

Portland State University

PDXScholar

---

Young Historians Conference

Young Historians Conference 2014

---

Apr 29th, 1:00 PM - 2:15 PM

# Aristotle's Common Good: A Historical Analysis of Aristotle's Politics

Connor D. Reising  
*Grant High School*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/younghistorians>



Part of the [Other History Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

---

Reising, Connor D., "Aristotle's Common Good: A Historical Analysis of Aristotle's Politics" (2014). *Young Historians Conference*. 9.

<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/younghistorians/2014/oralpres/9>

This Event is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Young Historians Conference by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

**Aristotle's Common Good:**  
**A Historical Analysis of Aristotle's *Politics***

Connor Reising

March 4, 2014

World History

Since the beginning of human history, people have organized themselves into communities. Coming together and establishing order are beneficial, as they allow for protections of safety and security. Together these form the foundation of human social agreement, but societies have structured themselves in vastly different ways over time. This often leads historians to speculate the reasons for variation in the evolution of government. Where did our contemporary understanding of government come from? Why is one government different from another? Many governments have risen from intense centralization of power; others have grown among a wide dispersion of power across the state. Ancient Greece can function as a specimen for historians, which one can look to for a stronger grasp on difference in society structure. This civilization was built from multiple city-states that all utilized varying forms of government. Studying these forms of government reveals not only the structures that were common in early human civilization, but also how distinct communities interacted with each other. Being a cluster of islands around a mainland, Greek city-states had much interaction throughout history. The other important factor of Greece was the level of documentation about the area and its influence done by scholars, such as Aristotle. Aristotle was a Greek philosopher who studied under Plato in Athens and compiled his own research on human social structure during the mid-4<sup>th</sup> century BCE. He observed each Greek community and the different roles the people and governments played in everyday life. Aristotle's *Politics* provides historians with three specific types of government, which existed in his historical context, by describing the composition of citizenship in each. With this foundation, historians can better understand how these societies have influenced the different forms of government that exist today.

Having lived in a Greek city-state, Aristotle based his observations on the structure of cities. Though larger societies existed at the time, small metropolitan areas were more present in the philosopher's life. In this context, Aristotle compares the balance between the individual and his or her community. He begins by defining the 'citizen.' Aristotle states the role of his citizen as "...one who has a share in the privileges of rule."<sup>1</sup> This understanding actually differs substantially from the contemporary understanding of a citizen. In the United States, citizenship is bestowed upon anyone born inside the country. Aristotle does not provide citizenship as fundamental of a right, but rather a privilege for those who take part in rule. He argues that in order to be an effective citizen, one must either be dutiful to their government or active in preserving a common good among people. If a person does not exhibit one of these traits, one

can argue that they are unfit to be a citizen.<sup>2</sup> Citizens in Aristotle's Greece were usually aristocrats or monarchs; however Aristotle's definition of the citizen changed depending on the form of government. Huge numbers of people in different city-states were usually without voice in government, but one type of society had a more contemporary view of the citizen.

Democracy allowed for the best application of Aristotle's citizen, as this form of government utilized rule by all of the people. In aristocracies, a small group of people held citizenship. In monarchies, one man could potentially be the all-powerful citizen. With power given to the people, citizenship gained the quality of a necessary right. Greek democratic citizens even went far beyond the contemporary understanding of the word, and placed high importance on their part in government as a civic duty. They showed disinterest in more personal matters and in some parts of Greece the public and the government appeared as a single entity, rather than the common feeling of separation of the people and their government that many other nations display. Even then though, this definition of citizenship was never extended to the massive slave class of Greece. Slaves were thought of as below deserving the natural rights that Greek citizens enjoyed. However, Aristotle disagrees with the Greek view of slavery. He argues that, "...we cannot say that some are slaves and others free by nature..."<sup>3</sup> Slavery was a part of the Greek social system, but Aristotle did not believe it was justifiable just for being so integral. He found that slavery only truly succeeded when the slave and master worked for the benefit of both, but then that is not truly slavery. The practice itself involves one laboring solely for the benefit of another. If slavery benefits the slave, he is receiving some form of compensation. Therefore, Aristotle's ideal form of slavery is oxymoronic, but perhaps he means for it to be. Balances like this are common in Aristotle's writing, and indeed he believes democracy works best if most citizens are moderate in their political beliefs. Aristotle continues his discussion of citizenship by explaining how the composition of citizens creates three different types of government.

Kingship, aristocracy, and polity are the possible structures of rule that Aristotle saw, and each one had their own counterpart. The constant aspect between the three was that each would rule aiming at a common good. This meant that the government would establish order and security, as well as provide opportunity to succeed in life to all of its citizens. When rule sought more selfish means, the three flavors of government would respectively take the forms of tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy. Aristotle wrote of each form of government being a different

type of constitution. His meaning of a constitution was an organization of authority, and he writes in connection to his definition of citizen: “*That* is what makes one constitution differ from another – the composition of the citizen-body...”<sup>4</sup> Aristotle continues by defining different constitutions based on this principle: “Kingship – One man rule aiming at a common good. Aristocracy – Rule of more than one man but only a few. Polity – Rule exercised by the bulk of the citizens for the good of the whole community.”<sup>5</sup> With the chosen definition of the citizen, a constitution would then form to allocate power, provide rules for exercise of this power, and place limitations upon the government it would create. Throughout the establishment of these three forms of constitution, the idea of common good remained as a strong influence. Focus on the common good did not simply mean that these constitutions would protect their people’s safety and security, but that they would also enable all to achieve a satisfying life within the state. Tyranny and oligarchy did not share this theme, because by definition they existed for the good of the rulers. In democracy, the common good is replaced by the good of the majority. Majoritarian democracies corrupt, because they hinder the minority’s ability to participate in government. Working towards a common good implies that the government strides towards agreement between the majority and the minority. As Aristotle writes, “For tyranny is sole rule for the benefit of the sole ruler, oligarchy for the benefit of the men of means, democracy for the benefit of the men without means. None of the three aims at the advantage of the whole community.”<sup>6</sup> Aristotle concludes his *Politics* with a discussion of the best constitution of these six options.

Aristotle’s first point is that the best form of government depends on the values of those being governed. If the general consensus is that citizenship should be reserved for those who exhibit traits of leadership and goodness, then a monarchy or aristocracy should rule over this distinct community. Aristotle writes, “If we wish to discuss the Best State really adequately, we must first decide what is the most desirable life...”<sup>7</sup> If the people feel that having a single ruler is best, then a Monarchy is the most adequate form of government for them. The same applies to aristocracy and polity, and Aristotle even draws on his teacher in this discussion.

Plato believed that the greatest constitution would bestow authority upon a ‘philosopher king.’ This monarch would act selflessly for his people, and take each minute aspect of his state into account before reaching a decision. Plato relates kingship to the helmsman of a ship, and writes, “...the true pilot must pay attention to the year and seasons and sky and stars and winds,

and whatever else belongs to his art, if he intends to be really qualified for the command of a ship...”<sup>8</sup> This idea of a virtuous, philosophical king was incredibly influential, and a figure such as this is actually the perfect form of kingship. However, Aristotle disagrees with the legitimacy of Plato’s fantastical claim. He dismisses the argument as impractical, as absolute power always corrupts and even if it does not, one man could not possibly fathom what is best for a whole community of people. Aristotle ultimately decides that polity is the best form, because it relies on compromises to fulfill the interests of the people. Though the perfect polity would involve citizens devoutly working together to satisfy each other as much as possible, majoritarian democracy was the most realistic reflection of desirable human life in Aristotle’s eyes. As is always the case though, his observation did not come without bias.

One aspect of a historian’s job involves both reading and understanding a source, while also placing it in the context of when it was written. Aristotle makes the point that a democracy is the most practical type of constitution, but there is no doubt that he was greatly influenced by his surroundings when deciding this. Aristotle studied for and wrote *Politics* while residing in the Greek city-state Athens, which many regard as the birth place of democracy. Aristotle also condemns oligarchy and tyranny as the most corrupt forms of government, but his bias in this area can be seen by looking at Athens’ enemies. Sparta was a military-based oligarchy with which Athens had a long history of war and hostility. The city-state was led by a few powerful aristocrats, and the people were brought up as soldiers from birth. In essence, Sparta was a sovereign army that tried, and succeeded, on multiple occasions to take control of Athens. Athens’ other foe, the Persian Empire, was a dominating tyranny led by a single totalitarian dictator. Seeing the promise and ambition that Athens inspired in its people, Persia invaded the city-state and burned Athens to the ground. These powerful states were the examples Aristotle saw of what aristocracies and kingships could become when corrupted. Historians must take this into consideration when evaluating Aristotle’s claims, and many have actually disagreed with the premise of his six constitutional classifications.

In “A Democracy of Distinction,” Collins claims that “...the truly best polity is a ‘mixed’ constitution in which the prohairetic activity of each individual citizen both expresses his or her individual virtue and contributes to the common good of all.”<sup>9</sup> Polity and Democracy are the two extremes that Aristotle provides, but there is a middle ground. Citizens can be both somewhat selfish while also contributing to common good. This form of virtue aligns the interest of the

individual with the interest of common good, and Collins continues by saying that a mixture of democracy and aristocracy is more effective at attaining this than the establishment of just one. Mixture of different constitutions is something Aristotle mentions, but abandons to focus on the distinct classifications he lays out. "...an aristocratic constitution does not fall within the competence of most cities unless it approximates closely to what we call polity."<sup>10</sup> He claims that probability is high for mixture of the types of government, but that the pure forms are better and more efficient. In addition, combination governments will often lean more towards one of the two forms with which it manifests itself. Aristotle continues by writing that combined governments often lead to development of class systems, with low-class, middle-class, and high-class peoples being the most common distinctions. The inequality between these groups will create factions and divide government, and could potentially lead to civil war between the different social classes. Though he emphasizes this as a very probable outcome, Aristotle believes that a robust middle-class could potentially solve this problem. Regardless of the effects though, combinations of Aristotle's different types of government throughout history are obvious responses to *Politics*. The most familiar combination to Americans is a republic.

A republic is what James Madison called, "...a government in which a scheme of representation takes place."<sup>11</sup> The United States Constitution requires that each state in the country be provided with a republican form of government, but representation is not the only system we encounter in America. Aristotle would see representatives as aristocrats; they are the few people who make legislative decisions for the many. Though this aspect of government aligns with aristocracy, the US also has more democratic tendencies. Many decisions within the several states are left to popular vote, with initiatives and election of politicians the most common. Some federal-level decisions even have democratic attributes, such as the public's role with the Electoral College when electing a president. This combination of government may have seemed impossible to maintain by Aristotle's understanding, but it actually provides for greater checks on power to account for selfish human intentions. Representatives of the people can overrule passionate majorities in the legislative process. The people themselves can then defend the common good by politically sanctioning representatives who make decisions against this good. The US democracy displays a negative trait through Aristotle's view of government though. The majority has immense legislative power, and many times in history minority groups have been politically persecuted. However, the United States governmental system has a judicial

branch that implements the doctrines of judicial review and substantive due process. These allow federal US judges to review the constitutionality of lower court decisions and even strike down laws that they find violate fundamental human rights.

The United States also provides historians with an interesting perspective on government, because it was the first of its kind. Though its framers took influence from Athenian Democracy and the Roman Republic, the US Constitution had aspects that would revolutionize how future governments would function. Lance Banning writes in “A Revolution in Favor of Government”: “The [US] Constitution was an effort to construct a viable competitor to Europe’s fiscal/military states and to legitimize this project in a culture in which opposition to strong government was standard...”<sup>12</sup> This constitution was designed to heavily limit the nation’s government and maintain the interests of the society. The country’s founders achieved this by combining different aspects of existing governments. Along with the democratic and aristocratic nature of the United States’ people and representatives respectively, the US also has an executive branch of government that fills many roles a monarchy would. Aristotle writes, “...a king is made king by the good men on account of his superiority in virtue or deeds of valour...”<sup>13</sup> Much like this, a US presidential candidate is chosen based on his or her political history and then voted on by the people. Though the US president is not truly a monarch, due to the limitations placed on him, this central figurehead was no doubt inspired by the kings and emperors who came before the nation’s founding. Because of this, the United States government is an excellent way for historians to see Aristotle’s influence in the modern day, but other ideas from *Politics* have also presented themselves throughout history.

The Roman Empire provides an interesting view of Aristotle’s classifications, because it was in essence a Kingship disguised as an Aristocracy. After being elected by the aristocrats as the dictator of Rome in 27 BCE, the king Augustus Caesar appeared to relinquish his political power back to the people’s representatives. Though the Roman people had forced the aristocracy to appoint Caesar as absolute monarch, his move only caused them to see Caesar as a more virtuous and valiant leader than they had previously. Rome took the shape of an Aristotelian aristocracy, but in reality Caesar still had control over the representatives of the people. The Roman people and their representatives would participate in *contios*, or debates about Roman law or governmental structure. In “Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic,” Mouritsen writes: “...the élite’s monopoly over the communication meant that the



people were easily misled and the *contio* therefore became an instrument of control rather than a vehicle for popular power.”<sup>14</sup> Unknown to the Roman people, their representatives ultimately made the governmental decisions that Caesar desired. The Roman Empire flourished under this form of rule for centuries, while the people believed that they had a voice in their republican city-state’s political process. Caesar and his successors held true authority in government, and in secret their monarchy continued unopposed for years. Gibson writes of the Roman Empire’s administration: “...patronage allowed Claudius [Caesar] to confirm privileges to...individuals in return for affirmation of the emperor’s position. This mutually beneficial exchange was how the new emperor secured his status and glued the empire together...”<sup>15</sup> The Roman Empire even came to encompass a massive portion of the European continent, stretching from the Northern Atlantic to the Middle East. The Roman Empire was so influential on these lands that aspects of Roman civilization remain in them to this day. For example, the Latin language spoken by the Romans has been the basis for many other European languages, including French, Italian, Spanish, and English. The empire may have never managed these feats of control and influence, if not for Caesar’s cleverly disguised monarchy.

Often throughout history, monarchs have been the driving force behind powerful nations like Rome. Aristotle defines the truest form of monarchy by saying, “...Absolute Kingship is the entire administration of a state or of a nation or nations.”<sup>16</sup> This has occurred in the past, by one ruler having complete authority over his people. King Louis XIV of France is one example of a monarch of this stature. He resided over the Bourbon dynasty in the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century CE, and was revered as a god-like ‘Sun King’ by the French people. One has to only see Louis’ palace at Versailles to know that it was, “...the supreme incarnation of absolute monarchy...”<sup>17</sup> Versailles is a fortress of majesty and wealth, and would lead a visitor to believe that France was the wealthiest land in the entire world. Louis was god-like simply because a man like him was so unreal. The power he held was unimaginable to most people, and he became legendary to his subjects. French people would even pay money during his reign to watch the king wake up, hoping that he may desire conversation with them on the way to his breakfast. This man’s immeasurable power helped him lead his nation to success, and France flourished economically under him for a time. Near the end of his reign Louis got France involved in wars that drained the nation’s wealth, but he was able to keep the government stable throughout this. Though

Louis XIV, and his successor Louis XV, more closely resembled Aristotle's 'monarchy for the common good' philosophy, the ruler who followed them would not.

Louis XVI took control of France in 1774, and unwittingly began a process by which the France monarchical system would meet abolishment. He used his total authority to exploit the lower-class Frenchmen, and they soon turned against their king. Though Louis XVI's two predecessors had also exploited their subjects and raised French debt during their reigns, the principles behind their economic decisions differed greatly from Louis XVI's. Louis XIV and Louis XV both attributed their costly spending to war efforts that would protect France from other European powers. Louis XIV had led the nation during the War of Spanish Succession, and secured a relative to the French royal bloodline, Philip V, as King of Spain. Louis XV then acquired debt for France by financing the Seven Years' War to defeat Great Britain, though France ultimately lost the conflict. These leaders spent to keep France secure as a European power. Louis XVI dealt with this inherited debt by raising taxes on the lower class, and continuing to spend money on luxury items for the higher class. The French people did not accept these new reasons for the increasing national debt and fought back.

Aristotle understood the effect that oppressive absolute monarchies had on their people though. People require the liberty to find happiness, and moderately structured societies usually fulfill this desire. Extreme oppression or radical government however do not, and Aristotle gave warning of this by saying, "...in order to maintain a particular type of constitution, the inherent pressures toward extreme forms of that constitution must be held in check."<sup>18</sup> Aristotle believed that tyrannies would ultimately lead to usurpation by the people and history would confirm his statement. In this case, Louis XVI ran the lower classes into financial ruin and prompted the backlash that became the French Revolution. The Second Estate, which consisted of French nobleman, was at this time running France into extreme debt with its extravagant lifestyle. Louis XVI believed that he could solve this problem and continue this Second Estate tradition by heavily taxing the French people. As the Third Estate, peasant class, tried to grapple with the new taxes, France took an economic plunge. The national debt became so extreme that the peasantry paid 80% of their income to the government during its height.<sup>19</sup> After deciding to face the nobles head on, representatives from the Third Estate were locked out of the French Estates-General meetinghouse. The outraged class cried for revenge, and after fighting the French government, they took control of France. King Louis XVI was beheaded by the new French

Republic as a message proclaiming an end to the Bourbon Monarchy. Looking at a source like this event and the history surrounding that source gives historians plenty of information for evaluation, but there is a third pathway to explore when trying to fully understand a primary document.

Analyses by other historians provide one with different perspectives, as well as debate on the substance of the source. In relation to *Politics*, this discussion usually leads to how well different historians have translated Aristotle's writings from Greek. Some like historian Peter Phillips Simpson prefer a literal translation of the words to best preserve exactly what the philosopher wrote. However, one can lose the true meaning behind the work through colloquialisms and phrases used by Ancient Greeks that don't retain the same meaning in English today. For example, Aristotle refers to having children as 'child-getting' and teachers as 'child managers.'<sup>20</sup> Upon looking at these terms, the contemporary English speaker should not be surprised to find himself utterly confused. There is also much issue with what exactly Aristotle means by a 'polis.'<sup>21</sup> Different historians have interpreted this word to mean a constitution, a community, or a citizen, depending on the context. Some even dispute whether polis only applies to city-states or larger societies as well. Many of these originalist translations also include footnotes to help explain some of the more foreign Greek phrases to English readers. Some translators refuse to do this though, arguing that it reduces the originality of the document and allows influence from the translator to break through.

On the other end of the spectrum, historians such as T.A. Sinclair claim that Aristotle's writings should be translated to best fit his meaning. Understanding of Aristotle's message can be a better route of explanation than his literal word use, but this is of course left up to the translator to decide. Only Aristotle himself knew exactly what he meant in his writing, and it is the job of historians to provide differing perspectives so others may form their own opinions. When reading *Politics*, historians try to understand what life was like for the citizen in Ancient Greek governments. Taking different historians' opinions into account allows for a wider breadth of view when evaluating Aristotle's ideas, and different interpretations can insight new perspectives from readers. Perhaps leaving the text as literal as possible is the most effective way to block influence of translators to individuals, but doing this may actually diminish a source's usefulness to future historians. Regardless of the translation method, historians should always look to their colleagues' opinions to strongly develop their level of understanding. Strong

understanding of a source and its influences can show a historian the story of the source's place of origin, but applying it to the world as a whole can open new pathways when viewing the source. By tracking propagation of a source's influence, as well as the differences in its effects worldwide, historians can see the course upon which the source has set history to come. Placing something through a world historiographical lens like this reveals how it has affected the human race as a whole, and how, in the case of *Politics*, the human idea of government has swayed.

There is no doubt that Aristotle's writings have heavily influenced governments over the last two and a half millennia. Historians still must be critical of his works though. Taking into account Aristotle's surroundings versus the ones we know today help us relate his ideas of citizenship and organization in a more modern way. It is interesting to note that Aristotle's democratic home Athens was probably a chief influence to his writing. To put it in different terms, *Politics* would have never come out of Sparta. Despite speculation and debate over the details of *Politics*, Aristotle's message is clear. "The state is intended to enable all...to live well."<sup>22</sup> He differs from thinkers like Hobbes and Locke in his idea that communities are formed not because they have to be, but rather because they can lead to assurance of the common good. This is something everyone understands and wishes out of government, whether for selfish or selfless reasons. People agree to a social contract when they believe their lives will be better because of it. According to John Locke, "Where-ever therefore any number of men are so united into one society, as to quit everyone his executive power of the law of nature, and to resign it to the public, there and there only is a political, or civil society."<sup>23</sup> Locke believed that societies existed for the sole purpose of preventing hostility, and protecting the safety and security of the community as a whole. Though the obvious influence from Aristotle and Greek thought in general is present in Locke's view of the state, the 17<sup>th</sup> century Englishman takes a slightly different perspective on the true mission of government.

While Aristotle places more emphasis on the opportunity of the individual to help civil society succeed, Locke points out that individuals must relinquish certain natural rights in order for society to function properly. Though Locke did believe that humans naturally sought goodness, he thought that government was necessary to control the selfish nature that man sometimes exhibited. Thomas Hobbes strayed even further from Aristotle in his writings, and believed that humans were evil by nature. Without government as a barrier against them, people would utterly destroy each other in Hobbes' eyes.<sup>24</sup> These philosophers' disagreement with

Aristotle may have stemmed from their own experiences watching the warring states of 17<sup>th</sup> Century Europe. During this era, the English Civil War, the religious Thirty Years War, and the Fronde in France rocked the social, economic, and political foundations of Europe. Resources became scarce to finance the struggles, and people became hostile towards each other. Locke and Hobbes both lived in this time, and it is no wonder they proved to have more pessimistic views of government when looking at the violence that whirled around them. Safety and security were key concerns, and these philosophers stressed that governments should limit people's liberties to prevent communities from breaking into war-like chaos. Aristotle's more optimistic view of human virtue does carry a truth about government though.

Despite the government they reside under, people expect to live happy and fulfilling lives. If a state does not protect this sacred human right, it loses legitimacy to its citizens. Aristotle captures this by saying, "But a state is something more than an investment; its purpose is not merely to provide a living but to make a life that is worth while."<sup>25</sup> Because of this central idea, *Politics* is still relevant. Humans will never surrender their pursuit of happiness. Protecting security without ensuring opportunity is possible for governments, and failing to inspire ambition through a society's structure will lead it to ruin. Aristotle understood this, and we continue to understand it today. Though societies have arisen that do not fulfill this common good philosophy, they are often met with opposition and even revolution by their people. Aristotle's warning for extreme governments has been proven across history. American colonists broke away from the British in 1776 to escape the tyranny of King George III. After nearly seventy years, the corrupt Soviet Union in Russia fell to its own people in 1991. In 2011, the Lotus Revolution to overthrow Hosni Mubarak in Egypt began, and the nation is still in political unrest. Even if the common good is not sought in the eyes of a government, it still exists in the hearts of that government's individuals. Aristotle's theme is a constant throughout human history, and will continue until its end. *Politics* provides a web of different possibilities when applying this theme to societal structure and the role of the individual in community life. When applied to the realm of World History, this source uncovers influence on different societies throughout time. Many have looked to Aristotle for inspiration when structuring government, but most go about doing so in varying manners. Looking at the differences between these societies also shows how Aristotle's ideas mixed with the thoughts of other philosophers and figures relative to different areas on the planet.

## Notes

1. Aristotle, *Politics*. (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1976), 112.
2. Aristotle, *Politics*, 107.
3. Aristotle, *Politics*, 36.
4. Aristotle, *Politics*, 113.
5. Aristotle, *Politics*, 116.
6. Aristotle, *Politics*, 116.
7. Aristotle, *Politics*, 255.
8. Plato, *The Republic*, (The Internet Classics Archive, 2009), accessed March 4, 2014, Book VI.
9. Susan Collins, "A Democracy of Distinction: Aristotle and the Work of Politics," *Political Theory* 4 (2005): 872.
10. Aristotle, *Politics*, 171.
11. James Madison, *No. 10: The Same Subject Continued. The Federalist Papers*, Edited by Clinton Rossiter. (New York: New American Library, 2003), 76.
12. Lance Banning, "A Revolution in Favor of Government: Origins of the U.S. Constitution and the Making of the American State," *The American Historical Review* (2005): 133.
13. Aristotle, *Politics*, 217.
14. Henrik Mouritsen, "Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic," *The Journal of Roman Studies* (2005): 251.
15. A.G. Gibson, "Claudius Caesar. Image and Power in the Early Roman Empire," *The Classical Review* (2013): 192.
16. Aristotle, *Politics*, 138.
17. David Sturdy, "Louis XIV," *French History* 17 (2003): 214.
18. Deborah Mordak, "Aristotle: Politics, Books V and VI," *American Journal of Philology* 4 (2001): 585.
19. Prachi Mital, "What were the Economic Causes of French Revolution?," *Preserve Articles* (2012): 1.
20. Asli Gocer, "The Politics of Aristotle," *The Review of Metaphysics* 3 (1998): 719.
21. Jean-Philippe Ranger, "Aristotle on Political Communities: Lessons from Outside the Politics," *Apeiron* 4 (2013): 375.

22. Aristotle, *Politics*, 120.
23. John Locke, *The Second Treatise of Civil Government*, (Constitution Society, 2013),  
accessed March 4, 2014, chap. 7, sec 89.
24. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989), 107.
25. Aristotle, *Politics*, 119.

## Bibliography

- Aristotle. *Politics*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1976.
- Banning, Lance. "A Revolution in Favor of Government: Origins of the U.S. Constitution and the Making of the American State." *The American Historical Review*. 1 (2005): 132-133.
- Collins, Susan. "A Democracy of Distinction: Aristotle and the Work of Politics." *Political Theory*. 4 (2005): 867-957.
- Gibson , A.G. "Claudius Caesar. Image and Power in the Early Roman Empire." *The Classical Review*. no. 1 (2013): 191-193.
- Gocer, Asli. "The Politics of Aristotle." *The Review of Metaphysics*. 3 (1998): 719.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989.
- Locke, John. *The Second Treatise of Civil Government*. Constitution Society, 2013. Accessed March 4, 2014.
- Madison, James. *No. 10: The Same Subject Continued. The Federalist Papers*. Edited by Clinton Rossiter. New York: New American Library, 2003.
- Modrak, Deborah. "Aristotle: Politics, Books V and VI." *American Journal of Philology*. 4 (2001): 583-586.
- Mouritsen, Henrik. "Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic." *The Journal of Roman Studies*. (2005): 251-252.
- Plato. *The Republic*. The Internet Classics Archive, 2009. Accessed March 4, 2014.
- Mital, Prachi. "What were the Economic Causes of French Revolution?." *Preserve Articles*.



(2012). 1.

Ranger, Jean-Philippe. "Aristotle on Political Communities: Lessons from Outside the Politics." *Apeiron*. 4 (2013): 374-390.

Schall, James. "Aristotle: Religion, Politics, and Philosophy." *Perspectives on Political Science*. 1 (1998): 5.

Skeats, Terry. "The Politics of Aristotle." *Library Journal*. 4 (1997): 78.

Sturdy, David J. "Louis XIV." *French History* 17 (2003): 213-214.

Young, Charles. "Aristotle: Politics, Books I and II." *The Philosophical Review*. 1 (2000): 87-88.