morality is more than the sum total of mores, of customs and standards of behaviour solidified through tradition and valid on the ground of agreements, both of which change with time, it has, at least politically no more to support itself than the good will to counter the enormous risks of action by readiness to forgive and to be forgiven, to make promises and to keep them”.¹⁷⁹ At this juncture, the issue at stake here is, does the authorities in power have the right to promise and don’t keep the promise? Should there be civil disobedience when a contracting party don’t respect the agreement? Of course, it is difficult but not impossible to determine the fact, because in a contract, when one person fails to keep the covenant, the other party is condemned by necessity to seek redress and a reassessment, for all rights and interest to be protected, even if it means through violence,

¹⁷⁷Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace and Co, New York, 1972, p, 136.

¹⁷⁸Jennifer Kentaro Byarugaba, *How Love of Truth led to radical Good*, Hannah Arendt Philosophical journey, Pamplona, 2018, p, 125.

¹⁷⁹*Ibid*, p, 127.

revolutions and terrorism, especially when negotiation and dialogue is aborted or miscarriage. As Jennifer Kentaro establish Arendt respond to Bradshaw who pointed out that Arendt views in her human condition is contradictory because to him Arendt earlier stated that “acting is the political activity when then is the connection between political action and thinking? Which is superior? Acting or thinking? Aren’t responded with reference to ancient times that: “thought was secondary to speech, but speech and action were considered to be coeval and coequal, of the same rank and the same kind; and this originally meant not only that most political action, in so far as it remains outside the share of violence, is indeed transacted in words, but more fundamentally that finding the right words at the right moment, quite apart from the information or communication they may convey, is action”¹⁸⁰

This explain that human nature has that natural disposition to act the moment his or her interest is in jeopardy which of course is a serious foundation to violence and disobedience in it political and social perspective. This action as exhausted by Jennifer Kentaro in the lights of Arendt’s thought stipulate that “If actions are irreversible, how then does one undo the past? How does one deal with a ‘bad action or with ‘wrong’ or unwanted consequences? What happens to the challenges and risks implied by unpredictability and irreversibility? Previously, it was mentioned how important the virtue of moderation was a political. However, this goes to claim that “while the various limitations and boundaries are found in everybody politic may after some protection against the inherent boundlessness of action, they are altogether helpless to offset its inherent unpredictability”. This is because actions can never be fully restrained even by laws within a body politics”¹⁸¹

This is so because people’s actions are provoked by a number of factors either political, economic or social factors or even conflict of public interest, as other enjoy at the detriment of others in the same society or community. This moderation of action as stated by Jennifer in Arendt’s words established that, “Moderation of and by the people in the polis is necessary as a bid to try to keep actions within bounds. This Arendt claims is much more effective than “the will to power, as we are inclined to believe. In other words, what she is trying to say is that a will to power would provoke more actions and reactions than would be practise of political moderation.

¹⁸⁰Ibid, Op, Cit, p, 105.

¹⁸¹Jennifer Kentaro Byarugaba, *How Love of Truth led to Radical good*, Hannah Arendt’s Philosophical Journey, Pamplona, 2018, p, 19.

This is so because the use of power implies action and all action implies new beginning. However, if there is no space where men can congregate, then there is no generation of power”¹⁸²

In this regard, hatred cannot be tolerated among members of a given community they must love each other for a common good without bias to minimise the onslaught of violence and revolutions in our societies for peaceful co-existence which of course is the goal for every individual member of any community.

This means that, people can only change to disobey their laws when the authorities in power abuse the power trusted upon them, which then provoke and pushes the citizens to disobey their authorities. This is so because the basic law and contracts that exist among the people must be respect for peace to prevail, this issue of the law is of great importance as Arendt contented that, “the citizens moral obligation to obey the laws has traditionally been derived from the assumption that, he either consented to them or actually was his own legislator; that under the rule of law men are not subject to an alien will but obey only themselves with the results of course, that every person is at the same time his own master and his own slave, and that what is seen as the original conflict between the citizen, concerned with the public good, and his happiness, is international. This in essence the Rousseau and defects from my point of view is that, it turns again on conscience on the relation between me and me. From the point of view of modern political science, the trouble lies in the fictitious origin of consent; “many write as if there were a social contract or some similar basis for political obligation to obey the majority will” wherefore the argument usually preferred is; we in a democracy have to obey the because we have the right to vote. But it is precisely there voting rights for universal suffrage in free elections, as a sufficient basis for democracy and for the claim of public freedom that have come under attack”¹⁸³

This attack as misses Arendt put it, is the defiant or the disobedience of establish norms either by the authorities in power because of the atmosphere of convinienlity that surrounds them or the ignorant of the citizens who inherits landlessness to achieve a particular goal or claims. This is to say that government monopoly of power for the benefit of all its subjects can be question when the principles and the contract that binds them together is not respected.

“Arendt thinks that” all contracts, covenants, and agreements rest on mutuality, and the great advantage of the horizontal version of the social contract is that this mutuality binds each

¹⁸²Ibid, p, 20.

¹⁸³Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace and company, New York, 1972 pp, 84,85

member to his fellow citizens. This is the only form of government in which people are bound together not through historical memories or ethnic homogeneity, as in the nation state, and not through Hobbes leviathan, which “overawes them all” and thus unites them, but through the strength of mutual promises. In Locke’s view, this meant that society remains in that even if “the government is dissolved” or breaks its agreement with society, developing into tyranny. Once established, society as long as it exists at all, can never be thrown back into the lawlessness and anarchy of the state of nature. In Locke words, the power that every individual gave the society when he entered into it, can never be revert to the individuals again, as long as the society lasts, but will always remain in the community. This is indeed a new version of the old potestas in populo, for the consequence is that; in contrast to earlier theories of the right to resistance, whereby the people could act only “when their chains are on” they now had the right, again in Locke’s words “to prevent” the changing’s. When the signers of Declaration of independence “mutually pledged” their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honour, they were thinking in this vein of specifically America experiences as well as in terms of generalisation and conceptualisation of these experiences by Locke”¹⁸⁴

This entails that voluntary membership and association must be taken into consideration by all, which of course is the foundation for justice and peace in the society. Without which chaos and disorder becomes the regrettable outcome and consequences, and the growth or process of the society remains just in the mercy of an accident and God’s intervention as powerful people with authorities can easily misbehave and rule only for their interest at the detriment of it citizens.

This explains why Arendt holds that violent, hatred or sudden rebellion spring necessarily from great power and great abuses. She exemplified this with the Jews and consequently organised hatred of the Jews cannot but be a reaction to their importance and power as she stated that; “more serious because it appeal to much better people, is another common sense fallacy; the Jews, because they were entirely powerless group caught up in the general and insoluble conflicts of the time, could be blamed for them and finally be made to appear the authors of evil. The best illustration and the best refutation of this explanation, dear to the hearts of many liberals, are in a joke which told after the First World War.

An anti-Semite claimed that the Jews had caused the war, the reply was, Yes, the Jews and the bicyclists. Why the bicyclist, asked someone? Why the Jews, asked another? The theory that

¹⁸⁴ Ibid, p, 186.

the Jews are always the scapegoat implies that the scapegoat might have been anyone else as well. It upholds the perfect innocence of the victim, an innocence which insinuates not only that no evil was done but that nothing at all was done which might possibly have a connection with the issue at stake. It is true that the scapegoat theory in its purely arbitrary form never appears in print. Whatever, however its adherents painstakingly try to explain why a specific scapegoat was so well suited to his role, they show that they have left the theory behind them and have got themselves involved in the usual historical research – where nothing is ever discovered except that history is made by many groups and that for certain reasons one group was singled out. The so-called scapegoat necessarily ceases to be the innocent victim whom the world blames for all its sins and through whom it wishes to escape punishment; it becomes one group of people among other groups, all of which are involved in the business of this world. And it does not simply cease to be co-responsible because it became the victim of the world's injustice and cruelty.”¹⁸⁵

This is to say that, those in power always oppressed their citizens thereby giving chance to civil disobedience and violence. As political theories, Arendt put man at the centre of her works, how one can live with others or simply how one can relate with other members that make up the wider community. This is seen in her philosophical journey when as cited by Jennifer Kentaro that: “Arendt highlights the importance of the neighbour in love and saint Augustine which is related to *caritas* as was seen in her previous works. This is because she understood Augustine to mean that it is through the other that one is linked to one's neighbour. However, at this stage of her philosophical development, what is understood is also what Arendt maintains to the end of her doctoral dissertation and this is that to Augustine, the other is only an occasion to love god. For her it is not really the neighbour who loved it and that as a result, the individual is actually left in isolation. This answers the question what happens if there is no neighbour and one is in absolute isolation?”¹⁸⁶

This alone reveals that, she was very critical of the kind of love in the society of humans, where there is mixed blessing in their co-existence as other members simply subject others for their egoistic interest or otherwise. This in the restricted sense implies that human nature is unpredictable as one can never determine human action, this human action only manifests when there are abuses

¹⁸⁵Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt brace and company, New York, 1972, pp, 86, 87.

¹⁸⁶ Jennifer Kentaro Byarugba, *How Love of Truth Led to Radical Good*, Universidad DE Navarra, Pamplona, 2018, p, 59.

or when one's interest and happiness is jeopardised by others. This of course becomes the fertile reason for civil disobedience and violence as well as revolutions.

As a political thinker, Arendt focuses on man and his political society how he or she relate with others, and have to established that, some of the earlier cases of civil disobedience, violence, wars and revolutions seems to have laid a foundation for disorder and chaos in the world, in her preface to the first edition of the origins of totalitarianism she contended that: "The two World Wars in one generation, separated by an uninterrupted chain local wars and revolutions, followed by no peace treaty for the vanquished and no respite for the victor, have ended in the anticipation of a third world war between the two remaining world powers. This moment of anticipation is like the calm that settles after all hopes have died. We no longer hope for an eventual restoration of the old world order with all its traditions, or for the reinterpretation of the masses of five continents who have been thrown into a chaos produced by the violence of wars and revolutions and the growing decay of all that has still been spared. Under the most diverse conditions and disparate circumstances, we watch the development of the same phenomena homelessness on an unprecedented scale, restlessness to an unprecedented depth.

Never has our future been more unpredictable, never have we depended so much on political forces that cannot be trusted to follow the rules of common sense and self interest – forces that look like sheer insanity, if judged by the standards of other conditions. It is as though mankind had divided itself between those who believe in human omnipotence (who think that everything is possible if one knows how to organize masses for it) and those for whom powerlessness has become the major experience of their lives."¹⁸⁷ Third world indeed as we can experience, that civil disobedience, terrorism, violence and revolutions seems to be the order of the time as no place in the globe is safe from the uncertainty of this growing phenomena and bitterness in the minds of world citizens.

In as much as some government and their authorities over exercise power and authorities over its subjects, violence, disobedience and negative actions are bound to arise, more to that, when super powers over oppress and subjugate weaker ones the violence and revolutions becomes a common factor, added to this, some innocent citizens always suffer when big powers clash among themselves either for political, economic or social interest, leaving the citizens in a dilemma of uncertainty about the future.

¹⁸⁷Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 1958, p. vii.

This means that political action or actions that people undertake has impact in any society as masses. Arendt holds that: "the content of authentic politics is therefore deliberation and dispute about what policies are needed to preserve and keep in good repairs a political body, a form of government that has been designed to carry on its business by free deliberation, discussion and dispute" constitutional questions, questions concerning the spirit of the laws or the interpretation of the laws or (especially in modern times) changes in the political ground, rules all these are the stuff of authentic politics".¹⁸⁸

This entails that, Arendt's authentic political action is understandable for her specific meaning of each deed, can lie only in the performance itself which implies that, the greatness of politics is in doing politics. This explains why Hannah Arendt think that, the calibers of authorities and system of governance in any society matters because to her some governments are doctoral and treat it citizens without any conscience, like the totalitarianism system which to her "The totalitarian attempt at global conquest and total domination has been the destructive way out of all impasses. Its victory may coincide with the destruction of humanity; wherever it has ruled, it has begun to destroy the essence of man. Yet to turn our backs on the destructive forces of the century is of little avail".¹⁸⁹

This is to say that, any system or government which attempt total domination on its subjects without protection exposes itself to the evil of violence and civil disobedience whereby human lives are endangered with an unpredictable future, which is far from the essence of man and the reasons that brought humanity together, as their basic convenient and contract are been challenge by the radical action of man. To this effect, Jennifer Kentaro in her doctorate thesis at the university of Navarra 2018, cited misses Hannah Ardent when she struggled to describe human action that: "The breaking of eggs in action never leads to anything more interesting than the breaking of eggs. The result is identical with the activity itself, it is a breaking not an omelette". Her point is that the full actuality or the full meaning of action itself is in its performance. Therein lies its end, the means is the end or, "the product is identical with the performing act itself". She thus implies that a means is not always a necessity to achieve certain ends meaning that some ends are in the performance of the act itself. Therefore, action and speed themselves being the highest activities

¹⁸⁸Jennifer Kentaro B, *How love of Truth Led to Radical Good*, Universidad De Navarra, Pamplona, 2018, pp, 102, 103.

¹⁸⁹Hannah Arendt, *The origins of totalitarianism*, the World publishing company, Cleveland, 1958, p, viii.

in the political realm imply authentic political action and the greatest that man can achieve its own appearance and actualisation.¹⁹⁰

However, this action of man is analytical to the way he or she believes because behaviour and action are identical, which means that man action and behaviour can identify a person because not very one has the same though pattern, thoughtless of action, but when a people with the same conviction comes together by their thoughts and behaviour, their action becomes alarming as the strife towards equality; “William Galston holds that, When a society devotes resources to education and training, when it encourages individuals to believe that their life chances will be significantly related to their accomplishments, and when it provides an attractive away choices, that is good reason to believe that individuals will be moved to develop some portion of their innate capacities. Thus, it may be argued, equality of opportunity is the principle of task allocation most conclusive to the crucial element of the human good.”¹⁹¹

When this arena of equal opportunity is absence violence becomes the regrettable outcome. Analytically to William Galston view is Martin Luther King Jr. in his famous speech I have a dream delivered at the march on Washington, on 28 August 1963 when he clearly stated to the Americans and the world that: “we have also come to this hallowed spot to remind America of the fierce urgency of now. This is no time to engage in the luxury of cooling off or to take the tranquilizing drug of gradualism. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlight path of racial justice. Now is the time to open the doors of opportunity to all of God’s children. Now is the time to lift our nation from the quick sands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood, I have a dream that any four children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the colour of their skin but by the content of their character”.¹⁹²

This is to say that in any human grouping every individual seems to approve the tendency of equal opportunity. If actually it was respected various people or citizens would not protest, some people out of hypocrisy always claim this but in real sense they don’t what to have equal opportunity with one another because by their greed and egoistic nature they always want to dominate others, which of course always laid a very serious foundation to civil disobedience and violence, terrorism and revolutions, which in the restricted sense of it is an unhealthy situation if

¹⁹⁰Ibid, p, 104.

¹⁹¹Louis P. Pojman, *Global Political Philosophy*, McGraw-Hill companies New York, 2003, p, 93.

¹⁹²Ibid, p, 93.

they was equal opportunity why civil unrest and resistance in our contemporal era? Why the growing and rapid progress of the techniques of violence in our beloved societies, one can therefore establish that it is the lack of understanding and political will of certain greedy and egoistic individuals.

In like manner, such poor attitudes of contains individuals within the society is evil, and some of this evil can be unforgivable and punishable for reasons of cohesion, Arendt in the origins of totalitarianism put it this way. “Until now the totalitarian belief that everything is possible seems to have proved only that everything can be destroyed. Yet, in their effort to prove that everything is possible, totalitarian regimes have discovered without knowing it that, there are crimes which men can neither punish nor forgive when the impossible was made possible it became the punishable, unforgivable absolute evil which could no longer be understood and explained by the evil motives of self-interest greed, covetousness, resentment, lust for power, and cowardice; and which therefore anger could not revenge, love could not endure, friendship could not forgive. Just as the victims in the death factories or the holes of oblivious are no longer “human” in the eyes of their executions, so this newest species of criminals is beyond the pale even of solidarity in human sinfulness”¹⁹³

This is to say that, such poor action and human sinfulness simply places man in a dilemma either to punish an evil act and promote vicious act or to forgive such malicious behaviours with hope for changes towards a better future. One can therefore establish that all actions need a reassessment, an evaluation within the prescribe norms of the society, because tolerance at times is look upon by wrong or evil doers as sign of weakness and of course it lays a foundation for civil disobedience and violence and to an extend terrorism and revolutions in concern communities. As a political theories, Arendt believe that, the totalitarian system is not the best because of if endless character to spark up chaos, because to her it aim is total domination of power and in all sphere to destroy and discredits human dignity. To her “what totalitarian ideologies therefore aim at is not the transformation of the outside world or the revolutionising transmutation of society, but the transformation of human native itself. The concentration camps are the laboratories where changes in human nature are tested, and their shamefulness therefore is not just the business of their inmates and those who run them according to strictly “scientific” standards; it is the concern of all men. Suffering, of which there has been always too much on earth, is not the issue, nor is the number of

¹⁹³ Hannah Arendt, *Origins of Totalitarianism* the world publishing company Cleveland New York, 1958,p, 459.

victims. Human nature as such is at stake, and even through it seems that these experiments succeed not in changing man but only in destroying him by creating a society in which the nihilistic banality of homo lupus is consistently realised, one should bear in mind that the necessarily limitations to experiment which requires global control in order to show conclusive results”. This global control must be the guidelines and principles put in place as governing laws of their society by all members concern in the given community this explain why greedy and egoistic member who are in power must be constantly check to avoid the abuse of power an excesses by the authorities or even citizens.¹⁹⁴

However, to overcome this oblivion and negative practices where tension is more than too exertcibated by among some members in a given community. John Rawls in his excellent contribution in political philosophy of justice and fairness contented that”

“All social primary goods liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the bases of self respect-are to be distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any or all of these goods is to the advantage of the least favoured”¹⁹⁵

This Rawls view is been look upon as the most wonderful contribution in political philosophy because if all members in the society are equal and if the least favoured are privilege to benefit from the basic principles of equality, liberty, income, wealth justice and respect, it means that, the welfare and aspiration of the members in that community is attained as such, the phenomenon of civil disobedience, violence, terrorism and revolutions will be reduce drastically if not total eradication, because justice is the basic and foundation to peace and meaningful development in any society. This explain why Jennifer Kentaro, suggested the moderation of action as she holds that: “moderation of and by the people in the polis is necessary as a bid to try to keep actions within bounds. This Arendt’s claims is much more effective than the will to power, as we are inclined to believe, in other words, provoke more actions and reactions than would be practise of political moderation. This is because the use of power implies action and all action implies a new beginning, therefore use of power implies a new beginning, however, if there is no space where men can congregate, then there is no generation of power”.¹⁹⁶

In this light truthfulness is one of the important political victim whereby everyone as a

¹⁹⁴Ibid, op cit, P, 458.

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁹⁶Jennifer Kentaro B. *How Love of Truth Led to Radical Good*, Universidad De Navarra, Pamplona, 2018, pp, 119,20.

member in that community is entitled to because lies and non truthfulness is one of the vices that top officials and authorities within a given government use to deceive the masses and at times leaving the citizens with the only option to disobey and revolt against such a government which by mistaken patriotism tell lies to deceive the public, misses Arendt stated that: “Because of the extravagant lengths to which the commitment to non-truthfulness in politics went on at the highest level of government, and because of the commitment extent to which lying was permitted to proliferate throughout the ranks of all governmental services, military and civilian-the phony body counts of the “search-and-destroy” missions, the doctored after damage reports of the air force “the progress” reports to Washington from the field written by subordinates who knew that their performance would be evaluated by their own reports. One is easily tempted to forget the background of past history, itself not exactly a story of immaculate virtue, against which this newest episode must be seen and judged”¹⁹⁷ For justice and liberty, equality to prevail, truth is one of the basis, because some authorities think that deliberate falsehood and no truthfulness is one of their political virtues, by this they ignore the fact that some wise citizens know the truth and can react through voluntary association which is dangerous to the government or regime in place. This means that, every member of a given community must behave within expected norms of the society as prescribed by their rules and regulations that govern them. These rules are the laws put in place by all members for the common good and smooth functioning of their community and the laws are backed by the majority because it’s universally applicable. And any member or citizen who does not uphold this value is looked upon as a civil disobedient and an enemy of the society or state because he or her action is not for the progress of the community but for some self ends. In this regard if any member or citizen sees that the law or rules put in place are not good enough he or she must use procedures for a modification not just by disobey but upon consensus to proof the weaknesses or oddities of the law and by seeking redress or modification through normal channels. Otherwise the law will be applying on him for disobeying that which was supposed to be protected.

Senator Philip A Hart holds that “Any tolerance that I might feel toward, the disobedient is dependent on his willingness to accept whatever punishment the law might impose. This argument harks back to the popular understanding and perhaps misunderstanding, of Socrates but its plausibility in this country seems to be greatly strengthened by “one of the most serious oddities

¹⁹⁷Louis. Pojmain, *Global Political Philosophy*, McGraw-Hill companies New York, 2003, pp, 130, 131.

of our law through which an individual is encouraged or in some sense compelled to establish a significant legal right through a personal act of civil disobedience””. This oddity has given rise to a strange and as we shall see, not altogether happy theoretical marriage of morality and legality conscience and the law of the land”¹⁹⁸.

In this one can depict that some of the oddities of the laws are because of those who times they establishes the laws for their interest and not for the mass, which therefore arm the citizen with adequate reasons to resist some of the ordinances of the law because they are not enacted and promulgated for a common good nor are they reasonable enough to meet up with the aspiration of the masses or citizens, thereby swing way for civil unrest like violence, terrorism and revolutions.

One can therefore understand that , our communities need guiding principles even though some individuals always abuse these principles, which is look upon as evil, as Arendt contented that, “it is indeed my opinion now that evil is never radical; that it is only extreme, and that it possesses neither depth nor any demonic dimension. It can overgrow and lay waste the whole world precisely because it spreads like a fungus on the surface. It is “thought defying; as I said, because thought tries to reach some depth, to go to the roots, and the moment it concern itself with evil, it is frustrated because there is nothing. That is its banality only the good has depth and can be radical”¹⁹⁹.

This thought as Arendt stated is the root of evil because when we think, we are tempted to act the we us which now becomes a school of thought in voluntary association to act in like manor if our thoughts are positive, then the scenario is different as commonly seen in our society today damage by demonic action of other members in the society who by their political virtues provoke such actions and violence.

4.3 The Justification of Legitimate Revolution

In Arendt’s political thought before the civil society man was first of all living in isolation and the state of nature which was more violent as outrage to common sense and reasoning. In this light, Simon Blackburn holds that, “The state of human beings outside civil society, involved by philosophers such as Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau in order to clarify what is explained by nature as opposed to what is explained convention, and what is justified in each way. For Hobbes the

¹⁹⁸Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt brace and company, San Diego, New York, 1972, p, 52.

¹⁹⁹ Jennifer Kentaro, *How love of truth led to Radical Good* Universidad De Navarra, Pamplona, 2018, p, 13.

state of nature is a war of all against all and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. Society is justified as the remedy to this appalling state (see also social contract). Others such as Rousseau have been more optimistic, up to the vision of noble anarchy with family-like relations performing all the role of social bonding that modern society supplement with legal coercion. The whole notion is rejected as an analytic tool by Hegel and Marx, since it is society itself that has created the nature of human beings and their capacity for rational action. Sociology confirms that we naturally inherit a network of adaptations for life in society,²⁰⁰ which therefore implies that for human to live happily in society they must use their reasoning in order to escape from the barbaric state of nature which stronger members of the society endangered the lives of the others, it is upon human reasoning that the state was founded or exist just for purpose of coercion and the avoidance of anarchy. This is to say that the state originates from man's natural insufficiencies and human differences in skills and aptitude. The state therefore is seen as "a human grouping constituting of permanent population, living in a determined territory, and having a political organisation and is self-dependent."²⁰¹ In fact it is organised political community under one government, it is therefore the most complex and elaborate social unit.

This therefore means that the state is an artificial co-ordinating structures that has been superimposed on a pre-existing natural community or nation. This association is a geographically established entity with internationally recognised boundaries as sovereignty, with a government, laws and political values as well as a body of obedient citizens who has surrendered their rights to the dictates of the state for a common good which is considered as a contract, a covenant or agreement of members in a given society. This explain why misses Arendt contended that "All contracts, covenants and agreements rest on mutuality and the great advantage of the horizontal version of the social contract is that this mutuality binds each member to his fellow citizens. This is the only form of government in which people are bound together not through historical memories or ethnic homogeneity as in the nation-state and not through Hobbes leviathan, which "overawes them all" and thus unites them, but through the strength of mutual promises. In Locke views, this means that the society remains intact even if "the government is dissolved or breaks its agreement with society, developing into a tyranny. Once established, society, as long as it exists at all, can never be thrown back into the lawlessness and anarchy of the state of nature. In Locke's words,

²⁰⁰Simon Blackburn, *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*, Oxford New, University Press, 1994, p, 363.

²⁰¹Samah Abang Mugwa, *Certificate Philosophy for Cameroon G.C.E. Examination*, Catwa education, 2020, p, 494.

“the power that every individual gave the society, when he entered into it; can never be revert to the individuals again, as long as the society lasts but will always remain in the community. This is indeed a new version of the old *Polestas in populo*. For the consequence is that in contrast to earlier theories of the right to resistance, whereby the people could act only “when their chains are on, the chaining, when the singers of the declaration of independence” mutually pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honour, they were thinking in this vein of specifically American experiences as well as in terms of the generalization and conceptualization of these experiences by Locke”.²⁰²

This contrast or break of contract is what pushes people or citizens to violence; George Sorel is remembered for reflection on violence in 1914. He argues that; “one cannot deplore violence in the hands of opponents of the state (itself no stronger to the violence of war and legal coercion) without understanding the situation and the aims of those who use it, perhaps the most scandalous part of the doctrine was Sorel’s recognition that violence might equally be used against those who, appearing to sympathise with a movement, in fact lure it into collaboration with the system that aims to overthrow. Sorel also perceived the central role of myth and image in creating a dramatic focus for political emotions. Social forces, which may transform societies in ways that are necessary to create their own truth, although Sorel was a theorist of the left, his contempt for democratic liberalism was most closely echoed by the violent and myth-governed fascist regimes of the 20th century”.²⁰³

With the above argument and views, it therefore implies that the states have certain features and characteristics that are akin to her, because it comprises of people who have surrender their rights to the state.

Arendt hold, that “every organisation of men, capacity for making promises and keeping them”²⁰⁴ so in as much as citizens promised by contract or covenant to respect and obey the dictates of the state, so too the states must have some characteristic and features that are within the framework of their mutual agreement some of these characteristics of the state include;

- A sovereign territory or geographical, established entity, which is the land surface of the state internationally recognized, which of course is borne by the fact that it has a given

²⁰² Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt brace company Sandiego, New York, 1972, p, 87.

²⁰³Simon Blackburn, *Oxford Dictionary of philosophy*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1994, p, 357.

²⁰⁴Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt brace company Sand Diago, New York 1972, p, 93.

population answerable to the dictates of the state.

- In addition to this, it is a legal entity sovereignty with which is supreme and autonomous with the right to own an army and other structures of law enforcement so as to be able to be maintained peace, law and order within the territory of the state. This sovereignty refers to full right and power of a governing body or state to govern itself without any interference from outside sources or bodies because it have a ruling class and various organs and institutions as elaborated by Samah Abang Mugwa²⁰⁵.

These features of the state entails that all the forces operating within a given geographical territory like citizens, other associations and government are subjected or condemned by necessity to obey the rules of the state, which of course explain that, there is some degree of obligation base on the contract which citizens and the state agreed upon. This is to avoid violence and anarchy in the society because it is only in the society that man can develop his potentialities as a human being. With these features and characteristics of the state, it therefore means that the state has some sources and origins that are why it exist which of course explain how social life in the form of a complex structure of the state came about. This can actually be traced from the natural origin theory and the social contract theory. With these features and characteristics of the state, it therefore means that the state has some sources and origins that is why it exist which of course explain how the social life in the form of a complex structure of the state came about. This can actually be traced from the natural origin theory and the social contract theory.

To begin, the natural theory of the state entails that life in a state is an obligation imposed on man by natural instincts as Samah Abang put it that “the state is the product of natural factors that are independent of any human choice or decision. So it is nature that compelled man to live, if he must survive in the state as the only social institution under which he fined fulfilment and survival”²⁰⁶

To Plato in his famous book, *the Republic* as cited by Samah Abang Mugua in his certificate philosophy for Cameroon G.C.E Examination holds that nature made man and compelled him to live in a social group or in fellowship with fellow man. Nature designed man such that none can live and survive in solitude, no man can survive as an island. He can only find fulfilment and

²⁰⁵Samah Abang Mugwa, *Certificate Philosophy for Cameroon G.C.E*, p, 494.

²⁰⁶ Ibid, pp, 494,495.

survive when he lives in a “polis” or political community with fellowmen, because to him nature is discriminatory in the way it endorse people with skills. And that man by nature is self-insufficient in that none has all that he needs and none can provide for all he needs”²⁰⁷

For this reason all members of the communities must come together for a common good and shared their various skills in which these are endowed with for progress and better life for all of them.

This is in the same line with Aristotle who contended that “the state originated from man’s natural instinct of reproduction and that of self-preservation. In his book, the politics he stated that the start is a community of some kind. Like all other communities the state must exist for an end and the end of the highest good of man, which for him is the life of virtue and contemplation, because all communities aim at some good, then the state or political community, which is the highest of all, and which embrace all the rest, aims at the good in a greater degree than any other and at the highest good”²⁰⁸

Hannah Arendt cited Hobbes was right when he said; “covenant, without the sword, are but words”²⁰⁹ words because some people in the political society thinks that there were born to dominate others or bring others under control, which means that glory for them and almost nothing for the others which of course is the chief issue responsible for violence and revolution across the world or in some states. They forget their basic contract or that man as individual is self-insufficient as Aristotle will have it that, the reproductive instinct which leads men and women unites and that of self-preservation, which causes master and slave to come together for their mutual benefit.

This explain the fact that for human being to come together was the best thing ever in the history of mankind, this is to say that Aristotle was right when he established that “man is by nature a political animal; and he who by nature and not by mere accident is without a state, is either a beast or above god”²¹⁰

In this light one can say that the state is omnipotent to man in he or her society given that nature provide different societies with different gifts, so too men are given different talents and skills, which then compel them to come together for mutual benefits.

²⁰⁷Ibid, p, 495.

²⁰⁸ 1 bid, p, 495.

²⁰⁹ Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt brace, New York, 1974, p, 107.

²¹⁰1 bid, p, 496.

Apart from these views of Plato and Aristotle on the origin of the state some scholars and thinkers hold that, the state is the product of a social contract or agreement between fellow humans being in a given state. This view was because they believed that, life in a state is the product of a social agreement or covenant and voluntary and conscious association between man and man. This idea was provoked by the strive for better human life paradoxically to the barbaric state of nature whereby man lived in a deplorable and unacceptable situation, which then laid the foundation to move from this primitive state to a civilise one in order to exchange civility in a peaceful coercion.

This explain why Samah Abang Mugwa cited the English political philosopher Thomas Hobbes in his famous book *the leviathan* in which been largely considered as a contractualize stipulated that “previously man lived in “the state of nature” of which life in the state of nature is brutish and selfish, characterised by lawlessness, anarchy, brutality savagery, individualism, egocentrism, a war of all against all and the spirit of survival of the fittest. No one had a legal right or interest over any property, each man struggled to protect himself and grab for himself what and how much he could. No one ruled the others, there existed no how, to Hobbes, “in the state of native, man-to-man was a wolf”, man was anti-social to fellow man it was in the face of this and its resultant evil consequences and desire to avoid the state of native that man resolved with fellowman to enter into an agreement or social contract or consensus to create the modern civil state. Man accepted to abandon the state of nature in favours of the new modern and civil state where lawlessness thrived in the state of nature, was prevailed in the civil state”²¹¹

“Arendt estimated that, “the consensus is very strange for to equate political power with the organisation of violence” makes sense only if one follows max’s estimate of the state as an instrument of oppression in the hands of the ruling class”²¹²

This is to say that, misses Arendt was insinuating that the power fisted on the state by the civil society for common good is some time been abuse as the state use it as an instrument or weapon to subjugate and expresses it fellow citizens which is the chief reason why civil disobedience and violence has become the main event in the societies.

These Arendtian views can be substantiated or elaborated with reference to Hobbes notion of the modern or civil state whereby life is characterised by civil laws with an absolute monarch as leader, as he contended that;“In this state, laws were enacted and put in place; man could now

²¹¹Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, P, 135.

²¹²Samah A. Mugwa, p, 497.

own property and respect the property interest of others. Rights were conferred and duties imposed, in addition, government was introduced, the government was represented either by a single ruler or monarch or chosen to enact laws and ensure that the laws are respected. As a ruler he enjoys absolute powers to make laws and enforce them, no matter how bad he may be, the society under him is better than that in the previous state of nature. For that reason, his rule is absolute till death, in addition, the authority of the monarch must be obeyed and respected by the citizens, who must not rebel or revolt against it, this implies that the monarch enjoys absolute reign. His reign is absolute given that, He does not share power an authority with any institution, there is no separation of powers, his executive, and the legislative and judiciary of combine in him, he cannot be removed or replaced unless by death, his authority and exercise of such authority cannot and should not be questioned or challenged”

This was actually better than the state of nature but the amalgamation of powers by a ruler couples with his absolute powers of ruler ship questionable as violence, terrorism and revolutions has prevailed to question such absolutism of the monarch because when power is over vested to an individual or authority, abuses are likely to arise. As the authority or monarch may develop interest in extending powers, this can be explain in Arendt political thought when she cited Cecil Rhodes that;

“Expansion is everything”, said Cecil Rhodes, and fell into despair, for every night he saw overhead “these stars” these vast world which we can never reach, I would annex the planets if I could. He had discovered the moving principle of the new imperialist era”²¹³

This expansion and imperialist ideologies is the crux of the matter which has created antagonism between members of the state or community, in as much as an individual want to expand an unquestionable powers then to an extent they must be some spirit of discontent that some if not all members will riots, whereby chaos disorder, violence and revolutions will be certainly be the regrettable outcome as to why the mutual agreement and contract is abrogated or abuse.

This to Locke is going back to the state of nature which according to him; “the state of nature, (the natural condition of mankind) is a state of perfect and complete liberty to conduct

²¹³Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, the world publishing company, Cleveland New York, 1958 p, 124.

one's life as one best sees it. One's life is free from interference of others, man is social towards fellow man, this does not mean however, that it is a state of license or excess liberties; one is not free to do anything that one pleases or even anything that one judges to be in one's interest. The state of nature although being a state where in there was no civil authority or government to punish people for transgressions against laws, is not a state without morality. The state of nature is pre-political, but it is not pre-moral, person are assured to be equal to one another in such a state, man is social to fellow man, for there exist one law. This called the law of nature, in Locke view, this is the basis of all morality, and since given to us by God, it commands that we must not harm others with regards to their life, healthy liberty, or possessions” because we all belong equally to God, and because we cannot take away that which is rightly his, we are prohibited from harming one, another. So, the state of nature is a statue of liberty was persons are free to pursue their own interests and plans and are free from interference by others, because of the law of nature and nature is relatively peaceful²¹⁴”

The issue at stake here is the divine law or state of nature be respected as ordained? Strong men and weak ones exists in the society, if both have interest on particular resources then it is obvious that the stronger one must dominate and prevail over the weaker one who must perish, this way they can never be equality, justice and peace in that society. Arendtian political views clearly explained that, “ it is against the background of these experience that I propose to raise the question of violence in the political realm, this is not easy, what Sorel remarked sixty years ago, “the problems of violence still mentioned the general reluctance to deal with violence as a phenomenon in its own right, and I must now qualify this statement, if we turn to discussions of the phenomenon of power, we soon find that there exist a consensus among political theorist from left to right to the effect that violence is nothing more than the most flagrant manifestation of power. “All politics is a struggle for power; the ultimate kind of power is violence; said C. Wright mills, echoing as if it were, max Weber’s definition of the state as the rule of men over men based on the means of legitimate, that is allegedly legitimate, violence.”²¹⁵

In addition, Locke sees the modern civil state as one in which, life is characterised by democracy and the contract can be broken, a leader who has relative powers as he assured that; “it is possible for war and conflict to arise occasionally when people fail to respect the law of nature

²¹⁴ Ibid, Opt, Cit, p, 497.

²¹⁵ Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic* , Harcourt Brace and company San Diego, New York, 1972, p, 134.

and infringe on the life, property and liberty of one another. This will all for a law-maker and law-enforcer, each man would surrender his right to self-defence and self-preservation to the ruler(s) called the government. They he or she shall have as mission to protect the life and property of each citizen, the state will then have laws that go beyond the law of nature, so, it shall be known the civil state or the state of law, such laws shall regulate the rights and duties of each member. Where the ruler shall fail to maintain this and fall short of his primary functions, the citizens shall have a right or even an obligation to resist and even overthrow him. This is a justification for a revolution or a rebellion against a tyrant “This shows that Locke does not believed in absolute authority and power of the monarch within the state. Which of course is chaotic to ambitions and power mongers, as Arendt further stated that;

“Expansion as a permanent and supreme aim of politics is the central idea of imperialism, since it implies neither temporal looting nor the more lasting assimilation of conquest; it is an entirely new concept in the long history of political thought and action”²¹⁶

To this effect this expansion is better understood in Rousseau’s notion of the state of nature as extra-social “according to him the state of nature, man attained an extra-social relationship with fellow man. He argued that man is extra-social friendly towards his kind, to him, the state of nature was a peaceful and down-to-earth time, and people lived solitary uncomplicated lives. Their few needs were easily satisfied by nature, because of the abundance of nature and the small size of population, competition was non-existent and person’s rarely even saw one another, much less had reason for conflict or fear, moreover, these simple, moral pure reason were naturally endowed with the capacity for pity and therefore were not inclined to bring harm to one another”²¹⁷

Society by then was really peaceful if judge by Rousseau view but paradoxically, as time passed by, however, humanity faced certain changes, as the overall population increased, the means by which people could satisfy their needs changed. People slowly began to live together in small families and then discoveries and leisure time inevitable led people to make comparisons between themselves and other, resulting in public values, leading to shame and envy, pride and contempt. Most importantly however, according to Rousseau, was the invention of private property which constituted the pivotal moment in human evolution out of simple, pure state into one

²¹⁶Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, p, 25.

²¹⁷Samah Abang, p, 498.

characterised by greed, competition, vanity, inequality, and vice. For Rousseau the invention of property constitutes humanity's "fall from grace out of the state of nature"²¹⁸

More to that, having introduced private property, initial conditions of inequality became more pronounced, some had property notice that it would be in their interest to create a government that would protect private property from those who do not have it but can see that they might be able to acquire it by force, so government is established, through a contract, which is intended to guarantee equality and protection for all".²¹⁹

Therefore, the social contract, argued for Rousseau was meant to solve the problems related to this bad state of affairs and to address the social and moral ills that been produced by the development of society. From the above analyse, it follows that power and sovereignty recite in the hands of the citizens and all members who make up the wider community within the limits of the monarchs fails to fulfil their purpose for which the covenant or contract was base. The citizens are then arm with ample reason to revolt or rebel and may even overthrow such a government within their state which does not measure up or satisfy the wish and aspirations of the people as agreed in their social contract giving chance to civil disobedience, violence and revolution in the state.

To this effect, state therefore is compelled or obliged to perform certain tasks and assignment some of these functions of the state include; coordination and over right function, this is to say that, the state provide the scheme and directives to it citizens to follow so as to acquire a collective vision and strive towards a common good and collective wellbeing. This explains why Samah Abang Mungwa holds that "the state is a necessary instrument for the satisfaction for the need of the citizens because the state is a control value of the individuals' uncontrolled actions, passion, emotions and desires. Going by social contract theory premises of Thomas Hobbes, man is selfish, egoistic and egocentric, and always desiring to a mass and accumulates for himself, without bothering about the welfare of others. Following from the description of nature of the human soul, by Plato and Aristotle, the spirited, the appetitive and the national parts of the soul may dominate the rational part and when this occurs man acts irrationally under the control of

²¹⁸Ibid, op cit, p, 499.

²¹⁹Ibid, P499.

passions, emotions and desires, usually wrongly. The state comes in through laws rules, norms and injunctions to limit and moderate such excesses; it makes laws that define the limits of such excesses and places sanctions as well. For fear of such sanctions, individuals are compelled to control their passions and desire²²⁰. when the state coordinate and oversee it members affairs and militate for a common good then violence, civil disobedience and revolutions will be reduce to it minimal.

In this vein misses Hannah Arendt thought as such when she uphold the value of promise, for people to respect especially the contract which binds them together mutually, as she cited Montesquieu that; “the spirit of the laws” as Montesquieu understood it, legal system act and are inspired to act. Consent, the spirit of American laws is based on the notion of mutually binding’s contract, which established first the individual colonies and then the union. A contract presupposes a plurality of at least two and every association established and acting according to the principle of consent, based on mutual promise, presupposes a plurality that does not dissolve but shaped into the form of a union pluribus Unum. If the individual members of the community thus formed should choose to disappear into complete unity, such as the union sacred of the French nations, all talk about the citizen’s moral relation to the law would be mere rhetoric²²¹

Another legitimacy of the state is the ordering of security and defence function to guarantees peace in the society, this is to say that in any human grouping people work towards the satisfaction of their desires, by so doing they find themselves in necessary competition and conflict due to limited resources. In order to coexist the state comes in with a neutral force arbitrate between citizens by using the laws of the land to sanction defaulters and guarantee peace and collective well-being, it is for this reason that Samah Abang emphasise that “the state is a necessary evil because it promote peace and ensures peace and security in the society, this is so because interpersonal conflicts in the society, create fear and insecurity. As Hobbes says, “in the state of nature, man to man is a wolf”, the creation of and the transition to the civil state brings in a sense and a spirit of security. The state possesses several instruments and mechanisms for guaranteeing the peace and security of the individual. The law enforcement and judiciary instruments of the state work to ensure that justice is promoted and peace and security are maintained and that fear is eliminated. These are

²²⁰Ibid, p, 500.

²²¹Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt brace and company, San Diego, New York, 1972, p, 94.

benefits that only the state can adequately provide, and which the individual citizen cannot provide for and by himself”²²²

Without which the society will be left in the hands of dangerous individuals, whereby civil disobedience violence and revolutions will be the regrettable outcome.

In addition, the state promote peace and harmony, this is so because human differences are natural, people have different desires, different goals, different interest, different degrees of satisfaction and others. They seek to satisfy there by different means and measures, as a result of this, it is obvious that inter-personal clashes and conflict will arise. The state comes into impose obligations, duties as well as limits and to confer rights and privileges, it puts in place different mechanisms for preventing and minimising conflict as well as resolving those that inevitably arise. The state is the police of individuals liberties, even though man is naturally free (according to Rousseau), he does not enjoy license to promote anarchy, he natural freedom and liberty is cushioned and rationally channelled by the state natural freedom do not mean license or freedom to promote anarchy in the society”²²³

This heavy mechanism to ensure cohesion can only be carried out by the state to avoid civil disobedience and violence unfortunately, the misappropriation of state functions are the reasons why human society is largely involve in civil disobedience and violence as well as revolutions across the globe. Hannah Arendt contented that “Disobedience to the law, civil and criminal has become a mass phenomenon in recent years, not only in America, but also in a great many other parts of the world. The defiance of established authority, religious and secular, social and political, as a world-wide phenomenon may well one day be accounted the outstanding event of the last decade. Indeed, “the laws seem to have lost their powers viewed from outside and considered in historical perspective, no clear writing, on the wall-no more explicit sign of the inner instability and vulnerability of existing governments social-science theories-it is that a disintegration of political systems precedes revolutions, that the telling symptom of disintegration is a progressive erosion is caused by the government authority, and that this erosion is caused by the government inability to function properly, from which spring the citizen doubts about its legitimacy. This is

²²²Samah Abang Mungwa, *Certificate Philosophy for Cameroon GCE Examination*, Catwa education Yaoundé 2020 p, 500.

²²³Ibid, p, 500.

what the Marxists used to call a “revolutionary situation-which, of course more often than not does develop into a revolution”²²⁴

This means that, the defiance of states authorities and the law is when its government do not function properly, that is when the basic covenant and agreement that binds the people is not respected, which of course always push the citizen’s into chaos because there are sceptical about their government, which therefore means that the state is an obstacle or a hindrance to individuals liberty. This therefore makes the citizens not to enjoy their natural rights liberties and freedom. The state is an impediment to human liberty as seen in the view of Louis Pierre Althusser as cited by Samah Abang Mugwa that. “The state perpetuates violence against the individuals, to Louis Pierre Althuses, he considers the state as an instrument of violence and repression. The state enacts laws and attaches sanctions to them, such laws deprive citizens of their natural right, they may equally limit the extent to which citizens enjoy and express such rights. Where citizens are steadfast to their rights, state violence is used to compel them into submission and obedience, this is Manistee in the state’s monopoly of the use of force to elicit submissions from citizens through the use of the police, the army and other such apparatus of law enforcement. This can be exemplified by the forces of law and the other military that are brought into maintain peace and public order in the event of public manifestations, riots and strike actions. It is common place to find such forces brutalising and molesting then masses”²²⁵

This does not without the citizens retreating which of course further deepen the spirit of antagonism within the state.

In addition, is in essence an oppressor that is a disguised form of class domination, which according to Karl Marx who holds that, “class separation is the main issue in the history of every human society? The dominant bourgeoisie class constitutes itself into the governing group, as opposed to the working or labouring proletariat class. The former class working class, so the state according to Marx, is simply the will intention, decision and choice of the powerful dominant class, so the state according Marx, is simply a representation of the whims and caprices of the bourgeois class. That is why he opine that “in every era in human history, the ruling ideas are the

²²⁴Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace and co. San Diego, New York 1972, p, 69.

²²⁵ Samah Abang Mungwa, *Certificate Philosophy for Cameroon G.C.E. Examination*, Catwa education, Yaounde, 2020, p, 501.

idea are the idea of ruling class”²²⁶

More so, the state is an instrument and perpetrator coercion or force against the individual, this can be justify from the view of Marx sterner and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon as well as Joseph Déjacque. They are known as anarchists, and they see the state as a tool for subjecting and chaining the individual, whose will is constrained to unconditional subordination, the will of the citizen is destroyed and subjugated to the overbearing dictates of the state. The individual does not always move freely, eat freely, talk freely, dress freely and so on and so forth, the state dictates at times what the individual, eats, drinks, wear, how much he sells or buys what he says, how he votes and such others. Anarchists think that individual in his relationship with the state, actually has no freedom as the force of the state overshadows him completely. Any form of dissent or disobedience is forcefully and forcibly dealt with”²²⁷. These over actions of the state are too disheartening ergo-provoking and despicable as the will of citizens or its members is marginalised thereby abandoning the society to danger from violence mongers.

This is why Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, qualify the state as “a cold monster”; the state to him is a supra-structure that engulfs and swallows the liberties of citizen, it snuffs out their rights and keeps them empty and miserable, for example the state has the right to eliminate a citizen who is seen as a nuisance and an obstacle to the goals of the state: it is in same light that Rousseau and Mikhail Bakunin, thinks that, the state is “ the grave yard of individual liberties”. To him the state thrives were and because the natural liberties and freedoms of the individual citizens have been killed or sacrificed”²²⁸. To this effect, state actions can as well be accountable for the regrettable violence in our societies.

However, the state function on the legitimate right to use coercion or legal violence within the state its defined territory(where it exercises sovereignty), as max Weber put it this monopoly in the use of force has been assigned to the state so that it may use it in fulfilling it ordering, security and defence functions. Unfortunately, however, although this monopoly in the use of force was initially intended for good reasons, it has everywhere, instead become a duty weapon in the hands of opportunists, dictators, fascists tribalistic and other self-seeking holders of public power

²²⁶Ibid, p, 501.

²²⁷Ibid, p, 501.

²²⁸Ibid, p, 501.

it has become a duty weapon because they can use it to stifle all the individual liberty that the citizen may want to have in order to creatively produce and eke a better lifestyle for himself. It has become a weapon in state affairs or national life where the logic of action is premised on a mighty-is-right social order when the state fail from it function and when it unbleached the covenant or contract that exists between its citizens, then violence, civil disobedience and revolutions becomes the regrettable outcome. Which by implication citizens lives are endangered by others or governmental authority, which is another vexation, in fact state inability to function in order is a serious foundation to chaos? This is also because of the govern put in place by the state, because when there is a good government, then the citizens will cooperate with the state for it smooth functioning, it is at this level that we shall examine the kind of government that can exist or be suitable for members or citizens of a given community for community for peaceful coexistence and coercion.

Government therefore is different from the state but operate within the state as a convention of conduct, by which law and order are maintained, as the state is limited by national frontiers which is international recognise which is in the end an act of government which must be chosen by the people. In this regard, “Government refers to the body, the institution or the group of people with the authority to govern a state” from this government could represent a single individual, it may be a few individuals, furthermore, it may be a group of such individuals. Be it one few or many government comprises institutions organisation, and bodies that coordinate the activities and actions of the masses or the citizen that make up a state. They constitute the ruling class, for government to function properly, its members must be empowered by the laws of the state to create and enforce laws, and they are also empowered to control and regulate the inter-relationship of the people within their territorial boundaries as well as such inter-relationship between their population and people in other political units”²²⁹

It is only when the government fails to function as expected then chaos becomes unavoidable Arendt have us to understand that; “no clearer writing on the wall-no more explicit sign of the inner instability and vulnerability of existing governments and legal systems-could be

²²⁹Samah Abang, p, 505.

imagine”²³⁰

These existing government per se exist upon consensus because the individual citizens have sacrifice their rights to their government she proceeded that “the disintegration of political systems precedes revolutions, that the telling symptom of disintegration is a progressive erosion of governmental authority and that this erosion is caused by the government’s inability to function properly from which spring the citizen’s doubts about its legitimacy”.²³¹

This is to say that, the authority of the government is derives from the laws of the state, and when a government within the state carries out it task properly, it is call a responsible government or good governance. This government responsibility is very crucial as it foil use can be well exploited by brain damage individual for negative purposes and a good governance can as well enhance or facilitate progress in the society which of course guarantee peace and collective happiness. This can be examining through the moral relation towards the expectation of its masses and the competency of the government whereby the basic contract or covenant is manifested. This government responsibility can be appreciated when its provides the service required by the people whom it govern, when this is adequately done then it can be qualify or term a responsible government which deserve citizen’s respects and loyalty to their government.

This government responsibility can be acknowledge or appreciated through,

-legitimacy, which is the primary evaluation government responsiveness, this of course refers to moral and its citizens or member to agree and permit the use of power or force exercised by a given establish government if such government owes its existence from the will of the people who trust upon the government sacrifice their rights and the mandate the government to act as expected especially upon coercion. This therefore enable the government to enjoy certain coercive powers base on the principles and guideline of prescribed by its citizens this therefore make the government a legal one. This means that, its legality is because it exists and functions only by the rule of law to a lesser extent; its legitimacy is because government exist on leadership on an account of the use of authorities power as agreed upon by all the members.

²³⁰Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*.

²³¹Ibid, p, 505.

In addition, accountability, is another important government responsibility as it is obliged to update and justifies its actions towards the governed or its members for the government to be access or be evaluated if it meets up with the aspiration or demands of the mass positively, because government is running the errands and affairs of the people whose rights are sacrifice in the alter of the government for a common good. In this regard when the government accomplish it tasks or when she meet up with the needs of the citizens it can be qualify as a responsible government.

Furthermore, equality is another important area whereby a given government manifest it will, that is by providing social justice for all equally without bias and discrimination, this is to say that the third governmental evaluation or assessment is focus on justice or equality in it society whereby all members or citizens are treated equally for an egalitarian community. Couples to this government exist to protect the lives and properties of those within it territorial bounds to ensure fairness and the welfare of it people. This way individual rights and freedom is protected and guaranteed, any violation of these above mentioned, the government will rather established injustice, rancour and conflict and above all civil disobedience and violence. Such a government can be qualifying or better be describing as an irresponsible government, because it promotes anarchy.

In this vein, Hannah Arendt holds that, “the answer of the government to this, and to similarly obvious breakdowns of public services, has invariably been the creation of study commission, whose fantastic proliferation in recent years has probably made the United States the most researched country on earth”.

No doubt the commission, after spending much time and money in order to find out that “the poorer you are, the more likely you are to suffer from serious malnutrition” (piece of wisdom that even made the New York Time’s “Quotation of the Day”). Often come up with reasonable recommendations. These, however, are seldom acted on, but rather, are subjected to a new panel of researches. What all the commission have in common is a desperate attempt to find out something about the “deeper causes” of whatever the problem happens to be-especially if it is the problem of violence-and since “deeper causes” are, by definition, concealed the final result of such team research is all too often nothing but hypothesis and undemonstrated theory. The net effects is that research has become a substitute for action, and the “deeper causes” are overgrowing the

obvious ones, which are frequently so simple that no “serious “ and “learned” person could be asked to give them attention. To be sure, to find remedies for obvious shortcomings does not guarantee solution of the problems even be properly defined? Research has become a technique of evasion, and this has surely not helped the already undermined reputation of science”.²³²

Indeed to avoid this phenomenon of civil disobedience, violence and terrorism, they must put in place good governance that guarantees the wish and aspiration of the people reasons why Arendt as mentioned above a elaborated more on education commissions whereby research can be adequately caused out to avoid such griminess’s. This way peaceful coexistence and coercion would be assured among the citizen in that community.

However for a state or government to realise its objectives and the task assigned to it, it must be in position of certain instruments or weapons which enable her exercise her action and functions among these instrument are, power, which is seen as the ability to achieve intended effects. In own societies it is seen the force use to reduce or weakens others by imposing on them, this power can be more adequate when groups or institutions enact and enforce their wills, this power can also be seen as factor in all social relationships and interactions. This power may have many sources like brute force which is an ancient practice mostly was been practice within the era of the state of nature as Thrasymachus sophists in his famous definition of justice in *Plato’s Republic* as cited by Arendt holds that, justice is the interest of the stronger party or that might be right. Coercion is the only instrument and weapon by which this type of power is exercised as can be seen from military regimes and dictatorship.

More to that, wealth is another source of power as in most societies especially the capitalist one, the political system is been most often sponsored and controlled by the rich or the wealthy class. Which of course commands the loyalty of all its members to obedience, this can be well elaborated in the famous dictum that “he who pays the piper dictates the tune” this can also be seen from position, that is those who have certain power as a source of their power knowledge, skills, ideology among others.

This explain why Hannah Arendt in her famous book “*crises of the Republic*, new York

²³²Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, pp, 72, 73.

1972, holds that". "Power corresponds to the human ability not just to act but to act in concert. Power is never the property of an individual; it belongs to a group and remains in existence only so long as the group keeps together. When we say of somebody that he is in "power" we actually refer to his being empowered by certain number of people to act in their name. The moment the group, from which the power originated to begin with (potestas in populo without a people or group there is no power), disappears, "his power" also vanishes"²³³. If this power is not checked or controlled it could lead to abuse because power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupt absolutely as lord action puts it. This power and corruption emanate from acts or violence committed by dictators who rule for their interest while ignoring the wish and aspiration of the masses.

In addition to this, authority is another tool or instrument of a government which it uses to realise its objectives, this authority therefore is seen as the right of the government to subject its citizens to submission or obedience. These authorities only exist between two or more people whereby decision of one guides the action and behaviours of others. It is paramount when it subjects others to abandoned their reasoning and activities to do that which has been commanded by a superior or authority. Hannah Arendt have it that; "Authority, relating to the most elusive of these phenomena and therefore, as team, most frequently abused, can be vested in persons-there is such a thing as personal authority, as for instance, in the relation between parent and child, between teacher and pupil-or it can be vested in office, as, for instance in the Roman senate (auctorial in senates) or in the hierarchical offices of the church(a priest can grant valid absolution even though he is drunk). Its hallmark is unquestioning recognition by those who are asked to obey; neither coercion nor persuasion is needed. (A father can lose his authority either by beating his child or by starting to argue with him, that is, either by behaving to him like a tyrant or by treating him as an equal.) To remain in authority requires respect for the person or the office, the greatest enemy of authority, therefore, is contempt, and the surest way to undermine it is laughter"²³⁴

This implies that, any government within the state must first of all have some degree of legitimacy which h is the general acceptance that permits it's to use power or the existence of such a political regime given that it existence of such a political regime given that it exist as mandated

²³³ Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace company New York, San Diego, 1972, p, 143.

²³⁴ Ibid, p, 144.

by the people whom it is accountable for Arendt have it that, “ when a movement, international in organisation, all-comprehensive in its ideological scope, and global in its political aspiration, seizes power in one country, it obviously puts itself in a paradoxical situation. The socialist movement was spared this crisis, first, because the national question-and that meant the strategic problem involved in the revolution-had been curiously neglected by Marx and Engels, and, secondly, because it faced governmental problems only after the first world war had divested the second international of its authority over the national members, which everywhere had accepted the primacy of national sentiments over international solidarity as an unalterable fact. In other words, when the time came for the socialist movements to seize power in their respective countries, they had already been transformed into national parties”²³⁵

This is to say that, any form of violation of the task assigned to a government is tantamount to evoke violence where civil unrest remains a regrettable consequence, given that any government be it Totalitarian system monarchy or democracy must work on consensus upon the will and wishes of the people for peaceful coercion and cohabitation to reign.

In a nutshell, Arendt political philosophy examines political values and judgements, to an extent her political thought is practical as one can find it manifesting in our contemporaneous societies and in almost all governments within state, her political thoughts deal with rational discourse on pertinent issues of any human grouping and their attitude towards their relationship with government and state authority these are some of the pre-occupying political thought of Hannah Arendt. She analyses more on the role of the state, the relationship between the governors and the governed, that is the rulers and the ruled as well as the relationship between individuals and the state, the right freedom and obligation of the state within the bounds of their covenant or contract as agreed upon consensus.

This clearly shows how political power is expressed and exercised, or how justice, equality and the aspiration of the citizens can be attained, by these one understands theories and her political doctrines which provide a reasonable ground of the political belief systems and institutions that have been glorified and appreciated in our world of politics and social organisations. Karl Marx

²³⁵Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, The World Publishing Company, Cleveland and New York, 1958, p, 389.

was right when he thought as such, that is when he models his thought and ideology that men are to a great extent product of their institutional environment. So therefore, the origin of the state orchestrated the necessity for a government within its territorial boundaries for a harmonious and peaceful living together.

Arendt further in lighted that “the paradox of totalitarianism in power is that the possession of all instruments of governmental power and violence in one country is not an unmixed blessing for a totalitarianism movement, its disregard for facts, its strict adherence to the rules of a fictitious world, becomes steady more difficult to maintain, yet remains as essential as it was before. Power means a direct confrontation with reality and totalitarianism in power is constantly concerned with overcoming this challenge, propaganda and organisation no longer suffice to assert that the impossible is possible that the incredible is true, that can insane consistency rule the world. The chief psychological support of totalitarian fiction—the active resentment of the status quo, which the masses refused to accept as the only possible world—is no longer there; every bit of factual information that leaks through the iron curtain, set up against the ever-threatening flood of reality from the other, non-totalitarian side, is a greater menace to totalitarian movements”²³⁶

A great menace indeed as can be seen in all governments which want to totally dominate and subjugate its people, which then make the people to revolt or rebel against the government, which of course is the foundation to disorder, anarchy, civil disobedience and violence. As she further reiterated that, “the struggle for total domination of the total population of the earth, the elimination of every competing non-totalitarian reality, is inherent in the totalitarian regimes themselves; if they do not pursue global rule as their ultimate goal. They are only too likely to lose whatever power they have already seized; even a single individual can be absolutely and reliably dominated.

Only under global totalitarian conditions ascendancy to power therefore means primarily the establishment of official and officially recognised headquarters (or branches in the case of satellite countries) for the movement and the acquisition of a kind of laboratory in which to carry out the experiment with or rather against reality, they experiment in organising a people for ultimate purposes which disregard individuality as well as nationality, under conditions which are

²³⁶Ibid, p, 391.

admittedly not perfect but are sufficient for important partial results. Totalitarianism in power uses the state administration for its long-range goal of world conquest and for the direction of the branches of the movement; it establishes the secret police as the executors and guardians of its domestic experiment in constantly transforming reality into fiction; and it finally erects concentration camps as a special laboratories to carry through its experiment in total domination”.²³⁷

These actions perpetrated by some authorities in powers always provoked civil disorder, and such government which sponsored its authorities towards total domination of its people is an evil government because it snuffs out and swallows up the rights and liberties of its citizens. These natural rights which citizens are entitled to, immediately when they are violated the citizen or masses must react to safeguard their liberties and freedom.

In all Hannah Arendt's political thought to an extent raises basic acquisition of the law as an impediment if the law is not respected, likewise the covenant or social contract when abused becomes questionable as a disappointment for failure to uphold the agreement, this of course the root map of violence and disorder as she contended that;

“these disappointments suffered by statesmen and diplomats find their parallel in the earlier disillusionment of benevolent observers and sympathizers with the new revolutionary in content, would lead to a stabilization of conditions and thus check the momentum of the totalitarian movements at least in the countries where they had seized power. What happened instead was that terror increased both in Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany in inverse ratio to the existence of internal political opposition, so that it looked as though political opposition had not been the pretext of terror (as liberal accusers of the regime were wont to assert) but the last impediment to its full fury”²³⁸

However, every organization of human grouping must have rules and regulations that shape or guard their ways of life, their government is put in place by them for them and all members within are called upon to abide by the norms. In this regard everyone is called upon to perform his or her task within the bounds or limit of the law as prescribed in their mutual agreement and covenant

²³⁷Ibid, p, 392.

²³⁸Ibid, op. cit, p, 393.

when this is violated or abused, disorder, violence and revolutions are bound to arise whereby people's lives and properties will be endangered.

“if I disregard all the national differences, which of course are very great, and only take into account that thus is a global movement some things that has never existed before in this form-an if I consider what (apart from goals, opinions, doctrines) really distinguished this generation in our countries from earlier generations then the first thing that strikes me is its determination to act, its joy in action, the assurance of being able to change things by one's own efforts. This, of course is expressed very differently in different countries according to their various political situations and historical traditions, which in turn means according to their very different political talents”.²³⁹

She further explained or elaborated that let us look briefly at the beginning of the movement. It arose in the united state quite unexpectedly in the fifties, at the time of the so-called “silent generation” the apathetic, undemonstrative generation. The immediate cause was the civil-rights movement in south, and the first to join it were students from Harvard, who attracted students from other famous eastern universities. They went to the south, organised brilliantly, and for a time had a quite extraordinary success, so long that it is, as it was a simply a question of changing the climate of opinion-which they definitely succeeded in doing in a short time-and doing away with certain laws and ordinances in the southern states; in short, so long as it was a question of purely legal and political needs of the city ghettos in the North-and there they came to grief, there they could accomplish nothing”²⁴⁰

It was only later, after they had actually accomplished what would be accomplished through purely political action that the business with the universities began. It started in Berkeley with the free movement and continued with the anti-war movement, and again the results have been quite extraordinary. From these beginning and especially from these success springs everything that has since spread around the world.²⁴¹ This implies that, any voluntary association with legal backing and with adequate reasons can cause changes in societies to achieve certain goals which are by rights legitimate. These revolutionary changes are more important in politics,

²³⁹ Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace and New York, San Diego, 1972, pp, 201,202.

²⁴⁰ Ibid, 1972, p, 202.

²⁴¹ Ibid, p, 202.

as can be seen when dictator rulers are always removed and replaced with new ones through violent changes or through democratic procedures.

To an extent as time passes so too things change, the development in our societies today is far advanced with modern technology than in previous years decades ago. This is to say that there are changes caused by certain revolutionary ideologies and movements that can be supported by Arendt's views or reflections on the Hungarian Revolution as she holds that;

“As I write this, more than one year has passed since the flames of the Hungarian revolution illuminated the immense landscape of post-war totalitarianism for twelve long days. This was a true event whose stature will not depend upon victory or defeat; its greatness is secure in the tragedy it enacted. For who can forget the silent procession of black-clad women in the streets of Russian-occupied Budapest, mourning their dead in public, the last political gesture of the revolution? And who can doubt the solidity of this remembrance when one year after the revolution the defeated and terrorised people have still enough strength and action left to commemorate once more in public the death of their freedom by shunning spontaneously and unanimously all places of public entertainment, theatres, movies, coffee houses and restaurants?.

The context of circumstances within which the revolution happened was of great significance, but it was not compelling enough to release one of those automatic processes that seem almost always to imprison history and which actually are not even historical, if we understand by historical whatever is worthy of being remembered. What happened in Hungary happened nowhere else and the twelve years since the Red Army had “liberated” the country from Nazi domination.²⁴²

However, this means that, the death of people liberty killed by others mythic human action either by authority or through the powers of institutions, requires reassessment or evaluation even if it can be through violent changes and revolution this is because people's rights cannot just be snuffed out without regards to agreement that to humanity and the covenant, Social contract or agreement that the people as members in their government or communities put in

²⁴² Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, the World Publishing Company, Cleveland and New York, 1958, p, 480.

place for a common good. This without prejudice always accelerates chaos and disorder in Hannah Arendt political thought especially on revolutions.

In this regard Cheikh Anta Diop, in his conception of kinship at the clan and tribal stage stated in his different phases of evolution that;

Absolute matriarchy, in its pure state, is characterised by avuncular Inheritance. This system was conceived only at the truly elementary stage of the first emergence of the matriarchy clan. The mistakes in analysis have come from the fact that most of the clans and tribes studied had already undergone a very complex evolution. This was the case for African societies that had live under a monarchy and that detribalized to different degrees during the period of the slave trade. These were then a coexistence of tribal and monarchical elements as well varied systems of filiations that mislead the observer who is not perspicacious".²⁴³

This absolute ruler ship always leads to tribalism which of course always provoke other members of that societies to voluntary associate so as to overcome such a government, which always goes along with violent changes and revolutions.

Arendt analyse that; " For twelve years everything had happened according to expectations the long dreary story of deceit and broken promises, of hopes against hope and finally disillusionment; from the beginning with popular front tactics and a sham parliamentary system to the open establishment t of a one-party dictatorship which quickly liquidated the leaders and members of the formerly tolerated parties, until the last stage was set when the native communist leaders , whom Moscow rightly or wrongly mistrusted, were no less brutality framed, humiliated in show trials, tortured and killed while the most despicable and most corrupt elements in the party, not communists but Moscow agents, ruled the country. All this and much more were predictable, not because there were a y social or historical forces pressing in one direction, but because this was the automatic result of Russian hegemony. It was as through the Russian rulers repeated in great haste all the stages of the October's revolution up to the emergence of totalitarian dictatorship. The story, therefore, while unspeakable terrible, is without much

²⁴³ Cheikh Anta Diop, *Civilization or Barbarism an Authentic Anthropology*, Lawrence Hill Books, Brooklyn, New York, 1991, p, 119.

interest of its own and varies very little; what happened in one satellite country happened at almost the same moment in all others from the Baltic sea down to the Adriatic²⁴⁴.

This is to say that when promises are broken, it frustrates hope, and any hopeless individual or group of hopeless people can easily associate voluntarily to secure their rights and interest. This always goes along with revolutions to change such scenario for a common good and avoid anarchy and dictatorship or to an extent fake promises which laid the foundation to disorder. The basic question raised by Arendt is; what really did happen? “As I see it, for the first time in very long while a spontaneous political movement arose which not only did not simply carry on propaganda, but acted, and, moreover acted almost as a factor, quite rare in what is usually considered a mere power or interest play, another experience new for our time entered the game of “politics; it turned out that acting is turning. This generation discovered what the eighteenth century had called “public happiness” which means that when man takes part in something close to him and that in some way constitutes a part of complete happiness”²⁴⁵

This means that, people are more happy to act when they associate with one another for a common interest which is Arendt's political goal for people to coexist happily as can be depicted with the students' movement in America when they learned that their service employees were not receiving standard wages, they struck with success. Basically it was against the policy of the administration more to this in 1970 university students demanded time off in order to be able to take part in the election campaign and a number of the larger universities granted them this free time. This is a political activity outside in recognition of the fact that students are citizens as well”²⁴⁶

This solidarity was to ensure collective happiness for efficient and effective work to be done because the low wage rate was alarming and discouraging. This is to say that, when authorities in power do not rule for the common good it will be enough reason to arm the citizens to rebel against such authorities in a government which had failed to use the power rested upon her

²⁴⁴ Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of totalitarianism*, the World Publishing Company, Cleveland and New York, 1958, p, 481.

²⁴⁵ Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace company San Diego New York, 1972, p, 203.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid*, p, 203.

for a common interest as agreed upon by all in their social contract this alone is factor for the disintegration of power from such authorities as she established that;

“Where power has disintegrated, revolutions are possible but not necessary, we know of many instances when witter impotent regimes were permitted to continue in existence for long periods of time either because there was no one to test their strength and reveal their weakness or because they were lucky enough not to be engaged in war and suffer defeat. Disintegration often becomes manifest only in direct confrontation; and even then, when power is already in the street, some group of men prepared for such an eventuality is needed to pick it up and assume responsibility. We have recently witnessed how it did not take more than the relatively harmless, essentially non-violent French students rebellion to reveal the vulnerability of the whole political system, which rapidly disintegrated before the astonished eyes of the young rebels unknowingly they had tested it. They intended only to challenge the ossified university system, and down came the system of governmental power, together with that of the huge party bureaucracies “une sorte de disintegration de toutes les hierarchies”. It was text book case a revolution because there was nobody, least of all the students prepared to seize power and the responsibility that goes with it. Nobody except of course, de Gaulle nothing was more characteristics of the seriousness of the situation than his appeal to the army his journey to see massy and generals in Germany, walk to Canossa, of there ever was one. In view of what had happened only a few years before. But what he sought and received was support not obedience and the means were not commands but concessions if commands had even enough, he would never have had to leave Paris”²⁴⁷

This means that a people cannot only achieve their goals only through violence or revolutions because even dictatorial systems whose main weapons of ruler ship are torture need some basis of power and reasoning. This can be effectively carried out or put into place when the laws of any given society or community are respected, that is when the basic contract, agreement or covenant that binds people together is violated the civil disobedience, violence and revolutions becomes the disastrous outcome, because most revolutions always goes along with bloodshed, as well as properties destroyed, however peaceful coercion or coexistence is very essential when people see the reasons for belonging into a social group and when right and duties are respected without anyone trying to dominate the other I another to avoid anarchy, disorder

²⁴⁷ Hannah Arendt, op. cit, pp, 148, 149.

and chaos. It should be noted that some of these Arendtian political reflections are quite visible in our contemporal societies as we can easily witness coup d'états, civil unrest and disorder around the world, not only in under developing countries but also in advance societies. Cheikh Anta Diop elaborated from the Chinese Revolution in the ninth century AD that;

“In China of the Tang Dynasty, after the revolt by An Lu-Shan, the process of primitive accumulation assumed clearly capitalistic forms. Crisis during which the imperial regime almost collapsed, during the Tang period, the state no longer enjoyed anything other than the eminent domain of land. In fact, the state had become merely the distributor of it; each peasant automatically received a life time concession of three to six hectares on the land of his village, and the “ownership” one and-a-half hectares that he could pass on to his descendants. These two types of concession that the peasant received from the state remained inalienable. In return, he paid a land tax, served in the militia, and did statute labour, at his death, the land returned to the village community for redistributions”²⁴⁸.

This gesture of the state was quite wonderful but when the capitalist with their high quest for wealth began manifesting, it carefully organised the society into chaos and disorder. It is on this account that misses Arendt also exemplified her ideology within the top Russian leadership as she had if that;

“Not even in difficulties which began short after Stalin’s death can be called unexpected, because they reflect so faithfully the difficulties, or rather the controversies, within the top Russian leadership. Here too there seemed to be a repletion of conditions in the twenties, before the streaming of the international communist movement party and each splinter looked up to its respective Russian protector as to a patron Saint which indeed he was since the destines of his protégés all over the world depended utterly upon his own fate. It certainly was interesting, and gave food for thought about certain unchanging structures of this moments that Stalin’s death was not only followed by the same succession crisis as Lenin’s thirty years ago (which, after all, in the absence of any law of succession is rather a matter of course), but that the crisis was met again by the temporal solution of “collective leadership” in term coined by Stalin in 1925, and that the result the communist parties abroad was again a desperate struggle to line up with one of the leaders and

²⁴⁸ Cheikh Anta Diop, *Civilization or Barbarism an Authentic Anthropology*, published by Lawrence Bookln, New York, 1991, p, 143.

form a faction around him. Thus Kadar is a much a protégés of Khrushchev as Nagy was a protégé of Malenkov. Even in the atmosphere of stark and sometime sublimes tragedy which the Hungarian revolution created, this receptiveness frequently border upon the comical, as when one of the last broadcasts of the communist free Radio Rajk from Hungary urged “the comrades’ to join the pseudo-communist party of Kadar” and turn it into a “true Hungarian communist party. For in the same vein the early opposition to Stalin had urged the comrades not to leave the party but to use the Trojan-horse tactics until Stalin himself ordered the same tactics for the Germans communists with respect to the Nazi movement. Each time the result was the same, the joiners became true and good Stalinists and Nazis for all practical purposes”.²⁴⁹

In all, in this stimulating studies of Arendt collection beginning on violence Arendt political view especially the crises in the sixties and early seventies was really a challenge to the American form of government. She began expressing her political thought in a book lying “in politics” which was of course a penetrating analysis in the pentagon paper that deal with image-making and public relations in politics “civil disobedience” examines the various oppositions movement from the freedom riders to the war to the war resisters and segregationists. “Though on politics and Revolution”, cast in the form of an interview containing the authors theses in on violence and her commentary which she really expressed her political thoughts.

Through these connected essays, Arendt examines, define and clarifies the current concerns of only America but as can be seen across some countries, she was of course a prophetess who saw tomorrow because her thought are clearly seen in our contemporal societies. A sampler of her thought. The oppressed do not lead revolutions and the revolutionists do not “make” them; rather, they pick up power that is left “lying in street”; capitalism and communism are systems that are both based on expropriation, and neither is the remedy for the other. American student radicalism has been of world-wide importance primary because it has been morally motivated, but if students destroys the universities by politicising them, they destroy the base of their rebellion civil disobedience is actually an organised activity, and civil disobedient are neither conscientious objectors nor common lawbreakers but members of voluntary association” bound by common opinion, not common interest.

²⁴⁹ Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, the World Publishing Company, Cleveland and New York, 1958, pp, 481,482.

The obligation to obey laws rest in our society on the original universal consensus that is embodied in the constitution, and the fact that American blacks and Indians were not included underlies their disaffection, which of course and revolutions across the states. This Arendtian thought are clearly seen in our present day societies as they manifest. Making Hannah aren't an admirable political thinker and theories.

CHAPTER 5

ECONOMIC CONFLICT AS THE BASIS OF REVOLUTION

The struggle for survival in the society is of primary importance as human desires demand, human survival is not only political or social but also economic interest which they scramble upon due to scarcities and the misuse of these resources by other members of the human community for their egoistic interest, which always provoke chaos and disorder in the society. Since others in privilege positions because of the atmosphere of conviviality that surrounds them, uses the resources to suppress or dominate others. This view is seen with Arendt conception especially her analogy on Karl Henry Marx's ideologies.

It is interesting to know that, economic conflict and class struggle is one of the factors of civil disobedience and violence. Hannah Arendt contented that "The technical development of the implements of violence has now reached the point where no political goal could conceivably correspond to their destructive potential or justify their actual use in armed conflict".²⁵⁰ However, Karl Marx on his part believe that it is as a result of economic conflict that we are experiencing revolutions in our societies, such as class struggle, the desire for material as well as instinct for domination as he elaborated.

5.1 Class Struggle as the Foundation to Revolution

Some of the factors which cause conflict in the society are class struggle and the struggle for survival. This notwithstanding always go along with economic desires and peoples attitudes because in some communities certain individuals with economic means and at times political powers always subjugate, oppress and exploit the less privileged ones, especially those with low political and economic status and power. This spirit and behaviour always accelerates revolutions and conflicts thereby opening the way for civil disobedience and violence in our communities.

Those with economic powers Karl Marx called them," The bourgeoisies which means class of modern capitalism, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage labour. By proletariat, the class of modern wage labourers who, having no means of production of their

²⁵⁰ Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace and Co. New York, 1972, p, 105.

own are reduced to selling labour power in order to live”²⁵¹. This is exactly some of the issues that often pave the way for class struggle, conflict and revolution in the world because Marx sees man as an economic animal. It is an economic activity which makes man unique and differentiates him from other animals just as the capitalist differentiate themselves from the labourers. This is clearly seen when he contended that “the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles, freedom and slave, patrician and plebeian, Lord and self, gulled-master and journeyman in a world, 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 to classes.”²⁵²

This is because Marx assumed like Arendt that, the capitalist system in the society treats human beings as a means to an end, whereby the product of their labour are valued than the human beings themselves. In fact the real values of the society are not people but money which gives power and this becomes more important than inter-personal relationship, of course in such society’s civil disobedience, violence and revolutions becomes unavoidable due to class struggle and economic conflict in the societies.

This explains why he emphasise that “in earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold graduation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the middle ages, feudal Lords, vassals, guild-master, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate graduations”²⁵³.

In this regards, capitalist societies emanate from such practices and have not yet done away with class antagonisms, but rather established new ways of conflicts and struggle in the place of the old ones.

This explains why Marx contended that conflict in the society is a historic affair from one era to another due to class struggle and material conception, because to him there is a definite process of movement and change in society, which produces history, and this history of change

²⁵¹ Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels, *Manifesto of the communist party*, progress publisher, Moscow, 1969, p, 14.

²⁵² Ibid, op cit, p,14.

²⁵³ Ibid, p, 14.

carries along with conflict and revolutions it was in these historical changes and motions that Marx predicted the fall of capitalism and the emergence of socialists and communists order in the society. This movement causes conflict, civil disobedience, and violence as each member of the society is struggling to achieve his or her aim. This to say that each epoch negates and contradicts the other giving way to revolutions since the whole history of mankind, be it social, political, intellectual or economical has been a history of an irreparable and unavoidable class struggle (conflict) between the exploiting class and the exploited class; the ruling and the ruled, The aggressor and the oppressor. Marx also predicted that, since the struggle of opposite is that of the struggle between the classes in the material order, that is the principal cause of movement and change would disappear, when the inner contradictions between the classes were resolved, resulting in the emergence of classless society where in all the forces and interests would be in perfect balance. This will be the end of history, hence the emergence of socialism and communalism.

Arendt and Marx justifies this notion with Engels views when he said that, “meantime the market kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. Even the manufacturer no longer sufficed these upon steam and machinery revolutionised industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, modern industry, the place of industrial middle class by industrial millionaires the leaders of the whole industrial armies; the modern bourgeois, modern industry has established the world market for which the discovery of America paved way. This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has in its turn, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital and pushed into the background every class handed down from the middle Ages”²⁵⁴

When this class is pushed to the background class struggle is once more accelerated for survival which of course always results to conflict and revolutions and to some extent terrorism.

Economically, Marx claims that the reasons of forces in social history are materials, which are economic factors of production. Hence, the evolution of economic production in society determines the relation to properly show how men are related to each other in the process of production. This relation results in conflict (struggle) between the classes, since the ownership of

²⁵⁴ Ibid, p, 15.

property divides the society between those who possess and those who do not possess property as indicated in various epochs.

He noted that, there is conflict between the two classes in the capitalist system; who have considerably developed the factors of production and the labourer or workers. The relation between these two classes becomes conflictual when the capitalist appropriates the social revenue, which he qualifies as surplus value. This conflict always begins with disobedience, and then develops or escalates into diverse forms such as violence, terrorism and revolutions whereby human life and properties are endangered.

However, it should be noted that, the capitalist, historically has played a revolutionary part wherever they have the labourers and have pitilessly turned asunder on the labourer and have continuously fought to maintain their status quo over the labourers or workers. This notwithstanding has not only encouraged or provoked the labourers but has rather push them towards revolution, violence and civil disobedience not left out. This is further illustrated in Mark's holding that "the bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, and the man of science, into its paid wage labourers. The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a money relation".²⁵⁵

If they can pay off any profession and reduce man to beggar even family relations as money making machine with very little income then violence must be unavoidable because Karl Marx assumed that the value of a product is created by the amount of labours put into it. But the product can normally be sold for the cost of the labours, the difference between the labour and wage or salary paid to the labourer or worker constitutes the profit or surplus value and this in the capitalist system gain, or appropriated by the owner or bourgeoisie. This is so disheartening and ergo-provoking because the surplus values gain-way by the capitalists provides the conditions for continuous domination by the capitalist or bourgeoisie. This of course create conflict as the proletariats or labourers will always want to overthrow or put an end to this oppression and at the same time the capitalists or bourgeoisies will also want to retaliate or defend but generally speaking, this opposing camps will always find themselves in antagonism and serious conflict

²⁵⁵ Ibid, p, 16.

because, the workers will develop collective consciousness and awareness of their wretched conditions, how they are been exploited, dehumanised, oppressed because of class domination, by the bourgeoisies. This class struggle is an effective gate-way for violence and revolutions whereby the labourers will certainly strive towards a classless society very much hated by the bourgeoisies.

He further established that “the bourgeoisie has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigour in the middle ages, which reactionaries so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man’s activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former exoduses of nations and crusades”.²⁵⁶

Crusades indeed understand as each camp is crusading towards its interest and maintaining the spirit of antagonism, anarchy and violence against each other. It is noted that the driving force of politics is development and self-development which is the basic requirement of any critical political thinker but unfortunately society is the moving balance of antithetical force, which generates social changes, by their tension and struggle. As such, struggle is the driving force, and the determine factors in the last resort is power. This is because the rise of political self-consciousness of the labourer may results in the attainment of power if they actually unite against the bourgeoisies.

However, the mechanism of development and progress is antagonism between social classes. Political change takes place in a situation whereby they is incompatible interest of social classes, and the struggle between them to dominate society in their own interest, this revolution always carries along with violence that is the reason why he saw the state as merely an apparatus of power for exploitation by the dominate class this view of Karl Marx further articulated when he contended that “ the state is disguised form of class domination because separation is the main issue in history of every human society. The dominant bourgeoisie class constitutes itself into the governing group, as opposed to the working or labouring proletariat class. The former class comprises of the rulers, the law-makers, the law enforcers, the businessmen, the capitalists and all

²⁵⁶ Ibid, p, 16.

powerful elites. They dominate, suppress and exploit the weaker and poorer working class. What the state is is simply dominant class. So, the state, according to Marx simply a representation of the whims and caprices of the bourgeoisie class. That is why he opines that “in every era in human history, the ruling ideas are the ideas of the ruling class”.²⁵⁷

This explains why he sees class as the relative wealth of a particular group of people in a particular society. This is why the rich will be more powerful and less dependent on others; just as other who is less powerful will be more dependent. This is the foundation of human relation with others and the bedrock of violence, civil disobedience and violence, for instance if an individual is in position of land he can lend it out to others for cultivation. One depends on the other and of course the forces or means of production indicate the relationship between the landlord and the tenant.

“Revolutions generally began with capitalism, an economic system that no one had planned and no one had foreseen. This system owed its start to a monstrous process of expropriation such as has never occurred before in history in this form that is, without military conquest. Expropriation, the initial accumulation of capital that was the law according to which capitalism arises and according to which it has advanced step by step. Now just what people imagine by socialism cannot really be explained. But if we look at what has actually happened in Russia, then you can see that these the process of expropriation has been carried further; and you can observe that thing very similar is going on in the modern capitalistic countries, where it is as though the old expropriation process is again let loose. Over taxation, a de-factor devaluation of currency, inflation coupled with a recession-what else are these but relatively mild forms of expropriation”²⁵⁸.

This is to say that, the capitalist exploit the labourers by the means of their capital, this expropriation is what is causing conflict between social classes, the dominant capitalist class with their means of production and the peasant class which can only survive by working for very little pay from the capitalist. When the labourers associate themselves for a reassessment or re-

²⁵⁷SamahAbang-Mungwa, **Certificate Philosophy for Cameroon G.C.E.**, Catwa education Yaoundé 2020, p, 501.

²⁵⁸Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, 1972, pp, 211, 212.

evaluation of their concerns that is, to improve their working conditions; when the capitalists are not ready, it will lead to class struggle and conflict.

The first great battle between proletariat class and the Bourgeoisies class became more violent for a time whereby the social and political aspirations of the European working really indeed became the struggle for supremacy. Revolution was between the different sections of the classes because the working class was reducing to fight for political elbow-room and to the position of extreme wing of the middle class radicals.

“Wherever independent proletarian movement continued to show signs of life, they were ruthlessly hunted down. Thus the Russian police hunted out the central board of the communist league, and then located in Cologne. The members were arrested, and after eighteen months imprisonment they were tried. Some prisoners were sentenced varying from three to six years after the sentence the league was formally dissolved by the remaining members. To the rest of the manifestos it seemed to be doomed to oblivion”²⁵⁹

This clearly show the capitalist and those in power can use the money and positions to dominate and subjugate others, which often create conflict violence and revolutions because of class conflict and the differences in the societies especially when they is a voluntary association of workers which make them stronger when together to militate for a common purpose as a people with the same fate being dominated by a given class because of their capital and means.

It is in this regard that Marx substantiated or estimated that “the revolution and manifesto entirely trusted to the intellectual development of the working class, which was serve to result from combined action and mutual discussion. They very events and vicissitudes of the struggle against capital, the defeats even more than the victories, could not help bringing home to men’s minds the insufficiency of their various favourites nostrums, and preparing the way for a more complete insight into the true conditions of working-class emancipation. And Marx was light. The international, on its breaking up 1874, left the workers quite different men from what it had found them in 1864, proud honism in France, lassalleanism in Germany were dying out, and even the conservation English Trades Unions though most of them had long since severed their connexion with international, were gradually advancing towards that point at which last year at Swansea, their

²⁵⁹Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Foreign Languages Press, Perking, 1970, p, 10.

president could say in their names “continental socialism of “manifesto” had made considerable headway among the working men of all countries”

These trade²⁶⁰ unions of working class was established to fight for better working conditions that is to improve the working conditions of labourers across the world, from the mischievous hands of the capitalist with their exploitation policies, this of course provoked a revolutions as the Bourgeoisies or capitalist were adamant to changes. This not different from what is still happening in our society today, be it in Europe, Asia, America or Africa, such practices are still manifesting, reasons why civil disobedience, violence and revolutions are still on the rise. This class struggle creates conflict, antagonism and anarchy in societies; this is what Arendt had it that “only in western countries are there political and legal obstacles that constantly keep this process of expropriations from reaching the point where life would be completely unbearable. In Russia there is, of course, not socialism, but state socialism, which is the same thing as state capitalism would be that is, total expropriation. Total expropriation occurs when all political and legal self-guards of private ownership have disappeared. In Russia for instance, certain groups enjoy a very high standard of living. The trouble is only that whatever these people may have their disposition care country houses, expensive furniture, chauffeur driven Limousines, et cetera they do not own; it can be taken away from them by government any day. No man there is so rich that he cannot be a beggar over night even the right to employment. In case of any conflict with the ruling powers (one glance into recent soviet literature, where people have started to tell the truth, will testify to the atrocious consequence more tellingly then economic and political theories”²⁶¹

This is to say that when power is centralise by the state whereby they control almost all state affairs and individual actions then it becomes difficult for certain authorities to abuse power because their power and wealth can still be taken away by the state. Even though certain powerful elites always a marks wealth and use it for their protection when there is absolute need this always pave the way for revolution, violence and civil disobedience. These ill are really the factors which create disorder in the societies.

In the regards our understanding is different from ideologies and theories which we were made to know that it all began with the uprising of capitalism which does not stop with the means of production “only legal and political institutions that are independent of the economic forces

²⁶⁰ Ibid, op.cit, p, 12.

²⁶¹ Hannah Arendt, Crisis of the Republic, p, 12.

and their automatism can control and check the inherently monstrous potentialities of this process”²⁶² such political controls seem to function best in so-called welfare state whether they call themselves “socialist” or “capitalist”. What protects freedom is the division between governmental and economic power, or to put into Marxian language, the fact that the state and its constitution are not superstructures.

This is to say that, those with economic power when given the authority and power in government then power tends to corrupt those, and action had it that power corrupts but absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Everywhere that revolution was the work of the working class. It was the latter that built the barricades and paid with its life blood. Only the Paris workers, in overthrowing the government, had the very definite intention of overthrowing the bourgeois regime. But conscious though they were of total antagonism existing between their own class and the bourgeoisies, still neither the economic progress of the country nor the intellectual development of the mass of French workers had as yet reached the stage which would have made a social reconstruction possible. In the final analysis, therefore, the fruits of the revolution were reaped by the capitalist class. In the other countries, in Italy, in Germany, in Austria, the workers from the very outset did nothing but raise the bourgeoisie to power. But in any country, the rule of the bourgeoisie is possible without national independence. Therefore, the revolution of 1848 had to bring in its train the unity and autonomy of nations that had lacked them up to then.”²⁶³

This autonomy of nations was established due to the fact that, it was to avoid the capitalist situation in the hands of few individuals, which was not only a threat to the government in states but also to individual citizens who were workers in the capitalist state. That is why people surrender the wills and power to the state for their safety, it becomes more dangerous if the state involves in such obnoxious practice which can provoke violence and revolutions as it has been in recent years in our own contemporary societies and states as we can observe civil disobedience, violence and all sorts of chaos and disorder in our communities caused by some of these phenomena. Misses Arendt have it that “ what protects us in the so-called “capitalist” countries of the west is not capitalism, but a legal system that prevents the daydreams of big business management of trespassing into

²⁶² Ibid, op. cit, pp, 212, 213.

²⁶³Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1970, p, 27.

the private sphere of its employees from coming true. But this dream does come true whatever the government itself becomes the employment. The recent appetite of certain government agencies to bus private home could also be seen as an attempt on the part of the government employees. And what else is bugging but a form of expropriation? The government agency establishes itself as a kind of co-owner of the apartments and houses of citizens. In Russia no fancy gadget in the walls necessary, there, a spy sits in every citizen's apartment anyhow"²⁶⁴

This of control at a government action on its citizens inferring on the right and liberties of its citizens which is a very great havoc that pave way towards violence, revolutions chaos and disorder whereby human dignity is endangered. It is at this juncture that the communist party was formed on order to liberate the workers or proletariat due to this control action, because these proletariat or labourers depends solely on the sales of their labour without any capital, which create grievances and conflict because of competition and the expropriation of the labourers who had no means of production and capital except their labour and this labourers have always been poor living under difficult conditions. This is to say that revolution and violence always emanate from such grievances, conflict and unbridled competition. It is important to notes that the proletariat originated in the industrial revolution, which took place in England In the 18th century and which has since then been repeated in all civilised countries in the world. Marx has that "this industrial revolution was precipitated by the discovery of the steam engine, various spinning machines, the mechanical loom, and a whole series of other mechanical devices. These' machines which were very expensive and hence could be bought only by the capitalist, altered the mode of production and displaced the former workers, because the machines turned out cheaper and better commodities than the workers could produce with their inefficient spinning wheels and handlooms. The machine delivered industry wholly into the hands of the big capitalists and rendered entirely worthless the merger property of the workers (tools, looms etc); the results has that the capitalists soon had everything in their hands and nothing remained to the workers, this marked the introduction of the factory system into the textile's industry. Once the impulse to given, this system spread quickly to all other branches of industry, especially cloth and book-printing, pottery and the metal industries. Labour was more and more divided among the individual workers so that the worker who previously had done a complete piece of work now did only a part of that

²⁶⁴Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, p, 213.

piece of work. This division of labour made it possible to produce things fastest and cheaper, it reduced the activity of the individual worker to simple, endless repeated mechanical motions which could be performed not only as well but much better by a machine. In this way, all of these industries fell, one after another, under the dominance of steam, machinery, and the factory system, just as spinning and weaving had already done.

But at the same time they also fell into the hands of big capitalists, and their workers were deprived of whatever independence remained to them. Generally, not only genuine manufacture but also handicrafts came within the province of factory system as big capitalist increasingly displaced the small master craftsmen by setting up huge workshops which saved many expenses and permitted and elaborated division of labour.

This is how it has come about that the civilised countries at the present time nearly all kinds of labour are performed in factories and, in nearly all branches of work, handicrafts and manufacture have superseded. This process has, to an ever greater degree, ruined the old middle class, especially the small handicraftsmen; it has entirely transformed the condition of the workers; and two new classes have been created which are gradually swallowing up all others. These are the class of big capitalist, who, in all civilised countries, are already in almost exclusive possession of all the means of subsistence and of the instrument (machine, factories) and materials necessary for the production of the means of subsistence. This is the bourgeoisie class, or the bourgeoisie

The class of the wholly propertyless, who are obliged to sell their labour to the bourgeoisie in order to get, in exchange the means of subsistence for their support. This is called the class of proletariat, or the proletariat²⁶⁵

In this light, in order to survive and not to perish there must be a struggle between these classes, which of course must spark up revolutions, given that the conditions in which the labourer has to sell their labour is unfavourable. None of these explain legitimate property in a satisfactory way, but they may be steps in this direction. The East German co-operatives by combining private ownership with the need for joint property in the means of production and distribution,

²⁶⁵Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Progress Publisher, Moscow, 1969, pp. 42, 43.

the workers councils by providing job security instead of the security of private property. In both instances individual workers are no longer atomised but belong to a new collective, the cooperative or the factory's council as a kind of compensation for membership in a class"²⁶⁶

5.2 The Desire for Material as the Root Cause of Revolution

The first great battle between proletariat class and the Bourgeoisies class became more violent for a time whereby the social and political aspirations of the European working really indeed became the struggle for supremacy. Revolution was between the different sections of the classes because the working class was reducing to fight for political elbow-room and to the position of extreme wing of the middle class radicals.

“Wherever independent proletarian movement continued to show signs of life, they were ruthlessly hunted down. Thus the Prussian police hunted out the central board of the Communist League, and then located in Cologne. The members were arrested, and after eighteen months imprisonment they were tried. Some prisoners were sentenced varying from three to six years after the sentence the League was formally dissolved by the remaining members. To the rest of the Manifesto it seemed to be doomed to oblivion”²⁶⁷

This clearly shows the capitalist and those in power can use the money and positions to dominate and subjugate others, which often create conflict, violence and revolutions because of class conflict and the differences in the societies especially when they are a voluntary association of workers which make them stronger when together to militate for a common purpose as a people with the same fate being dominated by a given class because of their capital and means.

It is in this regard that Marx substantiated or estimated that “the revolution and Manifesto entirely trusted to the intellectual development of the working class, which was served to result from combined action and mutual discussion. The very events and vicissitudes of the struggle against capital. The defeats even more than the victories, could not help bringing home to men's minds the insufficiency of their various favourite nostrums, and preparing the way for a more complete insight into the true conditions of working-class emancipation. And Marx was right. The International, on its breaking up 1874, left the workers quite different men from what it had found

²⁶⁶ Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, 1972, pp, 216, 217.

²⁶⁷Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1970, p, 10.

them in 1864, proudhonism in France, lassalleanism in Germany were dying out, and even the conservation English Trades Unions though most of them had long since severed their connexion with international, were gradually advancing towards that point at which last year at Swansea, their president could say in their names “continental socialism of “manifesto” had made considerable headway among the working men of all countries”

These trade²⁶⁸ unions of working class was established to fight for better working conditions that is to improve the working conditions of labourers across the world, from the mischievous hands of the capitalist with their exploitation policies, this of course provoked a revolutions as the Bourgeoisies or capitalist were adamant to changes. This not different from what is still happening in our society today, be it in Europe, Asia, America or Africa, such practices are still manifesting, reasons why civil disobedience, violence and revolutions are still on the rise. This class struggle creates conflict, antagonism and anarchy in societies; this is what Arendt had it that “only in western countries are there political and legal obstacles that constantly keep this process of expropriations from reaching the point where life would be completely unbearable. In Russia there is, of course, not socialism, but state socialism, which is the same thing as state capitalism would be that is, total expropriation. Total expropriation occurs when all political and legal self-guards of private ownership have disappeared. In Russia for instance, certain groups enjoy a very high standard of living. The trouble is only that whatever these people may have their disposition care country houses, expensive furniture, chauffeur driven Limousines, et cetera they do not own; it can be taken away from them by government any day. No man there is so rich that he cannot be a beggar over night even the right to employment. In case of any conflict with the ruling powers (one glance into recent soviet literature, where people have started to tell the truth, will testify to the atrocious consequence more tellingly then economic and political theories”²⁶⁹

This is to say that when power is centralise by the state whereby they control almost all state affairs and individual actions then it becomes difficult for certain authorities to abuse power because their power and wealth can still be taken away by the state. Even though certain powerful elites always a marks wealth and use it for their protection when there is absolute need this

²⁶⁸ Ibid, op.cit, p, 12.

²⁶⁹ Hannah Arendt, Crisis of the Republic, p, 12.

always pave the way for revolution, violence and civil disobedience. These ills are really the factors which create disorder in the societies.

In the regards our understanding is different from ideologies and theories which we were made to know that it all began with the uprising of capitalism which does not stop with the means of production “only legal and political institutions that are independent of the economic forces and their automatism can control and check the inherently monstrous potentialities of this process”²⁷⁰ such political controls seem to function best in so-called welfare state whether they call themselves “socialist” or “capitalist”. What protect freedom is the division between governmental and economic power, or to put into Marxian language. The fact that the state and its constitution are not superstructures.

This is to say that, those with economic power when given the authority and power in government then power turns to corrupt those, lord action had it that power corrupt but absolute power corrupt absolutely.

Everywhere that revolution was the work of the working class. It was the latter that build the barricades and paid with its life hood. Only the Paris workers, in overthrowing the government, had the very definite intention of overthrowing the bourgeoisie regime. But conscious though they were of total antagonism existing between their own class and the bourgeoisies, still neither the economic progress of the country nor the intellectual development of the mass of French workers had as yet reached the stage which would have made a social reconstruction possible. In the final analyses, therefore, the fruits of the revolution were reaped by the capitalist class. In the other countries, in Italy, in Germany, in Austria. The workers from the very outset did nothing but raise the bourgeoisie to power. But in any country, the rule of the bourgeoisie is possible without national independence. Therefore, the revolution of 1848 had to bring in it train the unity and autonomy of nations that had lacked them up to then”²⁷¹

This autonomy of nations was established due to the fact that, it was to avoid the capitalist situation in the hands of few individuals, which was not only threat to the government in states but also to individual citizens who were workers in the capitalist state. That is why people

²⁷⁰ Ibid, op. cit, pp, 212, 213.

²⁷¹Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Foreign Languages Press, Perking, 1970, p, 27.

surrender the wills and power to the state for their safety, it becomes more dangerous if the state involve in such obnoxious practice which can provoked violence and revolutions as it has been in recent years in own contemporal societies and states as we can observe civil disobedience, violence and all sorts of chaos and disorder in our communities cause by some of these phenomenon. Misses Arendt have it that “ what protects us in the so-called “capitalist” countries of the west is not capitalism, but a legal system that prevents the daydreams of big business management of trespassing into the private sphere of its employees from comings true. But this dream does come true whatever the government itself becomes the employment. The recent appetite of certain government agencies to bus private home could also be seen as an attempt on the part of the government employees. And what else is bugging but a form of expropriation? The government agency establishes itself as a kind of co-owner of the apartments and houses of citizens. In Russia no fancy gadget in the walls necessary, there, a spy sits in every citizen’s apartment anyhow”²⁷²

This of control at a government action on its citizens inferring on the right and liberties of its citizens which is a very great havocked that pave way towards violence, revolutions chaos and disorder whereby human dignity is endangered. It is at this juncture that the communist party was formed on order to liberate the workers or proletariat due to this control action, because these proletariat or labourers depends solely on the sales of their labour without any capital, which create grievances and conflict because of competition and the expropriation of the labourers who had no means of production and capital except their labour and this labourers have always been poor living under difficult conditions. This is to say that revolution and violence always emanate from such grievances, conflict and unbridled competition. It is important to notes that the proletariat originated in the industrial revolution, which took place in England In the 18th century and which has since then been repeated in all civilised countries in the world. Marx has that “this industrial revolution was precipitated by the discovery of the steam engine, various spinning machines, the mechanical loom, and a whole series of other mechanical devices. These’ machines which were very expensive and hence could be bought only by the capitalist, altered the mode of production and displaced the former workers, because the machines turned out cheaper and better commodities than the workers could produce with their inefficient spinning wheels and handlooms. The machine delivered industry wholly into the hands of the big capitalists and

²⁷²H. Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, p, 213.

rendered entirely worthless the merger property of the workers (tools, looms etc); the results has that the capitalists soon had everything in their hands and nothing remained to the workers, this marked the introduction of the factory system into the textile's industry. Once the impulse to given, this system spread quickly to all other branches of industry, especially cloth and book-printing, pottery and the metal industries. Labour was more and more divided among the individual workers so that the worker who previously had done a complete piece of work now did only a part of that piece of work. This division of labour made it possible to produce things fastest and cheaper, it reduced the activity of the individual worker to simple, endless repeated mechanical motions which could be performed not only as a well but much better by a machine. In this way, all of these industries fell, one after another, under the dominance of steam, machinery, and the factory system, just as spinning and weaving had already done.

But at the same time they also fell into the hands of big capitalists, and their workers were deprived of whatever in dependence remained to them. Generally, not only genuine manufacture but also handicrafts came within the province of factory system as big capitalist increasingly displaced the small master craftsmen by setting up huge workshops which saved many expenses and permitted and elaborated division of labour.

This is how it has come about that the civilised countries at the present time nearly all kinds of labour are performed in factories and, in nearly all branches of work, handicrafts and manufacture have superseded. This process has, to an ever greater degree, ruined the old middle class, especially the small handicraftsmen; it has entirely transformed the condition of the workers; and two new classes have been creates which are gradually swallowing up all others. These are the class of big capitalist, who, in all civilised countries, are already in almost exclusive possession of all the means of subsistence and of the instrument (machine, factories) and materials necessary for the production of the means of subsistence. This is the b bourgeoisie class, or the bourgeoisie. The class of the wholly property less, who are obliged to sell their labour to the bourgeoisie in order to get, in exchange the means of subsistence for their support. This is called the class of proletariat an, or the proletariat²⁷³

²⁷³Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, progress publisher, Moscow, 1969, pp, 42, 43.

In this light, in order to survive and not to perish they must be a struggle between these classes, which of course must spark up revolutions, given that the conditions in which the labour have to sell their labour is unfavourable. None of these explain legitimate property in a satisfactory way, but they may be steps in this direction. The East Germany co-operatives by combining private ownership with the need for joint property in the means of production and distribution, the workers councils by providing job security instead of the security of private property. In both instances individual workers are no longer atomised but belong to a new collective, the co-operative or the factory's council as a kind of compensation for membership in a class"²⁷⁴

This is class distinction and class struggle is the reason why violence and civil disobedience has become rampant in the contemporary era because of the over exploitation of the labourers by the capitalists or bourgeoisies. This is so because labour is also a factor of production and is been look upon as a commodity so therefore its price or wage rate should equally be determined by the principles of other commodities. This is to say that, the price of labour should be equal to the cost of production but conflicts often arise when labourers are paid less to render them poor and less competition compared to the sale of the commodity thereby making the rich more rich and the poor more poorer which of course is the civil disobedience, foundation to violence and revolutions.

However, the class of in this era are more like slaves of the owners in the middle ages they were the serfs of the land-owning nobility before the industrial revolution they were the journeymen who worked in the service of petty bourgeois master. In as much as these workers were not treated well, resistances, civil unrest became unavoidable all these as raised above are clearly seen in our present day societies, as other members of the societies always want to dominate and exploit others for their selfish reasons, thereby provoking chaos and disorder.

It is interesting to note that, whatever form these exploitations may be from one to the other, irrespective of the method it may use it goes towards the same direction of exploitations, which are some aspects that provoke revolutions, and these revolutions cannot be completely eradicated except with the complete elimination of class distinction and class antagonism, Marx and Engels established that, "the communist revolution is the most radical rupture with

²⁷⁴ Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, 1972, pp, 216, 217.

traditional property relations, no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas²⁷⁵. But let us have done with the bourgeois objection to communism because to the bourgeois or capitalists, communism is reducing them to the same level with others like the labourers or workers. And it should be noted that the early beginning of the revolution, is the proletariat position to become rulers or to win the struggle in consensus of democracy. This to say that, the rise of the proletariat to be position at the ruling class was the first step of the revolution of the working class. This proletariat will use its political supremacy since there are a majority, to centralise all powers in their hands like capital from the bourgeoisie and any other weapon or instrument of production in the hands of the state which rule for a common good and not just the interest of the capitalists.

This is to say that, the proletariat will organised themselves as the ruling class. To suppress the intention and the exploitative policies of the ruling class which is the revolution that will create conflict and class struggle with the capitalist or bourgeois. It is true that these revolutions will be different in different states obviously similar in advance societies like Russia.

- Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
- A heavy progressive or graduated income tax
- Abolition of all right of inheritance.
- Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
- Centralisation of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.
- Centralisation of communication and transport in the hands of the state.
- Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
- Equal liability of all to labours. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture
- Combination of agriculture with manufacturing in industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equable distribution of the population over the country.

²⁷⁵ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *the Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Foreign Languages Press, Perking 1970, p57.

- Free education for all children in public schools abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production among others"²⁷⁶

This was to reduced the powers of the bourgeois and capitalist especially their exploitative tendencies which was rendering the workers and labourers more poor and wretch as their members keep increasing while the bourgeois and capitalist get richer and richer and f fewer in number, this was in deed to disheartening and ergo-provoking that laid the foundation to chaos and disorder as revolutions and violence became unavoidable these means also centralised power in the hands of the state whereby all citizens has sacrifice and surrender their rights for a common good and common interest if they must escape the grimness's and exploitative character of the capitalist and bourgeois.

Marx and Engels have it that "when, in course of development, class distinction have disappeared, a d all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation. The public power will lose its political character, political power, properly so called, is merely the organised power of one class for oppressing another. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organise itself the ruling class, if by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and as such, sweep away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions of production, the n it will, along with these conditions, have swept the conditions for the existence of class antagonism and of classes generally and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class. In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonism, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for free development of all"²⁷⁷.

This implies that, civil disobedience, violence and revolution will never stop or come to an end, as each class will always want dominate and subjugate or oppressed others for their selfish ends, for instance if the communist take over the means of production and concentrate everything in the hands of the state, it may still provoke disorder as some members in government may still abuse the powers vested upon them, and as such class distinction conflict and antagonism will still continue, this is also seen as some members of government which by the powers and the

²⁷⁶ Ibid, op. cit, pp, 58, 59.

²⁷⁷ Ibid, op. cit, p, 59.

atmosphere of conveniently that surrounds them will still prove their superiority and supremacy over others, which of course is the continuation class distinction and class conflict.

Arendt has it that “the men elected were communist and non-communist; lines seem to have played no role whatsoever, the criterion, in the words of news-paper being solely that is” none among them who would misuse his power or think only of his personal position. And this is more a criterion of qualification than of morality. Whoever misuses power or pervert it in to violence, or is only interested in his private affairs and without concern for the common world, is simply not fit to play a role in political life. The same principles were observed in the further states of election for the councils, elected directly at the higher base bodies “without regard for party affiliation and with due regard to the confidence of the working people”.²⁷⁸

This therefore mean economic conflict as well as class struggle are some of the outstanding reasons why they are disastrous increase in crimes, such as street protest, uprising, civil disobedience and violence as well as revolution. These phenomenon’s seems to be similar almost in all nations and the continue practice of class domination seem adequate to definition for the outstanding debate on violence and revolutions which has also given birth to some unholly and obnoxious practice like terrorism, disorder, chaos and insecurity in our societies especially in the con temporal societies. One can therefore be tempted to establish that man is the most evil and dangerous animal on earth who deliberately uses his or her rational ability to suppressed some of it fellow citizens and members within their communities, worse of all when camp up themselves as militants of a common association what Marx call party, and of course militate for a common purpose, it can be more dangerous as the democratic majority may used it might to subjugate, oppressed and Into discriminate ate others, when always escalate into violence and revolutions.

5.3The Instinct for Domination and Competition

It was his communist manifesto that Karl Marx (1818-1883) formulated his basic theory which he considered original in many ways: this was prove;

That the existence of classes is only bound up with particular historical phases in the development of production.

²⁷⁸Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* the world publishing company, Cleveland, 1958, p.500.

- That the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the production.
- That the dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and to classless society.²⁷⁹

To Marx, the material world consists of the sum total the natural environment, Marx defines matter as “objective reality existing outside the human mind”. The chief characteristics of Marxist materialism are that recognises a wide diversity in the material world without reducing it to any one forms of matter. The material order contains everything in the natural world that exists outside of our minds, the notion that any spiritual reality, God, for example exist outside our minds and as something other than nature is denied. Marxism affirms the primacy of the material, order and regard mental activity as a secondary by-product of matter.

In particular, the material order consists of;

- The factors of production to have material things such as food; clothing, and shelter, people must produce them. Production always takes place as a social act;
- The relations of production what determined how men were related to each other in the process of production was their relation to property.

Although in all period there is a conflict and struggle between the indifferent classes, the struggle is particularly violent under capitalism. There are at least three characteristics of class struggle under capitalism.

First, the classes’ are reduced basically to two, the owner (bourgeoisie) and the workers (proletariat).

Secondly, the relations of those classes to each other rest upon a fundamental contradiction, namely, that although both classes participate in the act of production, the type of distribution of the fruits of production does not correspond to the contribution made by each class. But the products created by labour could be sold for more than it cost. From this point of view, since the product of labour could be sold for more than the cost of labour, the capitalist would then reap the difference e, which Marx call surplus value. The class conflict caused by this contradiction of surplus value would force the dialectic movement to the next stage of history, namely, socialism and finally communism.

²⁷⁹ Karl Marx quote by Armstrong Ndi Niba, *Advance Level Philosophy for Cameroon G.C.E Examination*, star electronic Graphic, Buea, 2011, p,117.

Thirdly, the prediction that the condition of the workers in capitalism would become progressively more wretched. The poor would become poorer and the more numerous while the rich would become richer and fewer, the masses would take over all the means of production which will give rise to Bourgeoisie.

Marx has already told us that we should understand society by means of classes; the bourgeoisie is the class of the industrial capitalists. But how are we to explain the development of the classes? It is fairly obvious that this depends on the resources of a given society. As for Marx the rise of the bourgeoisie is due to the following factors;

- Colonial expansion: the annexation of new colonies meant the opening up of raw material sources and new markets.
- Industrial revolution: the predominant occupation and even here with the feudal system the farmers were being exploited. With the introduction of new industries there are now new industries for work. However the capitalists have a big revolutionary role to play in history.

As a class, the bourgeoisie has the following characteristics:

1. The only bond of relationship between men is naked self-interest and insensitive class transaction. Money is the value and force or power in the capitalist system.
2. The bourgeoisie cannot survive without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production and thereby the relations of production and with them the whole structures of society. In fact they have to modernise their machine ever so often in order in order to produce more in less time and at minimal cost. This leads to confusion even between the rich to see who will get richer.
3. They cannot help but give rise to a new revolutionary force in history namely the proletariat who are the main producers of goods. The more goods to be produced, the more workers are needed and thus the more members of the society who are dependent on the bourgeoisie for unemployment of the vast majority of the society by the few²⁸⁰.

In this way, proletariat will also emanates, where it is a class of labourers who live only so long as they find work and find work only so as their labour increases capital. There labourers who must sell themselves piecemeal are commodity like any other article of commerce and are consequently exposed to all the variations of competition and to all the fluctuations of their market. There is a

²⁸⁰ Ibid, op. cit, p, 118.

fierce competition for work as there are too few jobs for too many potential workers and those who are lucky find employment and should be with the little pay they have or serve. There is no social security programme for the unemployed, with the rise of the proletariat there is increasing opposition in the society are between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The result is that all other groups in the society are forced into one or the other of these classes. At some point the proletariat molds itself into a fighting for him/her. True there had been rebellions but they were ineffective because individuals rebelled against individuals instead of the system. The rise of trade union changed all these when workers realised that their real strength lay in their numbers and so they began to organise themselves accordingly. They discovered that the strike weapon is most effective, that is they could stop work until such time when all their demands were met (civil disobedience).

With the beginnings of such organisation, we have the formation of the proletariat as a class and their organisation as a political party a political expression of a class and common interest. The proletariat is the only revolutionary class according to Marx because they constitute the vast majority in any society but have no vested interest in the society in which they find themselves. They do not own or have any property as this belongs to the capitalists. They do not have any family due to the instability of work. They do not have any national loyalties either; they have no prospects of improving their lot in society. The only prospect of improving their situation is by changing the society radically, that is, by revolution. This of course will give way for manifestation.

The communists are opposed to private property and ownership in the capitalist system. For this reason they are the natural lead of the proletariat, the communists have no interests which are separate from the proletariat as a whole. They merely bring out into the open the common interest of the entire proletariat independent of nationality. What is common among them is that they are an oppressed class or party. Communism is a universal movement which opposes capitalism. Its immediate aim is; the formation of the proletariat into a class; the overthrowing of the bourgeoisie and the conquest of political power by the proletariat.

According to Marx, there are two stages in the communist evolution; first, there is the dictatorship of the proletariat. Once the proletariat has been put into position as the only political party, they will change the society by some measures and the result will be the achievement of the utopia the classless society. This is done in two stages;

- To raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class.
- And then the proletariat will use its political supremacy to take over the capitalist system. The state at this point introduces two importance reforms: the abolition of property and the abolishment of all rights to inheritance. The goal of the dictatorship is the classes' society through the taking over of the capitalist system and using this for the common good. Hence, the clash of interest and class struggle in the society as the basis of disobedience and violence²⁸¹.

²⁸¹ 1 bid op cit p, 119.

CHAPTER 6

THE CLASH OF INTEREST AND RIGHTS IN THE STATE

This chapter focuses on the clash of interest of the state, especially the interest of some citizens to their right and that of the state, as Arendt estimated that “certainly the danger of this development had been inherent in the structure of the nation-state since the beginning. But insofar as the establishment of the nation-state coincided with the establishment of constitutional, they always had represented and been based upon the rule of law as against the rule arbitrary administration and despotism. So that when the precarious balance between nation and state, between national interest and legal institution broke down, the disintegration of this form of government and organisation of people came about with terrifying swiftness. Its disintegration, curiously enough, started at precisely the moment when the right to national self-determination was recognised for all and when essentially conviction, the supremacy of the will of the nation over legal and “abstract” institutions, was universally accepted”.²⁸²

This view was further, reiterated by Hegel when observed that, the incompatibility of right of the state, political degeneration or the organic nature of the state should largely be taken into consideration as well as property right and revolution, as seen in his elucidations.

Arendt’s mistaken views that civil disobedience and violence is as a results of Government inability to function in order she did not take in to consideration the state absolutism as Hegel propounded and never saw anything wrong from the citizens, such as a poor educational training and non-respect of the laws and states institutions which requires the state to exercise it status quo and supremacy over it citizens which is been look up by others especially misses Arendt as government inability to function well. However, I subscribes to Hegel’s views on account of state absolutism, cannot be under estimated.

More to that, arendt also forgot, that, man’s insufficiency in the state of nature which compelled him to join the civil state as Locke propounded, where the laws of the society and human rights are guaranteed, through the government within the state as Hegel advocated, even the protection of private property.

²⁸² Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, the world publishing company, Cleveland, New York, 1958, p, 275.

It is evident, that every human being has certain privileges that he or she enjoys among which are rights. These rights could be natural or civil. Natural rights are those from God, that is, the right to live, the rights to work, eat among others, while in the civil rights, each citizen has the right to some basic social amenities, and the right to be protected by the state because the citizens enters into an agreement or contract with the state for such rights to be protected. And the citizens are also obliged to comply with the norms of the state for these rights to be guaranteed and protected from external injury.

In this vein, the state which embodied and accommodate all citizens in its territorial integrity, and who represent the will of its citizens has certain rights and privileges to enjoy apart from just duties, these rights include, the coordination and over right, that is it coordinates all activities and forces operating in her territory and also oversee into the affairs and actions of its members if it concurs with expected standards or prescriptions. The right to be respected by its members that is, citizens are supposed to obey or yield to state authorities without reluctance for the maintenance of law and order within any human grouping or territory. This therefore implies that, the citizens are condemned by necessity to obey the commands and dictates of the state for effective control which of course reduces chaos, violence and revolutions in the societies or disorder. These rights of the state can be better understood across Hegel's conception of the right of the state.

6.1 Incompatibility of Rights in the State

It is on this note that, Hegel sees the state as “the realized ethical idea or ethical spirit. It is the will which manifests itself, makes itself clear and visible, and carries out what it knows, and in so far as it knows. The state finds in ethical custom its direct and not reflected and existence, and its indirect and reflected existence in the self-consciousness of the individual and in his knowledge and activity. Self-consciousness in the form of social disposition has its substantive freedom in the state, as the essence, purpose, and product of its activity”²⁸³

This means that the state has the potentials and substantial capacity to direct the affairs of individual members of their community, which is a right as given by the people. This is because the citizens mandate the state to operate the way it does upon consensus and the will of the people.

²⁸³ G.W.F Hegel, *Philosophy of Right*, translated by S.W.Dyde, Batoche Books, Canada, 2001, P.194.

These rights given to the state can be challenged when they are abuses from the state. The challenge of the state and its laws is looked upon by the authorities in the state as disobedient which always exhibits tension within the state and of course lays the foundation to violence and revolutions.

It is on this that he further stated that “the pentanes are the inner and lower order of gods, the spirit of a nation, Athens, is the divinity which knows and wills itself. Piety is feelings, or ethical behaviour in the form of feeling: political virtue is the willing of the thought out end, which exists absolutely”.²⁸⁴

However, the state which realized substantive will, having its reality in the particular self-consciousness raised to the plane of the universal, is absolutely rational; this substantive unity is its own motive and absolute end. In this end freedom attains its highest right; this end has the highest right over the individual, whose duty in turn is to be member of the state.

Where the state is to be considered as exchangeable with the civic society, and where its decisive features to be regarded as the security and protection of property and personal freedom, the interest of the individual as such would then be the ultimate purpose of the social union. It would then be one option to be a member of the state, -but the state has a totally different relation to the individual, it is the objective spirit, and he has truth, real existence, and ethical status only in being a member of it. Union, as such, is itself the true content and end, since the individual is intended to pass a universal life, his particular satisfactions, activities, and way of life have in this authenticated substantive principle their origin and result”.²⁸⁵

This consist in the thorough unity of universality and individuality, taken concretely, and from the stand-point of the content, it is the unity of objective freedom with subjective freedom, of the general substantive will with the individual consciousness and the individual will seeking particular ends. From the stand-point of the form it consists in action determined by thought-out or universal laws or principles; -this idea is absolutely eternal and necessary being of spirit—the idea of the state is not concerned with the historical origin of either the state in general or of any particular state with its special rights and characters. Hence, it is indifferent whether the state arose out of the patriarchal condition, out of fear or confidence, or out of the corporation, it does not care

²⁸⁴ Ibid, p, 195.

²⁸⁵ Ibid, Hegel, p, 19.

whether the basis of state right is declared to be in the divine, or in positive right or contract, or custom; when we are dealing with simply with the science of the state, these things are mere appearances, and belong to history, the causes or grounds of the authority of an actual state, in so far as they are required at all, must be derived from the forms of right, which have validity in the state, but when this violated violence civil disobedience arise. To Hegel “the philosophic investigation deals with only the inner side of all this, the thought conception”²⁸⁶

To Rousseau, is to be ascribed the merit of discovering and presenting a principle, which comes up to the standard of the thought, and is indeed thinking itself, not only in its form, such as would be a social impulse or divine authority, but in its very essence. This principle of Rousseau is will, but he conceives of the will only in the limited form of the individual will as conscious. Thus, the union of individuals in a state becomes a contract, which is based upon caprice, opinion, and optional, explicit consent out of this view the understanding deduces consequences, which destroy the absolutely divine and absolute authority and majesty. Hence, when these abstractions attained to power, there enacted the most tremendous spectacle which the human race has ever witnessed. All the usages and institutions of a great state were swept away, it was then proposed to begin over again, starting from the thought and as the basis of the state to will only what was judged to be rational. But as the undertaking was begun with abstracting void of all ideas, it ended in scenes of tragic cruelty and horror, where violence and revolutions become inevitable.

As against the principle of the individual will, we must bear in mind the fundamental conception, whether or not it be known by the individual or willed as an object of his good pleasure. We must also keep in mind that the opposite principle, the subjectivity of freedom, i.e., such knowing and willing as are retained in that principle; contains only one, and that a one-sided factor of the idea of the reasonable will. The will is reasonably able only if it is so both in itself and when it is actualized.

The other, contrary of the thought, which apprehends the state as an embodiment of reason, is the theory which takes such external appearance as the accidents of distress, need, protection, strength, and wealth, for the substance of the state, when they are mere elements of its historical development. Moreover, it is in unique and isolated individuals that the principle of knowledge is

²⁸⁶ Ibid, op. cit, p, 196.

here said to be found, not however in their thought, but the attributes of their merely empirical personalities, such as strength or weakness, wealth or poverty. The freak of disregarding is absolutely infinite and reasonable in the state and of banishing thought from the constitution of the state's inner nature has never appeared so undisguised, "In all genuine attempts to reach the real nature of the state, though the principles adduced be ever so one-sided and superficial, it is yet implied that right to conceive of the state is to attain to thoughts and universal characters".

One of what Hegel calls the far-reaching effects of his work is due to the circumstance that in his inquiry he knew how to fasten the whole into one piece without the help of thought. Hence, he says, is absent the confusions and disturbances, which arise when into a discussion of suggestion about the substantive, and into a discussion of the empirical and external is injected a reminder of the universal and rational. Hence, when engaged inadequately and imperfectly he is not continually reminding his readers of what is higher and infinite-Yet even this method of inquiry has consequences. Since the fortuitous is taken as the essence of the state, and not the substantive, there results from the absence of thought and incoherence, which jogs on without looking back, and finds itself quite at home in the very opposite of what it had commanded a moment before" which is a foundation to violence and chaos.

In addition, the state as a completed reality is the ethical whole and the actualization of freedom; it is the absolute purpose of reason that freedom should be actualized. The state is the spirit, which abides in and realizes itself consciously, while in nature it is realized only as the other of itself or the sleeping spirit. Only when it is present in consciousness, knowing itself as an existing object. Is it the state in thinking of freedom we must not take our departure from individuality or the individual's self-consciousness, but from the essence of self-consciousness. Let man be aware of it or not, this essence realizes itself as an independent power, in which particular persons are only phases, the state is the march of God in the world; its ground or cause is the power of reason realizing itself as will. When thinking of the idea of the state, we must not have in our mind any particular state, or particular institution, but must rather contemplate the idea, this actual God, by itself".²⁸⁷

²⁸⁷ Ibid, p, 197.

Although a state may be declared to violate right principles and to be defective in various ways, its ways, always contains the essential moments of its existence, if, that is to say, it belongs to the full formed states of our own time. But as it is easier to detect short-comings than to grasp the positive meaning. One easily falls into the mistake of dwelling so much upon special aspects of the state as to overlook its inner organic being. The state is not a work of art. It is in the world, in the sphere of caprice, accident, and error; Evil behaviour can doubtless disfigure it in many ways, but the ugliest man, the criminal, the invalid, the cripple, are living men. The positive thing, the life, is present in spite of defects, and it is with this affirmative that we have here to deal.

- a) The idea of the state has direct actuality in the individual state, as a self-referring organism, is the constitution or internal state organization or polity.
- b) It passes over into a relation of the individual state to other state. This is its external organization or polity.
- c) As universal idea, or kind, or species, it has absolute authority over individual states, This is the spirit which gives itself reality in the process of world-history”²⁸⁸

More so, he added that state as an actual thing is pre-eminently individual, and what is more, particular, individuality as distinguished from particularity is an element of the idea of the state itself, while particularity belongs to history, any two states, as such, are independent of each other. Any relation between the two must be external, a third must therefore stand above and unit them, now this third spirit, which gives itself reality in world-history, and constitutes itself absolute judge over states. Several states indeed might form an alliance and pass judgment upon others, or interstate relations may arise of the nature of the Holy Alliance, but these things are always relative and limited, as was the over lasting peace. The sole, absolute judge, which always a vials against the particular, is the self-caused self-existing spirit, which presents it-self as the universal and efficient leaven of word-history”²⁸⁹ Hegel further stated that “the state is the embodiment of concrete freedom. In this concrete freedom, personal individuality and its particular interests, as found in the family and civic community, have their complete development. In this concrete freedom, too, the rights of personal individuality receive adequate recognition, these interests and rights pass partly of their own accord into the interest of the universal. Partly, also, do the

²⁸⁸ Ibid, Hegel, p, 198.

²⁸⁹ Ibid, p, 198.

individuals recognize by their own knowledge and will the universal as their own substantive spirit, and work for it as their own end. Hence, neither is the universal completed without the assistance of the particular interest, knowledge, and will, nor, on the other hand, do individuals as private persons, live merely for their own special concern. They regard the general end, and are in all their activities conscious of this end, the modern state has enormous strength and depth, in that it allows the principle of subjectivity to complete itself to an independent extreme of personal particularity, and yet at the same time brings it back into the substantive unity and thus preserves particularity in the principle of the state.

It should be noted that, it is state's government which lays down conditions for citizens to follow but when civil disobedience increases, government character becomes questionable as Hannah Arendt contended that "the number of civil disobedient or potential civil disobedient-that is, of people who volunteered for demonstration duty has steadily increased, and with it, the inclination of the government either to treat the protesters as common criminals or to demand the supreme proof of "self sacrifice", the disobedient who has violated valid state laws should "welcome his punishment"²⁹⁰. And when national laws are been challenged civil disobedience, violence and revolution becomes the chaotic outcome of disorder.

However, the peculiarity of the idea of the modern state is that it is the embodiment of freedom, not freedom, not according to subjective liking, but to the conception of the will. The will, that is, in its universal and divine character. Incomplete states are there, in which this idea is still only a germ, whose particular phases are permitted to mature into self-dependence. In the republics of classical antiquity universality, it is true, is to be found, but in those ages particularity had not as yet been released from its fetters, and led back to universality or the universal purpose of the whole. The essence of the modern state binds together the universal and the full freedom of particularity, including the welfare of individuals. It insists that the interest of the family and civic community shall link them to the state, yet is aware that the universal purpose can make no advance without the private knowledge and will of particularity, which must adhere to its right. The universal must be actively furthered, but on the other side, subjectivity must be wholly and vitally

²⁹⁰ Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt and Brace New York, 1972, p, 54.

developed, only when both elements are present in force is the state to be regarded as articulate and truly organized.

In a nutshell contrary to the spheres of private right and private good, of the family and of the civic community, the state is on one side an external necessity. It is thus a higher authority in regard to which the laws and interests of the family and community are subject and dependent. On the other side, however, the state is the indwelling end these things, and is strong in its union of the universal end with the particular interests of individuals. Thus, just so far as people have duties to fulfil towards it, they have also rights but when this is violated disorder take central stage.²⁹¹

Montesquieu in his famous book as cited by Arendt, "*the spirit of the Law*" has kept before his mind, and sought to prove in detail, the thought that the laws, especially those of private right, are dependent upon the character of the state. He has maintained the philosophic view that the regarded in relation to the whole.²⁹²

More so, to those who object that some unjustified beliefs have practical benefits, maintaining moral stability and order, Mill argues that intolerance ironically promotes the very opposite, dissimulation, encouraging atheists to lie and pretend to be believers. Mill would encourage debate on virtually every controversial subject, including political anarchy, legalization of drugs, average racial differences, and the value of liberty itself.

With regard to the need for devil's advocates, Mill's tolerance toward dissent is qualified by his strong ethics of belief. "No one can be great thinker who does not recognize that as a thinker it is his first duty to follow his intellect to whatever conclusion it may lead". In the quest for truth, we must examine both sides of the argument, "he who knows only his own side of the case knows little of that, his reasons may be good, and no one may be able to refute them. But if he is equally unable to refute the reasons on the opposite side, if he does not know what they are, he has no grounds for preferring either opinion; the rational position for him would be suspension of

²⁹¹ Ibid, p, 199.

²⁹² Ibid, op. cit, Hegel, p, 200.

judgment... Both teachers and learners go to sleep at their posts as soon as there is no enemy in the field”²⁹³.

Universal concern becomes his own private concern, the particular interest shall in truth be neither set aside nor suppressed, but be placed in open concord with the universal. In this concord both particular and universal are enclosed, the individual, who from the point of view of his duties is a subject, finds in fulfilling his civic duties, protection of person and property, satisfaction of his real self, and the consciousness and self-respect implied in his being a member of this whole. Since the citizen discharges his duty as a performance and business for the state, the state is permanently preserved, viewed from the plane of abstraction, on the other hand, the interest of the universal would be satisfied, if the contracts and business, which it demands of him, are by him fulfilled simply as duties”

It is in this light that Hegel added that everything depends on the union of union of universality and particularity in the state, in the ancient states the subjective end was out-and-out one with the violation of the state. In modern times, on the contrary, we demand an individual view, and individual will and conscience, of these things the ancients had none in the same sense. For them the final thing was the will of the state, while in Asiatic despotisms the individual had no inner nature, and no self-justification. In the modern world man’s inner self is honoured. The conjunction of duty and right has the twofold aspect that what the state demands are duty should forthwith be the right of individuality, since the state’s demand is nothing other than the organization of the conception of freedom. The prevailing characters of the individual will are by the state brought into objective reality, and in this way first attain to their truth and realization. The state is the sole and essential condition of the attainment of the particular end and good.

The actual idea, the spirit, divides itself, as we have said, into the two ideal spheres of its conception, the family and the civic community. It descends into its two ideal and finite spheres, that it may out of them become actually finite and real. Hence, spirit distributes to individuals’ as a mass the material of its finite realization in these spheres, in such a way that the portion of the individual has the appearance of being occasioned by his circumstances, caprice, and private choice.

²⁹³ Ibid, op. cit, pp, 49,500.

In the platonic state, subjective freedom has not as yet any place, since in it the rulers assigned to individuals their occupations. In many oriental states, occupation depends upon birth, but subjective freedom, which must be respected, demands free choice for individuals

In these two spheres, in which the elements of spirit, individuality, and particularity, have in one their direct and in the other their reflected reality, spirit is their objective universality in the form of appearance. It is the power of the rational in the region of necessity and becomes the institutions, which have already been passed in review.

However the state, as spirit, divides itself according to the particular determining attributes of its conception, in order to exist in its own way, “we may adduce an illustration out of the region of nature, the nerve-system is especially the sensitive system; it is the abstract element which aims, so to speak, to exist by itself, and in this existence to have its own identity. Now feeling, when analyzed, furnishes separate sides, dividing itself so that the difference appears as complete systems. On one side is the abstract sense of feeling, which withdraws by itself. It is the smothered movement going on internally in reproduction, internal self-nourishment, assimilation, and digestion. On the other hand this withdrawal into oneself has against itself the element of difference, or the movement outwards; and this outward movement of feeling is irritability. These two forms a system of their own, and there are lower orders of animals, in which this system alone is developed, being without that unity of feeling which marks the complete soul. If we compare these facts of nature with the facts of the spirit, we may place together family and sensibility on the one side, civic community and irritability on the other. The third is the state, corresponding to the actual nervous system as an internally organized whole, but it is a living unity only in so far as both elements, the family and the civic community, are developed within it. The laws which govern these two are the institutions of the rational; it makes its appearance in them, the foundation and final truth of these institutions is the spirit, which is their universal purpose and conscious object. The family is, indeed, also ethical, but its purpose is not a conscious one, in the civic community, on the other hand and separation is the definitive feature”.²⁹⁴

The individuals of a multitude are spiritual beings, and have a twofold character. In them are the extreme of the independently conscious and willing individuality, and also the extreme of

²⁹⁴G. W.F Hegel, *Philosophy of Right*, translated by S.W Dyde, Batoche Books, Canada, 2001, p, 202.

the universality, which knows and wills what is substantive. They obtain the rights of both these aspects, only in so far as they themselves are actually, both as private persons and as person and as persons and as persons substantive, one right they have directly in the family, the other in the civic community. In these two institutions, which implicitly universalize all particular interests, individuals have their real self-conscious existence, and in the corporation they provide for these particular interests a wider scope, and an activity directed to universal end. When individual right and liberties are injured violence and revolutions becomes the regrettable outcome.

These institutions comprise in detail the constitution that is the developed and actualized rationality; they are the steadfast basis of the state, determining the temper of individuals towards the state, and their confidence in it. They are, moreover, the foundation-stones of public freedom, because in them particular freedom, becomes realized in a rational form. They thus involve an intrinsic union of freedom and necessity.

Furthermore, it has been already remarked that both the sanctity of marriage, and also the institutions, in which the ethical character of the civic community makes its appearance, constitute the stability of the whole. The universal is the concern of every particular person; everything depends on the law of reason being thoroughly incorporated with the law of particular freedom. My particular end thus becomes identical with the universal, in any other case the state is a mere castle in the air, in the general self-consciousness of individuals the state is actual, and in the identity of particularity and universality it has its stability. It has often been said that the end of the state is the happiness of the citizens. That is indeed true, if it is not well with them, if their subjective aim is not satisfied, if they find that the state as such is not the medium through which comes their satisfaction, the state stands upon insecure footing.

But spirit is realized and becomes its own object, not only as this necessity and as a kingdom of appearances, but as their idealists or inner being, substantive universality is thus an object and end for itself, and necessity assumes the form of freedom.

By the necessity, which lies within these idealists, is meant the development of the idea within itself. As subjective substantiality the idea is a political temper of mind, and in distinction from this as objective, is the organism of the state, i.e., the strictly political state and its constitution.

The unity of the freedom, which knows and will itself, exists in the first instance as necessity, here the substantive is found as the subjective existence of individuals. But there is a second necessity, and that is the organism, in this case spirit is a process within itself makes within itself distinctions, divides itself into organic members, through which it passes in living circulation.²⁹⁵

Political disposition, or, in general terms, patriotism, may be defined as the assurance which stands on truth, and the will which has become a custom, mere subjective assurance does not proceed out of truth, and is only opinion. Genuine patriotism is simply a result of the institutions which subsist in the state as in the actuality of reason; hence, patriotic feeling is operative in the act, which is in accord with these institutions. Political sentiment is, in general, a confidence, which may pass over into a more or less intelligent insight; it is a consciousness (that ray) substantive and particular interest is contained and preserved in the interest and end of another, here the state, in its relation to me, the individual. Wherefore (the state is for me forthwith not another), and in this consciousness am free.

By patriotic feeling is frequently understood merely as readiness to submit to exceptional sacrifices or do exceptional acts. But in reality it is the sentiment which arises in ordinary circumstances and ways of life, and is wont to regard the commonwealth as its substantive basis and end. This consciousness is kept intact in the routine of life, and upon it the readiness to submit to exceptional effort is based, but as men would rather be magnanimous than merely right, they easily persuade themselves that they possess this extraordinary patriotism. In order to spare themselves the burden of the true sentiment, and to excuse the lack of it, if this feeling be regarded as something, which provides its own beginning, and can proceed out of subjective imaginations and thoughts, it is (con), founded with mere opinion, and in that case is devoid of its true basis in objective reality.

Uneducated men delight in surface-reasoning and faultfinding's, fault-finding is an easy matter but hard is it to know the good and its inner necessity. Education always begins with fault-finding, but when full and complete sees in everything the positive. In the case of religion one may say off-hand that this or that is superstition, but it is infinitely harder to conceive of the truth

²⁹⁵ Ibid, op.cit. p, 203.

involved in it. Political sentiment, as a mere appearance, is also to be distinguished from what men truly will, they will in fact the real matter, but they hold fast to bits, and delight in the vanity of making improvements. Men trust in the stability of the state, and suppose that in it only the particular interest can come into being, but custom makes invisible that upon which our whole existence turns. If any one goes safe through the streets at night, it does not occur to him that it could be otherwise, the habit of feeling secure has become a second nature, and we do not reflect that it is first brought about by the agency of special institutions; often it is imagined that force holds the state together, but the binding cord is nothing else than the deep-seated feeling of order, which is possessed by all.²⁹⁶

Hannah Arendt suggested that “At the height of its development in the nineteenth century, the nation-state granted its Jewish inhabitants equality of right. Deeper order, and more fateful contradiction were hidden behind the abstract and palpable inconsistency that Jews received their citizenship from homogeneity of population the outstanding characteristic of the body politic”²⁹⁷.

Political disposition is given definite content by the different phases of the organism of the state. This organism is the development of the idea into its differences, which are objectively actualized. These differences are the different functions, affairs, and activities of state; by means of them, the universal uninterruptedly produces itself, by a process which is a necessary one, since these various offices proceed from the nature of the conception. The universal is, however, none the less self-contained, since it is already presupposed in its own productive process, this organism is the political constitution.

The state is an organism or the development of the idea into its differences; these different sides are the different functions, affairs and activities of state by means of which the universal unceasingly produces itself by a necessary process. At the same time it is self-contained, since it is presupposed in its own productive activity, this organism is the political constitution. It proceeds eternally out of the state, just as the state in turn is self-contained by means of the constitution. If these two things fall apart, and make the different aspects independent, the unity produced by the constitution is no longer established. The true relation is illustrated by the fable of the belly and the limbs, although the parts of an organism do not constitute an identity, yet it is of such a nature

²⁹⁶ Ibid, p, 204.

²⁹⁷ Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, the world publishing company, Cleveland, 1958, p, 11.

that, if one of its parts makes itself independent, all must be harmed. We cannot by means of predicates, propositions, etc, reach any right, estimate of the state, which should be apprehended as an organism, it is much the same with the state as with nature of God, who cannot be through predicates conceived, whose life rather is within itself and must be perceived.

The abstract actuality or substantiality of the state consists in this, that the end pursued by the state is the general interest, which being the substance of all particular interests, includes the preservation of them also. (2) But the actuality of the state is also the necessity of the state, since it breaks up into the various distinctions of state-activity, which are implied in the conception; by means of the state's substantiality. These distinctions become real and tangible as the different public offices. (3) This substantiality, when thoroughly permitted by education, is the spirit which knows and wills itself, hence, what the state wills it knows, and knows it in its universality as that which is thought out. The state works and acts in obedience to conscious ends, knows principles and laws, which are not merely implied, but expressly before its consciousness. So, too, it works with a definite knowledge of all the actual circumstances and relations, to which the acts refer.²⁹⁸

6.2 The Political Degeneration of the State (The Organic View of the State)

Since in property my will is embodied in an external thing, it follows that just as far as my will is reflected in that object, I can be attacked in it and placed under external compulsion. Hence my will may be enforced; violence is done to it, when force is employed in order to obtain some possession or object of desire.

In crime, which is wrong in its proper sense, neither right in general nor my personal right is respected, both the objective and the subjective aspects of right are set at defiance by crime as a living creature a man may be compelled to do a thing; his physical and other external powers may be brought under the force of another. But the free will cannot be absolutely compelled but only in so far as it does not withdraw out of the external, to which it is held fast, or out of the imaginative reproduction of the external, it can only be compelled when it allows itself to be compelled.

Since it is only in so far as the will has visible existence that it is the idea and so really free, and its realized existence is the embodiment of freedom, force or violence destroys itself forthwith in its very conception. It is a manifestation of will which cancels and supersedes a manifestation

²⁹⁸ G.W Hegel, *Philosophy of Right*, translated by S. W. Dyde Batoche Books, Canada, 2001, p, 205.

or visible expression of will, force or violence, therefore, is, according to this abstract treatment of it, devoid of right.

Since it in its very conception destroys itself, its principle is that it must be cancelled by violence; hence it is not only right but necessary that a second exercise of force should annul and supersede the first. Violation of a contract through failure to carry out the agreement, or violation of the legal duties toward the family or the state, through action or neglect, is the first violence. It is an exercise of force, if I retain another's property, or neglect to do some duty force exercised by a teacher upon a pupil, or by any one against incivility and rudeness, seems to be the first act of violence, not caused by any previous display of force.

This consciously free will has a universal side which, consists in a formal, simple and pure reference to itself as a separate and independent unit. This reference is also a self-conscious one though it has no further content. The subject is thus so far a person. It is implied in personality that I, as a distinct being, am on all sides completely bounded and limited, on the side of inner caprice, impulse and appetite, as well as in my direct and visible outer life. But it is implied likewise that I stand in absolutely pure relation to myself. Hence it is that in this finitude I know myself as infinite, universal and free.²⁹⁹

Moreover, personality implies, in general, a capacity to possess rights, and constitutes the conception and abstract basis of abstract right. This right, being abstract, must be formal also. Its mandate is, be a person and respect others as persons. The particularity of the will, that phase of the will, namely, which implies a consciousness of my specific interests, is doubtless an element of the whole consciousness of the will, but it is not contained in mere abstract personality. It is indeed present in the form of appetite, want, impulse and random desire, but is distinct as yet from the personality, which is the essence of freedom. In treating of formal right therefore, we do not trench upon special interests, such as my advantage or my well-being, nor have we here to do with any special reason or intention of the will. Since the particular phases of the person have not as yet attained the form of freedom, everything relating to these elements is so far a matter of indifference. When anyone bases a claim upon comes from a contracted heart and mind. Uncivilized man, in general, holds fast to his rights, while a more generous disposition is alert to see all sides of the question. Abstract right is, moreover, the first mere possibility, and in contrast

²⁹⁹ Ibid, pp, 51, 52.

with the whole context of a given relation is still formal. The possession of a right gives a certain authority, it is true, but it is not, therefore, absolutely necessary that I insist upon a right, which is only one aspect of the whole matter. In a word, possibility is something which means that it either may or may not exist³⁰⁰.

In contrast with the deeper significance of a concrete act in all its moral and social bearings, abstract right is only a possibility. Such a right is, therefore, only a permission or indication of legal power. Because of this abstract character of right the only rule which is unconditionally its own is merely the negative principle not to injure personality or anything which of necessity belongs to it. Hence we have here only prohibitions, the positive form of command having in the last resort a prohibition as its basis.

A person in this direct and definite individuality is related to a given external nature. To this outer world the personality is opposed as something subjective. But to confine to mere subjectivity the personality, which is meant to be infinite and universal, contradicts and destroys its nature. It bestirs itself to abrogate the limitation by giving itself reality, and proceeds to make the outer visible existence its own. Right is at first the simple and direct concrete existence which freedom gives it directly. This un-modified existence is possession or property. Here freedom is that of abstract will general, or of a separate person who relates himself only to himself. A person by distinguishing himself only to himself becomes related to another person, although the two have fixed existence for each other except as owners. Their implicit identity becomes realized through transference of property by mutual consent, and with the preservation of their rights. This is contract.

The will in its reference to itself, as may be at variance not with some other person but within itself as a particular will it may differ from and be opposition to its true and absolute self. This is wrong and crime. The division of rights into personal right, real right, and right to actions is, like many other divisions, intended to systematize the mass of unorganized material. But this division utterly confuses rights which presuppose such concrete relations as the family or the state with those which refer to mere abstract personality. An example of this confusion is the classification, made popular by Kant, as quoted by Hegel of rights into Real rights, Personal Rights, and Personal rights that are real in kind. It would take us to afield to show how contorted and irrational is the classification of rights into personal and real, a classification which lies at the

³⁰⁰Ibid, Op. cit, pp, 53, 54.

foundation of Roman law. The right to actions concerns the administrations of justice, and does not fall under this branch of the subject. Clearly it is only personality which gives us a right to things, and therefore personal right is in essence real right. A thing must be taken in its universal sense as the external opposite of freedom, so that in this sense my body and my life are things. Thus real right is the right of personality as such. In the interpretation of personal right, found in Roman law, a man is not a person till he has reached a certain status. In Roman law personality is an attribute of a class and is contrasted with slavery. The so-called personal right of Roman law includes not only a right to slaves, a class to which probably belong the children, not only a right over the class which has been deprived of right, but also family relations.

With Kant, as cited by Hegel, family relations are wholly personal rights which are real in kind. The Roman personal right is not the right of a person as such, but of a special person. It will be afterwards shown that the family relation is really based upon renunciation of personality. It cannot but seem an inverted method to treat of the rights of persons who belong to definite classes before the universal right of personality. According to Kant personal rights arise out of a contract or agreement that I should give or perform something, this is the just and remain of Roman law which has its sources in an obligation. Only a person, it is true, can perform a thing through contract; and further; only a person can acquire the right to such a performance. Yet we cannot, therefore, call such a right personal. Every sort of right is right of a person, but a right, which springs out of contract, is not a right to a person, but only to something external to him, or to be disposed of by him, and this is always a thing³⁰¹. It is the abuse of these rights that causes defiance.

However, a person must give to his freedom an external sphere, in order that he may reach the completeness implied in the idea. Since a person is as yet the first abstract phase of the completely existent, infinite will, the external sphere of freedom is not only distinguishable from him but directly different and separable. The reasonableness of property consists not in its satisfying our needs, but in its superseding and replacing the subjective phase of personality. It is in possession first of all that the person becomes rational. The first realization of my freedom in an external object is an imperfect one, it is true, but it is the only realization possible so long as the abstract personality has this first hand relation to its object. That which is defined as different from the free spirit is both in its own nature and also for this spirit the external. It is an object, something not true, impersonal and without rights. "Thing" like "objective", has two opposite meanings.

³⁰¹Ibid, op. cit. pp, 54, 55.

When we say “that is the thing or fact,” “it depends on the thing itself, not on the person,” we mean by “thing” that which is real and substantive. But it is also contrasted with person, who here includes more than a particular subject, and then it means the opposite of the real and substantive, and is something merely external. What is external for the free spirit, who is different from mere consciousness, is absolutely external. Hence nature is to be conceived as that which is external in its very self.

Since a thing has no subjectivity it is external not merely to a subject, but to itself. Space and time are external. I, as sensible, am external, spatial, and temporal. My faculty of sense perception is external to itself. An animal may perceive, but the soul of the animal has as its object not itself, but something external. The person in his direct conception and as a separate individual has an existence which is purely natural. This existence is something partly inalienable, partly akin in its nature to the external world. As the individual is considered in his first abstract simplicity, reference is here made only to those features of personality with which he is directly endowed, not to those which he might proceed to acquire by voluntary effort. Mental endowments, science, art, such matters of religion as sermons, masses, prayers, blessings of consecrated utensils, inventions also, are objects of exchange, recognized things to be bought and sold. It is possible to ask, also, if an artist or scholar is in legal possession of his art, science or capacity to preach or read mass; and the question is put on the presumption that these objects are things. Yet one hesitates to call such gifts, knowledge, powers, mere things, because although they may be bargained for as a thing, they have an inner spiritual side. Hence the understanding becomes confused as to how they are to be regarded at law. Before the understanding always arises an exclusive disjunction, which in this case is that something must be either a thing or not a thing. It is like the disjunctive judgment that a thing must be either finite or infinite. But, though knowledge, talents, etc., are the possession of the free mind, and therefore internal to it, they may be relinquished and given an external existence. They would then fall under the category of things. They are not direct objects at the first, but the spirit lowers its inner to the level of the directly external, which most often always provoked violence and disorder.

6.3 Property Rights and Revolution

If we can speak of several persons, when as yet no distinction has been drawn between one person and another, we may say that in personality all persons are equal. But this an empty

tautological proposition, since a person abstractedly considered is not as yet separate from others, and has no distinguishing attribute. Equality is the abstract identity set up by the mere understanding, upon this principle mere reflecting thought, or, in other words, spirit in its middle ranges, is apt to fall, when before it there arises the relation of unity to difference. This equality would be only the equality of abstract persons as such, and would exclude all reference to possession, which is the basis of inequality, sometimes the demand is made for equality in the division of the soil of the earth, and even of even of other kinds of wealth. Such a claim is superficial, because differences of wealth are due not only to the accident from into which the original thinker threw his work.³⁰²

Thus those who have worked over the material a second time may regard as their own possession whatever money they may be able to extract from their work, and may contend that they have a right to reproduced it. In the transmission of the science in general, and especially in teaching positive science, church doctrine, or jurisprudence, is found the adoption and repetition of thoughts which are already established and expressed. This is largely the case with writing composed for the same purpose, it is not possible to state accurately, and establish explicitly by law and right, just how far the new form, which accrues through repeated expression, should transmute the scientific treasure or the thoughts of others, who are still in external possession, into to special mental possession of the person who re-constructs them; how far, in other words a repletion of an author's work should be called a plagiarism. Hence plagiarism must be a question of honour, and should be refrained from on that score.

Laws against reprinting protect the property of author and publisher in a very definite but, indeed limited measure, the ease with which one can intentionally alter the form or insert slight modifications into a large work on science or a comprehensive theory which is the work of another, and further, the great difficulty, when discoursing on what one has received, of abiding by the letter of the author, introduce, in addition to the special purposes requiring such a repletion, an endless variety of changes, which stamp upon the foreign article the more or less superficial impression of something which is one's own. The hundreds of compendiums, abridgments, compilations, arithmetic, geometries, religious tracts, every venture of a critical journal, an annual, or a cyclopaedia, keep on repeating under the same or an altered title, although each may be maintained to be something unique. Yet the profit which the work promised the author or inventor

³⁰²³⁰² Ibid, pp, 59, 60.

in the first place may be wiped out, or the purpose of both author and imitator may be defeated, or one may be ruined.

It is noteworthy that the term plagiarism, or scholar's larceny is no longer heard, it may be that the principle of honour has dislodged it, or that the feeling of honour has vanished or ceased to be directed against plagiarism, or that a small compilation or slight changes of forms is ranked as an original and independent production, and so highly esteemed as to banish all thought of plagiarism.

Since personality is something directly present, the comprehensive totality of one's outer activity, the life, is not external to it. Thus the disposal or sacrifice of life is not the manifestation of one's personality so much as the very opposite, hence I have no right to relinquish my life, only a moral and social ideal, which submerges the direct, simple and separate personality, and constitutes its real power, has a right to life. Life, a, being direct and unrelated, and death the direct negation of it, death must come from without as a result of natural causes, or must be received in the service of the idea from a foreign hand.

It is interesting to note that the particular person is really a subordinate, who must devote his life to the service of the ethical fabric; when the state demands his life, he must yield it up. But should the man take his own life? Suicide may at first glance be looked upon as bravery, although it is the poor bravery of tailors and maid-servants, or it may be regarded as a misfortune, caused by a broken heart. But the point is, have I any right to kill myself? The answer is that I, as this individual am not lord over my life, since the comprehensive totality of one's activity, the life falls within the direct and present personality. To speak of the right of a person over his life is a contradiction, since it implies a right of a person over himself, but no one can stand above and execute himself. When Hercules burnt himself, and Brutus fell upon his sword, this action against their personality was doubtless of a heroic type; but yet the simple right to commit suicide must be denied even to heroes.³⁰³

In a contract, outward and visible existence, as definite, is essentially existence for another thing, thus property, as a visible external thing, is determined by its relations to other external things, these relations being both necessary and accidental. But property is also a manifestation of will, and the other, for which it exists, is the will of another person, this reference of will to will is the true and peculiar ground on which freedom is realized. The means by which I hold property,

³⁰³ Ibid, op.cit, pp, 75, 76.

not by virtue of the relation of an object to my subjective will, but by virtue of another will, and hence share in a common will, is contract.

It is just as much a necessity of reason that men make contracts, exchange, and trade, as that they should have property, in their consciousness it is some want, benevolence, or advantage, which occasions the contracts, but really it is reason, or the ideas as it is embodied in the realized will of a free person. It is taken for granted that contracting parties recognize one another as persons and owners. Recognition is contained and presupposed in the fact that contract is a relation of the objective spirit.

In contract I hold property through a common wills, it is the interest of reason that the subjective will become universal, and exalt itself to this level of realization. In contract the particular will remains, although it is now in conjunction with another will. The universal will assumes here no higher form than co-operation.

He further reiterated that in contract property is no longer viewed on the side of its external reality, as a mere thing, but rather as containing the elements of will, another's as well as my own. Contract is the process which presents and occasions the contradiction by which I, existing for myself and excluding another will, am and remain an owner. Guided by the conception I must relinquish my property not merely as an external thing, but as property, if my will is to become a genuine factor in reality. But by virtue of this procedure my will, when relinquished, is another will, the necessary nature of the conception is thus realized in a unity of different wills, which nevertheless, give up their differences and peculiarities. But this identity implies not that one will is identical with the other, but rather that each at this stage remains an independent and private will. For two absolutely distinct and separate owners there is now formed one will while each of them ceases to be an owner through his own distinct will, the one will remains. Each will gives up a particular property, and receives the particular property of another, adopting only that conclusion with which the other coincides.

Since the two contracting parties appear as directly independent persons contract proceeds from arbitrary choice; the one will formed by the contract is the work merely of the two interested persons, and is thus a common, but not an absolutely universal will; the object of the contract is a single external thing, because only such a thing is subject to relinquishment at their mere option.

However, Marriage does not come under the conception of contract, this view is, we must say it, in all its shamelessness, propounded by Kant as little does the nature of the state conform

to contract, whether the contract be regarded as a compact of all with all, with the prince or government.³⁰⁴

Arendt holds that, in our today's society, neither potential lawbreakers nor law-abiding citizens need elaborate studies to led them that criminal acts will probably-which is to say, predictably-have no legal consequences whatsoever, we have learned, to our sorrow that organized crime is less to be feared. Than non- professional hoodlums who profit from opportunity and their entirely justified lack of concern about being punished, and this state of affairs is neither altered nor clarified by research into the public's confidence in our judicial system"³⁰⁵. This is so because of the contract we enter into with the state which ends up providing enabling grounds for violence.

Hegel further, articulated that, the introduction of the relations of contract and private property into the functions of the state has produced the greatest confusion both in the law and in real life. In earlier times civil rights and duties were thought and maintained to be a directly private possession of particular individuals in opposition to the rights of prince and state. In more recent years, also the rights of prince and state have been treated as objects of covenant. They are said to be based on contract, or the mere general consent of those who wish to form state, different as these two views of the state are, they agree in taking the phases of private property into another and a higher region. This will be referred to again when we come to speak of ethical observances and the state.

It is a popular view in modern times that the state is a contract of all with all, all conclude, so the doctrine runs, a compact with the prince, and he in turn with the subjects, according to this superficial view, there is in contract only one unity of different wills; but in fact there are two identical wills, both of which are persons, and wish to remain possessors. Contract, besides, arises out of the spontaneous choice of the persons, marriage, indeed, has that point in common with contract, but with the state it is different. An individual cannot enter or leave the social condition at his option, since everyone is by his very nature a citizen of a state, the characteristics of man as rational is to live in a state; if there is no state, reason claims that one should be founded. A state, it is true, must grant permission either to enter or to leave it; but this permission is not given in defence to arbitrary choice of the individual, nor is the state founded upon a contract which presupposes this choice. It is false to say that it rests with the arbitrary will of all to establish a

³⁰⁴ Ibid, op. cit, pp, 76, 77.

³⁰⁵ Hannah Arendt *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt brace companies, New York 1972, p, 71.

state; rather is it absolutely necessary for everyone to be in a state. The great progress of the modern state is due to the fact that it has and keeps an absolute end, and no man is now at liberty to make private arrangement ages.

Contract is formal when the two elements through which the common will arises, the negative disposal of the thing and the positive reception of it, are so divided, that one of the contracting parties makes one side of the agreement, and the other, the other. This is gift, contract is real when each of the remains an owner, this is exchange, couples to this, contract involves two agreements to two things; I both give up and acquire a property. Real contract occurs, when each yields up and acquires possession; in giving up he remains an owner. Formal contract occurs when a person only gives up or acquires.

In real contract everyone both keeps the same property as he had when he undertook, the contract, and also yields up his property, hence it is necessary to distinguish the property, which in contract remains permanently mines, from the external objects which change hands. The universal and self-identical element in exchange, that with regard to which the objects to be exchanged are equal, is the value.

By the very conception of contract of an annual the agreement, since the contractor, in disposing of his goods, must remain in possession of a quantitative equivalent. An injury may fairly be called enormous, if it exceeds half of the value: but it is infinite, when a contract or any stipulation is entered into to dispose of an inalienable good. A stipulation is only one single part or side of the whole contract, or a merely formal settlement, of which more hereafter. It contains only the formal phase of contract, the consent of one party to perform something, and the consent of the other party to accept the performance. It must, therefore, be classed amongst the so-called one-sided contracts, the division of contracts into one-sided and two-sided, and many other divisions of the same kind in Roman law, are superficial combinations, arising from some particular and external consideration, as, for instance, the way in which they are made. They may also introduce attributes which do not concern the nature of contract, such as those which have meaning only in reference to the administration of justice, and to the legal consequences and injure the conception of right.

The distinction between property and possession between the substantive and the external side assumes in contract the form of a distinction between the common will or agreement and the realization of this will in performance, is something imagined or symbolic, appearing in reality as

a visible sign. In stipulation it may be manifested by gesture or other symbolic act, but usually in an express declaration through speech, which is the most worth vehicle of thought.

Stipulation, is the form in which the content of a concluded contract is outwardly symbolized, (but this symbol is only the form, by this it does not mean) that the content is still merely subjective, merely a desideratum, but that the conclusion of the actual arrangement is made by the will.

As in property we had the distinction between property and possession, the substantive and the external, so in contract we have the difference between the common will as agreement and the particular will as performance. It is in the nature of contract that both the common and the particular wills should be manifested, because it is the relation of will to will. In civilized communities agreement, manifested by a sign, is separated from performance, although with ruder people they may concur. There is in the forests of Ceylon a tribe, which in trading puts down its property and waits patiently for the arrival of those who will place their property over against it; the dumb declaration of the will is not separated from performance.

As stipulation involves the will, it contains, from the standpoint of right, the substance of contract, in contract with this substantive contract the possession, which remains till the contract is fully carried out, has no reality outside of the agreement. I have given up a possession and my private control over it and it has already become the property of another, I am legally bound to carry out the stipulation.

Mere promise is different from contract, what I promise to do, give or perform, is future and a mere subjective qualification of my will. I am at liberty to change my promise. But stipulation is already the embodiment of my volition, I have disposed of my property, it has ceased to be mine, and I recognized it as already belonging to another. The Roman distinction between *partum* and contractus is not sound.

Fichte once lay it down that the obligation to hold to the contract began for me only when the other party began to do his share. Before performance I am supposed to be doubtful whether the other had been really in earnest, the obligation before performance is, therefore, said to be moral and not legal. The trouble is that stipulation is not merely external, but involves a common will, which has already done away with mere intention and change of mind. The other party may of course change his mind after the engagement, but has he any right to do so? For plainly I may choose to do what is wrong, although the other person begins to perform his side of the contract, Fichte's

view is worthless, since it bases the legal side of contract upon the bad infinite, that is, an infinite series, or the infinite divisibility of time, material and action. The embodiment of the will in gesture or a definite form of words is its complete intellectual embodiment, of which the performance is the merely.³⁰⁶

³⁰⁶Hegel, *Philosophy of Right*, translated by S.W. Dyde, Batoche Book limited, Canada, 2001, pp, 78,79,80.

PART THREE

CRITICAL EVALUATION AND PERSPECTIVES

CHAPTER 7
CONTRACTARIAN VIEWS AND SOME AFRICAN CRITIQUES CONTRARY TO
ADRENT.

Arendt's thought that civil disobedience and violence is a result of government inability to function in order which is incorrect, because to her she rather armed the citizens with reasons to revolt against their government which is bad, taking us backward to the negative era of the state of nature as explain in the Leviathan of John Locke that, it was too barbaric. This of course gives ways for the creation of the civil society due to man's insufficiency. Locke estimated that "conjugal society is made by a voluntary compact between man and woman; and thought it consist chiefly in such a communion of right in one another's body, as it necessary to its chief end, procreation; yet it draws with it mutual support and assistance, and a communism of interest too, as necessary not only to unite their care and affection, but also to be maintained by them, till they are able to provide for themselves."³⁰⁷

This is to say that man's potentials can fully be realised in a state, so individuals have no reasons to riot, violate or disobey state actions whatsoever. So, Arendt thought was a total deviation as can be seen from some contemporal Africans like,

Nkrumah's notion of unity in Africa stem from the negative role of colonialists, which left Africa with the spirit of revolt and Resistances as they were been exploited and by destroying their pride and personalities as human beings in their own continent. This spirit of revolutions instil in the African pave the way for civil disobedience and violence as well as terrorism. Nkrumah holds that "when the great scramble for Africa began in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, colonies had become a necessary appendage for European capitalism, which had then reached the stage of industrial and financial monopoly that needed territorial expansion to provide spheres for capital investment, sources of raw material, markets, and strategic points of imperial defence. Thus all the imperialists, without exception evolved the means, their colonial polices, to satisfy their ends, the exploitation of the subject territories for the aggrandizement of the metropolitan countries. They were all rapacious; they all sub served the needs the subject lands to their own demands; they all

³⁰⁷ John Locke, *Two Treaties of Government*, edited by Mark Goldie, Churchill College, Cambridge, Everyman publishing, London, 1993, p, 153.

circumscribed human rights and liberties they all expressed and despoiled, degraded and oppressed, They took our lands, our live, our resources, and our dignity. Without exception, they left us nothing but our resentment and later, our determination to be free and rise once more to the level of men and women who walk with their head held high³⁰⁸. This view of Nkrumah entails that he wanted Africans to get rid of colonial policies and their exhortative character which left Africa with the spirit of revolt, since most of these colonialist never wanted to grant independent to their colonies peacefully, this led to resistance and revolt till date. In this light Nkrumah further reiterated that, “when that time came and we show our resolution to be rid of them as unbidden and unwelcome foreign intruders, they still refused to go until we forced the issue. It was when they had gone and we were faced with the stark realities, as in Ghana on morrow of our independence that was brought sharply home to us. There were slums and squalor in our town’s superstitions and ancient rites in our village. All over the country, great tracts of open land lay untilled and uninhabited, while nutritional diseases were rite among our people. Our roads were meagre, our railways short. There was much ignorance and few skills, over eighty percent of our people were illiterates and our existing schools were fed on imperialist completely unrented to our background and our needs. Even during the first and second world war, African participated and learned the spirit of fighting with modern weapons brought by colonialists, leaving African with the spirit of violent.

7.1 THE HOBBSIAN VERSION OF THE SOCIAL CONTRACT

Even Thomas Hobbes in his version of the modern civil state, is different from Arendt as Hobbes holds that, “In this state, laws are enacted and put in place. Man could now own property and respect the property and interest of others. Right were conferred and duties imposed. In addition, government was introduced. The government was represented either by a single ruler or monarch or a college of such. The function of the government was chosen to enact laws and enforce them. No matter how bad it may be, the society under him is better than that in the previous state of nature. For that reason, his rule is absolute till death. In addition, the authority of the monarch must be obeyed and respected by the citizens, who must not rebel or revolt against it³⁰⁹. This

³⁰⁸ Nkwame Nkrumah, *Africa must unite*, publish by Frederick A. Praeger, University Place, New York, 1963, pp, XIII, XIV.

³⁰⁹ Samah Abang Mungwa, *Certificate Philosophy for Cameroon GCE*, Catwa Education, Yaounde, 2020, p, 497.

emphasized that the citizens are condemned by necessity to respect the laws of the rulers and that of the state not to disobey. This is further explained by Nkwame Nkrumah on the dynamism of violence in Africa orchestrated by western imperialism.

During and after colonialism, Africans have been struggling for self determination and liberty from the colonial yoke and colonists. These efforts of the Africans most often collided with resistances from their masters who in disguise claimed to have liberated Africans but their interest in African affairs like politics, education and economic exploitation still seems much more visible and otherwise has laid a very serious foundation for violence and revolutions across some parts of the continent. It is on this account the Ghanaian former politician and leader Nkwame Nkrumah in his famous book, *Africa must Unite* established that, “The realization was breaking upon the vast world of subject peoples that freedom is as much their inalienable right as it is of those who had set themselves over them on the pretext of bring them Christians and civilization. The ideas of freedom and democracy, which the western world was busily propagating to engage support for their cause, were being eagerly absorbed by those to whom they were not intended to apply. They were feeding the will to freedom in the overseas where their meaning was mostly felt and accepted. Turned by nationalists’ leaders to the interests of the struggle for political emancipation, they have helped to foment the revolt of the majority of the world’s inhabitants against their oppressors. Thus we have witnessed the greatest awakening ever seen on earth of suppressed and exploited peoples against the powers that have kept them in rejection. This without doubt, is the most significant happening in the twentieth century”³¹⁰.

These revolutions are the phenomenon’s that are shaping world politics and people’s life in the society. Arendt has it that “in the form of organisation, any original differentiation is effectively eradicated, in the same way that the essential equality of all men insofar as we are dealing with men, is destroyed. The downfall of politics in both directions has its origin in the way political bodies are developed out of the family. Here we have a hint of what becomes symbolic in the image of the Holy family – namely that god created not just man but family”³¹¹. Violence and revolutions only emerge when other members of the family take to their hands the decision to

³¹⁰ Nkwame Nkrumah, *African Must Unite*, publish in the United States of America by Frederick A Praeger, Inco. University Place, New York 3, 1963, p, X.

oppressed and exploit others which of course always force the other citizens to retaliate and resist the excesses of others thereby opening the way for violence revolutions and disorder.

Nkrumah reiterated by citing Mazzini that “every true revolution is a programmed; and derived from a new, general, positive and organic principle. The first thing necessary is to accept that principle. Its development must then be continuing to men who are believers in it, and emancipated from every tie or connection with any principle of an opposite nature.

These revolutions are the phenomenon’s that are shaping world politics and people’s life in the society. Arendt has it that “in the form of organization, any original differentiation is effectively eradicated, in the same way that the essential equality of all men insofar as we are dealing with man, is destroyed. The downfall of polities in both directions has its origin in the way political bodies are developed out of the family. Here we have a hint of what becomes symbolic in the image of the Holy family- namely that God created not just man but family”³¹² violence and revolutions only emerge when other member of the family take to their hands the decision to oppress and exploit other which of course always force the other citizens to retaliate and resist the excesses of others thereby opening the way for violence revolutions and disorder.

It is also important to note that, most colonial powers never wanted to liberate their colonies, reasons while they used a lot of tactics and lies to subjugate Africans from their true identity and liberty most of their lies self autonomy as the truth is been expose. It is on this that Antonio Maria Baggio in her article title *truth and politics* the loss of authoritativeness in contemporary politics cited Socrates that “Socrates represents the conflict between truth and politics in which opinion plays the lead role. Whether opinion is the true or false, it belongs to a different order from truth because it is not certain knowledge. Many people professed opinion over Socrates trial, which was effectively conducted by the civil authority in order to channel the proceedings in the desired direction and to determine the sentence from a philosophical standpoint, sycophants and sophists brought into the trial elements foreign to the truth but useful as instruments of the dialectics used by philosophers following Socrates in seeking the truth is distinguished from the latter precisely because it does not have the truth as its goal and orientation. The sophists, Plato observed do not use dialectic, but eristic, a form of struggle in which adversaries brandish opinions that are often only a camouflage for their real interests. Dialectic us the art of searching for truth

³¹² Hannah Arendt, *The Promise of Politics*, edited by Jerome Kohn, Schocken p, 94.

is replaced by theories the art of persuasion”³¹³ they always want to revolt. More provoking was during the colonial era when Africans were been deceive and taken as slaves and the pains they went through from their colonial masters pushed them to violent and revolution as Nkrumah described these phenomenon that, “colonialism and its attitudes die hard, like the attitudes of slavery, whose hangover still dominates behaviour in certain parts of the western hemisphere.

Before slavery, was practiced in the new world, there was no special denigration of Africans. Travellers to this continent described the inhabitants in their in records with the national curiosity and examination to be expected of individuals coming from other environment. It was when the slave trade and slavery began to develop the ghastly proportions that made them the base of capital accumulation which assisted the rise of western industrialism that a new attitude towards Africans emerged. Slavery in the Caribbean has been too narrowly identified with the man of colour. A racial twist has there by been given to what is basically an economic phenomenon. Slavery was not born of realism rather racism was consequence of slavery, with this racial twist was invented the myth of colour inferiority. This myth supported the subsequent rape of our continent with it despoliation and continuing exploitation under the advanced forms of colonialism and imperialism.”³¹⁴ Which of course left Africans with the spirit of violent and revolts.

These colonial tendencies were full of lies and exploitations of Africans which provoked some Africans to revolt. These colonial activities and attitude towards Africans actually left African with the spirit of rebellion as they are always in constant struggle and disagreement with colonial imprints Nkrumah have it that “the social effects of colonialism are more insidious them the political and economic. This is because they go deep into them minds of the people and therefore take longer to eradicate. The Europeans relegated us to the position of inferiors in every aspect of our everyday life; many of our people came to accept the view that we were an inferior people. It was only when the validity of that concept was questioned the stirrings of revolt began and the whole structure of colonial rule came under attack”³¹⁵

³¹³ Antonio Maria Baggio, *Truth and Politics*, The loss of authoritativeness in contemporal politics, sopia university institute, Claritas, journal of dialogue and culture, 2012, p, 47.

³¹⁴Nkwame Nkrumah, *Africa Must Unite*, Publish in the united state of America by Frederick A. Praeger, Inc New York, 1963, p, 1.

³¹⁵ Ibid, op.cit, p, 32.

This therefore confirm the fact that, the colonialists came to Africa to exploit African and brought in a lot of hardship and untold stories of economic and social stagnation worst of all their political agenda was to destroy and destabilized Africans, which of course open way for Africans to revandicated as they were been cheated, and look upon as beggars in their land. Thereby provoking them to violence and rebellion.

However, it is on this account that Hannah Arendt in an article evil and political resistance holds that, “the question of rights, and the relationship between the private and public, but she is often associated with her theory evil. First mentioned in her 1929 doctoral dissertation on love in Augustine. She continued to discuss the topic throughout her works, conceptually speaking, however, her analyses are more suggestive than developed.

She tends to describe individual behaviours, social practices, and political formations as evil without ever explaining what she means by the term or why those behaviours, practices, and formations qualify for nomenclature. This compounded by her habit of distinguishing between different versions of evil, including elemental”³¹⁶

This therefore implies that, colonial practices were basically evil as it deprived the people from their liberty and enjoyment in their environment. It is for this reason that some Africans began agitating against colonial imprints like Nkrumah who solicited a unity state in Africa for Africans to get rid of colonial malpractices, in a book Africa must unite Nkrumah stated that “it will be some time before all traces of colonialism will disappear from our society. Problems connected with heath, education, housing and having conditions generally, continue to remain us of the colonial period. We have much ground to make up, as a result of long years of being treated as an inferior people fit only to supposed not to be able to appreciate, or to need, any real measure of social improvement”³¹⁷

This deliberate disregard of the Africans provoked educated Africans like Nkrumah to start fighting towards independent of their societies and consequently the whole African continent to liberate the, from the bondage of colonialism which really provoked more counter- reactions and rebellion. It is important to note that the decline of the flourishing African state by colonialist after the first world war and the opening of the entrance to Africa in the 18th century by the Berlin

³¹⁶ Gavin Rae, Hannah Arendt, *Evil and Political Resistance*, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain pp, 125, 126.

³¹⁷ Nkwame Nkrumah, *Africa Most Unite*, p, 33.

conference orchestrated African slow development which provoked Africans and is still topical in Africa today, as the two wars experience by Africans which was purely a European affairs that introduced the used of weapons like guns in Africa and most of these weapons or guns are always been use to destabilize the African community by mischievous individuals either for political economic or social reasons, in this light, the spirit of civil disobedience, violence and revolutions remains a colonial imprint. It is on this account that Hannah Arendt stated that, “it is almost impossible even now to describe what actually happened in Europe on 4th August 1914. The days before and the days after first world war is separated not like the end of an old and the beginning of a new period, but like the day before and the day after an explosion. Yet this figure of speech is as inaccurate as are all others, because the quite of sorrow which settles down after a catastrophe has never come to pass. The First World War exploded the European comity of nations beyond repair, something which no other war had ever done. Inflation destroyed the whole class of small property owners beyond hope for recovery or new formation, which no monetary crisis had ever done so radically before. Unemployment, when it came, reached fabulous proportions, was no longer restricted to the working class but seized with insignificant exceptions whole nations.

Civil wars which ushered in and spread over the twenty years of uneasy peace were not only bloodier and more cruel than all their predecessor; they were followed by migrations of groups who, unlike their happier predecessors in the religious wars, were welcomed nowhere and remained homeless, and could be assimilated nowhere. Once they had left their homeland, once they have been deprived of their human right they were rightness, the scum of the earth. Nothing which was being done, no matter how stupid, no matter many people knew and foretold the consequences, could be undone or prevented, every event had the finality of a last judgment, a judgment that was passed neither by God nor by the devil, but looked rather like the expression of some unredeemable stupid fatality”³¹⁸.

This Arendtian views can clearly be seen deprived of their basic right and were taken away to western metropolitan western communities as slaves. Some were redeployed to Africa after the industrial revolution in sierra Leone, Liberia and more some did not even know their where about, those whose who remain in western world knew only that they were Africans and descendants. of

³¹⁸ Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, the world publishing company, Cleveland and New York, 1958, p, 267.

slaves, but did know exact communities in Africa, which is more annoying and provoking, which is and additional anger for civil disobedience, violence and revolutions in Africa.

It was more offending said Nkrumah that “with the close of the second world war there followed a change in the official outlook on these matters. Most established counties brought about tremendous alterations in the social pattern of their people by cleaning slums and launching vast housing schemes for the working population. These new ideas of popular housing, however never reached Africa. We could go on living as we had always lived. We knew no better what had been good enough for our great-grand parents could go on being good enough for us and our children.

The housing situation when we took office was shocking, it reflected what appeared to be a standard European view of the African attitude towards domestic shelter; anything that keeps off the rain and offers shade from the sun is good enough. The white man, living in his stone, brick or concrete house, seemed to think that the African “native” neither wanted nor needed an elaborate structure in which he and his family could live in comfort. It was considered enough for a few palm fronds and thatch to give shelter to the family living in the village and for an improvised shack with corrugated iron roof to serve the towns folks. This assumption was just another fact of the contemptuous regard of the African as a creature devoid of human sensibility”³¹⁹

This is to say that, when these housing situations were not extended to Africa and colonialists were exploiting the Africans for their aggrandizements was really shocking and provoking as most Africans revolted against these colonialists. Which of course is one of the roots causes of resistances and revolts in Africans, orchestrated by colonialists, Arendt better qualify it as the decline of the nation state and the end of the rights of man as she contended that “before totalitarian politics consciously attacked and partially destroyed the very structure of European civilization, the explosion of 1914 and it severed consequences of instability had sufficiently shattered the facade of Europe’s political system to lay bare its hidden frame. Such visible exposures were the sufferings of more and more groups of people to whom suddenly the rules of the world around them had ceased to apply. It was precisely the seeming stability of the surrounding world that made each group forced out of its protective boundaries look like an unfortunate exception to an otherwise sane and normal rule, and which filled with equal cynicism

³¹⁹ Nkwame Nkrumah, *Africa Must Unite*, published in the United State of America by Frederick A. Paeger, Inc New York, 1963, p, 34.

victims and observers of an apparently unjust and abnormal fate. Both mistook this civism for growing wisdom in the ways of the world, became more stupid than they ever had been before. Hatred, certainly not lacking in the pre-war world, began to play a central role in public affairs everywhere, so that the political scene in the deceptively quiet years of the twenties assumed the sordid and weird atmosphere of a string bargain family quarrel. Nothing perhaps illustrates the general disintegration of political life better than this vague, pervasive hatred of everybody and anything, without a focus for its passionate attention, with nobody to make responsible for the state of affairs-neither the government nor the bourgeoisie nor an outside power. It consequently turned in all directions, haphazardly and unpredictably. Incapable of assuming an air of health indifference toward anything under the sun”³²⁰

However, this is not withstanding some of these colonial imprint actually led to the decline of some African states an empires which factored in the mentality of civil disobedient, violence and revolutions as well as terrorism of which today is a growing concern in Africa given the rampant spread of the phenomena in almost all societies and government, these growing phenomena has accounted for lost of lives and properties across the globe Africa in particular. This is clearly seen a s most African countries be it north Africa, west Africa, south Africa, east or central Africa, there is severe rise of civil disobedience, violence and revolutions as well as terrorism some of which are been sponsored outside Africa, some due to bad governance and government inability to function in order, thereby provoking Africans elites and citizens to rebel against such abnormal practices which goes against the wish and aspiration of some Africans agitating for a positive change in political, economic and social wellbeing of the Africans as well as a speedy and meaningful development in the continent.

In an article Hannah Arendt, *evil and political resistance*, in the history of human science Gavin Rae emphasis that, the problem is that “the dark background of mere governess, the background formed by our unchangeable and unique nature, break into the political scene as the alien which in its all too obvious difference reminds us of the limitations of human activity which are identical with limitation of human equality developed political communities have actively fought against, this background difference by insisting on ethnic homogeneity to eliminate as far

³²⁰ Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, the world Publishing Company, Cleveland and New York, 1958, P 268.

as possible those national and always present differences and differentiations which by themselves arouse dumb hatred, mistrust, and discrimination. As a consequence, those considered to be alien to the required homogeneity are expelled from the community and, in so doing, refused the equality that defines those who accepted into the community. They become human beings and nothing else to partake in the human edifice. They come to belong to the human race in much the same way as animals belong to a specific animal species. Those excluded represent nothing but their own unique individuality which, deprived of expression within and action upon a common world, loses all significance.

Those political regimes have relied upon the notion of ethnic homogeneity and removed political status from the considered heterogeneous to make them non-political natural beings underpin Arendt's analysis of totalitarian regimes, which have, on her telling, taken this to its most extreme form. In so doing, they have given rise to some radical evil, previously unknown to us, the aim of which is not despotic rule over men but toward a system in which men are superfluous.

Paul Formosa suggests that, the claim that totalitarian regimes aim to make individuals superfluous is best understood in relation to Kant's ethical theory. Kant's categorical imperatives are based on the notion that ethical action requires the adoption of a moral maxim in which;

The human being and every rational being exists as an end in itself, not merely as a means to used by this or that will at its discretion; instead, he must in all his actions whether directed to himself or also to other rational beings, always be regarded at the same time as an end"³²¹

This therefore implies that, when individuals are treated as mere means is negative which always provoke violence and revolutions and in some case these rebellion activities in most cases often escalate to terrorism and wars. This notwithstanding is adequately what colonial administration orchestrated in African societies living them with the spirit of revolution, chaos and disorder. Nkrumah holds that, attempts were being made to bring about some amelioration, through the health services, but administrative policy did nothing to eliminate the economic conditions which assisted the incidence of death dealings and energy-depriving diseases and maladies. To some degree lack of education can also be blamed, because without knowledge superstition persist"³²²

³²¹ Gavin Rae, Hannah Arendt, *Evil and Political Resistance* History of Human Sciences Completeness University of Madrid, 2019, pp, 128, 129.

³²² Nkwame Nkrumah, *Africa must Unite*, p, 35.

This is so because Africans resisted white man's medicine because the Whiteman earlier betrayed them and provoked them to rebel. Nkrumah further stated that". The history of achievement illustrates that when an awakened intelligentsia emerges from a subject people it becomes the vanguard of the struggle against alien rule. There is a direct relation between this fact and the neglect of the Imperial powers to provide for the power growth of educational facilities in their colonies. I saw this connection quite soon in my career, and it was one of the main reasons why I became a teacher for a time. The tremendous enthusiasm for education in Africa never fails to impress visitors; a school boy once wrote "I think the happiest event in my life was the day when my father told me to go to school". Another said; the most unfortunate thing that could happen to me would be to have had no education or to be sent away from school now, for the all my life would be wasted. The burning desire for education among both children and adults received little encouragement from the colonial powers and one of the worst legacies of colonialism has been the absence of trained body of African technicians and administrators"³²³

In this African intellectual vanguard Nkrumah merit, that colonial education opened the eyes of the Africans to realized their oppress and exploitative policies, even through this colonial education was for colonial masters to be able to communicate with African so as to achieve their aims, this education betrayed them and punched Africans into conflict with their colonial mass as they rebel against them.

It is in this light this light that the prophetic African patriot strongly suggested and emphasis unity as in the law of nature all humans need to be free this can be explain when he contended that "freedom first" and further stipulated that" it is my deep conviction that all peoples wish to be free, and that the desire for freedom is rooted in the soul of every one of us. A people long subjected to foreign domination, however, does not always find it easy to translate that wish into action; under arbitrary rule, people are apt to become lethargic; their senses are dulled. Fear becomes the dominant force in their lives; fear of breaking the law, fear of the primitive measures which might result from an unsuccessful attempt to break loose from their shackles. Those who lead the struggle for freedom must break through this apathy and fear; they must give active expression to the universal longing to be free. They must strengthen the peoples' faith in themselves, and encourage them to take part in the freedom struggle. Above all, they must declare their aims openly and

³²³Nkrumah, *Africa Must Unite*, p, 43.

unmistakably and organize the people towards the achievement of their goal of self-government.”³²⁴

These Nkrumah’s views was a reawakening towards freedom and self determination, which of course conflicted with the views of the colonialists not to led free their colonist, which led to civil disobedience, violence and revolutions. This is because African is not objects but humans who deserve to live a better life like others in other continent reasons why Arendt on her thought on politics and revolution established that “the third world is a reality what’s more, a reality that was brought into being first by the western colonial power and later with the cooperation of the united states. And so it is not all surprising that this reality produced by capitalism should result, under the influence of world-wide and general indignation of youth, in a new ideology. However, the significant thing, I believe, is not this ideology of the new left, but simply the existence of the third world, the reality of the third world, which first made this ideology possible”³²⁵. That is the third world is not a reality but an ideology.

These conflicting views about the third world Africa included, provoked many Africans as the capitalists and colonial powers thought that, as a third-world continent they could be subjugated, oppress and their natural and human resources exploited these exploitation tendency led to violence and revolutions because Africans wanted to secure their liberty and freedom. From this Arendtian thought, it therefore implies that Nkrumah was right when he preached freedom first as he insisted that “the essential forger of the political revolution is a strong well-organized, broadly based political party, knit together by a programmed that is accepted by all members, who also submit themselves to the party’s discipline. Its program should aim for “freedom first”.

Seek ye first the political kingdom; became the principal slogan of the convention people’s party for without political independence none of own plans for social and economic development could be put into effect. There has been a good deal of talk about independent territories making them themselves viable before attempting to take upon themselves the responsibilities of self-government. That is precisely what they cannot do, as long as the government of less developed countries remains in the hands of colonial administrators, their economies is set to a pattern determined by the interests, not of the indigenous inhabitants but of the national beneficiaries of the ruling country. Improvement in living conditions for the bulk of the people will not come until

³²⁴ Ibid, p, 50.

³²⁵ Hannah Arendt, *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt brace and co, New York, 1972, p, 209.

political powers passes into their hands. Thus, every movement for independence in a colonial situation contains two elements; the demand for political freedom and the revolt against poverty and exploitation. Resolute leadership is required to subordinate the understandable desire of the people for better living conditions to the achievement of the primary aim of the abolition of colonial rule”³²⁶

For Africans to overcome these colonial policies they were revolutions, violence and chaos with colonial powers, which is still preoccupying in Africa today. This quest for liberty is fundamental and when it coincide with overzealous colonialist or those whose quest for powers is high the civil disobedience, violence and revolutions becomes the most unavoidable consequence. This is because for Nkrumah, “before the second world war, a number of political demonstrations and strikes took place in various parts of colonial Africa. The most common demands were for reforms; few people envisaged at that time the emergency of national political parties demanding independence”³²⁷.

Reasons why some African countries went through a lot of resistances chaos and disorder the quest for freedom made Africans suffer most, and the struggle for a united state of Africa aggravated it, as colonialist thought that permitting African to unite could act against their wishes. This explain why Kah Henry Kam of the University of Buea Cameroon, in his article: Africa must unite; vindicating Nkwame Nkrumah and writing Africa against global destruction, clearly explain Nkwame Nkrumah and the Africa must unite option as he struggle that “Dr. Nkwame Nkrumah in a coup d’état in 1966 actively contributed towards the liberation struggle and the needed for African unity in speeches, statements and books. His major preoccupation was for Africa to take its own destiny into its hands, as a mark of his unflinching commitment to the united states or a union government for Africa, he declared on the occasion of Ghana’s independence in 1957 that the country’s independence could only make meaning if all other Africa n people under colonial rule were liberated from the bondage of colonialism. Several important meetings, which included two conferences of independent African states and the “All African people’s conference held in Accra Ghana. “Within two years of independence the capital city of Ghana became the centre of diplomatic activities, which led to the liberation of African countries from colonial rule. The 1959

³²⁶ Nkwame Nkrumah, *Africa Must Unite*, United States America by Frederick A. Praeger, Inc New York, 1963, pp, 50,51.

³²⁷ Nkwame Nkrumah, *Africa Must Unite*, 1963, p, 51.

trade union conference established practical ways through which the rest of the countries still under colonial rule would be liberated and the independent African countries would unite”³²⁸

However, these hurdles and internal opposition to Nkrumah’s government, which culminated in his overthrow in 1966, did not dampen Nkrumah’s quest for a common position on all issues relating to Africa and the rest of the world. When he published his book *Africa must unite* in 1963, his other Casablanca group members of radical African states were against this and other proposals. Nkrumah in a speech to the Ghanaian National Assembly made his views loud and clear when he said, “this new Africa of ours is emerging into a world of great combinations—a world where the weak and the small are pushed aside unless they unite their forces”. In many of his other speeches like the one delivered during an organization of African unity (OAU) summit conference in Cairo Egypt, on 19th July, 1964, among other things, Nkrumah said unequivocally that “we must unite for economic viability, first of all and the to recover our mineral wealth in southern Africa, so that our vast resources and capacity for development will bring prosperity for us and additional benefits for the rest of the world. That is why I have written elsewhere that the emancipation of Africa could be the emancipation of man (Nkrumah 1964)”³²⁹

In these statement, one realize that Nkrumah knew that the benefits of unity were many and included the recovery of vast mineral wealth of the continent to benefit Africa and not those who wanted to exploit them, as stated by Henry Kam Kah. It should be noted that, these Nkrumah’s statement course conflicted with their colonial master’s interest that led to revolutions in some parts of Africa.

Hennery further emphasis that “similarly, in a notes on *Africa must unite*, Nkwame Nkrumah argued convincingly that, no single part of Africa can be safe, or free to develop fully and independently, while any part remains un-liberated, or while Africa’s vast economic resources continue to be exploited by imperialist and neo-colonialist interests. Unless African is politically united under an All-Africa union Government, there can be no solution to our political and economic problem (Nkrumah, 1963).

In this regard, Nkrumah frown against exploitation and destruction of Africa by the colonial masters in his speeches and publication as he experience disunity among African leaders which

³²⁸ Henry Kam Kah, *Africa Must Unite*, vindicating Nkwame Nkrumah and uniting Africa against destruction, the journal of pan-Africa studies vol. 4 no, 10, 2012, p, 28.

³²⁹ *Ibid*, op.cit, p, 29.

was a total failure because to him “the cajolement, the weed lings, the seductions and the Trojan horses of neo-colonialism must be shortly resisted, for neo-colonialism is a latter-day harpy, a monster which entice it victims with sweet music”³³⁰

This therefore entails that, the sweet and flattered policies of the Whiteman was to deceived Africa as the pretended to preach Christianity and good life for Africans mean while it was for their interest as they disguise as missionaries and evangelists, this of course met with serious native resistance. Whereby violence and revolutions were the regrettable outcome and still persist today in diverse forms, as one can clearly see chaos, disorder and terrorism in Africa because this neo-colonialism is a monster that must be resisted as Nkrumah described it, politically, economically and it socio-cultural predicaments.

7.2 John Locke’s Notion

Arendt’s misconception that the law is dead due to the increase of crimes in society fail to see that, it was ignorant of citizens due to poor educational training for them to observe as Locke that “God having made man such as a creature, that in his own judgment, it was not good for him to be alone, but put him under strong obligations of necessity, convenience and inclination to drive him into society, as well as fitted him with understanding and language to continue and enjoy it. The first society was between man and wife, which gave beginning to that between parent and children; to which, in time, that between master and servant came to be added and though all these might and commonly did meet together and make up one family wherein the master or mistress of it had some sort of rule proper to a family each of these or all together came short of political society”³³¹. Why then should citizens disobey the government rulers and laws of their land? Arendt thoughts therefore need modification.

Violent and barbaric acts in Africa as a legacy of colonial imprint, some of these barbaric acts and revolutions is because some Africans have access to modern weapon smuggled into the continent to antagonize Africans and destabilize them so much so that they can be fragile for easy manipulation, politically, economically and socially for their interest, the advance metropolitans’ countries. These manipulations are either to sell their weapons or to exploit the natural resources

³³⁰ Ibid, p, 30.

³³¹ John Locke, *Two Treaties of Government*, Edited by Mark Goldie, Churchill College, Cambridge, and Everyman published company, London, 1993, p, 153.

of the Africans for their selfish gain, because they believe that they are more superior to the Africans and treat them as such. It is on this account that Cheikh Anta Diop stated that “For social anthropology, all sociological phenomena, and class relations, wealth, distribution of cities, political events, are explained by biological consideration by the presence or absence (the degeneration) of the character traits of the superior race, the Homo Europeans. G. Vacher de Lopoige developed Gobineau’s racist theory at the end of the 19th century, in an article published of wealth, which stipulated that in the mixed Europeans alpinic countries wealth grows in inverse ratio to the cephalic indicator. The law of urban of indicators which proclaimed that inhabitants of cities are much more dolichocephalic those of the surrounding country side; according to the “law of stratification” the cephalic indicator decreases and the proportion of dolichocephalic increase from the interior to the superior classes in each locality.

According to A. Rosenberg, as quoted by Cheickh the French revolution was only a revolt at the brachycephalics of the Alpine race against the dolichocephalism of the Nordic race, and Bolshevism was nothing but an insurrection of monogoloids”³³²

This is exactly the kind of revolution that took place in Africa where Africans wanted to discard the western ideologist of superiority, which of course instil in the spirit of violence and revolution till date, these barbaric attitude implanted by western in Africa is responsible for most military takeover in Africa and coup d’états in Africa carefully orchestrated by colonialist to manipulate African. It is on this account that Arendt, on race thinking before racism contented that, “if race-thinking were German invention, as it has been sometimes asserted, then “German thinking”(whatever that may be) was victorious in many parts of the spiritual world long before the Nazis stated their ill-fated attempt at world conquest. Hitlerism exercised its strong international and inters European appeal during the thirties because racism, although a state doctrine only in Germany, had been a powerful trend in public opinion everywhere. The Nazis political war machine had long been in motion when in 1939 Germany tanks began their march of destruction, since- in political ally than any paid agent or secret organization of fifth columnists”. Strengthened by the experiences of almost two decades in the various capitals, the Nazis were confident that their best “propaganda” would be their racial policy itself, from which, despite many other compromises and broken promises, they had never severed for expediency’s sake. Racism

³³² Cheikh Anta Diop, *Civilization or Barbarism*, an Authentic Anthropology Lawrence Hill books, Brooklyn, New York, 1991.

was neither a new nor a secret weapon though never before had it been used with this thoroughgoing consistency”³³³

However, she proceeded to established that “the historical truth of the matter is that race-thinking, with its roots deep in the 18th century, emerged simultaneously in all western countries during the 19th century. Racism has been the powerful ideology of imperialistic policies since the turn of our century, it certainly has absorbed and revived all the old patterns of race opinions which, however by themselves would hardly have been able to create or for that matter, to degenerate into racism as a weltanschauung or an ideology. In the middle of the last century, race opinions were still judged by the yardstick of political reason, Tocqueville wrote to Gobineau about the latter’s doctrine, “they are probably wrong and certainly pernicious; not until the end of the century were dignity and importance accorded race-thinking as though it had been one of the major spiritual contributions of the western world”³³⁴

This race thinking before racism did not go without reactions from those who were been discriminated upon worst of all in African continent whereby the whites believe that, their colour was more superior to that of the Africans till today emphasized that “until the fateful days of the “scramble for Africa” race-thinking had been one of the many free opinions argued and fought each other to win the consent of public opinion. Only a few of them became fully fledged ideologies, that is systems base upon a single opinion that proved strong enough to attract and persuade a majority of people and broad enough to lead them through the various experiences and situations of an average modern life. For an ideology differs from a simple opinion in that it claims to posses either the key to history, or the solution for all the riddles of the universe” or the intimate knowledge of hidden universal laws which are supposed to ruled natural and man. Few ideologies have won enough prominence to survive the hard competitive struggle of persuasion, and only two have come out on top an essentially defeated all others; the ideology which interprets history as an economic struggle of classes, and the appeal of both to large masses was so strong that they were able to enlist state support and establish themselves as official national doctrine. But far beyond the boundaries within which race thinking and class-thinking have developed into obligatory patterns of thought, free public opinion has adopted them to such an extent that not only

³³³ Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of Totalitarianism* the World Publishing Company, Cleveland and New York, 1958, p, 158.

³³⁴ *Ibid*, p, 158.

intellectuals but great masses of people will no longer accept a presentation of past or present facts that is not in agreement with either of these views”³³⁵

This economic scramble in Africa by western imperialists around the 18th century provoked a lot of violent and revolutions in Africa as a struggle for equality and liberty given that the whites believe that, because of their colour, they were more superior to the Africans as seen during the period of apartheid in south Africa. The violence and revolution was a clear hand work of colonial masters, even today it is still very common in Africa and some parts of the world which is quite regrettable as an inhuman treatment. It is on this account that Hannah Arendt generously emphasis on equality of all human races in the world as jealously cited by Jennifer Kentaro Byarugaba in her thesis. *How love of truth led to radical good*, Hannah Arendt’s philosophical journey when she lengthily stated on the equality as a political concept that” These human treatments pushed Arendt to emphasize on the quality as cited by Jennifer Kentaro that “one of the outstanding and defining qualities of the polis is that it made men equal. They were made equal because men are by nature not born nor created equal and they needed this created space to equalize them as citizens. Arendt explains that, “the equality of the Greek polis, its isonomy, was an attribute of the polis and not of men, who received their equality by virtue of citizenship, not by virtue of birth”. In other words, there is equality by virtue of citizenship and another equality that is by virtue of birth of interest is the former. As opposed to Hobbes, Arendt saw man as being a social before he is a “political animal” who has nothing in common with Hobbes so called state of nature she however, refers to equality in the political realm which, she claims, is different from our concept of equality. Rather, equality in the political realm meant; “to live among and to have to deal only with one’s peers and it presupposed the existence of unequal who as a matter of fact, were always the majority of the population in a city-state.

Our human nature is something that all share as men, in this sense, men are inherently equal in as far as human dignity and other qualities that make men, human beings are concerned. However, existentially, all men are individuals and therefore unique, Arendt’s emphasis in this is the individual’s man was made equal as a political being among his peers in the polis. “The polis

³³⁵ Ibid, p, 159.

was distinguished from the household in that it knew only “equals” where as the household was the centre of the strictest inequality”³³⁶

This alone is enough to provoke violence, civil disobedience and revolution as can be seen across African countries carefully fashioned in by colonial imprints with their negative tendencies of exploitations and overzealous superiority of race and social classes as they always claim to be Cheikh Anta Diop highlighted that “all the social revolutions that have intervened since the age of polished stone, no matter how radical, have not succeeded in completely wiping out the original clanic structures, which still remain embedded in our respective societies and are recognizable by numerous characteristics.

A modern European language like French reflects, in its deep structures the nomadic indo-European institutions unfavourable to the women; there is no proper word in French to express the murder of father or brother respectively are used; parricide=murder of one’s father, or one’s mother by extension. Fratricide = murder of one’s brother one’s sister by extension”³³⁷

This is to say that, all these immoral acts matted on Africans by the western oriental are not necessary because we are all brothers and sisters, and we are all human beings and sisters, and we are all human beings and products of God’s creations, so it is bad to inflict pains on a people and instil in them the spirit of rebellion and revolts some of these revolutions as Diop stated are mostly because of some causes and condition such as”

The economic functions of the state and its relations with village communities

The characteristics of village production

The fundamental contradiction in societies defined by this mode of production.

The administration of land in these societies

The role of commerce and urban life in these societies

The economic functions of the state have a direct relation to the conditions and reasons of its creation. It will be remembered that a whole community must accept a supraclannish authority transcending tribal self interests, it must be able to act, at the beginning at least, for the greater good of all, for the survival of all “citizens” of the state without exception and not only in the

³³⁶ Jennifer Kentaro Byarugaba, *How Love of Truth Led to Radical Good*, Hannah Arendt’s Philosophical Journey, Universidad De Navarra, Pamplona, 2018, p, 94.

³³⁷ Ibid, p, 113.

interests of all small minority group of “Eupatridae” that is those of noble birth, or the “conquerors”.

The public, economic, social and military usefulness of the state is therefore an indisputable, tangible fact in the eyes of the entire community. As long as the state does not betray its mission, it may as much without fear of being disobeyed or encountering resistance, because the ideological, religious, and social superstructure has been intensely experienced by the group, it does not feel alienated when the state requires work from it. This is how tasks were accomplished that today amazes us, from the great pyramids of the Incas to the Celtic megaliths”³³⁸

He further emphasize that Marx calls this type of work “generalized slavery” as opposed to the private slavery that was practiced in the individualistic societies of the Greco-Latin city-states. Does this concept really explain the unique and complex relations that existed between states type and their citizens? Does it not misrepresent the reality of things to a certain extent by its Eurocentrism? By definition, is not the slave the individual who has the feeling of having lost his freedom? This slave becomes an actor in history only to the extent that he is fully conscious of his alienation and actively tries to change his condition. A slave who is unaware of having lost his freedom will play no trouble demonstrating his status as a slave; such would be the case of the citizen in a society. We will examine the circumstances under which this citizen came to change his attitude historically.

Besides, slaves have never been responsible for any historical revolution, except perhaps the one took place in Bagdad in the eleventh century A.D; revolutions have always been made by free men of humble station.

Only a free man, made a slave, rebels; the slave born into the second generation (diam njudu in wolif) already has the outlook of a lumpen-proletarian, who is less inclined to revolt, this is an error that almost all theoreticians continue to make: the theoretical agent of revolution has never, or almost never, carried it out anywhere.

In conclusion, the public role of the state is more obvious than that of the individualistic Greco-Roman city-state, the people of the first type of state are, with all due allowances, less revolutionary, having less desire for change than those of the second type of state.

³³⁸ Cheikh Anta Diop, *Civilization or Barbarianism*, an Authentic Anthropology, Lawrence Hill Books, Brookilyn, New York, 1991, pp, 135, 136.

According to Marx, as cited by Cheikh village communities live in a closed economic system, and Marx sees in this economic autarchy, this “immutability”, one of the reasons for the “stagnation of the state”

The divorce between work and working conditions does not materialize; agriculture and local industry are part of village activity. Now, for Marx, the condition of capitalist productions; the village peasant masses must be expropriated in order for them to become alienated workers, no longer owning any means of production and having only their labour to sell, either to the country farmer or to the boss of the urban enterprise; this wage-earnings functioning of the necessary and insufficient condition for the birth and functioning of the capitalist system that must lead to revolution, by the uprising of the exploited masses.

We realize that this principal condition will be met in the Egyptian and Chinese societies that revolutions will break out without the resulting revolutionary movements ever leading to victory; the study of the cause of these failures is what will furnish truly new elements to sociological or revolutionary theory.

What is called the fundamental contradiction of societies is the fact that “state capitalist” production develops on community bases characterized by the collective appropriation of the land. The society does not appear to have enough internal forces to carry this contradiction to its conclusion, i.e. the dissolution of collective ownership and the appearance of individual private ownership of land.

We still see that the facts are more complex and that societies (Egypt and chine), during periods of anarchy and social decomposition, had a regime of private alienable ownership of the land.

The role of commerce and urban life: The average density of the population, the greatest in antiquity, reached two hundred inhabitants per square kilometre in the Nile valley, ancient Egypt was par excellence the country whose towns bulged with multitudes of completely detribalized individuals and in which commerce with all known regions of the time flourished, “Ulysses carried cargo to Egypt” business people from all over the Mediterranean coast could settle in Egypt and open shops under certain conditions. From the time of Psamtik I, in the seventh century BC... Greek was authorized to settle in the port of Naucratis, in the Nile delta, to do business. A Greek vase of the fifth century B.C (among other objectives) representing an Amazon, found in a pyramid in Nubia, gives an idea of the extent of this commerce, which was already active in the Neolithic

period all along the shores of the Mediterranean, as shown by the pottery unearthed and the chemical analysis of amber beads.

So many facts show that the ideas that were held about the singularity of commerce in the individualistic slave regimes of the city-states were wrong and must be corrected. Cities and commerce were not peculiarities of these regimes, they were also found in West Africa of the middle Ages, as well see below. Commerce occupied so important a place in the economic life of Mali and Songhai that the emperor used to name a head of the market. It is erroneous to attribute such commerce to the state, in order to make one's point. And to decree that only private ownership of the land can bring forth private commerce: in Greece, after the victory of the aristocracy over the royalty, with the feudalization from the durians, lived in the country on large private properties where they were served by a mass of slaves and clients working on their estates; the multitude of all these landowners excluded any notion of collective or state ownership of the land, or of commerce for the profit of the state.

Ownership of the land can engender private commerce only when the land is exclusively reserved for the Eupatridae and the plebeians must resort to commerce in order to make a living; and this is indeed what happened in Greece before the peoples' revolutions, at the time when the domestic religion of the Eupatridae forbade ownership of the land by the homeless. This individualistic, patriarchal religion, inherited from nomadic life, had indexed all possible and imaginable goods, as in Aryan India, and stamped them with its seal, in order to forbid their possession by the plebs; it overlooked only money, which did not exist, and secular commerce, unworthy of a great lord. In order to survive and live outside the cities that were so long forbidden to the, the common people did not have any choice: they were forced to turn to commerce and usurious lending; in fact, they accumulated wealth in the same proportion that the landowning nobility became poorer, pauperized to the point that very often, between the sixth and fourth centuries, the nobility, in order to rebuild its fortunes, had to marry plebeians. A famous quip of the times ran; "of what birth is this man?"-"wealthy"

From then on, the money of those who originally did not have the right to own land, that plebs who had now become bourgeois, opened the doors of the great noble landowners who were now in need; those are the very special, even exceptional, reasons that explain the development of commerce in the individualistic regimes of Greece and its city-states. Therefore, there is no

necessary and sufficient, logical relationship between private ownership of land and the development of commerce, not even to increase the value of land as Maurice Godelier believes.

To sum up, the distinctive elements cited above, namely, “generalized slavery”, the administration of land ownership and the fundamental contradiction of the societies, the domestic type of village economy, the importance of urban life, and individual as opposed to state-owned commerce, all these factors developed sufficiently here and there in the societies to engender germs of dissolution leading to true revolutions, which indeed broke out later failed. That being the case, the specificity of the state, as heretofore discussed no longer matters.

Indeed, whatever the virtues or failings of the societies, they ended up being questioned by the people, who attempted to overthrow them through authentic revolutionary movements, as in the individualistic societies of the Greco-Latin city-states. Once more, why did revolution succeed in the individualistic city-states and fail without exception in the community states, or even individualistic states (but Asian inform due to the vastness and complexity of the state machinery, as in Rome)?

That is the big question that cannot be evaded, not knowing how to answer the question, the theoreticians have avoided asking it up to now, revolutionary movements in the states and that the social convulsions that arose and developed there were only vulgar Jacqueries that could not be taken for revolutions. It is against this erroneous manner of seeing the problems, which almost amounts to a Eurocentric attitude that we speak out. It is as if those holding this position elevate to the dignity of revolution only those movements that “succeeded”. However, the Paris commune and the Russian revolution of 1905 show that not all revolutions are successful and that sometimes the cases that fail are more instructive.

We will now undertake to demonstrate that there were authentic revolutionary movements in the societies and that the study of the causes of their failures alone might renew the theory in this area. We will successively review: the Osirian evolution in Egypt, sometimes referred to as “proletarian”, the first in the history of the universe, which marked the end of the ancient Empire (2100BC); and the Chinese revolution of An Lu-Shan during the T’ang period, in the ninth century AD”³³⁹

Egypt in Africa was not the only country affected that led to the collapse of ancient empire but many other African countries and the revolutions are still going in diverse forms.

³³⁹ Ibid, pp, 137,138,139.

From Judeo-Christian history of creation in the book of Genesis, it is evident that, man is a socio-political animal. The human will to power is highlighted in this story where man seeks to take the place of God in the universe, specifically, the stories about the Tower of Babel. Cain and Abel are concrete examples; those with power portray the spirit of domination, which can be manifested in the superiority of the rich over the poor, the strong over the weak and the whites over the blacks for socio-political, economic and cultural seasons. Which in some ways always inculcate the spirit of revolutions for stance, colonialism which was a form of oppression, exploitation and domination of the weaker party by the stronger one? This is seen in the domination of the European countries over African countries for instance, Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Spain and Portugal were colonial masters of Africa. Nkwame Nkrumah referred to this phenomenon as "up rootedness of being" in Africa which was one of the major cause of civil disobedience, violence and revolutions in Africa as it deprive Africans of their freedom, rights and values as human beings with an identity.

This is because colonialism brought the culture of capitalism and selfishness in the African milieu, negative values that are stringed to the intrinsic nature of the Africans. Some Africans thinkers like Nkrumah frowned upon this phenomenon by calling for a radical change in order to restore the lost values of Africa. Which equally spark up chaos in some if not all parts of Africa, however, the revolutionary scholar Walter Rodney in his book *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* summarizes that "the question as to who and what is responsible for African underdevelopment can be answered at two levels? Firstly, the answer is that, the operation of the imperialists system bears major responsibility for African economic retardation by draining African wealth and making it impossible to develop more rapidly the resources of the continent. Secondly, one has to deal with those who manipulated the system and those who are either agents or unwitting accomplices of the said system. The capitalists of Western Europe were the ones who actively extended their exploitation from inside Europe to cover the whole of Africa. In recent times, they were joined, and to some extent replaced, by the capitalists from the United States; and for many years now even the workers of those metropolitan countries have benefited from the exploitation and underdevelopment of Africa"³⁴⁰.

³⁴⁰ Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, panaf publishing Abuja Nigeria, PXII.

This is to say that civil disobedience, violence and revolutions in Africa is as a result of such obnoxious practices

7.3 ROUSSEAU NOTION OF POSITIVE LIBERTY

However, Rousseau's views are different from Arendt's thought in that "To him, in the state of nature man entertained an extra-social relationship with fellow man; he argued that man is extra-social and friendly towards his kind. To him state of nature was a peaceful and down-to-earth time. People lived solitary uncomplicated lives. The few needs were easily satisfied by nature. Because of the abundance of nature and the small size of the population, competition was non-existent and persons rarely even saw one another much less had reason for conflict or fear. Moreover, the simple morally pure persons were naturally endowed with the capacity for pity and therefore were not inclined to bring harm to one another."³⁴¹ So why should people voluntarily associate to disobey or violate established order of the society?

This conception of violence and civil unrest in Africa today has taken a different dynamics caused by colonializers as Walter Rodney would have it. The Whiteman colonial policies left Africa under develop and with the spirit of violence, terrorism and revolutions either within themselves or against the westerners, this is because the black man seems to pay very dearly for carrying the white's man burden even to the extent of recruiting Africans as slaves, economically and evidently enough, European exploitation of Africa functioned well in the interest of the colonialists.

It should be noted that, these colonialists built schools railroads, hospitals among others were amazingly small to that which they exploited from Africa, and the sole objective in these institutions like schools hospitals churches and roads was to satisfy their greedy ends for instance, roads was to transport raw materials exported to their respective countries, hospitals were to ensure their health due the tropical climate and malaria, and also to ensure the health conditions of their slaves who were labourers and porters. So it was quite exploitative and oppressive, which left some Africans countries to revolt, hence was. The spirit of civil disobedience and violence was inculcated

Interestingly, the first three decades of colonialism almost nothing was that could be qualify as services to the African, and by the end of the first decade of Africa independence, in areas of

³⁴¹ Samah Abang Mungwa, *Certificate Philosophy for Cameroon G.C.E*, Catwa Education Yaounde, 2020, p, 498.

health, housing and education were several time more than what they inherited from the colonialists, this entails that the metropolis were really and are really armed bandits this explain why Rodney contented that, “ capitalism did bring social services to European workers, firstly, as by-product of providing such services for bourgeoisie and the middle class, and later as a deliberate act of policy-mouthing remote comparable occurred in Africa. In 1934, expenditure for social services in the British Isles amounted to €6 15s per-person. In Ghana, the figure was 7/4d per person, and that was high by colonial standards, in Nigeria and Nyasaland; it was less than 1/9d per head. None of the other colonizing powers were doing any better and some much worse”³⁴²

“However, the central inner-European event of the Imperialist period was the political emancipation of the bourgeoisie, which up to them had been the first class in history to achieve economic pre-eminence without aspiring to political rule”³⁴³ as stated by Hannah Arendt. This was a deviation because they wanted to underdevelop Africa for their interest.

This clearly shows that, Europe actually underdeveloped Africa leaving Africans with the spirit of revolts, worse of all colonialists like the Portuguese boasted the most and did the least, they claimed that Angola, guinea and Mozambique was their possessions for 500years, during the era when civilizing mission were on-going during this time the Portuguese have not trained even a single African doctor in Mozambique, and life expectancy in eastern Angola was less than 30years, worse among was guinea-Bissau was even more neglected than Angola and Mozambique. All these are reflections on how the white man exploited and oppressed Africa, leaving Africa in the worse dilemma of development, which today is one of the major concern and growing debates not only in African continent but also in some of this western dominated countries, and some African Diaspora, nationalists, pan-Africanists, argue the matter with a lot of emotion as a nostalgia.

This alone is also the issue that is responsible for, civil disobedience, violence, terrorism and revolutions in Africa aside bad governance. However, few social amenities in Africa within this colonial era clearly indicate the domination and exploitation of the Africans by the westerners. This is because these colonialists wanted to have luxuries and better living condition in Africa

³⁴² Walter Rodney, *How Europe under developed Africa*, panaf published, Abuja, Nigeria, 2005, pp, 247,248.

³⁴³ Hannah Arendt, *The origin of totalitarianism*, meridian books, the world publishing company, Cleveland and New York, 1958, p, 123.

since a handful of them escape from poverty in their respective countries. For Instance colonies like Algeria, Kenya and worse of all South Africa, the whites created infrastructure for their interest. Despite the huge profits they make from mining industries in Africa, this explains why Rodney explains that.

“The south, the southern part of Nigeria was one of the colonial areas that was supposed to have received the most from a benevolent mother country Ibadan, one of the most heavily populated cities in Africa, had only about 50 Europeans before the last war for those chosen few, the British colonial government maintained a segregated hospital service of 11 beds in well furnished surrounding these were 34 beds for the half million blacks. The situation was repeated in other areas, so that altogether the 4000 Europeans in the country in 1930s had 12 modern hospitals, while the African population of at least 40 million had 52 hospitals”³⁴⁴

This is really deplorable how the colonial masters treated Africans in their home lands as there were oppressed, exploited and disregarded. And today Africans are still living in this misery as they are in a disguise decolonization process whereby colonial power still influence the political, economic and social affairs of the Africans and of course exhibiting tension, violence and revolutions across some African countries. It is really difficult to despite the fact that, colonial policies were the most part to develop themselves and their countries. This is to say that, colonialism introduced in Africa some elements of capitalism in all spheres, where communalism came into contact with the money economy, and subsequently, cash-crops farming and wage labour led away from extended family as a system and basis for production and distribution.

It is in this context that Rodney in his book *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* stated from one South African saying that “the Whiteman has no skin, his skin is money” this clearly distinguishes the era of the pre-capitalists society with the capitalists society and when this capitalists system was introduced it eroded the communal practice in Africa, since money and gifts became the order of things at the expense of kinship ties, and extended family system in Africa which was a strong force and base for Africa development as well as the spirit of solidarity and fraternity among the African people.

³⁴⁴ Ibid, pp, 249,260,261.

This clearly explains why sentiments and the spirit of solidarity among the Africa indigent greatly reduced living them with the spirit of civil disobedience violence and revolution.

It is obvious that, these capitalist do not set but rather to subjugate and eliminate competition so some of these capitalist even had clashes with the middleman who were equally benefiting from compared the bourgeoisie.

However, it is important to note that, some of the few social amenities African benefited from colonialism were relatively small and were not even gifts from the colonialists but were rather fruits of African labour and resources. So what the colonialists claimed to have developed African was rather a paradox for over exploitation of African resources towards the advancement of their capitalists and heavily industrialized countries. This clearly indicate that, the advent of colonialism towards Africa had a long lasting negative impact, as Africans are now left with the spirit and question on how to better develop their continent, which has equally coincided with the spirit of violence and revolutions as they started resisting the colonialists.

It is equally important to note that, during this periods of colonialism, most colonial nations greatly experience rapid progress than ever before and even when further to grow faster in technology whereby they even entered the nuclear age, due to raw materials collected from Africa, while Africa mark time or even to move slowly while others leap ahead this can be better qualify as going or moving backwards. This exploitative and oppressive mechanism is what push or urge Africans to raise up against their colonial masters by revolting against certain obnoxious practices however, this spirit of revolt actually laid the foundation for civil disobedience and violence in Africa as they lost power to the capitalists and colonialist.

Regrettably, power to the ultimate determinant of any human society and it is basic as it determine. The relations between any group and within any groups, reasons Rodney said that; “it implies the ability to defend one’s interest and if necessary to impose one’s will by any means available”³⁴⁵.

This is so because, with regard to the relation between people, the question of power always arise and when this happens, people begins bargaining for their interest and the extent to which

³⁴⁵I bid, p, 271.

other people respect the interest of others becomes questionable. As in most cases the issue of people to survive as a physical and cultural entity becomes problematic as when one society or community find itself forced to relinquish or surrender power entirely to another which pave the way for underdevelopment, violence, and revolution becomes the unavoidable outcomes.

All of the above was accelerated by the colonialists as the Tunisian thinker Albert memmi contented that, “The most serious blow suffered by the colonized is being removed from history and from the community. Colonization usurps any role in either war or peace every decision contributing to this destiny and that of the world, and all cultural and social responsibility”³⁴⁶

This therefore entails that, the removal of history is equivalent in removal of power as colonialism represented because Africans could not act independently and consciously in accordance to their history and culture identities.

Politically, it is too disheartening and ergo- provoking that some of these colonial masters choose rulers in Africa these rulers were puppets and to serve for colonial interest as the case whereby the French and the Portuguese had the habit of always choosing their African chiefs. The British went further by creating warrant chiefs at Iboland and their main intention was to maintain their superiority, this in most case angered the local population who hated such local stooges. This is exactly how the Africans lost power to the colonialists and today the nostalgia is to regain our Africanity which is causing more harm as some of these stooges are resisting relinquishing western domination over Africa. These resisters from the lineage of colonialism are the reasons why civil disobedience, violence, terrorism and revolutions are in the rise in Africa.

In this regard, colonial rule was meant to effectively eradicate African political power throughout other to weaken the spirit of solidarity and fraternity that existed among them reasons why the divide and rule system was implemented, the Belgian and whites racist consciously promoted this practice, in south Africa by 1950s the white racists quickly develop the oppressed African population as Zulu, as Xhosa and as Sotho, so that the wider African spirit of solidarity could be stopped to contradict with European overlords”³⁴⁷

³⁴⁶ Ibid, p, 272.

³⁴⁷Ibid, pp, 273, 277.

However, “that statement, who thought primary in terms of the established national territory, were suspicious of imperialism was justified enough except that more was involved than what they called “overseas adventures”. They knew by instinct rather than by insight that, this new expansion movement, in which “patriotism... Is best expressed in money-making” and the national flag is a commercial asset” could only destroy the political body of the nation-state. Conquest as well as empire building, had fallen into dispute for very good reasons”³⁴⁸

It is understood that, this territorial expansion was in Africa as a fertile place for European Imperialists for their egoistic interest. That is why the civil war in Nigeria was generally looked upon as a tribal affair. Educationally, the Whiteman introduced a system of education in Africa which is in contrast with the need of the people, this is to say that African education was relevance to Africans because there was no difference between education and productive activity, which means that, their theory match with practice, equally there was no distinction between manual and intellectual education which means that, their system match with realities. However, this issue on education is quite crucial because it is a phenomenon of social change in any given community or society.

In this regard, education provide the scheme and syllabus for citizens to follow a pedagogic structure for instance Rodney stated that; “the greatest portion of that education is informal being acquired by the young from the example and behaviour of elders in the society. Under normal circumstances, education grows out of the environment the learning process being directly related to the pattern of work in the society”³⁴⁹

They equally faced contradiction and a series of problems, such as poor quality education, they had no program of instruction with regard to their plans of life. Issue around Africa with which they were familiar with were not taught but rather, they were taught about flowers and European roses. This is what provoked Dr. Kofi Busia who stated that; “At the end of my first year at secondary school (mfantsipim, cape coast, Ghana), I went home to wenchu for the Christmas vacation. I had not been home for four years, and on that visit I became painfully aware of my isolation, I understood our community for less than the boys of my own age who had never been

³⁴⁸ Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, meridian books, the world publishing company Cleveland, New York, 1958, p.125.

³⁴⁹ Ibid, p, 291.

to school. Over the years, as I went through college and university, I felt increasingly that the education I received taught me more and more about Europe and less and less about my own society”³⁵⁰

This is to say that studied that which was of no practical value to them as African students will listen to geography lessons about the change in seasons of the , spring, summer, autumn and winter. They will also learn about Alps, and river Rhine but absolutely nothing about the atlas mountains of North Africa or the river Zambezi, to those that were in British colonialists, they will study how Britain defeated the Spanish armada in 1588, at the time when Hawkins was stealing Africans and been knighted by Queen Elizabeth I for so doing, and to those in the French colony, they will learn how “the Gaul’s, our ancestors had blue eyes and they will be the same Napoleon was the greatest general the same Napoleon who re-instituted slavery in the Caribbean island of Guadeloupe. The issue at stake here is how relevant was this to the Africans? If not only to distract them, It is in this light that, the African Nationalist J.E. Casely-Hayford in 1922 stated that “Before even the British came into relations with our people we were a developed people, having our own institutions, having our own ideas of government. This therefore means that colonial education and colonial policies shattered the ideologies of the Africans into shambles.

However, Africa was developed at their own level before the pre-colonial era and were equally civilized due to their cultural practices, for instance in all social spheres, they were unique in their communalistic life style as can be seen the way they were always present at birth, marriage, initiation, which make them too fast tract the spirit of development, solidarity and fraternity in Africa, which of course enable them to reached the pinnacle of achievement in almost all aspect. This spirit of communalism which ensure civilization and living together fought against civil disobedience, violence and revolutions as authorities, institutions and human value was uphold with most importance and good faith

African civilization was only eclipsed during the colonial era but could not completely eradicate it because the values of the Africans is their heritage it is also important to note that, long before the colonial era, the art of Egypt, the Sudan and Ethiopia was equally known to the rest of the world. Rediscovered by the westerners, that is why the life and Benin bronze is well known as

³⁵⁰ Ibid, pp, 300,301.

indicated by historians citing from the 14th to the 15th centuries which were quite relevant for African development and civilization.

This easier way of succeeding in Africa was well embedded in their culture as there was no contradiction between the young men and their eldest, and their relationship was one that could not cause violent antagonism and revolutions. But young men had all the reasons to respect and depend on eldest even when it concerns with the issue of choosing a wife this therefore reduce the phenomena of violent civil disobedience and revolutions due the mutual respect and concern for each other.

In this light, the roots for African underdevelopment by the Europeans was the root cause of violent, terrorism and crises in Africa, this can be briefly explain with the words of Ahmed Sekou Toure in the republic of guinea 1926 that;

“The relations between the degree of destitution of peoples of Africa and the length and nature of exploitation they had to endure are evident. Africa remains marked by the crimes of the slave-traders: up to now her potentialities are restricted by under-population”³⁵¹

This anger and grievances due to the western practices of slavery and exploitation in Africa, actually planted the seed of antagonism in Africa as they were been subjected to slavery and captives to various other parts of the world where there were to work as property of Europeans. A case in point in east Africa and the Sudan whereby many Africans nationalists were taken by the Arabs and sold to their Arab buyers which better qualify as Arab slave trade. This alone is to provoking and ergo-disheartening to treat fellow human beings in Africa as objects and even animals of the jungle.

In most part, violence reached the peak during this period and through the process by which slaves or captives were obtained not only by the trade but also through warfare, trickery, banditry and kidnapping. In this regard “when one tries to measure the effects of European slave trading on the African continent, it is very essential to realize that one is measuring the effect of social violence rather than trade in any normal sense of the word”³⁵² as stated by Rodney.

This actually an abuse to human right and the rape of Africa because the consequences quite evident and enormous in Africa till today due to its destructiveness, more regrettably is the fact that, the slave buyers preferred their captives to be able-bodied young men and young women

³⁵¹ Ibid, p, 108.

³⁵² Ibid, pp, 110,112.

between 15 to 35 years and most preferably in the early twenties and the sex ratio was more higher in young men than in women. That is to say that it could be four young men and two young women out of six and older persons were not accepted because they needed a healthy population as captives to provide sufficient man power in European plantations before the advent of the industrial revolution.

At this juncture, African economic activity was most affected either directly or indirectly due to population loss especially the youthful, healthier and productive age group. However, violence which is also insecurity was presented by European slave dealers which became the major stimulus of great violence between different Africa communities and within any given community, and also took diverse form like kidnapping, them of regular warfare, and this increase fear and uncertainty, this spirit has today taken diverse forms like civil disobedience, violence and terrorism.

By implication, European powers in the 19th century indicated their awareness of the fact their policies and activities were corrected with producing captive or slaves which was inconsistent with other economic pursuits. Within this era, Britain recruited Africans for the collection of palm produce and rubber and to grow agricultural crops for export in the position of slaves or captives. It was very evident and clear that slaves raiding were violently conflicting with those objectives in western, eastern and central Africa.

Even with the discouraging and abolition of slave trade, the spirit of resistances, violent, antagonism and revolutions were already inculcated to the Africans today, terrorism, wars and civil disobedience has become the order of the day because it is important to note that, to achieve economic development, one essential condition is to make maximum use of the country's labour and natural resources but this was not the case in Africa.

Critically, this obnoxious practice of the westerners distorted and retarded if not stagnation of African economy within this epoch because the time in which African entered the colonial page she was more concentrated entirely of exporting raw materials very cheaply and importing manufactured goods very expensively for instance cotton was the main raw material exported but they imported manufactured cotton cloths. This of course was due to advancement of technology in Europe and technological stagnation in Africa, this technological³⁵³ "regression in Africa is

³⁵³ Ibid, p, 114.

probably the abandonment of traditional smelting iron. This so because development is the capacity for self sustaining growth which leads to advancement in economy but this was not the case in Africa. This was also due to the Africans lack of the spirit of scientific acquiring which is closely related to production, thus lack of skill and industries was one the very feature as European capitalist dominated and exploited their raw materials to their respective countries. That is they benefited from the weaknesses and ignorant of the Africans to impose their superiority, this is to say that, the European slave trade was a direct block, in removing young dynamics, creative and intelligent Africans to Europe, meanwhile, there were ones to make use of their local technology and creativity to build Africa.

CHAPTER 8

CRITIQUE OF ARENDT TOTALITARIANISM AND LEGITIMATE MONOPOLY OF POWER BY THE STATE

Arendt misconception of the totalitarianism and power was a total deviation because she advocated what is completely different from our societies today, especially Africa. Her views were paraphrased to solve the problem of her time which is different today as she stated that “The struggle for total domination of the total population of the earth, the elimination of every competing non-totalitarian reality, is inherent in the totalitarian regimes themselves, if they do not pursue global rule as their ultimate goal, they are only likely to lose whatever power they have already seized. Even single individuals can be absolutely and reliably dominated only under global totalitarian conditions. Ascendancy to power therefore means primarily the establishment of official and official recognised headquarters for the movement and the acquisition of a kind of laboratory in which to carry out the experiment with or rather against reality. The experiment with or rather against reality, the experiment in organizing a people for ultimate purposes which disregard individuality as well as nationality, under conditions which are not admitted not perfect but are sufficient for important partial results. Totalitarian in power uses the state administration for its long range goal of world conquest and for the direction of the branches of the movement. It establishes a secret police as the executors and guardians of its domestic experiment in constantly transforming reality into fiction, and it finally erects concentration camps as special laboratories to carry through its experiment in total domination”.³⁵⁴

This is not true today because most societies use democratic models to subjugate the masses with serious security to threaten the masses as Belachew Gebrewold contended as well as entanglement of the society against self-determination which has orchestrated more violence and revolutions, these views are also being shared by some African contemporaries like Achille Mbembe, who contextualises their views to Africa and other parts of the globe.

8.1 CRITIQUE OF STATES AND SECURITY SYSTEMS

Conflict, violence and civil disobedience seem to be on a rise in Africa due to bad governance and laws of institutions, which rather provoke constant disorder, chaos and revolutions across the continent which is a clear indication that, the interrelationship between citizens and the state and its security agency are not cordial especially when they are bad governance authorities in power use securities to quack down any form of insurrection and uprising as a means to limit citizens from expressing their grievances and aspirations. This therefore entails that conflict in

³⁵⁴ Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, the world publishing company, Cleveland, New York, 1958, p, 392.

Africa emerge from states behaviours Belachew Gebrewold have it that “state systems, in attempts to act as independent actors in the international system are founded on systems of conflicts and wars that sustain them. The structures of the modern state are based on the capacity to organize violence through hierarchical state structures, organization of material resources directed towards the destruction of enemy countries that are seen as a threat to national.

Security threatening to conflict injury or actually inflicting injury to the enemy. Bernard suggests that all social life consists of interaction within and between social systems, for compel security can become absence of movement or death via stasis or for Deutsch a violent stability and stagnation”³⁵⁵

When this happened, violent within the country becomes unavoidable as lost of lives and properties becomes the regrettable outcome. The behaviour of the state at times is questionable as it cannot sometimes manage it subjects who goes into violent practices and revolutions, because the altitudes of a government within the state arm the citizens with ample reasons to resist the altitude of their government which does not take in to consideration the wish and aspiration of it people, simply because they so much believe in the might of the state, with it forces of law and order and other law enforcement agencies, as apparatus and arms of the state which of course is an oppressive mechanism that in one way or the other always spark up the spirit of violence and revolutions. Reasons why he further reiterated that, “the conflict system where in the value of anything changes, neither the human beings nor the national resources have constant values. A conflict system reproduces itself autopotentially in the sense that, values of the factors and actors that constitute the conflict system change continuously due to intensification of conflict. That is, the self-production takes place because the role of elements changes continuously by changing the status and type of relations between elements. There is nothing which is there, in violent conflicts human beings are dehumanized (as sex slaves, raped, killed, displaced etc), natural resources acquire more value than the human beings or they are destroyed if they cannot be possessed (like bridges, harvest, oil refineries etc: which are deliberately destroyed during wars)”³⁵⁶

³⁵⁵ Belachew Gebrewold, *Anatomy of Violence*, understanding the systems of conflict and violence in Africa. Helmut Schmidt University, university of the Tedeval Armed forces Germany, Ashgate, 2009, p, 71.

³⁵⁶ Ibid, p, 71.

This is to say that, it is an injury to oneself or an injury to the state due to its inability to function well, which often orchestrate violence, civil disobedience, revolutions and terrorism, this alone are some of the reasons why chaos and disorder persists in the society.

Arendt contented that, “the technical development of the implements of violence has now reached the point where no political goal could conceivably correspond to their destructive potential or justify their actual use in armed conflict. Hence, warfare—from time immemorial the final merciless arbiters in international disputes—has lost much of its effectiveness and nearly all its glamour”³⁵⁷

This therefore implies that, nobody wins in violent as it tarnish each other’s image as one who does not reason worst of all the states which seems to be failing on daily experiences as conflicts and violence threatens its peace and security, some of these revolutions or wars between states holds that, “civil war is a highly armed conflict of long duration, carried out between two or more groups (states, ethnic or religious) in a state, in order to achieve a division or allocation of power and resources, civil wars happen in weak or collapsing states; where there are internal tensions and social clefs with religious, social, ethnic and political character). When there were fights among these groups already in the past and when social and political change takes place due to demographic shift of balance or dominance, state collapse, military coup, refugees from third countries, or external intervention”³⁵⁸

More to that, when a group of people within a given state are been marginalized, it becomes easier for them to associate themselves in defence of their territory and interest reasons why Belachew Gebrewold in his book, *Anatomy of violence*, understanding the systems of conflict and violence in Africa stated that “Territory constitutes an important component of individual, group and national identities and determine daily behaviours and practice. The symbolic dimension determines the attachment and affiliation of the citizens to particular spaces and places because they are the location of historical and mythical events imbued with exclusive significance. Territory is more important than mere natural resources; it is the symbol to define and one’s social, spiritual and communal world, the most important focal principles for defending territory are

³⁵⁷ Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt brace and company, New York, san Deigo, 1972, p, 105.

³⁵⁸ Belachew Gebrewold, *Anatomy of violence*, Helmut Schmidt university/university of federal armed forces, Germany, Ashgate, 2009, p, 71.

natural frontiers based on the common knowledge common culture, common language and religion of the group. Even the deterritorialized Diaspora maintains the strongest attachment to homeland territory. It can contribute to the exacerbation of conflict back at home through lobbying and or the raising of finance, this de-territorialized commitment of the Diaspora originates in the intangible and symbolic factors that constitute the national territorial identity, which are the most difficult to resolve between belligerents. Newman as cited by Belachew, suggested that, territory related conflict resolution should move beyond the traditional discourse of demarcation, proximately, size and shape of territories to more functional definition of territorial phenomenon”³⁵⁹ in the course of defending one’s interest always degenerate to violence, terrorism and revolutions.

These dynamics says Belachew “As the dynamic of various conflicts suggest, however the territorial factor cannot be dismissed as simply primitive that is not relevant for the modern world. Beside territoriality, the intangible and symbolic facts remain the most difficult to resolve between belligerents, measuring the value of land starkly in terms of just tangible assets and making these assets the basis of settlement is unlike to bring long-peace. To date, policymakers have tended to focus inappropriately on issues related to border length and placement, and the distribution of natural resources, rather than dealing with the deep psychological bonds that may exist amongst individuals at the local level.”³⁶⁰

But when these natural resources at the local levels are been exploited by authorities in power without the corresponding development in said areas, always spark up an atmosphere of chaos, and disorder where civil unrest, violence and revolutions becomes unavoidable, regrettably, these phenomenon seems to be in a rise in Africa, whereby resources are been exploited in a given local level with little or no development in the said areas. Which often goes with incompatible interest either psychologically or sociologically, this incompatible interest always breeds violence and the regrettable outcome is always the loss of lives, properties as well as human-relationship since interest are not fixed. Kresbers as quoted by Belachew, who suggests that, “Each side in a conflict usually blames the others aggressive behaviours for the fight, and however, might conclude the adversaries are mistaken; each is actually seeking to defend what it has and its

³⁵⁹, Ibid, p, 72.

³⁶⁰ Ibid, p, 73.

defensive efforts are incorrectly perceived by the other as threatening. Or the observer may believe that the basis of the conflict is a natural consequence of imbalance of power among the adversaries and lack of agreed-upon procedures for managing issues in dispute between them”.³⁶¹

It is on this account that Girard stated that violence inspire counter-violence by those against whom it is directed. It consumes scarce resources that could otherwise be use to satisfy aspirations, worst of all it consumes men, its victims physically, its practitioners mentally by habituating them to violence as the means and end of life. The more intense and widespread the use of force the less lively is those who use it rebels or regimes, to achieve their objectives except through total victory.³⁶²

He went further to reiterate, “this passionate destruction applies not only to the material things, but also to the human beings. Displacement mutilation and rape of the civilian are just, the expression of this passionate violence and violent passion, The civilian are potential prey or supporters of the other party, and their outsiders is an existential conclusion of the rivals, various conflicts, such as in Congo, Sudan and Somalia, have been strategically transforming the civilians from accidental victims into strategic targets. In the Tutsi-Hutu conflict in the eastern DR Congo, Rwanda and Burundi the inter-clan conflict in Somalia, in the interethnic and centre-periphery conflict in Sudan, the civilian deliberately targeted by the warring groups in order to perish the rivalling armed groups which could gain support from the civilians or otherwise the later will be displaced, mutilated, killed, raped etc through their “outsideness” the civilian dilute the “truth” the rivalling rebels and the government claim, the civilians are desired “object” that have to be integrated into violence or destroyed through violence. This is why desired object embodies at the same time desirability and destructibility, since it is desired by both rivals”³⁶³

With regard to Hannah Arendt who opines that, “it is against the background of these experiences that propose to raise the question of violence in the political realm. This is not easy; what Sorel remarked sixty years ago”, the problems of security and violence still remain very obscure” is as true today as it was then. I mentioned the general reluctance to deal with violence as a phenomenon in its own right and I must now qualify this statement, if we turn to discussions

³⁶¹ Ibid, p, 76.

³⁶² Ibid, p, 81.

³⁶³ Ibid, p, 134,135.

of the phenomenon of power, we soon find that, there exists a consensus among political theorist from left to right to the effect that violence is nothing more the flagrant manifestations of power. "All politics is struggle for power; the ultimate kind of power is violence". Said C. Wright mills, echoing as it were Marx Weber's definition of the state as "the rule of men over men based on the means of legitimate that is allegedly legitimate, violence, and this of course provoke insecurity. The consensus is very strange for to equate political power with" The organization of violence" makes sense only if one follows Marx's estimate of the state as an instrument of oppression in the ruling class. Let us therefore turn to authors who do not institutions are merely coercive superstructures, secondary manifestation of some underlying forces. Let us turn for instance, to Bertrand de Jouvenel, whose work power is perhaps the most prestigious and anyway, the most interesting recent treaties on the subject. " To him" he writes "who contemplates the unfolding of the ages war present itself as an activity of states which pertains to their essence" this may prompt us to ask whether the end of warfare, then, would mean the end of the states, would the disappearance of violence"and the insecurity.

This therefore implies that most of the violence acts in our societies is because of the quest for power and how some members resist to be dominated by the ruling class, because, who rule for their interest and at the same time used oppressive mechanism to subjugate the mass which in one way or the other always create tension and antagonism of which violence remains the regrettable outcome as the loss of lives, properties and other inter-personal relationship prevails. This disorder in Arendt perspective is perpetuated by the state as a system of rule and dominion as she contended that "power is an instrument of rule, while the ruled owes their existence to the instinct of domination." This is to say that man feels himself more of a man when he is imposing himself and making others the instruments of his will which gives him incomparable pleasure as stated by Sartre in his reading of Jouvenel. One can therefore be tempted to established that violence in most cases is orchestrated by states norms and it authorities in Arendt's thought.

This phenomenon of civil disobedience and violence has left people in confusion and isolation as to whether we as human are quite rational or not? If we are rational why n ot used this rationality to quench down the appetite of chaos and disorder. This therefore explain why Belachew Gebrewold in his publication Anatomy of violence holds that "Globalisation can be designated as "rationalization" of international relations. But it is strongly disputed how rational it

is. Such perception of rationality compels us to redefine rationality. Those who plead for globalization argue that the benefit of globalization outweighs isolationism and that in the long run it furthers the welfare of all; and the actors in this global system are considered as rational action. According to rational choice theory, states or people are consistent and coherent about the want. That is not only the system is rational but also the elements that constitute the system are considered as rational. They act strategically and rationally in the use of and in the face of violence. Instead of the system level and element-level rationality, we see irrational behaviour of structural exploitation. It is irrational behaviour because structural exploitation will sooner or later undermine those who believe they are making profit rationally, accumulate their wealth or guarantee their security.

More to that gathering has extensively demonstrated that structural violence occurs when nobody feels personally responsible for damage; violence is inherently part of the system and manifest in unequal power relations caused by the social structure of the society.”³⁶⁴

This entails that the lack of human reasoning or adequate rationality is the root cause of violence in Africa and the world at large. This therefore means that, we cannot have a global solution to problems because of the different levels of rationality or the different degrees of reasoning since each individual gives birth to his or her own thoughts and views.

However, the global structure has been considerably contributing to killing, displacement, and rape, destruction of economic infrastructure, hunger and famine. As the Sudanese case shows, the humanitarian tragedy in Darfur cannot be explained by internal factors only. The global structure of incoherent donor country policies driven by contradictory interests plays a decisive role in Congolese, Sudanese and Somalia conflicts. Various studies suggest that the P5 provide over 60% of legal arms transfer to Africa contributing to conflict, instability and food insecurity. Whereas the European community imposed an arms embargo in Sudan in March 1994, The USA in 1995 imposed sanctions on Sudan only in 1997. When the UNO in 1994 resolution imposed an arms embargo, China ignored it”.³⁶⁵

³⁶⁴ Belachew Gabrewold, *Anatomy of Violence*, Ashgate publishing limited, England, 2009, p, 83.

³⁶⁵ Ibid, p, 86.

This show to what extent big nations or states orchestrate in violence in some states in Africa in order to maintained themselves in positions of domination over Africa which of course has further promoted violence as bigger nations infiltrate weapons to Africa, thereby living African society in danger and threats of war. Worst of all, the UN first embargo was imposed only on transfers to non-governmental armed forces and individuals operating in Darfur inspite of reports accusing the Sudanese government of supplying weapons and military support to the janajawiid. Russia chose to care for economic interest in Sudan by selling combat aircraft in 2004 and military helicopters in 2005. China and Russia undermined the armed embargo when they abstained from the vote of UNSC Resolution 1591 in March 2005, which attempted to expand the scope of the UN arms embargo to cover all parties to the 2004 Humanitarian ceasefire Agreement. The Sudanese government, the Sudan Liberation Movement/army, and the justice and Equality movement – and any other belligerents in Darfur, including Sudanese government forces that were active in the region.”³⁶⁶

This therefore, clearly explain the fact that political violence, civil disobedient, revolutions and terrorism in African states are carefully organised and planned out of Africa with the help of some Africans to maintain themselves in power or for economic gain, just like the western capitalist states who manipulate political affairs in Africa for either, political, economic or social interest, which of course has left Africans in the dilemma of confusion, as wars, civil unrest, violence and chaos is very regular and rampant in Africa. Because of the quest for power and domination of Africans states and some Africans to remain in power thereby causing civil disobedience and violence all over African countries.

However, Belachew Gebrewold lengthy stated that “In the complexity of the global system the non-identifiable of the key competent of structural violence; as William Easterly suggests are the rich government and international aid agencies are supposed to work together to achieve the millennium Development goals. So when the goals are not attained, no one can be held accountable. This weakens the incentive of any one agent to break its neck to reach the goals. It is understandable that aid agencies want to share the blame with as many others agencies as possible if something goes wrong. This complexity of actors involved makes difficult not only the

³⁶⁶ Ibid, p, 86.

identification of main actors, but also exacerbates the structural violence against the poor, who are made dependent upon the structures.

The increasing global demand for oil is one of the leading factors of structural violence. By 2015 Africa is expected to provide 25 percent of US oil imports. New deposits are being developed offshore in deep water all along the African west coast as far north as Togo and Ghana. Many US oil natural gas firms like Exxon-Mobil and Chevron-Texaco and their affiliates are expected to spend about \$60 billion in the coming years on exploration and development in countries such as Nigeria, Mozambique and South Africa. In Eastern Africa, in addition to Sudan, Ethiopia will be a producer of oil. Agreements between Russia and Ethiopia in February 2008 have confirmed this. Such new discoveries usually do not benefit the poor or further broad-based institutional reforms. Angola is a good example".³⁶⁷

These powerful nations suppressing weaker ones for their egoistic interest is enough reason why they sponsors wars and violent acts in Africa for their economic gain, they also import arms to Africa for the destabilization of the continent, because if Africa is united, it will be difficult for them to achieve their aims, reasons why they always look for puppets and power mongering leaders in Africa to used them and penetrates their government for their manipulation tendencies, which actually provoked and is still provoking violence in Africa. In addition to oil, the development of modern technology has become an integral component of global structural violence. A lot of Sub-Saharan African countries dispose of a lot natural resources like gold, diamonds, uranium, copper, coltan etc. the demand for the later has been increasing over the last few years because it is used for the production of cell phones, computer chips, missiles etc. nevertheless, most of the African countries that dispose of natural resources are characterized by poverty, corruption, environmental damage, human rights abuses, violence and war, resulting in the paradox of plenty. The transparency international corruption index shows that, those African countries that dispose of a lot of natural resources have mostly poor results. In 2005, for example, it was Chad that was declared to be the most corrupt country in the world. However, countries such as France and China are strong allies of Chad. The extraction of raw materials very often leads to human rights abuses

³⁶⁷ Ibid, p, 87.

like for example, poor working conditions, poor natural resources extraction sector, limited rights to organized themselves, environmental destruction displacement, etc.

Regions rich in raw materials can contribute to dissolving of social structures such as migration (into cities) prostitution, conflict of communities about the new resources and increasing illegal business. A lot of wars and conflicts in Africa are based on natural resources facilitating structural violence. Structural violence on national or global level results in slavery and abductions, debt slavery, forced domestic labour, commercial sexual exploitation, forced overtime labour under threat of dismissal, unpaid compulsory labour for public servants and trafficking in persons³⁶⁸. This shows that the causes of conflict and violence in Africa are systematic and complex.

It is on this account that Hannah Arendt reiterated that, “Nothing, in my opinion, could be theoretically more dangerous than the tradition of original thought in political matters by which power and violence are interpreted in biological terms. As these terms are understood today, life and life’s alleged creativity are their common denominators, so that violence is justified on the grounds of creativity. The organic metaphors with which our entire present discussion of these matters, especially of the riots, is permeated—the notion of a “sick society”, of which riots are symptoms as fever is a symptom of disease – can only promote violence in the end. Thus the debate between those who proposed violent means to restore “law and order” and those who proposes nonviolent reforms begins to sound ominously like a discussion between two physicians who debate the relative advantages of surgical as opposed to medical treatment of their patient. The sicker the patient is supposed to be, the more likely that, surgeons will have the last word. moreover, so long as we talk in non-political, biological terms, the glorifiers of violence can appeal to the undeniable fact that in the household of nature destruction and creation are but two sides of the natural process, so that collective violent action quite apart from its inherent attraction, may appear as natural a prerequisite for the collective life of mankind as the struggle for survival and violent death for continuing life in the animal kingdom”.³⁶⁹

This is to say that, this organic metaphors just like the rationality of humanism as stated by Belachew is quite fundamental as the issues of civil disobedience, violence, wars, terrorism and

³⁶⁸ ILO, 2005, pp, 87, 88.

³⁶⁹ Hannah Arendt, *Crises of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1972, p, 172.

revolutions are concern especially in Africa. It is interesting to note that some of the reports and news on the event and conflict and violence in some parts of Africa are not clearly exposed or brought to the lime light, because some guilty governments distort and filtered information before public consumption, this is to hide some hidden agenda. However, according to reports without border, security agents in Sudan are increasingly suffocating, raiding, confiscating and sabotaging and closing privately owned media, forcing their editors to live in fear and depriving them of significant resources (annual Report of Reports without Borders 2008). Media covering sensitive issues, including the conflict in Darfur, is punished by a code of criminal procedure. One alarming method of controlling the media is that media outlets are required to employ security personnel to review stories prior to publication: in addition, the government – influenced national press council is responsible for licensing and has the power to suspend journalists and newspapers. Moreover, entry into the media is difficult unless one is a supporter of the government. According to Freedom House throughout 2007 journalists faced harassment, attacks, intimidation and direct censorship at the hands of both government and non-governmental forces (Freedom House Report 2008).

However, the Sudan case shows that peace and democracy cannot be possible unless the complex conflict consisting of various internal, regional and global actors is addressed. As shown above the lack of unity among rebels, ethnic groups and regions has been one of the main sources of violence in Sudan. Such inter-rebel division has caused external involvement as well as it has been caused and exacerbated by external involvement³⁷⁰ as stated by Belachew.

In this regards, the prohibition of people to express themselves like the men and women rather accelerate civil disobedience and violence as they are being tortured psychologically and otherwise. This alone always leads to the inheritance of lawlessness. It is for this reason that Arendt established that, “Nationalism is essentially the expression of this perversion of the state into an instrument of the nation and the identification of the citizen as member of the nation. The relationship between state and society was determined by the fact that of class struggle, which had supplanted the former feudal order, society was pervaded by liberal individualism which wrongly believed that the state ruled over mere individuals. When in reality it ruled over classes, and which saw in the state a kind of supreme individual before which all others had to bow. It seemed to be the will of the nation that the state protect it from the consequences of its social atomization and

³⁷⁰ Belachew Gebrewold, *Anatomy of Violence*, Ashgate publishing Limited, England, 2009, p, 178.

at the same time guarantee its possibility of remaining in a state of atomization. To be equal to the task, the state had to enforce all earlier tendencies towards centralisation; only a strongly centralized administration which monopolized all instruments of violence and power – possibilities could counterbalance the centrifugal forces constantly produced in a class-ridden society. Nationalism then became the precious cement for binding together a centralized state and an atomized society and it actual proved to be the only working, live connection between the individuals of the nation – state”.³⁷¹ This provoked more violence because this nationalism was intimate loyalty to the government and any disobeyer is a threat to the state. Even though some of the state most often abuse certain norms especially the aspiration of the citizens because states ... exist within the framework of an interstate system, and their relative strength is not merely the degree to which they can effectively exercise authority internally but the degree to which they can hold their heads high in the competitive environment of the world system. All states are theoretically sovereign, but strong states find it easier to “intervene” in the internal affairs of weak states by pressuring them to keep their frontiers open to those flows of factors of production that are useful and profitable to firms located in the strong states, while resisting any demand for reciprocity in this regard”³⁷².

This therefore implies that, the pressure from advanced metropolitant states urges the weaker ones to sacrifice the aspirations of their citizens, since their frontiers are always open for the flows of economic goods for the interest of the advance and stronger states. It should be noted that not only those factors of production are been allow to enter and circulate within the weaker states, guns and other war weapons are most often infiltrated into some of these weaker states which of course endanger the lives of citizens and some of the brain damage citizens who most often have conflict with their regimes or some tribes always make use of these dangerous weapons, for further escalation of conflict and violence. This explains why Belachew further highlighted that “States is a system of tension between legitimate power monopoly (ideal state) and organised crime (real state). According to Marx Weber’s famous definition “State is a human community that (successfully) claim the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory, state is simply institutionalisation of power in. The important question in this section will

³⁷¹ Hannah Arendt, *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, the world publishing company, Cleveland, New York, 1958, p, 231.

³⁷² Belachew Gebrewold, *Anatomy of Violence*, Ashgate publishing limited, England, 2009, p, 7.

be what constitutes states as system? Before we deal with this question, let us see what the system of the state from point of view of system theory is. Wilke suggests that in the form of politics, the state creates its own principles. Since secularisation dynamics and the awareness of contingency have undermined the external (such as supernatural) justifications of politics, the politics has created its own legitimacy by replacing dangerous contingency by formal necessity as a form of operation. Social systems as communicative and symbolically systems- in the face of lacking religious plan of salvation or objective truth-are exposed to the power of contingency determined by changeable and selectable alternatives and operations. Consequently, social systems change their modes of operation from unity to difference, from the continuation of always identical to the contingency of particular identity. It is about how the system within states sees and understands itself in comparison with the other systems or other sides of its world or environment. State is neither a supra-societal and autonomous reality nor mere means of power elites and their interest; instead it is a specific function of a political system for a differentiated society as well as it is preconditions of operations in a self-legitimizing politics by excluding arbitrariness or contingency. Wilke further contended that, the notion of territory is a good example here: territory becomes a homeland; fatherland, or motherland that has to be commonly defended by those who share similar obligations for its protection and because it defines them from others. Specification of homeland requires focal principals: natural frontiers by reference to nature and topographical features; mountains, rivers, seas, common cultures (pre-existing principles, language, religion, ethnicity, nationality) prior historical formation and cartography (conventions and maps) as stated by Goeman”,³⁷³ as clearly cited by Belachew.

However, this tension between legitimate power monopoly and organised crime is enough reason for some of its members or citizens to react against their state especially when such a state is careless about the welfare of its people. This way chaos, insecurity, disorder and violence become unavoidable which may lead to a general breakdown or total collapse of the system. However, it is on this account that Belachew jealously stated Newman when he holds that, “The political organisation of space is not limited to notions of the state but it equally, perhaps even more importantly, impacted at the local and micro levels of daily behaviour and practices, Territory constitutes an important component of our individual, group and national identities, not simply

³⁷³ Ibid, pp, 12, 13.

because our states territories are delimited by fixed boundaries but because territory has a symbolic dimension which determines our attachments which are thought consciously through political and territorial socialisation since we reject the absolute notion of deterritorialization (in favour of continuing process of reterritorialization and changing territorial configuration of power). We must, by definition, reject the notion of a borderless world”.³⁷⁴ Borderless world which has become a channel through which smugglings of weapons and other all intention people to perpetuate violence and insecurity.

8.2 The Entanglement of Society into Violence and Revolutions

Africans has gone through a lot of suffering and pains, most of these sufferings are civil disobedience, violence and revolutions, and there are still going through till today and there is no sign that these too disturbing phenomena’s will stop as it keep increasing day in day out, Achille Mbembe considered it that Africans are been entangles as he clearly cited Hegel’s radical verdict, Robert Kaplan authored a portrayal as Fukuyama when he lengthily stated the Hegelian mythat that:

“More than a century after Hegel’s verdict, Robert Kaplan authored a portrayal of that same continent in the February 1994 issue of the US-based *Atlantic Monthly*. The Cold War had just ended and most of the Western world was triumphantly riding on the crest of a wave of optimism. Celebrating this triumph – which of the West and of what he called the Western idea – Francis Fukuyama suggested in 1989 that “what we may be witnessing is not just the end of the Cold War, or the passing of a particular period of post-war history, but the end of history as such”. By “the end of history as such”, he did not simply mean the end point of humankind’s ideological evolution. More fundamentally, he meant the reconciliation of the market principle and the idea of freedom, and “the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government”

Yet, projecting himself to the day and times after history had ended, he could only see melancholia and sadness, a profound nostalgia for the Hegelian world:

The end of history will be a very sad time. The struggle for recognition, the willingness to risk one’s life for a purely abstract goal, the worldwide ideological struggle that called forth

³⁷⁴ Ibid, p, 13.

daring, courage, imagination, and idealism, will be replaced by economic calculation, the endless solving of technical problems, environmental concerns, and the satisfaction of sophisticated consumer demands. In the post historical period there will be neither art nor philosophy, just the perpetual caretaking of the museum of human history.

As Fukuyama wrote his epitaph to history, Africa was in the midst of a spectacular collision. While Apartheid and white minority rule were coming to a formal end in South Africa, a genocide of cataclysmic proportions was unfolding in Rwanda. The apotheosis of long years of struggle on the one hand, self-destruction on the other. Declining per capita incomes and production, low levels of savings and investment, slow growth in agricultural production, failing export earnings, strangled imports and unserviceable foreign debt burdens-all plagued most of sub-Saharan Africa.³⁷⁵

In this scenario for the twenty-first century, Kaplan argued that West Africa in particular was becoming “the symbol of worldwide demographic, environmental, and societal stress, in which criminal anarchy emerges as the real strategic danger. Disease, overpopulation, unprovoked crime, scarcity of resources, refugee migrations, the increasing erosion of nation-states and international borders, and the empowerment of private armies, security firms, and international drug cartels are now most tellingly demonstrated through a West African prism. In Kaplan’s political geography just as in Hegel’s a century earlier “West Africa” became the epitome of those regions of the world where central governments were withering away, tribal and regional fiefdoms were on the rise, and war had turned pervasive. West Africa, he argued, “is reverting to the Africa of the Victorian Atlas. It consists now of a series of coastal trading posts... and an interior that, owing to violence, volatility and disease, is again becoming... ‘Blank’ and ‘unexplored’. It is Thomas Malthus, the philosopher of demographic doomsday, who is now the prophet of West Africa’s future. And West Africa’s future, eventually, will also be that of most of the rest of the world... in an age of cultural and racial clash”.

This apocalyptic view of Africa’s future was echoed in 2000 when, building upon Hegelian tropes once again, the influential financial weekly the *Economist* declared that Africa was a “hopeless continent”. In a famous editorial, it conjured up images of destitution, failure and despair, floods and famine, poverty and pestilence, brutality, despotism and corruption, dreadful

³⁷⁵Achille Mbembe, *Out of the Dark Night*, Copyright at Columbia University Press, 2021, pp, 8, 9.

wars and plunder, rape, cannibalism, amputation, and even the weather to suggest that Africa's future was definitely doomed. Foreign aid workers, peacekeeping missions, humanitarian agencies, and the world at large could well give up, so deeply "buried in their cultures" were the reasons for so much human misery, it concluded.

As the twenty-first century unfolds, it is gradually seeping into the minds of many that to a large extent our planet's destiny might be played out in Africa. From a philosophical and cultural point of view, this planetary turn of the African predicament takes us far away from the Hegelian myths, which, for too long, have colonized Africa's imagination of the world and the world's imagination of Africa. On the continent itself, older senses of time and space and notions of history based on linear approaches to development and progress are gradually being replaced by newer senses of futures founded on open narrative models. There are many who increasingly believe that, through self-organization and small ruptures, we can actually create myriad "tipping points" that may lead to deep alterations in the direction that both the continent and the planet take.

Yet to write the world from Africa, or to write Africa into the world or as a fragment thereof, is an exhilarating and, most of the time, perplexing task. As a name and as a sign, Africa has always occupied a paradoxical position in modern formations of knowledge. On the one hand, the region has provided most of our modern disciplines with some of their foundational categories. From anthropology to political economy, from post structuralism to psychoanalysis and postcolonial theory, the continent has been the purveyor of some of the most compelling concepts, without which modern criticism would be utterly poor.³⁷⁶

It should be noted that this Hegelian myth and the entanglement of African society is one of the reasons why there is disorder in Africa since there is conflict of ideas as well as conflict of interest and the Africans who are in defence of their heritage has always been in conflict with the westerners or among themselves carefully organized and manipulated by the western imperialist who has much interest in Africa. And of course has provoked more violence and terrorism and revolutions in Africa.

Hannah Arendt in *The Human Condition* had it that "Under the conditions of a common world, reality is not guaranteed primarily by the "common nature" of all men who constitute it, but

³⁷⁶ Ibid, p. 10.

rather by the fact that, differences of position and the resulting variety of perspectives notwithstanding, everybody is always concerned with the same object. If the sameness of the object can no longer be discerned, no common nature of men, least of all the unnatural conformism of a so mass society, can prevent the destruction of the common world, which is usually proceeded by the destruction of many aspects in which it presents itself to human plurality. This can happen under conditions of radical isolation, where nobody any longer agrees with anybody else, as is usually the case in tyrannies. But it may also happen conditions of mass society or mass hysteria, where we see all people suddenly behave as though they were members of one family, each multiplying and prolonging the perspective of his neighbour. In both instances, men have become entirely private, that is, they have been deprived of seeing and having others, of being seen and being heard by them. They are all imprisoned in the subjectivity of their own singular experience is multiplied innumerable time. The end of common world has come when it is seen only under one aspect and is permitted to present itself in only one perspective.³⁷⁷

This therefore implies that these diversities and tyrannies group people as a family to act for a common course which at times may be too destructive as there are various people with varying opinions. This is actually a threat to peace and security as human action may be more tailored into disorder, chaos, violent and revolutions as well as terrorism.

She further cited Isak Dimesen who contended that “All sorrows can be borne if you put them into a story or tell a story about them.”³⁷⁸

This is to say that any action that citizens or a group of people many undertake will have some effects or impacts as this will be historical and will be told as a story from generations to another.

Reason why Arendt insisted that “(for in every action what is primarily intended by the doer, whether he acts from natural necessity or out of free will, is the disclosure of his own image. Hence it comes about that every doer, in so far as he does, takes delight in doing, since everything follows... thus, nothing set unless [by acting] it makes patent its later self.)

³⁷⁷ Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, The University of Chicago, Press, Ltd, London, 1958, 1998, pp, 57, 58.

³⁷⁸ *Ibid*, p, 75.

However, these forms of entanglement where people even act in disorder is more on the rise in our contemporal societies”³⁷⁹

It is interesting to note that these going chaos and disorder is not only in Africa but also in some western societies, but worse of all in Africa with too much marginalisation either within the countries whereby some regions and those in dominant position do all to maintained their status quo over the others or from dominant metropolitan countries in the west, which in most part is responsible for the entanglement of Africans into violence, civil disobedience, terrorism and revolutions, these entanglement has actually endangered lives in Africa due to so much marginalization. Achille Mbembe contented that”

To maintain military numbers, unemployed or underemployed whites are not enough. Vast reserves of racially disenfranchised men have been recruited. It hardly matters that some are uneducated. Those with criminal pastes are granted “moral waivers” that allow them for the first time to join the lower rungs of military ranks and, hence, to gain a semblance of enfranchisement and citizenry. Those who are marked as waste are disenfranchised, or simply spatially confined within the prison industrial complex. Another form is through cross-border migrant labour. Labour operating in the interstices or the entrails of the global economy is hyper exploited. The racial subsidy is precisely what allows global capital to feel no sense of responsibility for its actions, its crimes against humanity, and the horrendous damage done not only in Euro-America but in the rest of the world as well.³⁸⁰

He added that “seen from Africa, global capitalism is moving in two directions. The first is toward increasing exploitation of large parts of the world through what Marx called “primitive accumulation” which, as suggested earlier, is increasingly taking the form of a “raw economy”. The other direction is toward squeezing every last drop of value out of the planet by increasing the rate of innovation and inventions, or through an active refiguring of space, resources, and time, or through a planned human intervention in the climate system that would undermine all notions of limitation, or even by boosting difference and inserting that difference into the cycles of reproduction of capital – contracts, but also coercion and racial subsidies.

³⁷⁹ Ibid, p, 175.

³⁸⁰ Achille Mbembe, *Out of dark Night*, copy right © Columbia University Press, 2021, pp, 32, and 33.

Significant too is the increasing conflict between market forces and democracy. Democracy should normally imply the rule of the majority. Since the rich in any given society are almost always a minority, democracy in the form of majority rule should – taken to its logical consequences – imply the rule of the poor over the rich. It is also the idea that people have rights that take precedence over the rich; it is also the idea that people have rights that take precedence over the outcomes of market exchanges, and one of the roles of a democratic government is to honour, to some extent, this most human expectation of a life outside the law of the market and the right of property. Historically, the biggest fear of capital has always been that the rule of the poor over the rich would ultimately do away with private property and the “free” play of market forces. Faced with this dilemma, capital would rather abolish democracy in order to save capitalism from a majority dedicated to economic and social redistribution,³⁸¹ to avoid civil disobedience and violence.

It is increasingly apparent that capitalism is not naturally compatible with democracy. For capitalism to be compatible with democracy capitalism would have to be subjected to extensive political control and democracy would have to be protected from being restrained in the name of market power. Under the emerging international politics of public debt, global capital increasingly requires that the “average citizen” pay (for the consolidation of public finances, the bankruptcy of foreign states, the rising rates of interest on public debt, and, if necessary, the institutions over the last twenty years and, in even more caricatural manner, by the actions of innumerable agents whose status exceeds by far the classical distinctions between public and private (nongovernmental organizations, private actors, and so on). At the same time, a labyrinth of international networks has emerged at the local level. All claim to belong to “civil society”, but in reality most of them arise out of the overlap of networks inside the state and others that constitute an informal extension of the state. Others are either umbrella for political parties or urban elites, or local branches of international organizations. The heterogeneity of the logics that these different actors put into motion explains, in very large part, the fragmented nature of the forms of composing life that now prevail, at least in urban settings. The old world is crumbling without its customs necessarily becoming outdated.³⁸²

³⁸¹ *Ibid*, p. 33.

³⁸² *Ibid*, p. 174.

In this light Hannah Arendt had it that “political institutions, no matter how well or badly designed, depend for continued existence upon acting men; their conservation is achieved by the same means that brought them into being. Independent existence marks the work of out as products of making utter dependence upon further acts to keep it in existence marks the state as a product action.”³⁸³

This therefore means that Africans actually deserve their right in their states reasons why Achille Mbenbe further stated that

At the same time, the arguments that, following independence, served to legitimate the project of a nation-state are the objects of sometimes bloody contestations. Postcolonial authoritarian regimes had indeed raised the double construction of the state and the nation to a categorical imperative. In parallel, they had developed a conception of the nation based on the affirmation of collective rights, which rulers purposely opposed to individual rights. Development, as a central metaphor of power and as the utopia of social transformation, represented the site where these rights, as well as collective well-being, were to be realized. It was thought that development would be easily achieved if Western forms of democracy were curtailed and native traditions of communalism promoted.

Postcolonial communalism – whether it saw itself as inspired by socialism (for example, the *ujama* in Tanzania) or by capitalism (Ivory coast, Cameroon, or Kenya), whether it was based in civil government or military regimes – emphasized, even if only in words, the quest for consensus, regional and ethnic equilibrium, reciprocal assimilation of different segments of the elite, and the construction of a shared world by means of social control and coercion, as needed. The goal of these tactics and mechanisms was to prevent dissent as well as ethnic strife. By foregrounding notions of individual rights and reigniting debates over the legitimacy of property and inequality, multipartyism and the market economy model have ruined this ideological construction of consensus. However, they have not led to automatic transition to be liberal democracy model either, and even less have they led to local re-appropriation and translation of its main philosophical tenets (political recognition of the individual as a rational citizen, capable of making independent choices on his or her own, and affirmation of individual freedom and the

³⁸³ Hannah Arendt, *Defending a common world*, Hannah Arendt on the state, the nation and political education, By Peter Lilja Faculty of Education and society, Malmo University, 20506 Malmo Sweden, p, 541.

rights attached to it). Thus, one of the ambiguities of democratization³⁸⁴ violent actually came in place as Africans struggled to come out of the dark of colonialism of which colonial imperialist where not ready for decolonisation. Making Africa a common place for of disorder carefully organised by the westerners as Mbembe qualifies it as entanglement.

However, Achille Mbembe had tit that, this entanglement and antagonism could clearly be seen the very Africans were poorly treated by the westerners as slave, a lot of discrimination racism among others as he stated that

“Since the everyday structures of gender domination that have emerged in the process (as well as in the aftermath) of racial domination tend to replicate the routine of colonial and racial brutality toward black men, it is important to understand how the black body came to be constituted in and through this economy of violence in the first place.

In this regard, many studies have shown that what determined the fate of manhood in a racist state was closely linked to an ongoing war of races. As Michel Foucault has argued, racism does make the relationship of war function in unexpected ways. On the one hand, racism makes it possible to establish a relationship between my life and the death of the other that is not a military or marlike relationship of confrontation, but a biological-type relationship... The fact that the other dies does not mean simply that I live in the sense that his death guarantees my safety; the death of the bad race, of the inferior race (or the degenerate, or the abnormal) is something that will make life in general healthier: healthier and purer.

On the other hand, “the enemies who have to be done away with are not adversaries in the political sense of the term; they are threats, either external or internal, to the population and for the population”. In such a context, “killing or the imperative to kill is acceptable only if it results... in the elimination of the biological threat to and the improvement of the species or race”³⁸⁵

Indeed, whether in South Africa or in the United States (two late modern racist states), the war between races was constructed as a war between men, but a war in which the main assets were women’s bodies. Women’s bodies were themselves imagined as territories to be invaded, to be protected against the enemy, or, when lost to the enemy, to be won back. At stake in these racist states was the body as a territory of male power. The body was what gave substance to the signifier

³⁸⁴ Achille Mbembe, p, 174.

³⁸⁵ Achille Mbembe, *Out of the Dark Night*, copy right © Columbia University Press, 2021, p, 205.

(race) and what marked the limits of territorialisation. Reflecting particularly on reproduction in bondage, Dorothy Roberts has shown how the control of black procreation not only helped to sustain slavery, but was a central aspect of whites' subjugation of African people in America. Critical to the dehumanization of slaves was the capitalization of black women's wombs as vessels which today, Africans are still in violence and insecurity caused by colonialists.

He also added that "two forms of sexual violation were particularly strategic in the process by which black female slaves were disowned of their personhood. The first was rape by the white master – a weapon of terror that reinforced white domination over their human property. As a matter of fact, sexual terror under slavery was a means to subjugate both black men and black women. Significant, in this regard, was the fact that in addition to the rape of black women, the ownership of the body of the white female by white masters became the terrain on which to lynch the black male. As shown by Roberts, white sexual violence not only attacked black men's masculinity by challenging their ability to protect black women; it also invaded black women's dominion over their own bodies.

The second form of sexual violation was the practice of breeding that consisted of compelling slaves considered "prime stock" to mate in the hope of producing children especially suited for labour or for sale. Edward Covey purchased a twenty-year-old slave named Caroline as a "breeder", writes Frederick Douglass. Covey mated Caroline with a hired man and was pleased when a pair of twins resulted. Men of exceptional physical strength could be rented to serve as studs: "The master was might careful about raising healthy nigger families and used us strong, healthy young bucs to stand the healthy nigger gals," recalls Jephtha Choice, once a "stockman" or "breedin nigger."³⁸⁶

This terror and spirit of domination is still ongoing in our societies today carefully orchestrated by the colonialist, and of course the policy of devise and rule which has further antagonise African either within or without themselves, making violence and rebellion as a treat to mankind as the lost lives, properties is even more targeted, which is actually a regrettable situations in our communities as colonial masters still check and remote control our affairs within African state James Harris had it that "still, over time the master began to take on some of the traits of his loyal blood-hound. Lein kept the checker close to exercise strict control, but the information

³⁸⁶ Ibid, p. 206.

it supplied regarding security threats had a clear impact on his world view. Lenin has become quite in same Leoniel Krasin complained in 1918, and if anyone has influence over him it is only “Comrade Felix” Dzeyzhinski cm even greater fanatic, and, in essence, a cunning piece of work, who scares lenin with counter revolution and the idea that this will sweep us all away. If we look at the precise??? On the checks by other society politicians when they occupied senior posts.³⁸⁷

However, this is exactly how the colonial master had kept watching us not to truly and fully come out of the Dark Continent as Mbembe Achille stated. Which of course is one of the outstanding reasons for violence, rebellion and revolutions in Africa.

In this light, James Harris on checklist mentality and origins of the Great Terror established that “One possible way of accounting for, and to some degree reconciling these mutually incompatible explanations, is to view the terror, in all its manifestations, not as the product of a particular agency or event, but of a general mindset. The plethora of sources (secondary and primary, public and private from long familiar official proclamations of the soviet state to recently discovered secret correspondence), in spite of all their contradictions, reveal a shared mentality among the various perpetrators which drove the terror from above and below in the party and the police, at the centre and the periphery. By mentality I mean the board Annals sense of the word, mentalities: taking into account not just ideology (a consciously) constructed belief system), but also the unconscious influence of social, emotional, cultural, and contextual factors. This set of beliefs practices, and assumptions emerged first and was most pronounced in the security police, it was the mentality of chekism. This was a Landmine planted over a decade before the great Terror; it was a product of the formation, expansion and survival of Felix Dzerzhinsky’s security police”³⁸⁸

These just entrails the mentality of African people not just in terrorism but also in diverse forms like rebellion, violence, civil disobedience and revolution which has made the progress and future of Africa and Africans black as chaos and disorder seems to be the order of things.

Arendt contented that” it was rather, on unbelievable example of using excessive means to achieve minor aims in a region of marginal interest. It was precisely this unavoidable impression of wrongheaded floundering that finally brought the country to the conviction widely and strongly

³⁸⁷ James Harris, *The Anatomy of Terror*, Political Violence Under Sterlin, Oxford University Press, 2013, p,14.

³⁸⁸ Ibid, p,1.

held that “the Establishment is out of mind. The feelings is that we are trying to impose some U.S. image on distant peoples we cannot understand, and we are carrying the thing to absurd lengths”³⁸⁹ as she quoted or cited McNaughton in 1967.

This despite how colonial masters are controlling African states and has completely entangled Africans into the spirit of violence and rebellion as most citizens will always want to retaliate as James Harris, lengthy contented on the origins of modern state violence that

“To illuminate the conceptual and technical origins of social categorization and social exclusion, I will pursue two lines of enquiry. First I will look at documents with social science to show how 19th-century social thinkers came to conceive of malignant segments within the body social and the practical steps they took to remove them. Second, I will look at the influence of colonialism – the ways that colonial rule promoted the categorization of indigenous peoples and spawned new technologies to isolate groups deemed socially or politically dangerous. These practices social cataloguing and removal represented important antecedent Soviet State in the forms it would later take.

Political leaders’ use of coercion against their own population was of course not new in the modern era. Throughout history rulers have killed, displace or Subjects, particularly in the aftermath of military conquest to avoid threats to their domination. Only in the modern era.

Discipline also replaced the traditional phorical relationship between the individual and society with a conception of individuals as component parts of the overall social body a concept that implied that an individual’s illness or deviance might infect society as a whole.

By the early 19th century, British sociologists and social thinkers widely accepted the idea that there was a criminal class understood to be a distinct group within society. They thus attributed crime not to socio-economic conditions but rather to this social stratum that could be documented and quantified through crime statistics. Between 1787 and 1868, the British government deported (transported) roughly 150,000 convicts to penal colonies in Australia. As one scholar concludes, the aim of the transportation system was less to punish or deter crimes than to extract permanently the criminal class from British society. In France also, criminologists came increasingly to see criminals as particular types who could not be reformed and instead had to be removed from

³⁸⁹ Hannah Arendt *crises of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace and CO, New York, 1972, pp, 27, 28.

society. In 1852, the French government began to deport political prisoners to a penal colony in French Guiana and two years later it began to deport common-law criminals as well.³⁹⁰

In addition to this, “the aftermath of the Paris Commune in 1871 marked another important step in the development of excisionary violence. Following the suppression of the commune, French military tribunals carried out quick trials of the communards. They then drew up lists of the guilty and placed the worst offenders revolutionary leaders, foreigners, criminals, and deserters in the first category for execution or deportation. The French military executed roughly 20,000 communards and deported another 5,000 to penal colonies in New Caledonia. As General Gallifet declared, we have more than enough foreigners and scum here, we have to get rid of them. French government leaders refused to recognize the commune as a political event and instead portrays. Communards as immoral criminals, even referring to them as vermin. The execution and deportation of communards, in the words of one scholar, amounted a social cleansing of Paris. Viscount Orthenin d’Haussonville, who headed a parliamentary commission on crime, believed that most communards were recidivist criminals, and he recommended the deportation of not only dangerous criminals but repeat petty offenders as well. French penal legislation in the mid-1880s allowed for the mass deportation of repeat offenders, vagrants, beggars, and social marginal.

The Paris Commune both its short-lived existence and its blood demise - as an important reference point for Marxist revolutionaries. Karl Marx himself was for say the Commune as the bold champion of the emancipation of labour, and the glorious harbinger of a new society. But he and Friedrich Engels also says lessons from the Paris commune thatreinforced their concept of the dictate the proletariat. Reflecting on the Commune, Engels concluded that the was nothing but a machine for the oppression of one class by another, and he agreed that following a victorious proletarian revolution, the state would continue Evil inherited by the proletariat to be used against its enemies until such time as a generation reared in new, free social conditions is able to throw them lumber of the state on the scrap heap. Later Marsists, including Trotsky, was lessons from the repression of the communards, and stressed that revolutionaries needed a centralized apparatus to wage war against the capitalists in the way that capitalists used their state apparatus to suppress revolutionaries.

³⁹⁰ James Harries, *The Anatomy of Terror*, Oxford University press, 2013, pp, 90, 91.

In Russia the Tsarist government had a long tradition of exiling criminals and political prisoners, dating from the 17th century. In the late 19th century, Russian criminologists embraced the concept of social defence as the basis for penal code. In contrast to classical deterrence theory, this approach sought punishment was not on the crime but on the future danger posed by the criminal. In cases of any repeat offenders it called for indefinite incarceration to protect society against crime. One Russian criminologist argued that criminals with morally corrupted natures...should not be terrorised with severe penalties but simply isolated as it were, removed from everyday life with a view to protecting society from their harmful influence. Another advocated labour colonies where dangerous and could be accommodated and ultimately restored to an honest way of life. The principle of social excision physical isolation of those was posed as society was therefore well established among Russian psychologists and the anthropologists in the late imperial period. Some of these specialists continue to play a prominent role formulating policy under the Soviet government.³⁹¹

However, these state violence did not only end in the western world but also in Africa, as colonial imperialist entangled Africans for their selfish ends, till date violence revolutions and rebellions has been a common practice in Africa.

As terrorism and civil disorder as well as chaos is a major threat in our modern states Africa in recent years actually being a common place for such ugly practices.

8.3 The Quest for Self Determination as one the Beginning of Violence and Revolutions in Africa

African has experience diverse causes of violence and revolutions in Africa among which are slavery, colonisation, and exploitation among others; be it politically, economically or socially the turning point of disorder and chaos in Africa was really marked by these phenomenon.

“Whether in literature, philosophy, the arts or politics, Black discourse has been dominated by three events: slavery, colonization, and apartheid. Still today, they imprison the ways in which Black discourse expresses itself. These events have acquired certain canonical meanings, three of which are worth highlighting. First, as we have suggested in the previous chapters, there is separation from oneself to the point that the subject, estranged, is relegated to an alienated, among

³⁹¹ Ibid, pp, 91, 92.

lifeless identity. In place of being connected to itself (another name for tradition) that might have shaped experience, one is constituted out of an alterity in which the self becomes unrecognizable to itself: this is the spectacle of separation and quartering. Second is the idea disappropriation. This process refers, on the one hand, to the juridical and economic procedures that lead to material expropriation and dispossession, and, on the other, to a singular experience of subjection characterized by the falsification of oneself by the other. What flow from this is a state of maximal exteriority and ontological impoverishment? These two gestures (material expropriation and ontological impoverishment) constitute the singular elements of the Black experience and the drama that is its corollary. Finally, there is the idea of degradation. Not only did the servile condition plunge the Black subject into humiliation, abjection, and nameless suffering. It also incited a process of “social death” characterized by the denial of dignity, dispersion, and the torment of exile. In all three cases, the foundation events that were slavery, colonialism, and apartheid played a key role: they condensed and unified the desire of the Blackman to know himself (the moment of sovereignty) and hold himself in the world (the moment of autonomy).”³⁹² This of course angered Africans to plunge into violence. However, he further emphasised that the exploitation of Africans resources and racial discrimination was also an issue to be considered as he holds that

“From historical perspective, the emergence of the plantation and the colony as institutions coincides with the very long period in the West during which a new form of governmental reason emerged and was affirmed: that of mercantile reason. It considered the market as the ultimate mechanism for exchange and the privileged focus of the veridiction both of the political and of the value and utility of things in general. The expansion of liberalism as an economic doctrine and a particular art of governance took place at a time when the European states, in tight competition with one another and against the backdrop of the slave trade, were working to expand their power and saw the rest of the world as their economic domain and within their possession.

The plantation specifically and later the colony were in gestation from the second half of the fifteenth century. They constituted essential machinery within a new form of calculation and planetary consciousness. It considered merchandise to be the elemental form of wealth and saw the capitalist mode of production as being fundamentally about the immense accumulation of

³⁹² Achille Mbembe, *Critique of Black Reason*, Translated by Laurent Dubois, Duke University press, Durham and London, 2017, p, 78.

merchandise. Merchandise had value only to the extent that it contributed to the formation of wealth, which constituted the reason for its use and exchange. From the perspective of mercantilist reason, the Black slave is at once object, body, and merchandise. It is work substance, which creates its value, flows from its physical energy. This is the first door through which he enters into the process of exchange. As an object of value to be sold, bought, and used, the Black Man also has access to a second door. The planter who purchases a Black slave does so neither to destroy nor to kill him but rather to use him in order to produce and augment the planter's own power. Not all Black slaves cost the same. The variability in price corresponds to the formal quality attributed to each of them. But any use of the slave diminishes the attributed formal quality. Once subjected to use, consumed and exhausted by their owner."³⁹³

In this light Arendt ignores the history and function of state – sanctioned violence in reproducing white domination through its own institutions or by tolerating the racist violence of non-state agents making resistance to it appear as unprovoked. In turn, she views the violence of the state and white communities as defensive and thus justified. In on violence, Arendt mocks “Negro demands” as “silly and outrageous” claims “the Negro community moodily indulges” in “fantasies” asserts that are “black rage” is “irrational” and describes accusation of a “police state” as “meaningless” she describes black power activist as glorifying violence” or practising “racism in reverse” and, what is worse, hypocritically attempting to provoke a non-violent state into becoming violent in order to prove its supposed violent nature; Arendt faults the “guilt feelings” of whites for leading them to take the “irrational” claims of black activities more seriously than the disinterested and usually highly moral claims of white rebels”.³⁹⁴

However, Arendt's implicit assumption is that white violence has not been significant and has not yet developed a racist ideology among whites to support such violence. Indeed, the black power movement and black community uprising could, she writes “provoke a really violence white backlash, whose greatest danger would be the transformation of white prejudices into a full-fledged racist ideology for which law and order would indeed become a mere facade”, she made a similar claim in her New York Times Magazine article ‘Lawlessness is Inherent in the uprooted’, wherein she warned that the “lawlessness” of black community was creating real danger of a white

³⁹³ Ibid, p, 79.

³⁹⁴ Chad Kautzer, *Political Violence and Race*, A critique of Hannah, Purdue University press, Purdue University, pp, 10, 12.

backlash”. In the Origin of totalitarianism, Arendt argued that racism emerged in nineteenth century imperialism, not European colonisation, but racism is not view by Arendt as a cynical justification for plunder, rape enslavement, and murder. It was, she argues, rather the logical reaction of frightened, yet “civilized” European imperialist. In on violence, she similarly argued that Black violence could ultimately push the white community to rationally endorse “the invisible terror of police state for law and order in the streets”³⁹⁵. These Arendtian predictions are actually manifesting itself today in our society as violence revolutions and terrorism as evidence of these views. Even though in a complete different and diverse form in Africa.

³⁹⁵ Ibid, p, 10 - 12.

CHAPTER 9

CRITICAL APPRAISALS

This chapter focuses on the right attitude to adopt as the much needed vaccine to eliminate or reduce these problems of civil disobedience, violence and insecurity in our communities. This is to guarantee harmony and peaceful co-existence, even though, these phenomenon cannot be completely wipe off due to human emotions and desires. It is observed that, civil disobedience and violence are as old as the history of mankind. And in any human community, there is bound to be misunderstanding which can always inevitably lead to violence and civil unrest, but there are also solutions to eliminate or reduce it, such as education of the mass, goods laws, good governance among many other strategies.

This is to say that, if the right attitude is adopted, which can only come from well-trained citizens through education, and the respects of society norms or laws will logically be guaranteed in a well ordered state given that, these barbaric act perpetrated by some individual citizens within a given society either consciously or unconsciously is as a result of poor educational training, this has actually cause a lot of insecurity in our communities such as terrorism, violence, revolutions among others and can only be overcome through the above mentioned.

9.1. Education of the Mass as a Moral Armament

All citizens have to be trained in such a way that they should be academically fit, morally upright and socially balance, this therefore means that, our curriculum must be adjusted to suite and meet up with the challenges in our societies, this entails that our system of education rather arm citizens with irrelevant training, which cannot longer be accepted in our communities. Such as poor training with complete lack of moral values, and this fallen standard of immorality has accounted for some of the outstanding moral decadence and of course has open more doors to insecurity.

However, this moral education of the mass must be upheld with much determination and hard work. More to this governments should reinforce it in all sectors of social life, it has been observed over the years that, even when government launches competitive entrance to public service, they always exclude religious studies which is part, of moulding the minds and moral

armament. It is believe that if all institution reinforce ethical values and ensures these values goes down to every sector then our communities will experience peace and positive changes. John Dewey had it that “A genuine purpose always starts with an impulse. Obstruction of the immediate execution of an impulse converts it into a desire. Nevertheless neither impulse nor desire is itself a purpose. A purpose is an end-view. That is it involves foresight of the consequences which will result from acting upon impulse. Foresight of consequences involves the operation of intelligence. It demands, in the first place, observing of objective conditions and circumstances. For impulse and desire produce consequences not by themselves alone but through their interaction or cooperation with surrounding conditions. The impulse for such a simple action as walking is executed only in active conjunction with the ground on which one stands. Under ordinary circumstances, we do not have to pay much attention to the ground. In a ticklish situation we have to observe very carefully just what the conditions are, as in climbing a steep and rough mountain where no trial has been laid out. Exercise at observation is, then one condition at transforming of impulse into a purpose. As in the sign by a railway crossing, we have to stop, look listen”³⁹⁶

This is to say that we must develop our potentials within our environment, this means that our educational system must take into consideration the needs and aspiration of the people and most especially ethical values must be upheld, because it is exactly this ethics and moral values that are lacking in our societies among several aspects, so therefore, these crisis of immorality can be suppress through good educational programs, with moulding of the minds instead of the abstract of human desire. It is in this light that George F. Kneller emphasize on ethics and education that:

“Education is widely regarded as a moral enterprise. Teachers are always drawing attention to what ought to be said and done and how students ought to behave. They are concerned with imparting moral values and improving individual and social behaviour.

What kind of moral behaviour should a teacher advocate in his classes? Should he seek to promote the behaviour that he values or the behaviour valued by his community? Should he encourage the growth of certain character traits that he believes are desirable or should he let the child’s character form itself in response to the expectation of the classroom peer group? One’s answers to these questions will depend on one’s ethical attitudes. Any teacher who takes his

³⁹⁶ John Dewey, *Experience & Education*, Touchstone Rockefeller Centre, New York, published by Simon & Schuster, 1997, pp, 67,68.

vocation seriously must seek to answer the questions and justify his attitudes. He will be assisted in doing so by a formal study of ethics.

Ethics is the study of values in the realm of human conduct. It deals with such questions as: what is the good life for all men? How ought we to behave? It is concerned with providing “right” values as the basis for “right” actions. At one time ethical systems were linked to religions. Today, however, the ethical systems of the Western world, although largely derived from religious teaching has been banned in American public schools. But this ban in turn has stimulated a desire to substitute some kind of moral training”³⁹⁷

So with emphasis on moral education of the mass, the problem of rightness and wrongness can better be assessed. And good training can reduce the problem of insecurity, violence, terrorism, civil disobedience among others because the citizens are well equipped.

Moreso, if we engage in meaningful educational programs which mostly trains the mind, it will be a true panacea to the problem of insecurity, and revolutions in our societies, Arendt have it that “A crisis in education would at any time give rise to serious concern even if it did not reflect, as in the present instance it does, a more general crisis and instability in modern society. For education belongs among the most elementary and necessary activities at human society, which never remains as it is but continuously a renew itself through the arrival of new human beings. These newcomers, moreover, are not finished but in a state of becoming thus the child, the subject of education has for the educator a double aspect: he is new in a world. That is strange to him and he is in process of becoming, he is a new human being and he is a becoming human being. This double aspect is by no means self-evident and it does not apply to the animal forms of life; it corresponds to a double relationship. The relationship to the world on the one hand and to life on the other. The child shares the state of becoming with all living things; in respect to life and its development, the child is a human being in process of becoming, just as a kitten is a cat in process of becoming. But the child is new only in relation to a world that was there before him, that will continue after death, and in which he is to spend his life. If the child were not a new comer in this human world but simply a not yet finished living creature, education would be just a function of

³⁹⁷George F. Kneller, *Introduction to the philosophy of education*, Macmillan. Publishing company, New York, 1971, p, 29.

life and would need to consist in nothing save. That concern for the sustenance of life and training and practice in living that animals assume in respect to their young”³⁹⁸

This therefore implies that, our children inherit only what we transmit to them, which of course means that if there is rising insecurity in our societies, then it follows that, it was implanted by our parent and the state in which they structured for us, so it will be relevant to equip and educate the mass with moral values, ethics and other forms of training that enforces human capacities positively. Hannah Arendt further articulated that: “Human parent, however, have not only summoned their children into life through conception and birth, they have simultaneously introduced them into a world in education they assume responsibility for both for the life and development of the child and for the continence of the world. These two responsibilities do not by any means coincide; they may indeed come into conflict with each other. The responsibility for the development of the child turns in a certain sense against the world: the child requires special protection and care so that nothing destructive may happen to him from the world. But the world, too, needs protection to keep it from being overrun and destroyed by the onslaught of the new that bursts upon it with each new generation”³⁹⁹

This is because if the child is not protected in the world and grew up to realise that other members of the inherited world are a threat to his desire, then he or she is left with no option them self-defence and violence and civil disobedience becomes becomes regrettable.

In this regard for a citizen to associate and fully participate in community life he or she must first at all be educated on the norms and moral values of the society, which means that community life must be inclusive to permit community action and thought. So in any society educational programs should be establish with the ultimate good to have a positive and with regards to the concerns of its members, Plato suggested that “Education proceeds ultimately from the patterns furnished by institutions, customs, and laws. Only in a just state will these be such as to give the right education; and only those who have rightly trained minds will be able to recognize the end, and ordering principle of things. We seem to be caught in a hopeless circle. However, Plato suggested a way out. A few men, philosophers or lovers of wisdom or truth may by study learn at least in outline the proper patterns of true existence. If a powerful ruler should form a state

³⁹⁸ Hannah Arendt, *Crises in Education*, 1954, pp, 7, 8.

³⁹⁹ *Ibid*, pp, 7, 8.

after these patterns, then its regulations could be preserved. And education could be given which would sift individuals, discovering what they were good for, and supplying a method of assigning each to the work in life for which his nature fits him. Each doing his own part, and never transgressing, the order and unity of the whole would be maintained.

The democratic conception in Education

Those who possess this are capable of the highest kind of education, and become in time the legislators of the state for laws are the universals which control the particulars of experience. Thus it is not true that in intent, Plato subordinated the individual to the social whole. But it is true that lacking the perception of the uniqueness of every individual, his incommensurability with others, and consequently not recognizing that a society might change and yet be stable, this doctrine of limited powers and classes came in net effect to the idea of the subordination of individuality.

We cannot better Plato's conviction that an individual is happy and society well organized when each individual engages in those activities for which he has natural equipment, or his conviction that it is the primary office of education to discover this equipment to its possessor and train him for its effective use. But progress in knowledge has made us aware of the superficiality of Plato's lumping of individuals and their original powers into a few sharply marked-off classes; it has taught us that original capacities are indefinitely numerous and variable. It is but the other side of this fact to say that in the degree in which society has become democratic, social organization means utilization of the specific and variable qualities of individuals, not stratification by classes. Although his educational philosophy was revolutionary, it was done the less in bondage to static ideals. He thought that change or alteration was evidence of lawless flux; that true reality was unchangeable. Hence while he would radically change the existing state of society, his aim was to construct a state in which change would subsequently have no place. The final end of life is fixed; give a state framed with this end in view, not even minor details are to be altered. Though they might not be inherently important, yet if permitted they would insure the minds of men to the idea of change, and hence be dissolving and anarchic. The breakdown of his philosophy is made apparent in the fact that he could not trust to gradual improvements in education to bring about a better society which should then improve education, and so on indefinitely. Correct education could not come into existence until an ideal state existed, and after that education would be devoted simply to its conservation. For the existence of this state he was obliged to trust to some happy

accident by which philosophic wisdom should happen to coincide with possession of ruling power in the state.”⁴⁰⁰

However, when people are well train in their respective specialties, the spirit of civil disobedience and violence will pertly be resolve and the norms of the society also taken to a higher light by revitalising the curriculum to meet up with standard and expectation of the society.

The educational curriculum is primarily a matter of knowledge, knowing that and knowing how, together with some beliefs and attitudes, all of which it is thought desirable that children should be introduced to. The question is: what knowledge, what beliefs and what attitudes? Plainly, not everything which counts as knowledge and most certainly not everything that can be believed would be suitable for inclusion in an educational curriculum. Lack of time alone would require that a selection should be made from the vast amount of knowledge available. Moreover, the normative sense of education requires that what is taught should be worth learning, capable of improving the person who learns. So the question may be put as: what knowledge is of most worth? Different answers to this question will result in different conclusions about the curriculum. Now, it is perhaps important to note that few teachers are in real doubt as to what the curriculum should include. Most teachers would be surprised and puzzled if they went into a school which did not teach mathematics, some science, history, geography, some aesthetic subjects and some religious and moral content. There are areas of knowledge and belief generally accepted as worth teaching to children. The main question to be asked about the contents of the curriculum is not: what knowledge is to be include? But: what grounds are there for holding that the traditional curriculum should be as it is? We have a general conviction about what knowledge is of most worth. The problem is to make clear why we have this conviction. This is a problem about which the philosopher of education may have something useful to say, since it is a problem about justification.

Different answers to the question: why should we teach these subjects or these disciplines rather than any others? Really amount to different theories of the curriculum. They are subordinate prescriptive theories which find their place within the framework of a general theory of education. They come under the heading of ‘assumptions about knowledge’. The assumptions are to the effect that certain kind’s knowledge are necessary to realise the educational aim presupposed by the

⁴⁰⁰John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, the Macmillan Company, New York, 1930, pp, 103, 105, 106.

overall theory. In the remainder of this chapter some major theories of the curriculum will be outlined.

The word ‘utilitarian’ may be understood in two different although related ways. It may be equated roughly with ‘useful’, so that a utilitarian curriculum would be one justified on justified because it is useful, to the workman, the householder, the engineer, the scientist. So too with science. One influential educationalist of the nineteenth century, Herbert Spencer, thought that scientific knowledge was at the bottom of all that one needed to know in order to be a competent worker, successful parent, responsible citizen and wise user of leisure. Apart from mathematics and science, other disciplines –history, geography, and the various arts and crafts– may be justified on the grounds that they too are useful in one way or another. This view of the curriculum is revealed in Rousseau’s *Emile*, in which it is held⁴⁰¹ that everything *Emile* learns should be justified in terms of ‘what use is this to me?’

Another, more restricted meaning of the term is, roughly, ‘conducive to human happiness’. This was the view of those philosophers known as Utilitarians. James Mill, declared that it was the business of education to make the human mind the source of happiness; Happiness, both to the individual himself and to other strictly Utilitarian curriculum would be justified on the grounds that it conduces towards human happiness. Happiness, the Utilitarian’s thought, was largely a matter of the way in which the external world of things and the social world of neighbours and institutions made an impact on men’s lives, and education was way of preparing the pupil to live happily in these worlds. Science, for example, enables us to foresee the consequences of our actions and their effect on our own happiness here and hereafter. The traditional curriculum, the arts and sciences, may be justified simply because the various disciplines included in it have been found to conduce to happiness, not only that of the learner himself, but also of all those with whom he comes into social contact.

It may be useful to refer briefly here to a position maintained in recent years by the sociologists of education who, following a Marxist line of thought, point out that an educational curriculum in fact reflects an interest. The knowledge included is that which, by and large, is in the interest of those whose ideas are predominantly influential in society. The curriculum of the

⁴⁰¹ T.W. Moore, *Philosophy of Education, An Introduction*; Routledge and Kegan Paul, London Boston, and Henley, 2010, pp, 25, 26.

nineteenth century reflected the interests of the commercial and industrial middle class whose social position was the dominant, and such a curriculum is not necessarily appropriate to a different social situation with different class interest. An extension and implication of this position was then dominant, and such a curriculum is not necessarily appropriate to a different social situation, with different class interests. An extension and implication of this position is that there can be no 'absolute' knowledge since what counts as knowledge will always be socially determine and therefore relative. It is not possible to deal here with the interesting but complicated and therefore relative. It is not possible to deal here with the interesting but complicate further implications of this position. What can be said here is that this 'relativist' theory of knowledge contains a truth obscured by a muddle. The truth is that what counts as *worthwhile* knowledge and skill will be socially determined. Different kinds of societies and societies at different stages of follow from this that, as is sometimes suggested, society makes its own knowledge, that knowledge is, by its nature, socially determined and relative. The truths of applied mathematics and science, for example, do not depend on what men think or decide, although the value of these disciplines will to a large extent do so.

The idea that a curriculum is justified to the extent to which it produces a 'rational mind' is as old as Plato. The curriculum outlined in *The Republic* was designed to produce the sort of man who would be able to apprehend the Forms of reality which lay behind the shifting appearances of the everyday world. Plato's curriculum involved certain initial empirical studies for the young child, to acquaint him with the order which exists in the phenomenal world, but the emphasis soon shifts to more formal studies for the young men destined to become the Guardians of the state. These formal studies involved certain initial empirical studies for the young child, to acquaint him with the order which exists in the phenomenal world, but the emphasis soon shifts to more formal studies for the young men destined to become the Guardians of the state. These formal studies involved mathematics – for Plato the paradigm of knowledge, and a sort of philosophy akin to mathematics, which would eventually yield true knowledge, a quasi-mathematical grasping or intuition of the Forms. Such knowledge would be true knowledge, a rational grasp of reality, as distinct from the opinions men may have, which are all they can have, of the world of appearances.”⁴⁰²

⁴⁰² Ibid, pp, 26, 27.

A modern theory of the curriculum which, despite many significant differences, has some points of similarity with the Platonic view, is that offered by P.H. Hirst account is that, historically, men have adopted certain ways of looking at their world, certain “forms of knowledge’ as he calls them. They may perhaps be best understood, not as entities in the Platonic sense, but as different perspectives, giving different viewpoints concerning the world. Each form has its own characteristic conceptual structure and a characteristic way of coming to conclusions. Mathematics is one such form, with its own set of concepts, like ‘number’, ‘square root’, ‘cosine’, and its characteristic procedures, deductive argument and demonstration. Science is another form of knowledge, once again with its characteristic concepts, such as mass energy, protoplasm, and osmosis, and its own characteristic ways of arriving at conclusions: observation, experiment, inductive reasoning. Other forms are those of morals, aesthetics and religion, each of which has its own conceptual apparatus and its own particular way of arriving at conclusions and testing those conclusions for truth. This theory has not been fully worked out in detail and there are still unanswered questions concerning it. The tests for truth in morals, aesthetics and religion, for example, have not been clearly set out or even established so far as to meet general acceptance. The point about the theory, however, is that it offers a justification of the curriculum as a means of the making of a mind, a rational mind. Hirst’s major recommendation is that, since each form is separate and distinct and no one form is a substitute for another, the curriculum should contain all the forms of knowledge if a rational mind is to be fashioned by it. For rationality is a matter of acting for good reasons, and good reasons ultimately depend on knowledge? So, unless the pupil is initiated into all the forms of knowledge there must be areas of human experience in which he will not be able to act for good reasons? A man who knows no science cannot act rationally within a scientific context. In so far as he acts effectively it will be by chance, or, more likely, as a result of being directed by someone who does have the required knowledge. Anyone who has not been initiated into the arts, music or literature will be unable to make rational decisions or choices in these fields, will not be able to act with rational autonomy. The same will be true of anyone whose learning is quite outside the area of religious belief or moral knowledge. That knowledge will be of most worth which prepares the pupil for rational living, by giving him the intellectual basis of rational action. The traditional curriculum is justified to the extent to which it provides such a preparation.

Another theory of justification, not altogether different from the preceding one, might be put in this way: the point of education is to bring children into what exist as a public tradition of shared knowledge. This public tradition may be seen as a kind of heritage, an estate in which all members of the human race have an interest, a part or a place. Another word for the tradition or estate is 'culture', and culture comprises the intellectual, aesthetic, moral and material achievements of mankind in its long history. Mathematics and science are a part of this heritage; so too are music and painting and architecture. So too are morality and the religious point of view. History is a part of it, since history is about man's past; geography is a part of it, since geography is about man's place in the physical world. These different areas of knowledge and belief constitute a human outlook on reality. To be able to move about freely in these areas is to be a human being, as distinct from a human animal. A human being is one who is able to understand his situation in these terms. Children are not born with this understanding. They are born human, but they are born human animals rather than human beings. Education is the means by which the human animal is converted into a human being. Or, in other words, the means by which the child is brought into the systems of shared knowledge which constitutes his cultural heritage or estate. The curriculum is justified to the extent to which it is capable of bringing about this conversion, or may be used to do so.

There is something to be said for each of these attempts at justification, but it may be argued that each, taken by itself, is to some extent inadequate. If according to one version of 'utilitarian', justification is given strictly in terms of usefulness, this would be an indictment of what is now generally accepted as a curriculum, since much of what is included in it would not seem to be particularly useful in the ordinary sense of the word. Trigonometry knowledge of the policies of the Plantagenet kings, or of the causes of the Trade Winds, is not all that useful for the average citizen who would get on very well without them. Most teachers, however, would want to include knowledge of this kind in the curriculum even though it might not seem 'useful' in any ordinary, mundane sense. This follows from a conviction that education should involve the acquisition of some knowledge 'for its own sake' apart from any direct or immediate usefulness it may have for the learner. The more particular, hedonistic Utilitarian version, which bases its justification on the production of happiness, seems suspect in that it is likely that education, as structured by the traditional curriculum, does not on the whole, or necessarily, tend to increase a man's happiness or make him a source of happiness to others. Indeed, by making him more aware

of and sensitive to the human condition it may only succeed in making him less contented than before. Moreover, it may be argued that happiness depends so much on the general circumstances of a man's life that education is able to do very little about it so far as individuals are concerned, and to try to justify a curriculum as a means to happiness is to claim more for it than the facts warrant.

The 'rational mind' type of justification, whilst it has the merit of seeing education in terms of human improvement, as tending towards rationality and autonomy, is perhaps open to the objection that it leans too far away from what was, after all, acceptable in the utilitarian case. It tends to emphasise the 'understanding', aspect without necessarily emphasising the need to make sure that what is taught is, in a mundane sense, useful to the learner. It would be possible to give a rational understanding, to make a rational mind, through mathematics and science, art and religion, by concentrating on aspects of those subjects which had little practical application to everyday life. Initiation into algebra, astronomy and the arguments involved in dogmatic theology would no doubt make for rationality, but would not be particularly useful to men in general. Much the same kind of reservations might be held concerning the 'heritage' approach which, whilst it meets the requirement that knowledge should be seen as important in its own right, as part of the human culture, may sometimes seem to be concerned with issues remote from everyday practical affairs.

The fact is that each of these attempted justifications calls attention in turn to an important aspect of the curriculum, although none of them will suffice entirely on its own. An adequate justification would involve what is sound in each of these approaches. Utility, or plain usefulness, may not be the only warrant for what is taught, but it is true that unless what is taught is likely to be useful to the learner, or tends towards happiness generally, its inclusion in the curriculum would be at least questionable. Then again, if it can be shown that a subject is a means of giving a child an increasingly rational grasp of the nature of reality, or is a way of introducing him to an appreciation and understanding of his cultural heritage, this would be a strong consideration in its favour and do much to offset any lack of direct or immediate usefulness. The curriculum may thus be partly and to some extent justified in a number of ways: that what it provides is directly useful, or tends on the whole to increase happiness, or underwrites rationality in the conduct of affairs, or does something to make the learner a civilised human being, aware of and appreciative of what is distinctive in human culture. A subject or discipline which met all these criteria would be a prime

candidate for inclusion; those which fell short in one respect or other would need to have a special case made for their inclusion⁴⁰³.

However, moral education of the mass is therefore suggested as a new social contract to be embraced by all as a pedagogic mitigation and syllabus of life to avoid civil disorder, violence, terrorism and other forms of insecurity which can also eliminate other negative practices such as embezzlement, corruption among other vice, this moral education of the mass suggests to be enshrined in our curriculum and it should be studied in all levels, and in all societies even as an obligation in the enterprise of education.

It is on this account that T.W. Moore further reiterated that "it is generally held that there is a close connection between education and morals and between education and religion. Indeed, many people in the past believed, although perhaps not so many would do so today, that the whole point of education lies in its moralising and religious force. Dr Arnold, the headmaster of Rugby, believed it to be the business of the public school to turn out Christian gentlemen. Cardinal Newman in his *Discourses on university teaching* emphasised the integral part which religious studies must play, as he saw it, in any system of liberal education. The great significance given to religious teaching in this country is reflected in the provision that such teaching should be regarded as compulsory in all schools covered by the Education Act of 1944. The assumption that education should be concerned with the moral life of the pupil is one that few teachers and parents would care to contest. In its strongest form the conviction would be that moral and religious teaching are essential to education, in that education is not really possible without them. We may note here that such a view would constitute a theory *about* education, that is, the theory that education necessarily involves a religious and moral content. It is such a theory which prescribes that in all state schools in this country the day should include some form of corporate worship, and which convinces many teachers that they have an obligation, as teachers, to further the moral training and religious beliefs of their pupils. The philosopher of education may point out here that such a theory may rest on, and derive its plausibility from, a stipulated use of the term 'education', whereby the inclusion of a moral and religious element is made a part of the

⁴⁰³ Ibid, pp, 28, 29.

meaning of the term. Whether or not this is a useful move to make will be examined briefly in this chapter, which takes a philosophical look at the theory, to its credentials as a theory of education⁴⁰⁴.

More to that “morals, or morality, have to do with human behaviour judged from a normative point of view. It is about what ought to be done, as distinct from what is in fact done. We may distinguish morals from prudential considerations, which are about what ought to be done primarily in the interest of the person doing the action. Prudence concerns those duties we owe primarily to ourselves/ morality is about those actions which affect the interests and well-being of others, as well as ourselves.

About the whole field of moral studies we may make the point which in our first chapter we made about education itself. We may think of morals as being concerned with a hierarchy of activities. At the lowest logical level there are moral practices, like telling the truth, keeping promises and paying debts. At a logically higher level there are moral theories, which try to give a general account of, or a justification of, conclusions about what ought to be done in practice. Moral theories like utilitarianism, intuitionism and emotivism belong at this level. At a higher level still come the analysis of concepts and the scrutiny of moral theories which constitutes moral philosophy. The moral philosopher is concerned with the actual usage of moral language, with concepts like ‘good’ and ‘right’ and ‘duty’, and with the validity and acceptability of theories which are offered to justify moral decisions and judgements. That there will be a connection between the findings of the moral theorist, the moral philosopher and the philosopher of education is very likely, the more so if education is regarded as a predominantly ‘moral’ enterprise. But the precise connection between morals and education and the degree to which they are connected are not at all easy to establish. There is, in fact, some reason to suppose that the study of education in the past has been somewhat over moralised, and that some educational theorists and philosophers of education have been led far deeper into the complicated labyrinths of moral theory than has been somewhat over moralised, and that some educational theorists and philosophers of education have been led far deeper into the complicated labyrinths of moral theory than has been strictly necessary. This is not to deny that the moral philosopher has some important insights to give to the educator and to the philosopher of education. It is simply to say that moral philosophy is a wide

⁴⁰⁴ T.W. Moore, *Philosophy of Education, An Introduction*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London Boston, and Henley, 2010, p, 42.

and still inadequately charted ocean and that the philosopher of education must be careful not to get lost on it⁴⁰⁵.

This why the view that morals and education are necessarily connected springs partly from the belief that education is the initiation of a pupil into areas of knowledge and understanding which are themselves valuable. Education is a normative matter. The implication here, more often stated than argued, is that the value, or worthwhile, involve is a moral quality, so that when one is teaching mathematics or science or history one is serving a moral end. A strong version of this view is that the real value of these disciplines comes from their moral content, that what is important in them is the concern for truth, order and discipline, which are categorised as elements of morality. If this were so, then the whole of education would be informed with morality and to talk about education apart from morality would be a contradiction in terms. This, however, seems to overstate the case. We may agree that to be educative what is taught must be something of value, something worth learning, but this is not to say that the subjects themselves must be worthwhile in any positive moral sense. Many of the traditional academic disciplines are in fact morally neutral. Their value consists in their being useful to the learner, or as involving worthwhile considerations of a non-moral kind. A concern for truth, in the sense of accuracy, correctness, and a respect for evidence, elegance and economy, are not as such to do with moral values. They have more in common with aesthetic appreciations. (This point may be contested on the grounds that there is in fact an 'ethics of belief', a moral value in getting at the truth. Discussion of this would require a further treatment than is possible here.) The real relevance of 'worthwhileness' to morality here is that no subject would be regarded as worthwhile in the educational sense if it is immoral; but subjects may well be worth learning even though they have no 'moral' dimension. Subjects have to pass a negative test as regards morality, not a positive one.

Another approach to the conclusion that morality is a necessary part of education is this it has been maintained that, there are a number of distinct forms of knowledge and understanding which men have evolved, different ways of looking at the world, all of which are essential to an adequate, or rational, comprehension of the human condition. Mathematics is one of these forms, science is another, aesthetics another, and so on. Initiation into these distinct forms of experience is needed to make a rational mind. It is

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid, p, 43.

claimed that morals, like religion, is one of these ways of understanding the human situation, and that without an entry into these specific areas a man lacks the basis for rationality of this particular kind. If this is so, then education, which is a means of initiating the young into these various forms of knowledge, must necessarily involve initiation into morals. For unless it does so the pupil is not properly equipped to act as a rational creature in that important area. A similar argument could be used to justify the inclusion of each and every one of the different forms, that failing any of them the pupil would not be 'educated'.

At this point we may remark that the argument depends upon a stipulative or definitional meaning being given to the term education. If education is understood as initiation into a number of different but essential forms of knowledge, and morals are accepted as one of those essential forms, then it follows of necessity that the teaching of morals must be a part of education, and education must be a moral concern. This however, is simply a matter of stipulation. We could always deny that someone who had not undergone some moral instruction was 'properly educated' since, given the stipulation, 'properly educated' means, amongst other things, having had some moral training. But to talk of being properly educated in this all-or-nothing way is to take up a position which does not altogether conform to popular usage. It doesn't seem absurd or self-contradictory to say of someone that he is well educated but totally lacking in moral understanding. We would presumably have to say of such a man that he was educated but that there were areas of understanding in which he was deficient, morals for one. We should have to say something of the same sort about one who, though otherwise educated, knew nothing about science, or art, or medicine, or law. Education is not a matter of all or nothing and we do not withhold the term 'educated' from those who are uninformed in one or two areas, however important these areas may be. Thus it would probably be more true to say that moral instruction is a desirable part of a general education, although only contingently so.

Another way of putting this is to say that moral education is not a necessary part of education in the sense that every teacher is or must be a teacher of morals. When a teacher is teaching mathematics or history or science he is not, or at least he need not be, engaged in moral teaching. These subjects, although value-loaded, are not 'morally loaded'. They are neutral in respect of morals. Moral education is a distinct kind of education, like

mathematical education. Moral education is thus a constituent part of the enterprise of education, like mathematical education. Moral education is thus a constituent part of the enterprise of education, and necessary in the practical sense that without it education is not complete. But it is not necessarily involved in education in the way in which the requirement that what is taught should be worth learning is necessarily involved in it. In other words, a moral content is not part of the definition of the term education. To make it so would simply be to restrict the term in a way that does not accord with our ordinary understanding of it. The teacher is of course, in his role as educator bound to practice morality in his teaching. He is bound to use morally acceptable procedures and to show respect for his pupils as persons. But to teach in a morally acceptable manner is not, as such, the same thing as engaging in moral education⁴⁰⁶.

Given that morality is an important though not logically necessary part of a general education, the question now to be answered is what is involved in moral education? Plainly it is, to begin with, a matter of transmitting knowledge. Moral education has to do with influencing behaviour and this presupposes a certain amount of knowledge to be acquired by the pupil. Children are not born moral, they have to be made so, and an indispensable part of this enterprise is that of equipping them with a certain conceptual apparatus. It is plain that a child will not be able to choose to do the right thing unless he knows what it is. He will not be able to attach any sense to the teaching that he ought to keep a promise if he doesn't know what a promise is, and it is useless to tell a child that he ought not to steal if he doesn't know the meaning of steal, and so on. Moral knowledge is thus an indispensable part of moral education. This acquisition of knowledge will involve an understanding of moral concepts like right, wrong, duty and promise together with a grasp of rules like 'One ought to tell the truth, to keep a promise, to pay debts, to be kind to others. 'How a child is given this knowledge and understanding is a matter of moral pedagogy. Two main tasks come under this heading. Firstly, the child must be initiated into 'moral' language; he must be taught to handle the concepts and he must learn the rules. Secondly, he must be encouraged to act according to the rules. He must be encouraged to speak the truth, keep his promises and be considerate to others. This latter aspect of the task is moral training, which consists

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid, pp, 43, 44.

in getting children to act in morally acceptable ways, to abide by the moral code of their society. This is an elementary form of morality: acting in accordance with customary social expectations.

The teacher's task in moral training has been facilitated during the past twenty or thirty years by detailed studies, carried out by child psychologists and others, concerning the way in which a child's moral consciousness develops. These studies, of which Piaget's and Kohlberg's are important examples, do not belong to the field of moral philosophy or of philosophy of education, but they enter into educational theory by providing information about the way in which children develop and so enable teachers to engage in moral training more effectively than might otherwise be possible. The findings referred to are detailed and complicated and will not be gone into here. The general conclusions differ between one theorist and another, but they amount to this: that, as is the case with a child's intellectual life, his moral consciousness develops in stages. There is an initial stage of non-morality, in which the child is not really conscious of rules or obligations. Then comes a stage in which rules are recognised and generally obeyed, but are regarded as arbitrary and as imposed from without, obedience being given simply as a matter of prudence. A further stage is where rules are accepted as fixed and unalterable but dependent upon some sort of group approval or authority. Then finally, the child comes to see the point of the rules, as limitations which make social life possible, and comes eventually to internalise them, adopting them for his own. This progression, from a non-moral position to one of recognition and appreciation, from heteronomy to moral autonomy, is seen as a logically invariant sequence. For Piaget it depends to some extent on maturation; for Kohlberg it is the consequence of the interaction of the child with social forces and institutions. The pedagogical implications are that, although little can be done in school about the actual stages of development, since these are a matter of maturation or of social interaction, what can be done is to provide moral teaching which fits in with the stage of development the child has at any given time reached. Moral training is thus parallel to intellectual training. There are points of readiness in the moral life as there are in the intellectual life, and the moral educator must be aware of them and ready to organise his teaching accordingly⁴⁰⁷.

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid, pp, 45, 46.

9.2 The law as mitigation

Observing from Thomas Hobbes philosophy on the origin of the state it is understood that the state of nature was a lawless one of which survival was based on the interest of the stronger that is survival of the fittest, to this effect human destiny especially to the weaker ones whose survival was just in the mercy of an accident. This human insufficiency necessitates the creation of the civil state or society which led to the introduction of laws to regulate life and human activities. This law which is a system of rules that are enforce through social institutions to govern behaviour, clearly define the relationship between individuals and their institutions as well as other members in their communities. Hobbes therefore sees the law of nature as “(lex naturalis) is a percept or general rule, found out by reason, by which a man is forbidden to do that which is destructive of his life or taketh away the means of preserving the same, and to omit that by which he thinketh it may be best preserved. For though they that speak at this subject use to confound jus and lex (right and law), yet they ought to be distinguished, because Right consistent in liberty to do or to forbear, whereas law determineth and bindeth to one of them. So that law and right literal much as obligation and liberty, which in one and the same matter are” inconsistent.⁴⁰⁸ By this since man left the state of nature which was barbaric and lawless, and of course join the commonwealth and civil society, he then proceeded to established that “the civil law is to every subject, those rules which the commonwealth hath commanded him (by word, writing, or other sufficient sign of the will) to make use of, for the distinction of right and wrong that is to say, of what is contrary, and what is not contrary to the rule”⁴⁰⁹

It will be of primary interest to enact and promulgate laws that are reasonable and commanding so that all members of that society must abide to. In this regard, members of that community must be educated at all levels and in all sectors, that is, all disciplines must incorporate the law in their pedagogic syllabuses and if education is made compulsory and law is part of the educational training, then citizens will be conscious enough to know that, what is wrong to be avoided and what is right to be done, because these laws established by the commonwealth for a common interest will certain regulate human actions automatically, this way civil disorder, violence, terrorism and revolutions as well as other societal ill will be avoided. In this regard, the

⁴⁰⁸Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Hackett publishing company, in indranapolis Cambridge, 1668, pp, 79, 80.

⁴⁰⁹Ibid, p, 73.

society can freely be called a well ordered society as John Rawls will have it and any well order society is bound to experience development, peaceful living together as the law imposes or dictates.

Rawls further articulated that,

As stated in the fundamental idea of a well-ordered society-a society effectively regulated by a public conception of justice is a companion idea used to specify the central organizing idea of society as a fair system of cooperation. Now to say that a political society is well ordered conveys three things:

First, and implied by the idea of a public conception of justice, it is a society in which everyone accepts, and knows that everyone else accepts, the very same political conception of justice and so the same principles of political justice. Moreover, this knowledge is mutually recognize: that is, people know everything they would know if their acceptance of those principles were a matter of public agreement.

Second, an implied by the idea of effective regulation by a public conception of justice, society's basic structure that is, its main political and social institutions and the way they hang together as one system of cooperation is publicly known, or with good reason believed, to satisfy those principles of justice.

Third, and also implied by the idea of effective regulation, citizens have a normally effective sense of justice, that is, one that enables them to understand and apply the publicly recognized principles of justice, and for the most part to act accordingly as their position in society, with its duties and obligations, requires.

In a well-ordered society, then, the public conception of justice provides a mutually recognized point of view from which citizens can adjudicate their claims of political right on their political institutions or against one another.

The idea of a well-ordered society is plainly a very considerable idealization. One reason we form this idea is that an important question about a conception of justice for a democratic society is whether, and how it can serve as the publicly recognized and mutually acknowledged conception of justice when society is viewed as a system of cooperation between free and equal citizens from one generation to the next. A political conception of justice that could not fulfil this public role must be, it seems, in some way seriously defective. The suitability of a conception of

justice for a well-ordered society provides an important criterion for comparing political conceptions of justice. The idea of a well-ordered society helps to formulate that criterion and to specify further the central organizing idea of social cooperation.

The idea of a well-ordered society has two meanings. Its general meaning is given above in a well ordered society is a society effectively regulated by some public political conception of justice, whatever that conception may be. But the idea has a particular meaning when we refer to the well-ordered society of a particular conception of justice, as when we say that all members of society accept and know that all the others accept the same political conception of justice, for example, a particular natural rights doctrine, or a form of utilitarianism, or justice as fairness. Note that, given the fact of reasonable pluralism, a well-ordered society in which all its members accept the same comprehensive doctrine is impossible. But democratic citizens holding different comprehensive doctrines may agree on political conceptions of justice. Political liberalism holds that this provides a sufficient as well as the most reasonable basis of social unity available to us as citizens of a democratic society.⁴¹⁰

Another fundamental idea is the idea of the basic structure of a well-ordered society. This idea is introduced so as to formulate and present justice as fairness as having an appropriate unity. Along with the idea of the original position, it is needed to complete other ideas and to order them into a perspicuous whole. The idea of the basic structure may be seen in that light.

As indicated above in the basic structure of society is the way in which the main political and social institutions of society fit together into one system of social cooperation, and the way they assign basic rights and duties and regulate the division of advantages that arises from social cooperation over time. The political constitution with an independent judiciary, the legally recognized forms of property, and the structure of the economy (for example, as a system of competitive markets with private property in the means of production, as well as the family in some form, all belong to the basic structure. The basic structure is the background social framework within which the activities of associations and individuals take place. A just basic structure secures what we may call background justice.

One main feature of justice as fairness is that it takes the basic structure as the primary subject of political justice. It does so in part because the effects of the basic structure on

⁴¹⁰John Rawls, *Justice as Fairness*, A restatement, Edited by Eria Kelly, the Belknap press of Harvard University press Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England, 2001, pp, 8,9.

Citizen's aims, aspirations, and character, as well as on their opportunities and their ability to take advantage of them, are pervasive and present from the beginning of life. Our focus is almost entirely on the basic structure as the subject of political and social justice.

Since justice as fairness starts with the special case of the basic structure, its principles regulate this structure and do not apply directly to or regulate internally institutions and associations within society. Firms and labor unions, churches, universities, and the family are bound by constraints arising from the principles of justice, but these constraints arise indirectly from just background institutions within which associations and groups exist, and by which the conduct of their members is restricted.

For example, while churches can excommunicate heretics, they cannot burn them; this constraint is to secure liberty of conscience. Universities cannot discriminate in certain ways: this constraint is to help to establish fair equality of opportunity. Parents (women equally with men are equal citizens and have equal basic right inclusion the right of property; they must respect the right of their children (which the latter have as prospective citizens and cannot, for instance, deprive them of essential medical care. Moreover, to establish equality between men and women in sharing the work of society, in preserving its culture and in reproducing itself over time, special provisions are needed in family law (and no doubt elsewhere) so that the burden of bearing, raising, and education children does not fall more heavily on women, thereby undermining their fair equality of opportunity.

One should not assume in advance that, the principles that are reasonable and just for the basic structure are also reasonable and just for institutions, associations, and social practices generally. While the principles of justice as fairness impose limits on these social arrangements within the basic structure, the basic structure and the associations and social forms within it are each governed by distinct principles in view of their different aims and purposes and their peculiar nature and special requirements. Justice as fairness is a political, not a general, conception of justice; it applies first to the basic structure and sees these other questions of local justice and also questions of global justice (what I call the law of peoples as calling for separate consideration on their merits.⁴¹¹

The principles of justice to be followed directly by associations and institutions within the basic structure we may call principles of local justice. Altogether then we have three levels of

⁴¹¹Ibid, pp, 10, 11.

justice, moving from inside outward: first, local justice (principles applying directly to institutions and associations, second, domestic, justice (principles applying to the basic structure of society); and finally, global justice (principles applying to international law). Justice as fairness starts with domestic justice- the justice of the basic structure. From there it works outward to the law of peoples and inward to local justice. The law of peoples has been discussed elsewhere. No attempt will be made here to deal systematically with local justice. In general, principles for the basic structure constrain (or limit) but do not determine uniquely, the suitable principles of local justice.

In addition

“Note that our characterization of the basic structure does not provide a sharp definition, or criterion, from which we can tell what social arrangements, or aspects thereof, belong to it. Rather, we start with a loose characterization of what is initially a rough idea. As indicated above, we must specify the idea more exactly as seems best after considering a variety of particular questions. With this done, we then check how the more definite characterization coheres with our considered convictions on due reflection.

The role of a political conception of justice, however, is not to say exactly how these questions are to be settled, but to set out a framework of thought within which they can be approached. Were we to lay down a definition of the basic structure that draws sharp boundaries, not only would we go beyond what that rough idea could reasonably contain but we would also risk wrongly prejudging what more specific or future conditions may call for, thus making justice as fairness unable to adjust to different social circumstances. For our judgments to be reasonable, they must usually be informed by an awareness of those more specific circumstances”.

Finally, to anticipate, since justice as fairness presents itself as a possible focus of a reasonable overlapping consensus, and since the basic structure is the primary subject of justice, the boundaries and aspects of this structure must eventually be drawn and specified in ways that, if possible, at least permit it not encourage, such a consensus. So generally stated, it is not evident what this condition requires; but these matters we try to answer as we take up a wider range of questions.”⁴¹²

However, Rawls justice can only be establish in a well ordered state with good laws that are been respected by all its citizens as an inheritance in their educational system as define by the

⁴¹²ibid, pp, 11, 12.

curriculum, with a lot of moral values, this way citizens becomes completely arm to respect the norms or laws of their societies, John Lock in the two treaties of the civil government holds that Jean-Jacques Rousseau on his view further articulated that: By the social compartment we have given the body politic existence and life; now it's up to the legislation to give it movement and will. The basic act that forms the body and pulls it together does nothing to settle what it must do in order to service.

It's the nature of things that makes an item good and in conformity with order-human agreements don't come into it. All justice comes from God, who is its sole source: but if we knew how to draw it from that high source we wouldn't need. Government or laws, no doubt there is a universal justice emanating from reason alone, but this justice can be admitted among us only if it is mutual. In the absence of natural sanctions the laws of justice are ineffective among men agreements and laws are needed to join rights to duties and relate justice to its object. In the state of nature where everything is common, I don't owe anything to someone to whom I haven't promised anything; I recognize as belonging to others only what is of no use to me. It's not like that in the state of society, where all rights are fixed by law"⁴¹³

This is to say that Rousseau also accepted societal norms especially moral ones from God which we must embrace as a societal rubric.

In this regard, Locke contented that

“God having made man such a creature, that, in his own judgment, it was not good for him to be alone, put him under strong obligations of necessity, convenience, and inclination to drive him into society, as well as fitted him with understanding and language to continue and enjoy it. The first society was between man and wife, which gave beginning to that between parents and children; to which, in time, that between master and servant came to be added: and though all these might, and commonly did meet together, and make up but one family, wherein the master or mistress of it had some sort of rule proper to a family; each of these, or all together came short of political society, as we shall see, if we consider the different ends, ties, and bounds of each of these.

⁴¹³Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *the social contract*, copyright@2010-2015 by Jonathan Bennet, December 2010, p,18.

Conjugal society is made by a voluntary compact between man and women: and though it consist chiefly in such a communion of right in one another's bodies, as is necessary to its chief end, procreation; yet it draws with it mutual support, and assistance, and a communion of interest too, as necessary not only to unite their care, and affection, but also necessary to their common offspring, who have a right to be nourished and maintained by them, till they are able to provide for themselves.

For the end of conjunction between male and female, being not barely procreation, but the continuation of the species, this conjunction between male and female ought to last, even after procreation, so long as is necessary to the nourishment and support of the young ones, who are to be sustained by those that got them, till they are able to shift and provide for themselves. This rule, which the infinite wise Maker hath set to the works of his hands, we find the inferior creatures steadily obey. In those viviparous animals which feed on grass, the conjunction between male and female lasts no longer than the very act of copulation: because the teat of the dam being sufficient to nourish the young, till it be able to feed on grass, the male only begets, but concerns not himself for the female or young, to whose sustenance he can contribute nothing. But in beasts of prey the conjunction lasts longer: because the dam not being able well to subsist herself, and nourish her numerous offspring by her own prey alone, a more laborious, as well as more dangerous way of living, than by feeding on grass, the assistance of the male is necessary to the maintenance of their common family, which cannot subsist till they are able to prey for themselves, but by the joint care of male and female. The same is to be observed in all birds (except some domestic ones, where plenty of food excuses the cock from feeding, and taking care of the young brood) whose young needing food in the nest, the cock and hen continue mates, till the young are able to use their wing, and provide for themselves.⁴¹⁴

And herein I think lies the chief, if not the only reason, why the male and female in making are tied to a longer conjunction than other creatures, *viz.* because the female is capable of conceiving, and *de facto* is commonly with child again, and brings forth to a new birth long before the former is out of a dependency for support on his parents' help, and able to shift for himself, and has all the assistance [which] is due to him from his parents: whereby the father, who is bound to take care for those he hath begot, is under an obligation to continue in conjugal society with the

⁴¹⁴John Locke, *Two Treatises of Civil Government*, Edited by Mark Goldie, Churchill College, Cambridge, 1993, pp, 153-154.

same woman longer than other creatures, whose young being able to subsist of themselves, before the time of procreation returns again, the conjugal bond dissolves of itself, and they are at liberty, till Hymen, at his usual anniversary season, summons them again to choose new mates. Wherein one cannot but admire the wisdom of the great Creator, who having given to man foresight and an ability to lay up for the future, as well as to supply the present necessity, hath made it necessary, that society of man and wife should be more lasting, than of male and female amongst other creatures; that so their industry might be encouraged, and their interest better unite, to make provision, and lay up goods for their common issue, which uncertain mixture, or easy and frequent solutions of conjugal society would mightily disturb.

But though these are ties upon mankind, which make the conjugal bonds more firm and lasting in man, than the other species of animals; ye it would give one reason to enquire, why this compact, where procreation and education are secured, and inheritance taken care for, may not be made determinable, either by consent, or at a certain time, or upon certain conditions, as well as any other voluntary compacts, there being no necessity in the nature of the thing, nor to the ends o it, that it should always be for life; I mean, to such as are under no restraint of any positive law, which ordains all such contracts to be perpetual.

But the husband and wife, though they have but one common concern, yet having different understandings will unavoidably sometimes have different wills too; it therefore being necessary, that the last determination, i.e. the rule, should be placed somewhere, it naturally falls to the man's share, as the abler and the stronger. But this reaching but to the things of their common interest and property, leaves the wife in the full and free possession of what by contract is her peculiar right, and gives the husband no more power over her life, than she has over his. The power of the husband being so far from that of an absolute monarchy, that the wife has, in many cases, a liberty to separate from him; where natural right, or their contract allows it, whether that contract be made by themselves in the state of nature, or by the customs or laws of the country they live in; and the children upon such separation fall to the father or mother's lot, as such contract does determine.

This is to say that, the law regulates human actions as well as humanizes man, this is so because for social life to be humane, peaceful and productive, laws are necessary, they are made as a results of social contract between man and, man such laws have the effect of transforming

man from the animal that he was in the state of nature to a friendly and civil animal in the state at law, especially when citizens are well educated on the ethics of law and how they can command their behaviours in the civil society. This way civil disorder, violence, terrorism will be reduced if not totally eliminated. Which will of course give birth to peaceful cohabitation and human happiness?

9.3 Good governance as panaceas

Every society has a form of government and ruler ship which is suitable to them and this form of government and ruler ship is been decided and agreed by large members of that society. It is interesting to note that, in any human grouping conflict is bound to arise based on different human desires, since the society embodied people with varying opinions, it follows that no matter the form of government and ruler ship chosen, not everybody will agree to it. This therefore implies that citizens must be educated on forms of government and how they function or operate.

However, no matter the form of government good governance is required to meet up with the wish and aspiration of the citizens; this will go a long way to eliminate the spirit of disorder among members of that community. “According to Samah Abang Muhwoh, government refers to the body, the institution or the group of people with the authority to govern (rule) a state”⁴¹⁵

With this one realises that, the government coordinates the activities and actions of its citizens for this to effectively be implemented, if members must be empowered by the laws of the state to create and enforce laws. They are also empowered to control and regulate the inter-relationships of the people within their territorial boundaries as well as such inter-relationships between their population and people in other political units.

Some arms of the government include,

- The executive arm, whose function is to define policies and ensure that they are implemented, this is to ensure good governance especially when they are well equipped with moral values.
- The legislative arm, whose function is to make laws (legislate) that will be used to govern the state, these laws can only be enacted and promulgated by some legitimate authorities for the

⁴¹⁵Samah Abang Mungwa, *Certificate philosophy for Cameroon G.C.E*, Examination Catwa Education, 2020 p, 505.

masses and as such, these laws must be good for public consumption so as to meet up with their aspiration.⁴¹⁶

- The judiciary arm, their role is to interpret and apply the laws of the state, in this regard a modern states must ensures that these three arms of government are distinct and separated. This is meant to guarantee good governance and justice. Montesquieu calls it the separation of powers, whereby there are three distinct and independent arms of government, performing distinct roles for the proper functioning of the state good governance therefore referees here.

Governmental responsibility which is one that examines the values of moral responsibility in relation to popular expectations concerning governmental authority and competence. The issue has its philosophical underpinnings in the *social contract, general will and general interest* theories. It involves an attempt to debate the question of governmental responsiveness to the acknowledged values and needs of the people to whom government administers its services. On what account should men accept a government? What should governments do in order to deserve the approval and respect of the citizen? On what grounds should the authority of government be founded or justified?

In answering the above questions, it would seem appropriate first of all to determine the contextual meaning of moral responsibility. Moral responsibility in this context refers to government's responsiveness to the acknowledged, popular aspirations, values and needs of the citizens in the discharge of its functions and the exercise of its authority. The question to be asked in this context is: is government delivering the goods? Normally, men accept government because it performs certain critical functions and its authority remains justified only so long as it continues to perform these functions. If it fails to perform these function, those under it may feel free to reject its authority or absolve themselves of their obligations to such a government. In what specific areas does this responsiveness need to be oriented? There are at least three areas in which governmental responsibility may be understood: *legitimacy, accountability and equity*.

Legitimacy, The first test of governmental responsibility is legitimacy. Legitimacy in political philosophy refers to the moral and popular acceptance that warrants the use of power exercised by government or leadership. Does such a government owe its existence to the consent, mandate and trust of the people or does it exist through force? Is the authority of such a government constitute

⁴¹⁶Ibid, p, 506.

along acceptable norms? In other words, is such a government exercising *authoritative power or coercive power*?

A separation needs to be made here between the notion of legitimacy and that of legality. Whereas legality refers to the existence of a government on grounds of the rule of law legitimacy refers to the existence of government and leadership on grounds of their use of authoritative power or grounds of the moral acceptability given by a majority of citizens. A government can have legality without having legitimacy.

Accountability, The second test of government responsibility has to do with the question of accountability that is to say, the practical ability of the government to enforce its obligations towards the governed, in other words is government responding positively to the aspiration and needs of the majority of its citizens? Whose errands give government officials running? The errands of the chief executive or the errands of a constituted few? The errands of the majority? Will the government be able to defend its records were it to face the people's verdict in an election? If it can face the verdict in a vote of confidence from the people, then such a government can be considered responsible.

Equity (Social justice), The third test of governmental responsibility concerns the demand for justice or equity or fairness in any given society. Aristotle one defined justice as the principle according to which equals ought to be treated equally and unequal's unequally. The notion of justice presupposes egalitarianism. Government functions to protect the lives and property of those under it, ensure the welfare of the citizens and to safeguard individual rights. If in carrying out these functions a government were to act in such a way as to favour imbalances, disparities and differentiations, such a government would be installing social injustice, rancour and conflict. It can only therefore be pronounced irresponsible.

There are several types of governments among which include:

Democracy, is the most popular form of government in modern societies. In fact, a majority of governments either practice or claim to be practising democracy. It is the modern trend to see governments moving towards and adoption the basic tenets of democracy. As such, it is important for us to examine what democracy is and what it means.

This is the most popular type of government in modern times. It traces its roots from Ancient Greek society. It originates from the two Greek words “demos” and “kratos”, which respectively mean “people” and “government” or “rule”. That is why democracy is etymologically defined as “government of the people, for the people and by the people”. It is a form of government where all rule. Power is in the hands of people or the masses as a whole, who collectively make decisions for their collective welfare.

As a form of government, modern-day Democracy is distinguishable a number of features such as

- **Periodic Elections:** elections constitute a primary element of representative democracy. It is the process by which leaders of the people are chosen or selected. They are elected to represent the people in the decision and law-making institutions of the government. This is the means by which the citizens exercise their sovereignty. For the representatives to have legitimacy, the election must be free, fair and transparent.
- **The separation of Powers:** This view is most defended by Montesquieu. He identifies three arms of power, which are, the executive, the legislative and the judiciary arms and which must be incarnated in one person or one group of persons or one institution. They must be distinct and independent of each other, even though being under some executive coordination.
- **The Rule of Law:** this concept means that just or good laws must be enacted and such laws must be applied fairly. We shall examine later the characteristics of a good law. So, the laws must not only exist, but they must be applicable and respected.
- **Majority Rule:** One cardinal principle of democracy is the power of numbers. This refers to the notion of majority. A democracy is characterised by the idea that the majority is always right and correct. So, the greater the numbers, the greater the legitimacy of the rulers.
- **Respect of Basic Human Rights and Freedoms:** In a democratic system of government, citizens enjoy and benefit from governmental respect and protection of certain basic rights, freedoms and liberties. Examples of such include fundamental human rights like the right to life, right to free speech and free expression, right to freedom of thought and others. This is not always the case in other systems of government.

- Ideological Pluralism: A democracy allows for the exercise of a diverse variety of opinions and ideas. Modern democracy is characterised by a plurality of opinions, which are expressed in the form of multiples political parties and civil society groups.⁴¹⁷

The modern trend in a democracy is that such decisions are taken by representatives of the people, who are elected through universal suffrage by the general citizenry. This is what is known as representative democracy. This is opposed to direct democracy that was practised by the Ancient Greeks, whose population and territorial sizes were relatively smaller. Here, all adult and eligible male citizens would congregate in the town hall or town square and personally and directly make their voices heard on any important issue of consideration. This was reflected in the trial and condemnation of Socrates, as revealed in Plato's book, *The Republic*.

It is common knowledge that the democratic form of government is the most popular and the most acclaimed in modern societies and in modern times. It is indicative of the fact it has a number of advantages. The first of these advantages is based on the fact that it promotes, ensures and guarantees checks and balances in the governmental, political and administrative framework of the State. In a democratic State, the leaders, who are elected by the citizens and who are representatives of such citizens, are accountable and responsible to them. The rules ought to render an account of their activities and stewardship to the citizens from whom they obtain legitimacy to govern. Hence, there is less or no abuse of power, for fear of being rejected by the masses in subsequent elections.

Another significant advantage of democracy borders on its greater ability to ensure the respect of human rights. It is a liberal form of government. Human rights are the first generational or basic rights of every human being, irrespective of gender, race, age, religious affiliation, or whatsoever. As enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, democrats uphold and promote the values of these rights. A democratic government ensures that its citizens' human rights are protected both constitutionally and practically. So citizens or members of democratic governments have the advantage that they are freer and enjoy greater liberties to worship, think contrarily, oppose, move, and associate more than their counterparts living under different systems of government⁴¹⁸.

⁴¹⁷Ibid, p, 507

⁴¹⁸Ibid, p, 508.

Democracy is a moderate and tolerant form of government. It is moderate in that it fights against tyranny, absolutism, totalitarianism and dictatorship. Democratic governments ensure that governmental and political excesses are eliminated from the public scene. Opposition is a common feature in a democracy. Varied and diversified opinions are expressed. Political divergencies and contradictions in the form of opposition political parties and civil society organisations exist. For this reason, democracy is a favourable form of government.

Democracy is advantageous in that it guaranties political stability and responsibility in administration. Democracy is known for its stability, firmness and efficiency. These days the mandate or tenure of the elected representatives is fixed. They form a stable government because it is based on public support. The administration is conducted with a sense of responsibility. In representative democracy, people's representatives discuss matters more thoroughly and take more reasonable decisions.

Another advantage of democracy lies in the fact that it safeguards the interests of the people. Real power lies in the hands of the people who exercise it by the representatives elected by them and who are responsible to them. It is said that social, economic and political interest of the individuals are served better under this system. This is the case given that the rulers, who are the elected representatives of the people expect to be voted or elected at future elections. To ensure this, they endeavour to take the interests of the people into consideration in their public and political debates and projects. That is why an element of the etymological definition of democracy is that "it is government for the people"

Furthermore, democracy is based on and promotes the respect and protection of human rights. Human rights protection is a cardinal benefit of democracy. Citizens' basic rights are enshrined in the state's laws. For example, citizens are equal before the law. All enjoy equal social, political and economic rights and the State cannot discriminate among citizens on the basis of caste, religion, sex, or property. All have equal rights to choose their government, as well as to benefit from the resources of the State. The principle of equality is enshrined in the concept of a good law. The law is not a respecter of persons and it is applied equally to each and everyone else.

Democracy promotes good governance. Good governance is the governmental process of making decisions that reflect and meet the aspirations of the population for a better livelihood. Democracy promotes good governance as it can be seen in its promotion of the rule of law, the respect of human rights and the separation of powers. These three characteristics of democracy

combine to ensure that the quality of governance in a democracy is good and far better than under other forms of government.

Lastly, another serious argument given in favour of democracy is that it ensures greater and wider political education and awareness to the people. Democracy serves as a training school for citizens. The citizens are motivated to take part in the affairs of the State. In times of elections, political parties propose their policies and programmes in support of their candidates. All means of propaganda—public meetings, posters, radio, television and speeches by important leaders of the parties—are used to win public favour. This creates political consciousness among the people. Public participation and involvement in the affairs of the State are deeply rooted in a democracy than in other systems of government.

Monarchy

More so, ancient history reveals evidence of monarchies as a popular form of government. Even though it is no longer a popular form of government, monarchies still exist till date. Kingdoms, queenoms, traditional chiefdoms and fionoms are illustrations of monarchies. A monarchy is a form of government quite different from a democracy.

The term monarchy comes from the word “monos”, meaning “one or singular”, and “kratos”, which means “rule”. Hence, monarchy is a rule by one man. Better still, a monarchy is a form of government where one man rules, usually according to the dictates of customs, tradition and religion. Power and authority are bestowed on a single individual, who may be a king, a queen, a fon, a chief, a prince, a sultan, an emir or whatever title he may hold.

Monarchy is peculiar in its structure and functioning. This peculiarity differentiates it from other forms of government. Some of its peculiarities or characteristics are as follows.

It is epitomised by one person: typical of a monarchy is the personality of the monarch. This is the individual who incarnates or personifies the form of government. He is the authority and authority is he. A sort of personality cult is constructed around him.

Access to power is hereditary: the monarch and his immediate collaborators are not elected. They come to power through inheritance or on the basis of birthright. Descendants succeed their ascendants and ancestors. This brings into play the notions of the royal blood, which are conditions sine qua non for belonging or aspiring to the ruling cult.

Authority is derived from customs/tradition/religion: Unlike in a democratic system where the authority of the democratic ruler is derived from the secular laws (for example, the constitution) of the land, in a monarchy, authority comes from the land. This indicates the infamous concept of the divine rights of kings, which holds that kings are selected and ordained by the gods.

Sovereignty is bestowed on the monarch: The lone character is the monarch. He does not take his legitimacy from the people. So sovereignty does not rest with the people, but rather with him. He is the lone and single sovereign.

Absolute power of the monarch: Monarchy is always characterised by the doctrine of absolutism. The monarch enjoys absolute powers and authority. He represents the judiciary, the executive and the legislative arms of power.

Life-long Rule, A monarch will rule for as long as the monarchy exists. Most politicians have term limits and, if not, have to be regularly re-elected. Monarchs, on the other hand, are appointed when a place opens (such as the Prince's father dying), and will keep their position until they die, are deposed or, in rare circumstances, choose to abdicate.

There are basically two forms of the monarchy. We have the absolute monarchy and the constitutional monarchy⁴¹⁹.

Absolute monarchy, it is a monarchical form of government where the monarch has to power to rule his or her land or state and its citizens freely. All the people, land and property of the nation belong to him. In an absolute monarchy there is no constitution or body of law above the decisions of the monarch. An absolute monarchy puts total trust in well-bred and well-trained monarchs raised for the role from birth. One of the best-known historical examples of an absolute monarch was Louis XIV of France. His alleged statement. "L'Etat, c'est moi" (the State is me), summarises the fundamental principle of absolute monarchy, whereby sovereignty is totally being vested in one individual i.e. the monarch.

Constitutional Monarchy, This type of monarchy is known as Limited Monarchy. It is a constitutional government where the monarch is bound by a national constitution. Most constitutional monarchies have a parliamentary system in which the hereditary monarch is the Head of State with executive power and an elected Prime Minister is the Head of the Government,

⁴¹⁹Ibid, p, 510.

with legislative powers. Examples of modern States with this form of government are Spain, United Kingdom, Luxembourg, Belgium and others.

The primary advantage of the monarchy is its greater speed and celerity in administration and decision-making. As we noted earlier as being one of its characteristics, the monarchy is incarnated by a single individual, the monarch. It is around him that power and authority revolves. He may be surrounded by a few or handful of advisers. But ultimate power in decision-making rests on his shoulders. This means that he does not have to consult neither an extensive nor an elaborate network of institutions and individuals, when urgent and emergency decisions have to be made. It lies within his prerogative to take swift and immediate decisions, as the case may be. This enables him to avoid the unnecessary bureaucratic bottlenecks and red tapes that are typical of a democracy.

Monarchy also has the advantage that it is a more solid and highly secretive and confidential system. Its solidity derives from its highly secretive nature. The scope of the power base is limited to a single individual, the monarch, and to a limited extent, his advisers and close collaborators. Very sensitive issues of State interest can be safely guarded as confidential secrets. This is not the case with other forms of government, must especially a democracy, which calls for accountability and the citizen's free access to public information. In addition, given its call for wider political and administrative consultation and concertation, the chances of leakage of sensitive information are high. With the monarchy, the chances of successfully maintaining sensitive secrets are greater and higher⁴²⁰.

One other advantage that is worth noting is the fact that a monarchy reduces the heavy amount of expenditures of the nation. Elections are very costly to run. It is a very expensive process. In addition, other forms of government usually have a vast and massive institutional base. Ministries, senates, court systems, national assemblies and electoral bodies have to be put in place. These require enormous manpower, as well as material and financial resources to keep them functional. But with the monarchical system of government, these are absent. The political and administrative network is simple and hence less costly to run. For this reason, the monarchy is a more feasible and advantageous form of government.

⁴²⁰ibid, P511.

A monarchy is further characterised by the merit that it guarantees greater political stability and calmness. The hereditary nature of the monarchy prevents or lessens the risk of political clamouring for positions. Generally, in monarchies, succession lineages are well defined in advance. Given that a monarchy is based on religion and tradition, such pre-determined rules of succession are hardly defied. They are largely respected and adhered to. Succession battles are either altogether absent or are reduced to the barest minimum. This ensures greater stability in succession.

One last demerit of the monarchy relates to its limited ideological scope and its narrow political and ideological sphere. The monarchy is a sort of mono-ideological or uni-ideological political system whereby the only dominant idea or voice is that of the monarch. Be it good or bad, correct or wrong, it is the political ideology of the monarch that prevails. This implies that the political orientation of the State is determined solely by the whims and caprices of the monarch. No divergent or dissenting ideologies and views or opinions are admitted. There is no room for political expansion and as such the state is most likely to be (mis)-led into the drain, where and when the monarch falters. This is unlike the case in a pluralistic democratic society where opposing and conflicting political ideas prevail on the political scene. It is clear that the monarchy is not a suitable form of government.

Aristocracy form of government

The term etymologically means “government of the best, the elite or the noble”. It derives from the Greek words “aristos” and “dratos”, which respectively mean “the best” and “government or power or rule”. In a better sense, “it is a form of government where a few rule”. In this form of government, sovereign power is vested in the hands of a tiny elite or a small number of citizens who are in theory considered as the best qualified to lead or rule. Their status is based either on birth (hence the notion of free birth), on wealth or on intellectual prowess. Prominent proponents of aristocracy in the history of philosophy include Montesquieu and Plato.

The distinctive features of aristocracy include the following:

The rule is by small elite: the ruling class is a small group of individuals, who constitute the ruling elite. The basis of selection and inclusion is nobility: The ruling elite are believed to be the best or the mostly in terms of some noble criterion, which could be by birth, intelligence or wealth.

Succession, succession is predominantly by inheritance.

Presumption of natural and artificial inequality among men: It is based on the fundamental presumption that not equal. There are both natural and artificial inequalities among men. These inequalities make people to be more suited for ruler ship, than others.

This form of government accords leadership to the highly-qualified citizens. It is the rule by the competent and Wiseman. By its very meaning, it is government of the elite, the noble or the excellent. It believes in meritocracy and advocates for the fact that power should be entrusted only to those who are most suited. They must be distinctively qualified morally, intellectually, physically, psychologically, and/or otherwise. It holds that not everyone is gifted with the qualities of leadership. Only those who possess such gifts should be allowed to rule. This implies that mediocre people would have nothing to do with the delicate task of managing public political affairs. It is for this reason and in support of aristocracy that Plato called for political power to be given only to philosophers, whom he considered to be “the aristocrats per excellence” of the State. That is why he stated that “until philosophers become kings or the present kings become philosophers, society will never know peace”. In Aristocracy the administration is in the hands of wise people. Only best people can run the administration, and not the common people. John Stuart Mill says that “the governments which have been remarkable in history for sustained mental ability and vigour in the conduct of affairs have generally been aristocracies”. This is indicative of the fact that the aristocracy a very laudable form of government.

Secondly, the aristocracy is meritorious in that it prevents the rise of a single dictator, by distributing power between members of a council. Power is in the hands of a select group. Even though we may have a king or monarch at the helm, the power structure is not personalised, like is the case with a monarchy. Power is shared and held by the entire clique. This eliminates the risk of the abuse of power by a single monarch or individual. For this reason, the aristocracy is a better form of government. It is better compared with the monarchy.

Aristocracy offers and allows for greater stability and efficiency. Since administration rests in the hands of the wise, talented and experienced administrators, there is stability and efficiency in the administration. We are inspired by the words of Socrates, who said “he who knows the good shall do the good”. In relation to aristocracy, the excellent and competent citizens who are chosen to govern the society have the skills and knowledge of good governance. They are

the most excellent and noble in terms of character, intelligence, probity and other skills. With such qualities, they shall work well, ensuring greater stability peace, justice and efficiency in the State.

Lastly, aristocracy offers opportunities for faster and quicker decisions to be taken in the event of emergencies. In the aristocracy the ruling class is fewer and more limited in number. It is never a mass or a crowd as it is in the case with a democracy. This guarantees the fact that there is greater celerity in administration. This increases the efficiency of the government, by reducing the chances of political deadlocks, red tapes, bureaucratic bottlenecks and disagreements that usually characterise more congested systems like democracies. There is little need for elaborate concertations, given that the decision-makers are few. This makes the aristocracy a better system of government.

Among these forms of government Hannah Arendt believe that the best will be the federal and council system. To eliminate revolution as she explain that:

The mere rudiments I see for a new state concept can be found in the federal system, whose advantage it is that power moves neither from above nor from below, but is horizontally directed so that the federated units mutually check and control their powers. For the real difficulty in speculating on these matters is that the final resort should not be supernational but international. A supernational authority would either be ineffective or be monopolized by the nation that happens to be the strongest, and so would lead to world government, which could easily become the most frightful tyranny conceivable, since from its global police force there would be no escape-until it finally fell apart.

Where do we find models that could help us in construing, at least theoretically, an international authority as the highest control agency? This sound like a paradox, since what is highest cannot well be in between, but it is nevertheless the real question. When I said that none of the revolutions, each of which overthrew one form of government and replaced it with another, had been able to shake the state concept and its sovereignty, I had in mind something that I tried to elaborate a bit in my book *On Revolution*. Since the revolutions of the eighteenth century, every large upheaval has actually developed the rudiments of an entirely new form of government, which emerged independent of all preceding revolutionary theories, directly out of the course of the revolution itself, that is, out of the experiences of action and out of the resulting will of the actors to participate in the further development of public affairs.⁴²¹

⁴²¹ Ibid, p, 511.

This new form of government is the council system, which as we know, has perished every time and everywhere, destroyed either directly by the bureaucracy of the nation-states or by the party machines. Whether this system is a pure utopia-in any case it would be a people's utopia, not the utopia of theoreticians and ideologies – I cannot say. It seems to me, however, the single alternative that has ever appeared in history, and has reappeared time and again. Spontaneous organization of council systems occurred in all revolutions, in the French Revolution, with Jefferson in the American Revolution, in the Parisian commune, in the Russian revolutions, in the wake of the revolutions in Germany and Austria at the end of World War I, finally in the Hungarian Revolution. What is more, they never came into being as a result of a conscious revolutionary tradition or theory, but entirely spontaneously, each time as though there had never been anything of the sort before. Hence the council system seems to correspond to and to spring from the very experience of political action.

In this direction, I think, there must be something to be found, a completely different principle of organization, which begins from below, continues upward, and finally leads to a parliament. But we can't talk' about that now. And it is not necessary, since important studies on this subject have been published in recent years in France and Germany, and anyone seriously interested can inform himself.

To prevent a misunderstanding that might easily occur today, I must say that the communes of hippies and dropouts have nothing to do with this. On the contrary, a renunciation of the whole of public life, of politics in general, is at their foundation; they are refuges for people who have suffered political shipwreck- and as such they are completely justified on personal grounds. I find the forms of these communes very often grotesque-in Germany as well as in America-but I understand them and have nothing against them. Politically they are meaningless. The councils desire the exact opposite, even if they begin very small-as neighbourhood councils, professional councils, councils within factories, apartment houses, and so on. There are, indeed, councils of the most various kinds, by no means only workers' councils; workers, councils are a special case in this field.⁴²²

The councils say: we want to participate, we want to debate, we want to make our voices heard in public, and we want to have a possibility to determine the political course of our country.

⁴²² Ibid, p, 512.

Since the country is too big for all of us to come together and determine our fate, we need a number of public spaces within it. The booth in which we deposit our ballots is unquestionably too small, for this booth has room for only one. The parties are completely unsuitable; there we are most of us, nothing but the manipulated electorate. But if only ten of us are sitting around a table, each expressing his opinion, each hearing the opinions of others, then a rational formation of opinion can take place through the exchange of opinions. There, too, it will become clear which one of us is best suited to present our view before the next higher council, where in turn our view will be clarified through the influence of other views, revised, or proved wrong.

By no means has every resident of a country needed to be a member in such councils. Not everyone wants to or has to concern himself with public affairs. In this fashion a self-selective process is possible that would draw together true political elite in a country. Anyone who is not interested in public affairs will simply have to be satisfied with their being decided without him. But each person must be given the opportunity.

In this direction I see the possibility of forming a new concept of the state. A council-state of this sort, to which the principle of sovereignty could be wholly alien, would be admirably suited to federations of the most various kinds, especially because in it power would be constituted horizontally and not vertically. But if you ask me now what prospect it has of being realized, then I must say to you: Very slight, if at all. And yet perhaps, after all in the wake of the next revolution.⁴²³

In all, this therefore, implies that, no matter the form or system of government what matters is good governance, that is the one which meets up with the wish and aspiration of citizens, as earlier mention, this can really be practice by people who have undergone some moral training this moral training is what I emphasis as moral education of the mass which should be made compulsion to all citizens or members of any given society, if not civil disorder will still be inevitable and of course, insecurity and survival of some members will be in the mercy of an accident,

So therefore, it should be establish that for good governance to prevail, we must first of all have good educational training and programs this education system “moral education of the mass” will enable members of the community to know what is right to be done and what is wrong

⁴²³Ibid, op.cit, p, 233.

to be avoided, moreover, it will equip citizens with right reasoning in order to be respectful to their laws, authorities and state institutions.

This way governmental action becomes easy to manage because authorities in power have equally received sound moral training in their educational programs, and of course the problem of civil disobedience, violence, revolutions as well as terrorism will be minimized.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

Arendt political thought, inculcate into people's minds certain prescriptions, the citizen should conform or revolt, should fight for their rights and freedoms or simply submit themselves to abuses, this of course are the basis the ever changing political dispensation and dynamism of any human grouping. This implies she raises questions about state's legitimate authority over its members and about social values, such as, justice, education, security among others.

In this regard, she suggested that, the establishment of civil disobedience among our political institutions might be the best possible remedy for this ultimate failure at judicial review. The first step would be to obtain the same recognition for the civil-disobedient minorities that is accorded the numerous special-interest group in the country, and to deal with civil disobedient groups in the same way as with pressure groups, which, through their representatives, that is registered lobbyists are permitted to influence and assist by means of persuasion qualified opinion and the numbers of their constituents. These minorities of opinion would thus be able to establish themselves as a power that is not only seen from afar during demonstrations and other dramatizations at their view point, but is always present and to be reckoned with in the daily business of government.

The next step would be to admit publicly that the Amendment neither in language nor in spirit covers the rights of association as it is actually practiced in the country, this precious privileged whose exercise has in fact been incorporated with the manners and customs of the people for century. If there is anything that urgently required in new constitutional amendment and is worth all the trouble that goes with it, it is certainly this otherwise as she reiterated, civil disobedience is bound to arise, and to an extent violence, that is when the normal channel of change is no longer accessible violence comes in as solution to redress their concerns⁴²⁴.

According to James Wilford Garner⁴²⁵, professor of political science at the University of Illinois in his book *Introduction of Political Science: a treatise on the origin in the nature, functions and organization of the state; contented that* "The term politics" employed by many writers is open to objection that it possesses several meanings and when use without qualification or discrimination leads to confusion if not misunderstanding"

⁴²⁴ Arendt *Crises of the Republic*, p 101.

⁴²⁵ James Wilford Garner, *Introduction to Political Science: A Treatise on the origin in Nature, functions and Organization of the States*, American Book Company, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago, P. 86.

According to popular usage it is a term for both science and art that is; it is employed to denote both the systematic study of phenomenon of the affairs both state. That is why Hannah Arendt sees it as governance or management. This therefore implies that, the task of her political thought was to study in their fundamental relations the public powers to examine the conditions under which they manifest themselves, their end and their effect to investigate the state in its inner nature.

In general ways, its fundamental problems include first an investigation of the common ends of society and the formulation of fundamental principles of state life. More to this, an inquiry into the nature, history and forms of political institution and so far possible laws of political growth and development

Above all, from the aforementioned, one can establish that, compulsory moral education of the mass is a great necessity to limit the increase of crimes in our societies such as civil disobedience violence and revolutions, which have been the most destabilizing factors for peace and social cohesion. In this regard, if good educational training is put in place or enshrine in our curriculum it will be easier for the laws of that societies to be respected by all a sundry, good governance and institutions as well will be respected while chaos and disorder will be avoided because all citizens are well equipped with moral values.

This is because the challenges of civil disobedience and violence in the contemporary era reveal that there exists a seemingly irreconcilable conflict between individual freedom and political authority. In an effect to gain relief from the overpowering state, some citizens have developed ways and means of escape. The most familiar and possibly widest practiced technique is nonviolent resistance, which had its roots deep in the annals of history. This technique is been exhausted by the philosophers analyzed in this work. The three major philosophers utilize the nonviolence technique. They are grounded in the assumptions that the government, in principle or practice, is unjust and therefore, the citizen has a right to disobey its laws. Moreover, there are certain inalienable rights of man and the right to obey the dictates of his conscience over injustice or what he or she qualifies as unjust.

The following conclusions are drawn from an analysis of the problems of civil disobedience of violence in contemporary era Non-violence as advocated by Henry David Thoreau does not appear to have been the same as the type used by recent explanations, Mahatma Gandhi and Martin

Luther King, Jr. To Thoreau, non-violent resistance seems to have meant the refusal to support the government in any way. He preached against what he called bad government and refused to pay taxes because the government used the money to support slavery which he thought was evil. On the other hand, nonviolent resistance to Gandhi and King meant a resistance to evil through boycott.

In this light, if one really reflects on contemporal politics and violence, one can be tempted to say that, states or governments have become powerless and have lost their effectiveness and the glories in which they were purposely intended for. Given that if the aim of politics of a government is to protect its citizens and territorial integrity, it must not use tactical means to achieve political gains or to consolidate power. It is of extreme relevance for the government to fulfil its tasks. This way, citizens will be condemned to abide by the norms of their community.

One can be tempted to say without any fear of contradiction that politics is supreme science geared towards good governance whereby the wishes and aspirations of a people can be attained. Unfortunately, some political actors may be because of mistaken patriotism or because of the atmosphere of conviviality that surrounds them, deliberately chose falsehood and lies telling in their political agenda and propaganda to their fellow countrymen which of course is too disheartening and ergo provoking thereby opening the way for civil disobedience, violence and revolutions. To this effect, civil disobeyers are some way aimed with reasons to resist these oddities, and in their assemblies and movement, they can be very effective in bringing changes to their constitutions and laws of their fatherland most hated by those in power and of course antagonism, chaos and violence are some of the regrettable outcomes as Arendt predicted.

However, this spirit of revolution among citizens of a country because of some wrong doing of state authorities always result to the inheritance of lawlessness, whereby civil resisters voluntarily associate or come together to protest against injustice and laws of impartiality and by so doing, civil disobedience, violence terrorism and revolutions are the most unavoidable outcomes, and human lives and properties are equally endangered. It is therefore a call for concern that all citizens most invest their energy towards peace and avoid violence to the nearest minimal.

It should be noted that, the contractarian theories, like Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean Jacque Rousseau, hold that man left the state of nature due to his or her inability given that,

human beings always seek self-preservation and protection. But unfortunately, the contract in which they enter into prevent them to achieve their objectives as Jean Jacques Rousseau stated in his famous book: *the social Contract* that: “*man was born free but everywhere in chain*” because the laws of the land or community do not satisfy the wish or aspiration of some citizens and this always pave the way for civil unrest due to human tyranic action and the challenges in the native of covenant between citizens and their government. These struggle for liberty and protection in civil society always clash against the interest of others and civil disobedience and violence became unavoidable.

Because to him it is only through the government that justice can prevail for all in the society. This is so because making use of the earth by all and property once it is distributed and recognised by all it now give birth to first rule of justice, for the society and every member in it secure each other’s property, because everyone has the same thing and the same treatment so any violation is against the norms of the society. In this regard, it seems natural that property cannot come only from man’s labour but also the natural environment created by god which every member must enjoy, and that which any person or individual generate from the grounds adds onto, to become he or her properties from his or her labour. For instance, harvest that one can obtained from his or her portion of land over a year can easily be transform into his or her personal property.

At this level, there is a degree of equality and balance progress to all in a given civil society and natural equality unfolds. Inequality only exist when the combination and the difference between developed by their difference circumstances, which may in one way or the other result to chaos if not adequately address. That is to say that if justice in the society is not on alert to arbitrate man’s difference with others, then that covenant or agreement that exists between the people will collapse and the community will be doom to suffer some devastative effects. In this regard, Rousseau stated, in his social contract theory as cited by Daniel Boneva that,

“Thus as everyman punished the contempt shown him by others in proportion to his opinion of himself, revenge becomes terrible and men bloody and cruel. This is precisely the state reached by most of the savage nations known to us; and it is forward of having made a property distribution in our ideas, and seen how very few they already are from the state of nature, that so many writers have hastily concluded that man naturally cruel and requires civil institutions to make him more mild; whereas nothing is more gentle than man in his primitive state as he

*is placed by nature at an equal distance from the stupidity of brutes, and the fatal ingenuity of civilised man. Equally confined by instinct and reason to the sole care of guarding himself against the mischief which threaten him, he is restrained by natural compassion from doing any injury to others and is not led to do such a thing even in return for injuries received. For according to the action of the wise Locke, there can be no injury where there is no property.*⁴²⁶

This is to say that justice is the watchdog in any civil society to guard people's actions.

Some great educationist like T.W. Moore holds that, it has been maintained in this book so far that education is an enterprise which aims at producing a certain type of person and that this is accomplished by the transmission of knowledge, skills and understanding from one person to another. This philosopher's role is seen as being that of scrutinizing the various assumptions and justifications made and offered by practitioners and theorists in this field. We have, consequently examined in elementary way notions like educational aims and purposes, the nature of educational theorizing and the nature of knowledge. We need now to look at the 'transmission' aspect of education. The curriculum sets out what is to be taught and, once again, raises implicitly the questions of justification. Transmission involves pedagogy and this in turn raises questions of clarification and justification. We are now to be concerned not so much with what is taught but with how it is taught, with the concepts of teaching and training and with the associated issue of indoctrination. In examining these topics, we shall need to deal with the roles and positions of both teacher and pupil and with the extent to which teaching and educating involves the concepts of authority, discipline and punishment.

In this regard, teaching is obviously closely connected with, if not necessary to, education. Whether or not education could go on in its absence is debatable, but in practice teaching is central to the enterprise. The concept of teaching, however, is by no means an easy one to handle. For one thing, the word 'teaching, is not the name of any one activity. Teaching may involve many different kinds of activities: talking, asking questions, and writing on a blackboard, setting up situations in which pupils can learn, and many others. It is often difficult to draw the line, which separates teach, from other activities, which may resemble it. For example, is giving information teaching? Is punishing a child a form of teaching? Does a teacher teach by his manner, his ways of life, and his

⁴²⁶Daniel Boneva, *Today's Moral Issues: Classic and Contemporary Perspectives*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 2006. pp, 492, 493.

example? Is dressing conventionally or unconventionally a kind of teaching? Can one teach unintentionally, by accident? These are not unimportant questions. A teacher will properly be held responsible for his teaching and so it is as well to be clear about what counts as teaching and what does not. The analysis given in this section will point to two conclusions. Firstly, that teaching necessarily involves the intension that someone should learn because of what one does; secondly, that teaching requires recognition by both teacher and pupil of a special relationship existing between them⁴²⁷.

More to this, teaching is an intentional matter. To teach is to intend that someone should learn something. If this intention is lacking, then whatever the agent is doing - acting, entertaining, and amusing himself he is not engaged in teaching although he may perhaps be pretending to be. Of course, it is not necessary that the pupil should as a matter of fact learn anything. Teaching need not be successful. But the teacher sets about his task in a way appropriate to the occasion, appropriate that is, to the age and abilities of his pupils, with the intension that they should learn something, then to that extent he is teaching. This means that although one can teach but be unsuccessful, one cannot teach by accident, or unintentionally. It may be that the pupil will learn something that the teacher does not intend him to learn. He may learn something from the teacher's accent, or his demeanor, or his style of dressing, but it does not follow from this that the teacher taught him to speak or behave or dress in a certain way. One can learn without being taught. An unsympathetic bad-tempered teacher does not 'teach' a child to dislike history or mathematics, although the child may come to dislike the subject simply because he dislikes the teacher. He learns to dislike the subject but he has not been taught to do so. Teaching has taken place when what is learnt is learnt as a result of someone's deliberate intension.

A qualification needs to be made here concerning the contention above that; teaching does not have to be successful. In general, this is so. Teacher may- teach throughout a whole afternoon, intending that his pupils should learn, but be defeated by their laziness, or tiredness or by some extraneous influence, noise or confusion. In this case, he could properly be said to have been teaching, although unsuccessfully, as one can properly be said to have spent the whole afternoon fishing although nothing was caught. There is, however, a sense of teach in which the notion of success is implied. I can hardly be said to have taught a boy to swim unless he actually learns to

⁴²⁷T.W Moore, *Philosophy of Education*, an introduction. Rutledge and Kegan Paul, London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley, 1982, 2010, p, 31.

swim as a result of my efforts. This complication comes about because the word ‘teach’ has both a ‘task’ and an ‘achievement’ sense

If the word is used, as it generally is, in its ‘task’ sense, the success is not implied in its use. We may fail at a task. If it is used as an ‘achievement’ word then the notion of a successful outcome is part of its meaning.

The second point to be made here is that to teach is to set up and recognize, however minimally, a special relationship between one person and another, teacher and pupil. A teacher is one who intends to make himself responsible for someone’s learning, and commits himself to take pains to see that the knowledge is acquired, to vary his methods if necessary to bring this learning about. A teacher, as such, assumes a responsibility towards his pupil. This recognition of responsibility to pay attention, to try to understand what is being done, to enter into a joint enterprise. These recognitions need be no more than minimal. They are compatible with laziness and naughtiness on the part of the pupil and with laziness and incompetence on the part of the teacher. But so long as there is this minimal recognition of their relationship, of what ought to be going on, teaching is taking place, however ineffectively, however badly. This dual requirement of intention and recognition of a special responsibility on both sides is what distinguishes a genuine teaching situation from one in which one party merely gives information to another. The announcer at Victoria station does not teach passengers about their trains. He tells them, gives them information. He intends that they should learn some facts, but there is no recognition on either side of the special relationship that characterizes a teaching situation. The announcer is not a teacher, nor is the passenger a pupil.⁴²⁸

Teaching, it was said earlier, is connected closely with education but the connection is, on one side at least, a contingent one only. We may teach all sorts of things, good or bad, error as well as truth, bad manners as well as good. We may teach children to be truthful and honest or, like Fagin, teach them to lie or steal. We may teach them truths which are trivial and which no one ever needs to know. Education, however, involves teaching what is worth knowing and attitudes, which are morally acceptable. Not all teaching need amount to educating. Moreover there is, in the normative concept of education, implication that the methods used are morally acceptable. This is not so in the case of teaching. Teaching would still be teaching, given the two criteria mentioned above, intention and recognition of responsibility, even if the methods used were harsh or immoral.

⁴²⁸Ibid, p, 32.

It does not follow from the fact that someone is teaching, and teaching effectively; that education is going on, although it would generally be somebody is doing the case that education is taking place some teaching. Education involves the transmission of knowledge and skills, and it is difficult to see how this could happen in practice unless someone makes himself responsible for the transmission. Of course, teaching need not to be of the obvious, didactic kind, with one person telling another what is the case, or what ought to be done. It might very well take the negative form recommended by Rousseau in *Emile*, where the pupil is encouraged to find out for himself. But in so far as this was an educational situation there would have to be some intervention by the teacher, giving a rationale for what was being done. In the special case of self-education, the same person shares the roles of teacher and pupil, but the teacher's role is there nonetheless. We may sum all this up by using some technical terms of philosophy and say, that teaching may be a necessary condition of education taking place but is not a sufficient condition. Education usually involves teaching, but not all teaching need be educative and some of it is not.⁴²⁹

This equally depends on how people are been train and indoctrinated these two terms bear a resemblance to the two dealt with in the previous section. Training seems to be analogous to 'teaching' and indeed may be substituted for it in some circumstances. 'Indoctrination'' seems analogous to 'education' but with the reservation that where as education carries overtones of approval, indoctrination usually has a provocative sense.

The term 'training' is usually used in those situations where some skill or competence is involved, often, though not always, where the skill is limited in scope. We talk about training animals to perform tricks and training soldier to operate their equipment. But we also talk of training teachers and lawyers and doctors, where the range of activities is by no means limited in scope. Perhaps the best interpretation is that training entails providing learners with a range of strategies and tactics which will enable them to operate successfully within a given field activity. A trained fireman is one who knows what to do at the scene of a fire, and a trained lawyer is one who is able to act expertly when presented with a legal problem. The connection with teaching is then straightforward. Trainees have to be taught the competences required and be given opportunities to exercise their newly acquired skills. Plainly, training can take place in circumstances where on one would claim that education was going on. To train a soldier in the use of a bayonet or a gas mask is hardly to educate him. The training of firemen, airline pilots or

⁴²⁹ Ibid, p, 33.

footballers seems to have little if anything to do with their education. ‘Highly trained but uneducated’ would not appear to be a contradiction in terms. Yet it would be wrong to suppose that there can be no connections between the two. There is no reason why training should not, in some circumstances, be educative. A training programme which involved not only giving skills of a particular kind, but also the giving to the trainee of some insight into different modes of thinking, an awareness of the interconnections of the various kinds of knowledge involved and concern for the intellectual virtues of accuracy and respect for evidence, would to that extent be educative. Teachers and lawyers, for example, could very well be given an education during their course of training and modern institutions for legal training and teacher training properly aim at doing this.

‘Indoctrination’ seems to have close connections with ‘teaching’ and ‘training’ in that the implication is in each case that the pupil or the learner is being manipulated in some way by an interested party, in so far as the manipulation is directed towards some end regarded as desirable by the manipulator it has some analogy with education. There is, however, very little agreement amongst philosophers of education as to what constitutes indoctrination in practice. Some have seen it as a form of teaching which relies heavily on authoritarian methods and which seeks to establish in the learner beliefs and attitudes which subsequent experience will not change. Some have wanted to deny that is a form of teaching at all, on the ground that teaching involves a willingness on the part of the teacher to ‘submit his teaching to rational criticism from the pupil, which the indoctrinator as such is generally reluctant to do. Some have shifted the emphasis from the intention of the indoctrinator to the subject matter he wishes to transmit to the learner. Indoctrination, it is said, is a matter of what is taught, indoctrination taking place when beliefs which are themselves open to question are taught as though they were not so. Perhaps the least contentious account would be that indoctrination is a form of teaching in which it is intended that certain beliefs should be accepted without question, either because it is thought that they are not only important but unquestionably true, or because, for various reasons, it is thought important that, true or not, they should not be questioned. Those who hold firm religious convictions might support indoctrination on the first count, and those who subscribe to certain sorts of political opinions might do so on the second. It is doubtful, however, whether indoctrination could ever amount to education in its normative sense, since this presupposes that the learner should be initiated into practices involving rational procedures. Indoctrination is typically non-rational in

temper, non-rational in the sense that it requires certain conclusions to be .Opout beyond the scope of critical enquiry.⁴³⁰

All citizens have to be trained in such a way that they should be academically fit, morally upright and socially balance, this therefore means that, our curriculum must be adjusted to suite and meet up with the challenges in our societies, this entails that our system of education rather arm citizens with irrelevant training, which cannot longer be accepted in our communities. Such as poor training with complete lack of moral values, and this fallen standard of immorality has accounted for some of the outstanding moral decadence and of course has open more doors to insecurity.

However, this moral education of the mass must be upheld with much determination and hard work. More to this governments to reinforce it in all sectors of social life, it has been observed over the years that, even when government launch competitive entrance to public service, they always exclude religious studies which is part, of moulding the minds and moral armament. It is believe that if all institution reinforce ethical values and ensures these values goes down to every sector then our communities will experience peace and positive changes. John Dewey had it that “A genuine purpose always starts with an impulse. Obstruction of the immediate execution of an impulse converts it into a desire. Nevertheless neither impulse nor desire is itself a purpose. A purpose is an end-view. That is it involves foresight of the consequences which will result from acting upon impulse. Foresight of consequences involves the operation of intelligence. It demands, in the first place, observing of objective conditions and circumstances. For impulse and desire produce consequences not by themselves alone but through their interaction or cooperation with surrounding conditions. The impulse for such a simple action as walking is executed only in active conjunction with the ground on which one stands. Under ordinary circumstances, we do not have to pay much attention to the ground. In a ticklish situation we have to observe very carefully just what the conditions are, as in climbing a steep and rough mountain where no trial has been laid out. Exercise at observation is, then one condition at transforming of impulse into a purpose. As in the sign by a railway crossing, we have to stop, look listen”⁴³¹

⁴³⁰ibid, p, 34.

⁴³¹ John Dewey, *Experience & Education*, Touchstone Rockefeller Centre, New York, published by Simon & Schuster, 1997, pp,67,68.

Observing from Thomas Hobbes philosophy on the origin of the state it is understood that the state of nature was a lawless one of which survival was based on the interest of the stronger that is survival of the fittest, to this effect human destiny especially to the weaker ones whose survival was just in the mercy an accident. This human insufficiency necessitates the creation of the civil state or society which led the introduction of laws to regulate life and human activities. This law which is a system of rules that are enforced through social institutions to govern behaviour, clearly define the relationship between individuals and their institutions as well as other members in their communities. Hobbes therefore sees the law of nature as “(lex naturalis) is a percept or general rule, found out by reason, by which a man is forbidden to do that which is destructive of his life or taketh away the means of preserving the same, and to omit that by which he thinketh it may be best preserved. For though they that speak at this subject use to confound jus and lex (right and law), yet they ought to be distinguished, because Right consistent in liberty to do or to forbear, whereas law determined and bindeth to one of them. So that law and right literal much as obligation and liberty, which in one and the same matter are” inconsistent.⁴³² By this since man left the state of nature which was barbaric and lawless, and of course join the commonwealth and civil society, he then proceeded to establish that “the civil law is to every subject, those rules which the commonwealth hath commanded him (by word, writing, or other sufficient sign of the will) to make use of, for the distinction of right and wrong that is to say, of what is contrary, and what is not contrary to the rule”⁴³³

It will be of primary interest to enact and promulgate laws that are reasonable and commanding the all members of that society must abide to. In this regard, members of that community must be educated to the lower level that is, all disciplines must incorporate the law in their pedagogic syllabuses and if education is made compulsory and law is part of the educational training, then citizens will be conscious enough to know what is wrong to be avoided and what is right to be done, because these laws established by the commonwealth for a common interest will certainly regulate human actions automatically, this way civil disorder, violence, terrorism and revolutions as well as other societal ill will be avoided. In this regard, the society can freely be

⁴³²Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Hackett publishing company, in indramapolis, Cambridge, 1668, pp, 79, 80.

⁴³³Ibid, p, 73.

called a well ordered society as John Rawls will have it and any well order society is bound to experience development, peaceful living together as the law imposes or dictates.

Every society has a form of government and ruler ship which is suitable to them and this form of government and ruler ship is been decided and agreed by large members of that society. It is interesting to note that, in any human grouping conflict is bound to crises base on different human desires, since the society embodied people with varying opinions, it follow that no matter the form of government and ruler ship chosen, not everybody will agree to it. This therefore implies that citizens must be educated on forms of government and how they function or operate.

However, no matter the form of government good governance is required to meet up with the wish and aspiration of the citizens; this will go a long way to eliminate the spirit of disorder among members of that community. “According to Samah Abang Muhwoh, government refer to the body, the institution or the group of people with the authority to govern (rule) a state”⁴³⁴

With this one realises that, the government coordinate the activities an action of it citizens for this to effectively be implemented, if members must be empowered by the laws of the state to create and enforce laws. They are also empowered to control and regulate the inter-relationships of the people within their territorial boundaries as well as such inter-relationship between their population and people in other political units.

Some arms of the government include:

- The executive arm, whose function is to define policies and ensures that they are implement, this is to ensure good governance especially when they are well equip with moral values.
- The legislative arm, whose function is to make laws (legislate) that will used to govern the state, these laws can only be and promulgated by some legitimate authorities for the masses and as such, these laws must be good for public consumption so as to meet up with their aspiration.⁴³⁵
- The judiciary arm, their role is to interpret and apply the laws of the state; in this regard modern states must ensure that these three arms of government are distinct and separate. This is meant to guarantee good governance and justice. Montesquieu calls it the separation of powers,

⁴³⁴Samah Abang Mungwa, *Certificate philosophy for Cameroon G.C.E.*, Examination CatwaEducation, 2020 p. 505.

⁴³⁵Ibid, op.cit, p, 506.

whereby there are three distinct and independent arms of government, performing distinct roles for the proper functioning of the state good governance therefore referees here.

Governmental responsibility which is one that examines the values of moral responsibility in relation to popular expectations concerning governmental authority and competence. The issue has its philosophical underpinnings in the *social contract, general will and general interest* theories. It involves an attempt to debate the question of governmental responsiveness to the acknowledged values and needs of the people to whom government administers its services. On what account should men accept a government? What should governments do in order to deserve the approval and respect of the citizen? On what grounds should the authority of government be founded or justified?

In answering the above questions, it would seem appropriate first of all to determine the contextual meaning of moral responsibility. Moral responsibility in this context refers to government's responsiveness to the acknowledged, popular aspirations, values and needs of the citizens in the discharge of its functions and the exercise of its authority. The question to be asked in this context is: is government delivering the goods? Normally, men accept government because it performs certain critical functions and its authority remains justified only so long as it continues to perform these functions. If it fails to perform these function, those under it may feel free to reject its authority or absolve themselves of their obligations to such a government. In what specific areas does this responsiveness need to be oriented? There are at least three areas in which governmental responsibility may be understood: *legitimacy, accountability and equity*.

Legitimacy. The first test of governmental responsibility is legitimacy. Legitimacy in political philosophy refers to the moral and popular acceptance that warrants the use of power exercised by government or leadership. Does such a government owe its existence to the consent, mandate and trust of the people or does it exist through force? Is the authority of such a government constitute along acceptable norms? In other words, is such a government exercising *authoritative power or coercive power*?

A separation needs to be made here between the notion of legitimacy and that of legality. Whereas legality refers to the existence of a government on grounds of the rule of law legitimacy refers to the existence of government and leadership on grounds of their use of authoritative power

or grounds of the moral acceptability given by a majority of citizens. A government can have legality without having legitimacy.

Accountability. The second test of government responsibility has to do with the question of accountability that is to say, the practical ability of the government to enforce its obligations towards the governed, in other words is government responding positively to the aspiration and needs of the majority of its citizens? Whose errands give government officials running? The errands of the chief executive or the errands of a constituted few? The errands of the majority? Will the government be able to defend its records were it to face the people's verdict in an election? If it can face the verdict in a vote of confidence from the people, then such a government can be considered responsible.

Equity (Social justice). The third test of governmental responsibility concerns the demand for justice or equity or fairness in any given society. Aristotle one defined justice as the principle according to which equals ought to be treated equally and unequal's unequally. The notion of justice presupposes egalitarianism. Government functions to protect the lives and property of those under it, ensure the welfare of the citizens and to safeguard individual rights. If in carrying out these functions a government were to act in such a way as to favour imbalances, disparities and differentiations, such a government would be installing social injustice, rancour and conflict. It can only therefore be pronounced irresponsible.

There are several types of governments among which include:

Democracy, is the most popular form of government in modern societies. In fact, a majority of governments either practice or claim to be practising democracy. It is the modern trend to see governments moving towards and adoption the basic tenets of democracy. As such, it is important for us to examine what democracy is and what it means.

This is the most popular type of government in modern times. It traces its roots from Ancient Greek society. It originates from the two Greek words "demos" and "kratos", which respectively mean "people" and "government" or "rule". That is why democracy is etymologically defined as "government of the people, for the people and by the people". It is a form of government where all rule. Power is in the hands of people or the masses as a whole, who collectively make decisions for their collective welfare.

INDEX OF NAMES AND CONCEPTS

INDEX OF NAME

A

Achille Mbenbe · 272

Antonio Maria Baggio · 223

Arendt · 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 21, 51, 52, 54, 55, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 174, 176, 177, 178, 180, 181, 183, 185, 188, 193, 199, 205, 214, 219, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 234, 235, 237, 243, 245, 248, 253, 255, 257, 258, 262, 263, 264, 269, 272, 276, 280, 281, 284, 285, 318, 322, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355

Aristocracy · 316, 317

Aristotle · 1, 2, 92, 121, 143, 144, 149, 309, 333, 351, 355

B

Bernard Nsokika Fonlon · 16

C

Caroline · 274

Comriade Felix · 275

D

Dani Noni Lantum · 16

Daniel Boneva · 73, 324

David Henry Thoreau · 81

Dixon R.M.W · 10

Donald Palmer · 119, 355

Dorothy Roberts · 274

Dr. Kofi Busia · 249

E

Edward Covey · 274

Eric Foner · 76, 82, 108

F

Felix Dzerzhinsky · 275

Frederick Copleston · 22, 23, 24, 34, 35, 47, 355

Frederick Douglass · 274

Fredrick Engels · 170

G

G.W Hegel · 206

George F. Kneller · 283, 284

H

Henry Kam Kah · 232, 233

Herbert Spencer · 288

I

Isak Dimesen · 269

J

James Harris · 275, 276, 355

Jean Jacques Rousseau · 21, 46, 47, 322

Jefferson · 318, 355

Jennifer Kentaro Byarugaba · 121, 127, 128,
129, 237

Jephta · 274

John Ansbro · 355

John Dewey · 283, 287, 330

John Locke · 21, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41,
43, 44, 219, 234, 305, 322

John Rawls · 11, 12, 137, 299, 301, 331

John Stuart Mill · 2, 96, 317

K

Kafka · 351, 355

Kant · 91, 93, 209, 214, 229, 348, 349, 351,
355

Karl Marx · 100, 116, 151, 159, 169, 170,
172, 173, 175, 177, 179, 180, 183, 185,
186, 189, 277

Kresbers · 256

L

Lenin · 118, 166, 275

Leoniel Krasin · 275

Louis P. Pojman · 125, 126, 135

Lynch · 274

M

Mahatma Gandhi · 52, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62,
69, 321, 324

Mazzini · 222

N

Newman · 256, 265, 293

Nkwame Nkrumah · 220, 221, 222, 224,
225, 227, 229, 231, 232, 233, 243

P

Paul Formosa · 229

Piaget · 298

Plato · 3, 25, 93, 98, 144, 149, 156, 223,
285, 286, 289, 311, 316, 317, 352, 355

Pope John Paul · 92

Q

Queen Elizabeth · 249

R

Robert Kaplan · 266

Rosenberg · 235

S

Samah Abang Mungwa · 148, 150, 151,
220, 244, 307, 310, 331

Simon Blackburn · 12, 13, 139, 140, 141

Socrates · 3, 4, 65, 81, 82, 138, 223, 311,
317, 355

Sorel · 103, 106, 141, 146, 257

T

T.W. Moore · 288, 293, 294, 324

Tangwa Godfred · 25

Thomas Hobbes · 17, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27,
29, 30, 94, 144, 148, 220, 298, 322, 330

Thomas Malthus · 267

V

Viscount Orthenin · 277

W

Walter Rodney · 243, 244

Wilke · 265

INDEX OF CONCEPTS

A

Absolutism · 145, 193, 311, 314

Accountability · 155, 308, 309, 315, 333

Anarchy · 26, 59, 68, 71, 126, 131, 140,
141, 142, 144, 150, 155, 159, 164, 166,
173, 176, 181, 200, 240, 267

Ancient rite · 220, 221

Apartheid · 11, 236, 279

Aristocracy · 316, 317

Aspiration · 40, 43, 82, 137, 139, 155, 156,
157, 158, 228, 254, 264, 283, 307, 309,
320, 322, 331, 332, 333

Authority · 8, 15, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42,
58, 72, 77, 83, 84, 98, 99, 101, 116, 117,
118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 127,
145, 146, 147, 150, 153, 154, 157, 158,
162, 177, 182, 196, 198, 200, 208, 220,
223, 238, 264, 298, 307, 308, 313, 314,
318, 321, 324, 325, 331, 332, 333

Awareness · 118, 173, 252, 265, 303, 312,
328

B

Bankruptcy · 271

Believers · 200, 222

Belligerents · 256, 260

Bourgeoisies · 169, 172, 173, 177, 182, 185

Brutality · 66, 144, 163, 268, 273

C

Camouflage · 223

Capitalism · 167, 169, 171, 174, 176, 177,
181, 182, 183, 189, 190, 192, 219, 231,
243, 244, 246, 270, 271, 272

Chaos · 2, 8, 9, 17, 21, 38, 43, 69, 83, 95,
108, 116, 131, 133, 136, 145, 151, 153,
163, 166, 169, 177, 178, 183, 186, 187,
188, 194, 197, 229, 232, 234, 243, 253,
255, 256, 258, 260, 265, 269, 270, 276,
278, 279, 321, 322, 323

Civil disobedience · 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12,
15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 32,
33, 37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 51, 52, 53, 54,
56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68,
71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84,
85, 86, 87, 97, 108, 111, 116, 117, 120,
122, 124, 126, 128, 132, 133, 134, 135,
136, 137, 139, 144, 148, 149, 150, 153,
155, 156, 159, 165, 167, 168, 169, 170,
171, 172, 174, 176, 177, 181, 183, 185,
188, 191, 193, 196, 199, 219, 225, 226,
228, 230, 232, 237, 243, 244, 245, 246,
247, 248, 250, 252, 253, 255, 258, 260,
263, 266, 270, 275, 282, 284, 285, 287,
320, 321, 322, 324

Civilization · 22, 54, 85, 221, 227, 250

Colonialism · 221, 223, 224, 225, 230, 232,
233, 234, 242, 243, 244, 246, 247, 248,
273, 276, 279

Communalism · 171, 246, 250, 272

Conflict · 3, 13, 26, 60, 74, 80, 103, 104,
129, 130, 147, 149, 150, 155, 169, 170,
171, 172, 174, 175, 176, 178, 180, 181,
183, 186, 188, 189, 190, 223, 230, 243,
253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 259, 262, 263,

264, 268, 271, 285, 307, 309, 321, 324,
331, 334, 351

Consciousness · 83, 173, 194, 195, 197, 201,
203, 204, 206, 208, 210, 213, 280, 298,
312

Corrupt · 58, 113, 157, 163, 177, 182, 261

Corruption · 112, 157, 261, 268, 293

Crises · 1, 5, 72, 86, 118, 143, 157, 158,
167, 250, 255, 276, 307, 331, 351

Curriculum · 282, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291,
292, 293, 303, 321, 324, 329

D

Damage · 38, 57, 63, 73, 89, 95, 109, 110,
138, 139, 154, 259, 261, 264, 270

Dehumanization · 274

Democracy · 37, 53, 83, 86, 94, 97, 116,
130, 147, 158, 186, 221, 263, 266, 271,
272, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 315, 317,
334, 351

Democratic · 12, 51, 66, 87, 141, 162, 189,
253, 271, 286, 300, 301, 310, 311, 313,
316

Dependence · 179, 184, 199, 272

Determination · 57, 161, 193, 220, 221, 230,
253, 282, 306, 329

Diamonds · 222, 261

Dictatorship · 17, 95, 101, 156, 163, 164,
189, 192, 311

Differentiation · 222

Dilemma · 26, 102, 134, 136, 245, 260, 271

Disenfranchised · 270

Disorder · 17, 21, 59, 87, 92, 95, 108, 116,
125, 131, 133, 145, 159, 160, 161, 163,
164, 166, 169, 176, 177, 178, 182, 183,

186, 187, 188, 194, 199, 200, 211, 222,
223, 229, 232, 234, 253, 255, 256, 258,
265, 268, 269, 270, 273, 276, 278, 279,
293, 299, 306, 307, 320, 321, 331

Domination · 94, 95, 96, 101, 122, 127, 134,
136, 151, 159, 160, 169, 172, 173, 188,
230, 242, 245, 248, 253, 258, 260, 273,
274, 276, 280

E

Eagerly · 221

Education · 1, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 91, 123,
135, 140, 143, 150, 151, 156, 174, 187,
206, 221, 225, 229, 230, 244, 249, 250,
272, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288,
289, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 297, 298,
299, 302, 306, 310, 312, 320, 321, 324,
325, 327, 328, 329, 331, 351

Emancipation · 79, 113, 123, 175, 181, 221,
233, 245, 277

Embezzlement · 293

Empowerment · 267

Epitaph · 267

Epitome · 267

Equality · 22, 28, 33, 37, 39, 48, 76, 113,
116, 127, 135, 137, 138, 146, 148, 155,
158, 205, 211, 222, 228, 236, 302, 312,
323

Equity · 30, 308, 309, 333

Ethical values · 283, 330

Exhilarating · 268

Exhortative · 220

Exploit · 51, 92, 169, 174, 186, 222, 223,
224, 233, 234

F

Family law · 302

Force · 4, 7, 11, 12, 20, 24, 26, 28, 34, 38, 44, 48, 54, 55, 57, 61, 62, 63, 68, 86, 94, 97, 98, 100, 106, 110, 118, 124, 128, 138, 148, 149, 151, 152, 154, 156, 173, 187, 190, 191, 200, 205, 207, 222, 223, 230, 246, 257, 265, 293, 308, 318, 333

Fraternity · 246, 248, 250

Freedom · 9, 20, 29, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 46, 49, 54, 61, 65, 68, 70, 82, 85, 86, 87, 106, 107, 111, 112, 114, 122, 124, 126, 130, 150, 151, 152, 155, 158, 160, 162, 167, 170, 177, 182, 194, 195, 196, 197, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 207, 208, 209, 210, 213, 221, 230, 231, 232, 239, 243, 266, 273, 310, 321, 324, 351

Frontiers · 76, 153, 256, 264

G

Geological surveys · 222

Global justice · 302

Good governance · 17, 18, 154, 156, 282, 307, 312, 317, 320, 321, 322, 331, 332

H

Hard work · 112, 282, 329

Harmony · 16, 17, 21, 66, 70, 83, 150, 256, 282

Holocaust · 6

Horrendous · 270

Human rights · 7, 8, 92, 193, 219, 261, 310, 311, 312

Hymen · 305

I

Illiterates · 220, 222

Immorality · 15, 282, 283, 329

Imperialist · 122, 145, 220, 222, 233, 268, 273, 278, 281

Inalienable · 8, 29, 166, 210, 216, 221, 321, 324

Industrial production · 171, 187, 222

Industrialism · 224

Inequality · 39, 48, 107, 127, 148, 211, 237, 272, 316

Injustice · 27, 29, 30, 47, 48, 51, 52, 53, 58, 66, 67, 69, 81, 82, 87, 92, 103, 104, 132, 135, 155, 309, 321, 322, 334

Insecurity · 3, 22, 48, 93, 149, 188, 251, 259, 282, 284, 285, 293, 320, 329

Instability · 150, 154, 191, 227, 259, 284

Institutions · 1, 2, 3, 4, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 27, 51, 60, 84, 93, 95, 97, 99, 119, 125, 142, 153, 156, 158, 162, 177, 182, 193, 196, 202, 203, 204, 205, 238, 244, 250, 258, 270, 271, 272, 279, 280, 285, 288, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 310, 314, 320, 321, 323, 328, 330

Instrument · 37, 55, 62, 87, 90, 93, 94, 106, 127, 144, 148, 151, 152, 156, 157, 179, 185, 186, 258, 263

International law · 302

J

Justice · 1, 9, 21, 22, 24, 25, 29, 30, 47, 48, 54, 55, 59, 60, 64, 66, 68, 81, 83, 92, 96, 103, 104, 114, 119, 126, 127, 131, 135, 137, 138, 146, 150, 155, 156, 158, 209, 216, 260, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 307, 309, 317, 323, 324, 332, 333

Justice as fairness · 301, 302, 303

L

Law · 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60, 64, 66, 67, 70, 71, 76, 77, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 93, 96, 97, 100, 101, 105, 110, 114, 116, 118, 124, 125, 127, 130, 138, 139, 142, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 153, 154, 160, 161, 167, 174, 193, 194, 203, 209, 211, 214, 216, 230, 234, 235, 254, 262, 271, 277, 281, 296, 298, 299, 302, 304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314, 330, 331, 333

Legitimate violence · 12, 127

Liberty · 18, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 38, 39, 41, 48, 49, 50, 52, 104, 107, 111, 112, 113, 114, 116, 137, 138, 146, 147, 150, 151, 153, 162, 200, 215, 217, 221, 223, 225, 231, 232, 236, 299, 302, 305, 306, 322, 330

M

Marginalization · 270

Melancholia · 266

Metropolitan countries · 219, 243, 270

Monarchy · 26, 37, 39, 42, 79, 94, 158, 163, 313, 314, 315, 317

Monopoly · 86, 127, 130, 151, 152, 187, 219, 264, 265

Moral education · 1, 14, 15, 17, 18, 282, 284, 293, 296, 297, 320, 321, 329

Moral values · 15, 63, 64, 282, 283, 285, 295, 303, 307, 321, 329, 332

Movement · 11, 59, 61, 62, 66, 79, 95, 101, 110, 120, 122, 141, 158, 159, 161, 162,

164, 166, 167, 170, 175, 180, 190, 192, 202, 231, 248, 253, 254, 260, 281, 303, 322

Multipartyism · 272

Mythical · 255

N

Nationalists · 221, 245, 251

Newman · 256, 265, 293

Nostalgia · 245, 248, 266

O

Orchestrated · 111, 159, 220, 225, 227, 229, 235, 253, 258, 274

Order · 1, 2, 7, 10, 13, 15, 17, 23, 24, 35, 37, 42, 50, 51, 59, 64, 68, 72, 74, 81, 83, 94, 104, 105, 107, 112, 114, 118, 121, 122, 126, 128, 133, 137, 139, 142, 144, 149, 151, 153, 155, 164, 171, 178, 179, 183, 185, 189, 190, 193, 194, 195, 200, 202, 204, 205, 207, 210, 223, 228, 239, 241, 243, 244, 246, 252, 254, 255, 257, 260, 262, 263, 271, 276, 280, 281, 286, 288, 289, 295, 299, 301, 304, 308, 320, 331, 332

Overlapping consensus · 303

P

Peace · 9, 12, 20, 23, 25, 29, 30, 36, 43, 44, 45, 46, 59, 71, 88, 90, 91, 92, 105, 109, 130, 131, 133, 137, 142, 146, 149, 150, 151, 154, 198, 226, 247, 255, 256, 263, 268, 269, 283, 317, 321, 322, 330

Pedagogic mitigation · 293

Pestilence · 268

Philosophy · 3, 5, 13, 14, 24, 35, 52, 57, 58, 62, 64, 84, 100, 116, 119, 125, 126, 137, 141, 142, 158, 217, 267, 279, 284, 286,

- 289, 294, 298, 307, 308, 316, 327, 330, 331, 333, 345, 346, 351
- Plethora · 275
- Politic · 109, 110, 129, 161, 205, 303
- Positive law · 31, 96, 306, 324
- Power · 1, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 55, 58, 61, 67, 73, 74, 75, 76, 83, 85, 86, 87, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 106, 108, 111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 136, 137, 141, 142, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 164, 165, 167, 169, 170, 173, 175, 176, 177, 180, 182, 183, 187, 188, 190, 192, 196, 197, 202, 208, 212, 222, 228, 229, 231, 242, 246, 247, 248, 251, 253, 255, 256, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 271, 272, 274, 280, 281, 287, 306, 308, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 320, 322, 333, 345, 351
- Proletariat · 151, 169, 173, 175, 178, 179, 180, 183, 185, 186, 187, 190, 191, 192, 277
- Property · 10, 22, 29, 33, 34, 35, 37, 41, 48, 49, 52, 56, 80, 98, 102, 113, 117, 122, 144, 145, 147, 148, 157, 172, 178, 179, 184, 185, 186, 189, 191, 192, 193, 195, 201, 206, 207, 208, 210, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 220, 226, 251, 271, 272, 274, 301, 302, 306, 309, 312, 314, 323, 333
- Protection · 1, 2, 24, 26, 28, 39, 42, 46, 47, 72, 76, 78, 89, 129, 134, 148, 176, 182, 193, 195, 197, 201, 265, 285, 310, 312, 322
- Purveyor · 268
-
- Q**
- Queen Elizabeth · 249
-
- R**
- Racism · 7, 100, 104, 224, 235, 236, 273, 280, 281, 345
- Rationality · 89, 203, 258, 259, 263, 290, 292, 293, 296
- Rebellion · 36, 56, 59, 67, 100, 104, 131, 147, 165, 168, 224, 225, 229, 238, 274, 275, 276
- Reconciliation · 60, 65, 67, 266
- Religions · 284
- Reluctance · 30, 98, 146, 194, 257
- Republic · 1, 17, 146, 250, 351
- Resentment · 63, 98, 136, 159, 219
- Resolution · 13, 220, 221, 256, 260
- Revolution · 17, 21, 36, 56, 61, 72, 73, 88, 96, 99, 103, 104, 105, 122, 124, 125, 139, 143, 147, 148, 151, 158, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 170, 172, 173, 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 182, 183, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 191, 193, 199, 211, 222, 223, 226, 229, 230, 231, 235, 236, 237, 239, 240, 242, 246, 247, 251, 275, 277, 318, 320, 322, 351
-
- S**
- Scrupulously · 222
- Security · 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 18, 22, 25, 28, 30, 49, 75, 78, 92, 106, 107, 149, 153, 180, 185, 191, 195, 253, 254, 255, 259, 263, 267, 269, 275

Self-defence · 147, 285

Slave trade · 163, 224, 252, 280

Slums and squalor · 220, 221

Social contract · 20, 21, 22, 33, 34, 37, 46, 48, 49, 83, 130, 140, 142, 144, 148, 160, 293, 304, 306, 308, 332

Society · 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 55, 57, 66, 75, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 96, 99, 105, 109, 110, 111, 113, 116, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 154, 155, 165, 166, 168, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 176, 181, 187, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 195, 214, 219, 220, 222, 225, 234, 239, 240, 244, 246, 247, 249, 253, 255, 259, 260, 262, 263, 265, 268, 269, 271, 272, 275, 276, 277, 278, 281, 282, 284, 285, 286, 287, 289, 297, 299, 300, 301, 302, 304, 305, 306, 307, 309, 310, 311, 316, 317, 320, 322, 323, 324, 330, 331, 333, 334

Solidarity · 136, 158, 164, 246, 248, 250

Stability · 85, 92, 200, 203, 205, 227, 254, 311, 315, 317

Strength · 3, 20, 22, 28, 40, 57, 61, 67, 87, 97, 98, 99, 100, 114, 131, 140, 162, 165, 191, 197, 199, 264, 274

Superstitions · 220, 221

T

Terror · 9, 90, 95, 101, 102, 160, 274, 275, 281

Terrorism · 8, 13, 37, 76, 89, 92, 95, 116, 128, 133, 135, 136, 137, 139, 145, 156, 171, 172, 188, 219, 228, 229, 234, 244, 245, 248, 250, 252, 255, 256, 260, 263, 268, 269, 270, 275, 278, 281, 282, 284, 293, 299, 306, 320, 322, 331

Terrorism · 13

Totalitarianism · 7, 8, 9, 93, 95, 101, 102, 118, 120, 124, 126, 133, 134, 136, 159, 162, 164, 245, 253, 281

Traditional · 22, 95, 186, 222, 252, 256, 276, 287, 288, 291, 292, 295, 313

Trafficking · 262

Truth · 4, 7, 10, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 104, 109, 119, 125, 126, 127, 138, 139, 141, 176, 181, 195, 200, 201, 202, 204, 205, 223, 235, 237, 257, 265, 286, 289, 290, 294, 295, 297, 327, 351

Tyrannies · 2, 101, 113, 269

U

Unity · 16, 25, 46, 149, 177, 183, 195, 199, 202, 204, 206, 211, 214, 215, 219, 225, 230, 232, 233, 263, 265, 286, 301

Utilitarianism · 294, 301

V

Violence · 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, 45, 51, 52, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 78, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 116, 117, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 129, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 141, 142, 143,

144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152,
155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 165,
167, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175,
176, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 183, 185,
187, 188, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197,
199, 203, 207, 211, 214, 219, 220, 221,
222, 223, 225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 231,
232, 234, 235, 236, 237, 243, 244, 245,
246, 247, 248, 250, 251, 253, 254, 255,
256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263,

264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 270, 273, 274,
275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282,
284, 285, 287, 293, 299, 306, 320, 321,
322, 324, 331, 350, 351

W

Western world · 221, 226, 236, 278

World health organization · 12, 13

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS OF HANNAH ARENDT

A-1 SELECTED BOOKS AND ARTICLES OF HANNAH ARENDT

- *The Origin of Totalitarianism*, Harcourt, Brace and Co, New York, 1951.
- *Dream and Nightmare. In Kohn, J., Essays in Understanding*: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1954.
- *Europe and the Atom Bomb. In Kohn, J., Essays in Understanding*. New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1954.
- *On the Nature of Totalitarianism: An Essay in Understanding*. In Kohn, J., *Essays in Understanding*, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1954.
- *Understanding and Politics; The Difficulties of Understanding. In Kohn, J., Essays in Understanding*: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1954.
- *Rahel Varnhagen: The Life of a Jewish Woman*. Winston, R. & Winston, C. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1958.
- *The Human Conditions*, University of Chicago, Chicago Press, 1958
- *The Human Conditions*, University of Chicago, Chicago Press, 1958
- *Between Past and Future: Six Exercises in Political Thought*, Viking Press, New York, 1961.
- *Eichmann in Jerusalem, A report on the Banality of evil*, Viking press, New York, 1963.
- *On Revolution*, Viking Press, New York, 1963.
- *Eichmann in Jerusalem, A report on the Banality of evil*, Viking press, New York, 1963.
- *On Revolution*, Viking press, New York, 1963.
- *Vita Activa, Milan*: Bom Piani, 1964.
- *On Violence, Thoughts on Politics and Revolutions*: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.
- *Crisis of the Republic: Lying in Politics, Civil disobedience, and Violence, thought on Politics and Revolution*, Harcourt Brace, and company, Sandiego, New York, 1972.
- *Rahe Varnhagen, the Life of the Jewiss*; Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, London New York, 1974.
- *The Jew as Pariah, Jewish Identity and Politics in the Modern Age*: Grove press, New York, 1978.
- *The life of the mind: 2 Vols Volume I: Thinking*, volume II: willing Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1978.
- *The Deputy: Guilt by Silence*; In Bernauer S.J.J.W. *Amor Mundi*, Boston College Studies in Philosophy, Dordrecht: Springer, 1987.

- *Love and S. Augustine*, trans, Joanna V. Scott and Judith C. shark, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- *Arendt, H. "On Hannah Arendt.* In Hill, M.A., Hannah Arendt: The recovery of the Public World, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1972.
- *Between Past and Future Eight: Exercises in Political Thought*, England: Penduguin Books, 1977.
- *The Last Interview with Roger Errera.* Uncertain regard, ORFTF TV. France, 1973.
- *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy:* Beiner, R. Chicago: Chicago Press, 1982.
- *The Jew as Pariah: A Hidden Tradition.* Jewish Social Studies in Kohn, J., The Jewish Writings, Canada, Toronto, Schocken Books, New York, 1973.
- *Love and Saint Augustine:* The University of Chicago Press, Chicago & London, 1996.
- *Madit and Gewatt, Munich:* Piper, 1970.
- *Israel, Palestine and the anti-Semitism, Eike Geisel and Klans Bittermann, Berlin: Veglas, 1991.*
- *Philosophy and Politics; The problem of action and thought after the French Revolution,* New York, 1954.
- *Critical Essays*, ed. Lewis Hichman and Sandra Hinchman, Albany: State University of New York press, 1994.

A-2. SELECTED ARTICLES OF HANNAH ARENDT

- Race- "Thinking before racism" the review of politics, 1944.
- Arendt, "The concentration of camps" partisan Review, July 1944.
- Arendt, expansion and the philosophy of power, 1946.
- Arendt, beyond personal frustration, the poetry of Bertolt Breche, 1948.
- "Totalitarianism Imperialism: Reflections on the Hungarian Revolution", The Journal of Politics, 1958.
- The two essays "Lying in Politics" and Truth and Politics, Viking press, 1967.
- The Jews as Pariah; "A Hidden tradition", The Review of politics, 1945.
- "Organized Guilt and Universal Responsibility", Jewish Frontier, 1945.
- "Privileged Jews", Jews social studies, 1946.
- "What is Existential Philosophy?" trans. Robert and Rita Kimbe, Partisan Review, 1946.
- "Expansion and the philosophy of power," The Sewance Review, 1946.

- “The Achievement of Hermann Broch”, The Kenyan Review, 1949.
- “The Aftermath of Nazi Rule. Report from Germany” Partisan Review, 1950.
- “Social Science Techniques and the study of Concentration Camps”, Jewish social studies, Partisan Reviews, 1950.
- “Peace or Armistice in the near East?” The Review of Politics, 1950.
- “Religion and the Intellectuals”, Partisan Review, 1950.
- “The Imperialist Character,” The Review of Politics, 1950.
- “Ideology and Terror: A Novel form of Government”. The Review of Politics, 1953.
- “Understanding and Politics, Partisan Review, 1953.
- “Religion and Politics, Confluence, 1953.
- “The personality of Waldemar Gurian”, The Review of Politics, The Gurian memorial issue, 1955.
- “Authority in the Twentieth Century”, the Review of Politics, 1956.
- “The Modern Concept of History”, The Review of Politics, 1958.
- “A reply to Critics”, Dessent, 1959.
- “Society and Culture”, Daedalus, mass culture and mass media, 1960.
- “Freedom and Politics”, In Freedom and Seldom, ed. Albert Hunold, Dordrecht: D. Riedel publishing company, 1961.
- “Action and the Pursuit of Happiness”, A reprint in: A Dempf, Munich, 1962.
- “Personal Responsibility under Dictatorship”, Listener, 1964.
- “Civil disobedience”, The New York, 1970.
- “Martin Heidegger at Eighty”, New York Review, 1971.
- “Thinking and moral consideration: A Lecture”, Social Research, 1971.
- “Public rights and Private Interests”, In Small Comforts: Hard Times for Humanists, ed. Michael Money and Florian Stuber, Columbia University press, 1977.
- “Some questions of Moral philosophy”, Social Research, 1994.
- “The Great Traditional law and power”, Social Research, Fall, 2007.

B.SELECTED WORKS AND ARTICLES ON HANNAH ARENDT

B-1 SELECTED BOOKS ON HANNAH ARENDT

- **Dana, Villa;** *The Cambridge Companion in Hannah Arendt*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- **Elisabeth, Young-Bruehi, Hannah Arendt;** *For Love of the World*, Yale University Press, 1982.
- **Elisabeth, Young-Bruehi,** *Why Arendt matters*, Yale University Press, 2006.
- **Elzbieta, Ettinger,** *Hannah Arendt/Martin Heidegger*, Yale University Press, 1995.
- **Margeret, Canova;***The Political Thought of Hannah Arendt*, London J. M. Dent, 1974
- **Margeret, Betz Hull,** *The hidden philosophy of Hannah Arendt*, Curzon Press, 2002.
- **Maurizio, Passerin d'Entrèves,** *The Political philosophy of Hannah Arendt*, London and New York, Routledge, 1994.
- **Patrick, Hayde;** *Political evil in a global age, Hannah Arendt and international theory*, Routledge, London and New York, 2009.
- **R. J., Benstein,** *Hannah Arendt and Jewish Question*, Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- **Shiraz, Dossa,** *The public Realm and the Public Self, The Political Theory of Hannah Arendt*, Waterloo, Ontario, Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1989.

B-2: SELECTED ARTICLES ON HANNAH ARENDT

- **Barthold, Lauren.** “Towards an ethics of love”: *Arendt on the will and St Augustine*. Philosophy & Social Criticism, 2000.
- **Beiner, R.** “*Arendt and Nationalism*”. In villa, D. R. *The Cambridge Companion to Hannah Arendt*, Cambridge, U.K, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2000.
- **Benhabib, S.** “*Arendt’s Eichmann in Jerusalem.*” In villa, D. R. *The Cambridge companion to Hannah Arendt*. Cambridge, U.K, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2000.
- **Benhabib, S.** “*Hannah Arendt and the Redemptive Power of Narrative*”. In Hinchmann, L., & Hinchmann, S. K. *Hannah Arendt: Critical Essays*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- **Bergen, B.J.,** *The banality of evil: “Hannah Arendt and The final Solution”*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc, USA, 1998.

- **Berkowitz, R. & Storey, I** *Artyifacts of thinking: "Reading Hannah Arendt"*. Bernauer, J. W. Boston: Nijhoff, 1987.
- **Bernstein, J. R.** "*Hannah Arendt and the Jewish Question*", UK, 1996.
- **Birmingham, P.** "*Hannah Arendt and Human Rights*", Bloomington & Indianapolis Indiana University Press, 2006.
- **Bowen-Moore, P.** "*Hannah Arendt's Philosophy of Nataliy*", St. Martin's Press, New York, 1989.
- **Bradshaw, L.** "Acting and Thinking": The Political Thought of Hannah Arendt. Toronto: University. of Toronto Press, 1989.
- **Buckler, S.** "*Hannah Arendt and Political Theory*": *Challenging the Tradition*. Edinburgh; Edinburgh University Press, 2011.
- **Byarugaba, J. K.** "*Reflexivity between the Mordem Society*" *Concepts of Equality and Plurality; Their Transformation according to Arendt.* "In Philosophy Study, New York, 2016.
- **Calhoun, C.** "*Plurality, Promises and Public Spaces*". In Calhoun, C. & Mc Gowan, J. *Hannah Arendt & the Meaning of Politics*, Minneapolis, London, University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- **Dietz, M.G.** "*Hannah Arendt and Feminist Politics*". In Hinchmann, L., & Hinchmann, S. K. *Hannah Arendt: Critical Essays*. Albany: State University of New-York Press, 1994.
- **Gottsegen, M.G.** "*The Political Thought of Hannah Arendt*". Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- **Hansen, P.** "*Hannah Arendt: Politics, History and Citizenship*". Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993.
- **Heidegger, M.**, "Poetry, Language, Thought", Albert Hofstadter (Trans.): Harper, New York, 1971.
- **Hinchmann, L.P. & Hinchmarm, S.K.** *Existentialism Politicized: "Arendt's Debt to Jaspers"*. In Hinchmann, L., & Hinchmann, S. K. *Hannah Arendt: Critical Essays*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- **Hansen, P.** "*Hannah Arendt Politics*", *History and Citizenship*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993.
- **Heidegger, M.**, "Poetry, Language, Thought", Albert Hofstadter (Trans.): Harper, New York, 1971.

- **Hull, M.B.** *“The Hidden Philosophy of Hannah Arendt”*. Richmond: Curzon, 2002.
- **Jackson, F. & Smith, M.** *The Oxford Handbook of Contemporary Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- **Jaspers, K.** *“The Philosophy of Karl Jaspers”*. Schilpp, P. A. Tudor Publishing Company, New York, 1957.
- **Kafka, F.** *“The Trial, Everyman’s Library”*, London, 1992.
- **Kant, E.**, *“Religion within the Bounds of Reason Alone”*. Wood, A. & Giovanni, G, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1996.
- **Kateb, G.** *“Political Action”: It’s Nature and Advantages*. In Villa, D. R, The Cambridge companion to Hannah Arendt, Cambridge, U.K.; Cambridge University Press, New York, 2000.
- **Kattago, S.** *“Hannah Arendt on the World”*. In Hayden, Hannah Arendt, London; Routledge, New York, 2014.
- **Kohn, J. & May, L.** *“Hannah Arendt”: Twenty Years Later*. (Ed.). Cambridge, Mass, [etc.]: MIT Press, 1997.
- **Kristeva, J.** *“Hannah Arendt”: Life is a Narrative*. Collins, F. (Trans.) Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- **Kristeva, J.** *“Hannah Arendt, Guberman R”*. (Trans.) New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- **La Caze, M.** *“Promising and Forgiveness”*. In Hayden, Hannah Arendt: Key Concepts London, New York, Routledge, 2014.
- **Lang, B.** *“Hannah Arendt and the Politics of Evil”*, In Hinchmann, L., & Hinchmann, S. K. Hannah Arendt: Critical Essays. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- **Levinas, E.**, *“Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority”*. Lingis, A., (Trans.) Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers, London, (2012)
- **Mac Call, C.** *“Concepts of person: An Analysis of Concepts of Person”*, Self and Human Seing. Aldershot, Avebury, 1990.
- **Masolo, D.A.** *“African Philosophy in Search of Identity”*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- **Maurizio, P.** *“The Political Philosophy of Hannah Arendt”*. Routledge, New York, 1994.

- **Parekh, B.** “*Hannah Arendt and the Search for New Political Philosophy*”, Macmillan, London, 1981.
- **Sigwart, H.J.** “*The Wondering Thought of Hannah Arendt*”, Behr, H. & Rösch, F. (Eds.) Newcastle, Macmillan, UK, 2016.
- **Spaemann, R.** “*Basic Moral Concepts. Armstrong*”, T.L. (Trans.). Routledge, London, 1989.
- **Steinberg, J.** “*Hannah Arendt on the Holocaust*”, The Edwin Mellen Press, New York, 2000.
- **Taminiaux, J.** “*Athens and Rome. In Villa*”, D. R. *The Cambridge companion to Hannah Arendt*. Cambridge, U.K.; Cambridge University Press, New York, 2000.
- **Thomhili, C. Karl Jaspers**, “*Politics and Metaphysics*”. London; Routledge, New York, 2002.
- **Tlaba, G.M.** “*Politics and Freedom*”, *Human Will and Action in the thought of Hannah Arendt*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987.
- **Villa, D. R.** “*Politics, Philosophy, Terror*”, *Essays on the Thought of Hannah Arendt*. Princeton, 1999.
- **Villa, D. R.** “*The Cambridge companion to Hannah Arendt*”. Cambridge, U.K.; Cambridge University Press, New York, 2000.
- **Villa, D.**, “*Hannah Arendt; From Philosophy to Politics*”, in *Politics, Philosophy, Terror*, Zuckert, C.H., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011.
- **Young-Bruehi, E.**, “*From the Pariah’s Point of View*”, *Reflections on Hannah Arendt’s*
- **Young-Braehl, E.**, “*Hannah Arendt, for love of the world*”: Yale University Press, New Haven, 1982.
- *Life and Work*. In Hill, M.A. *Hannah Arendt; Recovery of the Public World*, St.Martin’s Press, New York, 1979

C. GENERAL BOOKS AND ARTICLES

C-1: GENERAL BOOKS

- **Abbot, Philip.** *States of Perfect Freedom*, Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.
- **Alain P., Grimes.** *American Political thoughts Amazon books review*, New York 1958 as quoted by Hannah Arendt, in *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1972

- **Appleby, Joyce.** *Liberalism and Republicanism in the Historical Imagination*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- **Arugaba, J. K.**, Reflexivity between the Modern Society Concepts of *Equality* and Plurality: Their Transformation according to Arendt. *In Philosophy Study*, New York, 2016.
- **Ayissi, Lucien**, *Corruption et gouvernance*, Harmattan, Paris, 2008.
- **Bedau, Hugo Adam. ed.** *Civil disobedience*. Indianapolis, IN: Pegasus, 1969.
- **Bennett, Jane.** *On Being a Native: Thoreau's Hermeneutics of Self.* Polity, 1990
- **Bercovitch Sacvan**, *American Jeremiad*. Madison, WS: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.
- **Bloom Harold, ed.** **Henry David Thoreau.** NY: *Bloom's Literary Criticism*, 2008
- **Bradshaw, L.,** *Acting and Thinking: The Political Thought of Hannah Arendt*. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1989.
- **Buckler, S.,** *Hannah Arendt and Political Theory: Challenging the Tradition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.
- **Canby Henry Seidel**, *Thoreau*, Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1939.
- **Carlyle Thomas**, *Sartor Resartus and On Heroes and Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History*. London: J.M. dent; NY: E.P. Dutton, 1910.
- **Dedmond Francis B.** *Thoreau and the Ethical Concept of government*. The Personalist, 1955.
- **DELBANCO Andrew**, *The Abolitionist Imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- **Demos John**, *The Anti-Slavery Movement and the Problem of Violence Means*. New England Quarterly, 1964.
- **Dickens Robert**, *Thoreau*, NY: Exposition Press, 1974.
- **Ellis Richard**, *American Political Cultures*. NY: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- **Emerson Ralph Waldo**, *Essays and Lectures*. NY: *Library of America*, 1983.
- **Ferguson Laraine**, *Thoreau Daniel Berrigan, and the Problem of Transcendental Politics*, 1982
- **Foner, Eric**, *The Fiery Trial: Abraham Lincoln and American Slavery*. NY: W. W. Norton, 2010.
- **Francis Richard**, *Transcendental Utopias*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997.

- **Francis W., Coker, Recent *Political Thoughts***, New York Oribis books, 1934, as quoted by Hannah Arendt, in *Crisis of the Republic*, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1972.
- **Frank Tibor, ed. *The origins and Originality of American Culture***. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1984.
- **Gandhi, Mahatma, *Non-violence Resistance 1961***, quoted by Ervin Smith in the *Ethics of*
- **Martin Luther King Jr.** Leviston/Queenston, the Edwin Mellen Press, 1981.
- *Non-violence Resistance* quoted by John, J. Ambros in *Martin Luther King Jr*, 1961.
- *I still believe in non-violence Collier*; the *Ethics of Martin Luther King Jr*, 1943.
- **Glick Wendell P. *Thoreau and the 'Herald of Freedom***. *New England Quarterly* 22, 1949
- **Goldman Emma, *Anarchism and other Essays***. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1969
- **Greenberg, Amy S. *A Wicked War: Polk, Clay, Lincoln, and the 1846 Invasion of Mexico***. NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012.
- **Harding Walter and Michael Meyer, *The New Thoreau Handbook***. NY: New York University Press, 1980.
- **Harding Walter, ed. *Thoreau: A century of Criticism***. Dallas, TX: Southern Methodist University Press, 1954.
- *Thoreau Centennial. Albany, NY: the State University of New York Press, 1962.*
- *The Days of Henry Thoreau*. NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.
- **Harding Walter and Michael Meyer, *The New Thoreau Handbook***. NY: New York University Press, 1980.
- **Hartz Louis, *The Liberal Tradition in America***. NY: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1955.
- **Henry, David Thoreau, *On the duties of Civil disobedience, 1848***, quoted by Lawrence J. R. Herson, in *Politics of ideas, Homewood/Illinois, the Dorsey press*, 1984.
- *On the duties of Civil disobedience, 1884*, quoted by John Ansbro, in *Martin Luther King's Jr, Maryknoll/New York, Oribis books*, 1986.
- **Hicks, John, ed. *Thoreau in Our Season***. MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1967.
- **Hobbes, Thomas, *Leviathan, The power of ideas, 7th ed.***, edited by Emily Barose, *New York Magrow-Hill*, quoted by Federick Copleston in *history of philosophy* New York et al. Doubleday, 1985.

- *Leviathan*, quoted by Samuel Enoch Stumpf, in philosophy of history and problems, New York et al Graw-hill, 1989.
- **Hochfield George**, *Anti-Thoreau*. Sewanee Review, 1988.
- **Hollis Carroll**, *Thoreau and the State*. The Commonwealth, 1959.
- **Howe Daniel Walker** *Making the American Self*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America*, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- **Lawrence Jerome and Robert E. Lee**, *The Night Thoreau spent in Jail*. NY: Hill and Wang, 1970.
- **Lepore Jill**, *The Force: How Much Military is enough?* New York, 2013
- **Lipperman, Watter**, *The indispensable Opposition* 1939 as quoted by Hannah Arendt, in Crisis of the republic, Harcourt Brace and Company, San Diego New York, 1972.
- **Locke, John**, *The Second Treaties of Civil Government* 1690, as quoted by Frederick Copleston in the History of Philosophy, New York et al Doubleday, 1985.
- **Lynd Staughton**, *From Here to There*. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2010.
- **Machiavelli Niccolo**, *The Prince*. NY and London: W. W. Norton, 1977.
- **Madden Edward H.** *Civil Disobedience and Moral Law in Nineteenth- Century American Philosophy*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1968.
- **Mariotti Shannon L.**, *Thoreau's Democratic Withdrawal*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2010.
- **Marx Karl**, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* vol. one. One progress publishers, Moscow, 1969.
- *Philosophical Elements of the True Citizens*, 1989 as quoted by Frederick Copleston in history of philosophy, Vanderbilt University, University Press, 1989.
- **Marx Karl and Friedrich Engels**, *The Marx-Engels Reader*. Robert Tucker, ed. NY and London: W.W. Norton, 1978.
- **Matthiessen, F.O.** *American Renaissance*. NY: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- **Mcperson James M.** *America's 'Wicked War*. New York Review of Books, 2013.
- **McWilliams, Wilson Carey**, *The Idea of Fraternity in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1973.
- **Meyer Michael**, *Several More Lives to Live: Thoreau's Political Reputation in American*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977.

- **Miller Perry**, “*The Responsibility of Mind in a Civilization of Machines;*” American Scholar, 1961.
- **Niccolo Machiavelli**, *The Prince*, tr. Harvey C. Mansfield Jr. Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1985.
- *The Discourses*, tr. Bernard Crick, Middlesex: Penguin, 1970.
- *The Prince*, United States of America: The University of Chicago press, 1988.
- **Oakes James**, *Freedom National*. NY: W.W. Norton, 2013.
- **Ophuls William**, *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity*. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman, 1977.
- **Paley William**, *The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*. London: printed for F.C. and J. Rivington, 1822.
- **Paul Sherman**, *The Shores of America: Thoreau’s inward Exploration*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1958.
- **Paul Sherman, ed.** *Thoreau: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1962.
- **Peabody Elizabeth P. ed.** *Aesthetic Papers*: Boston, MA and New York, NY: G.P. Putnam, 1849.
- **Petrulionis, Sandra Habert**, *To Set This World Right: The Anti-Slavery Movement in Thoreau’s Concord*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- **Plato**, *Last Days of Socrates*. Baltimore, MD: Penguin, 1969.
- **Pocock, J.** *The Machiavelli Movement*, United States of America: Princeton University press, 1975.
- **Powell, J.** *The New Machiavelli: How to wield power in the modern world*, Great Britain: vintage, 2010.
- **Quarles Benjamin**, *Blacks on John Brown*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1972.
- **Radre, P.** *Against throne and Altar: Machiavelli and Political Theory under the English Republic*, United States of America: Cambridge University press, 2008.
- **Richardson Robert D.** *Henry Thoreau: A life of the Mind*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996.
- **Rorty Richard**, *Achieving Our Country*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.

- **Rousseau Jean- Jacques**, *Basic Political Writings*. Indianapolis, IN and Cambridge: Hackett, 1987.
- **Sanders Frederick K.**, *Mr. Thoreau's Time Bomb*. National Review, 1968.
- **Sims Michael**, *The Adventure of Henry Thoreau*. NY, London, New Delhi, Sydney: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- **Skinner, Q.** *The foundation of Modern political thought, volume one: The Renaissance*, United States of America: Cambridge University press, 1978.
- **Machiavelli**: *A very short introduction* United States of America: Oxford University press, 1981.
- **Sophocles**, *Theban Plays*. NY: Penguin, 1982.
- **Stoehr Taylor**, *Nay-Saying in Concord*. Hamden, CT: Archon, 1979.
- **Sweet John Wood**, *The Liberal Dilemma and Demise of the Town Church: Ezra Ripley's Pastorate in Concord, 17780-1841. Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 1992.
- **Tart Donna**, *The Goldfinch*. NY Hamden, CT: Little, Brown, 2013.
- **Thoreau Henry David, Familiar Letters of Henry David Thoreau**. F.B. Sanvorn, ed. Boston, MA and NY: Houghton Mifflin, 1894.
- *Journal of Henry D. Thoreau*. Bradford torrey and Francis H. Allen, eds. Boston, MA and NY: Houghton Mifflin, 1949.
- *Consciousness in Concord*. Perry Miller, ed. Boston, MA and NY: Houghton Mifflin, 1958.
- *The Variorum "Walden" and the Variorum Civil disobedience*. Walter Harding, ed. Washington Square Press, 1968.
- *A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers; Walden, or, Life in the Woods; The Maine Woods*; Cape Cod. NY: Library of America, 1985.
- *Thoreau: Political Writings*. Nancy L. Rosenblum, ed. NY: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- *Collected Essays and Poems*. NY: Library of America, 2001.
- *Essays*. Jeffrey S. Cramer, ed. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 2013.
- *A Yankee in Canada, with Anti-Slavery and Reform Papers*. Boston, MA: Ticknor and Fields, 1866.

- **Timpe Eugene F., ed.**, *Thoreau Abroad: Twelve Bibliographical Essays*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1971.
- **Turner Jack, ed.**, *A Political Companion to Henry David Thoreau*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2009.
- **Warburton, N. Pike, J. and MatraversD. Reading**; *Political Philosophy: Machiavelli to Mill*, USA and Canada: Routledge, 2000.
- **Walzer Michael**, *Exodus and Revolution*. NY: Basic Books, 1985.
- **Walker Brian**, *Thoreau's Alternative Economics: Work, Liberty, and Democratic Cultivation*. *American Political Science Review*, 1998.
- **Wolf Robert Paul**, *In Defense of Anarchism*. NY: Harper and Row, 1976.
- **Wood Gordon**, *Empire of Liberty*. NY Oxford University Press, 2009.
- **Calhoun, C.**, *Plurality, Promises and Public Spaces*. In Calhoun, C. & Mc Gowan, J. (Eds.). *Hannah Arendt & the Meaning of Politics*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, London, 1997.
- **Carbonell, C.**, Phantasia logistike in the Configuration of Desire in Aristotle. In *Ideasy Valores*, 2012.
- **Charles, D.**, *Aristotle's Philosophy of Action*. Duckworth, London, 1984.
- **D'agostini, F.**, Buenos Aires: Adriana Hidalgo, 2014.
- **Dietz, M.G.**, Hannah Arendt and Feminist Politics. In Hinchmann, L., & Hinchmann, S. K. (Ed.). *Hannah Arendt: Critical Essays* (pgs. 231-255). Albany: State University of New-York Press, 1994.
- **Draenos, S.S.** Thinking without a Ground: Hannah Arendt and the Contemporary Situation of Understanding. In Hill, M.A., (Ed.) *Hannah Arendt: The Recovery of the Public World*, (pgs. 209-224). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- **Ettinger, E.**, *Hannah Arendt y Martin Heidegger*, Barcelona: TusQuets, 1996.
- **Eze, M.O.**, *Intellectual History in Contemporary South Africa*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- **Fine, R.**, Understanding Evil Arendt and the Final Solution. In Pia, Lara, M. (Ed.) *Rethinking Evil* (pgs. 131-150). London: University of California Press, 2001.
- **Flamarique, L.**, Practicar la verdad. Sintonías y disonancias de Heidegger con el libro X de Confesiones. *Tópicos, Revista de Filosofía*, 2013.

- **Formosa**, Is Radical Evil Banal? Is Banal Evil Radical? In *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, vol. 33 no 6, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore, SAGE Publications and David Rasmussen, 2007.
- **Foucault, M.**, *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the Collège de France 1982-1983*, Gros, F., Davidson, A.I. (Eds.) Burchell, G. (Trans.). New York: Picador: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- **Fry, K.**, *Nativity*. In Hayden (Ed.), *Hannah Arendt: Key Concepts* (pgs. 23-35). London; New York: Routledge, 2014.
- **González, A.M.**, *Claves de ley natural*. Madrid: Rialp, 2006.
- **Gottsegen, M.G.**, *The Political Thought of Hannah Arendt*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- **Gracia, J. J. E.**, *Metaphysics and its Task: The Search for the Categorical Foundation of Knowledge*. Albany, N. Y.: State University of New York Press, 1999c.
- **Grisez, G.G. & Shaw, R**
Beyond the New Morality: The Responsibilities of Freedom. Notre Dame [Indiana] [etc.]: University of Notre Dame Press, 1974.

C-2 GENERAL ARTICLES

- **Bernstein, J.R.** “*Radical Evil: A philosophical Interrogation*”. UK, Polity Press, USA, 2002.
- **Eze, M.O.** “*Intellectual History in Contemporary South Africa*”, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- **Formosa, P.**, “*Is Radical Evil Banal*”? *Is Banal Evil Radical?* In *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, Los Angeles, New Delhi and Singapore, SAGE Publications and David Rasmussen www.sagepublications.com, London, 2007.

Foucault, M., “*The Government of Self and Others*”: Lectures at the Collège de France

- **Gracia, J. J. E.** “*Metaphysics and its Task*”, *The Search for the Categorical Foundation of Knowledge*, Albany, N. Y. State University of New York Press, 1999.
- **Grisez, G.G. & Shaw, R.** “*Beyond the New Morality*”; *The Responsibilities of Freedom* Notre Dame Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1974.
- Henem Kam Kah, “Africa must unite” verdicating Nkwame Nkrumah and uniting Africa against destruction, the journal of pan-African studies, 2012.

- **Plato Gorgias. Irwin, T.** (Trans.) *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- **Reitlinger, G.** “*The Final Solution: The Attempt to Exterminate the Jews of Europe*”. Mitchell, Vallentine, London, 1968.
- **Rhonheimer, M.** “*The Perspective of Morality*”, *Philosophical Foundations of Thomistic Virtue Ethics*. Malsbary, G. (Trans.). Catholic University of America Press, Washington DC, 2011.
- **Ring, J.** “*The Political Consequences of Thinking*”, *Gender and Judaism in the Work of Hannah Arendt*. Albany, N. Y.: State University of New York, 1997.
- **Shiraz, D.** “*The Public Realm and the Public Self*”, *The Political Theory of Hannah Arendt*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1989.

D. DISSERTATIONS AND THESIS CONSULTED

D-1 Dissertations

- CHRISTIAN, Siwiyini Wirnkar, *The quest for scientific in Alfred Jules Ayers language, truth and logic*, A dissertation presented and defended for the award of Master degree in philosophy, University of Yaoundé 1, 2015.
- TANGWA, Godfrey, *the contractarian theory of political obligation*, Nigeria, University of Life, 1979.
- Isidore KPA KOM, *the stakes of civil disobedience and violence*, A critical evaluation of crises of the Republic of Hannah Arendt, university of Yaoundé I, 2019.

D-2 THESES

- DeniS, Ghislain Mbessa, *Globalisation and culture in the light of Teilhardism*; thesis presented and defended for the award of Ph.D in Philosophy. University of Yaoundé 1, 2015.
- Francis, Tazoah, *philosophy and politics, a critical reading of Hobbsian*, University of Yaounde 1, 2007.
- Ndeh Paul Ade, *the question of tolerance in the world: A reading of John Locke*.

E-DICTIONARIES AND WEBIOGRAPHY

E-1 DICTIONARIES

- Audi Robert, *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy*, Second edition, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Dixon, R.M.W, *New approach to English Grammar on semantics principles*, Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Simon Black Burn, *Oxford dictionary of philosophy*, Oxford, New York, Oxford University press, 1994.

E-2 WEBIOGRAPHY

- Website and bibliography of Hannah Arendt's writings
(<http://contemporarythinkers.org/hannah-arendt/>)
- The Hannah Arendt Center for Politics and humanities at Bard College
(<http://hac.bard.edu/>)
- <http://www.e-n.info/2014/08/08/machiavelli-on> the use of immoral-means-in politics, quoted by Victoria Marcias Pereira-Ayuso, August, 8, 2014.
- <http://www.e-ir-.infor/2014/08/08/Machiavelli-on-the-use-of-immoral-means-in-politics>, by Victoria Marcia Pereira-Ayuso, University of Braimingham, university press. 2014. P.1/16.