



Approaches and Schools of Thought in Political Science / Dr. Doron Navot

Objective: Investigating the Political Inquiry

What is a society?

Is it an entity, a sum that is larger than its components, a structure that enables social action, or is it the product of social interaction among individuals? Is it an arena of consensus or conflict?

What is neutrality?

It is a discourse and legitimization of the status quo, and is, in fact, the politics of the strong (and ruling) throughout history. One of the things that gives power to a player in the political field is to present his position as a neutral position. An example: The Bank of Israel is required to make decisions that are actually political, and since it is a professional body, it is considered neutral. But this is not true - there are several possible answers, and there is no truth in the sense of the natural sciences, there is no neutrality.

And what is politics?

1. More than one person: Issues related to a cluster of **people with a common denominator**.
2. The interaction between them is more than one-time and random.
3. In the fields relating to the public: the preoccupation with politics tries to understand who **has power** among the members of the people in question, whether the power is in the people or that it is institutional - in the structures. How power works historically, and normatively - **how to create power**.

What is political? An action is political when it raises a problem or questions governmental existing arrangements. Something that is, is not enough for me, I want to change it, expose it.

Almost any action can become political.

The political is not confined to politics, but to spaces of problematic relations of control.

Power:

Power is the **potential** to act in the world, to influence, to take reality and change it. The emphasis is on the ability to influence - the potential, whether the ability is activated or not.

There are four different perspectives (dimensions-) on power. Every point of view reflects an approach and another school of thought on the study of politics:

First dimension - direct action:

The first characterization of power is provided by researchers who belong to **the pluralistic paradigm**. This is a paradigm that advocates that power is distributed in society and not concentrated in the few, the



elite, the wealthy, etc. The power lies in **interest groups, political parties, politicians, the military, universities, etc.** - a multiplicity of centers of power.

Positivist - a researcher who examines reality in accordance with tangible facts that can be absorbed through the senses or simply abstracted through sensory data. Often, due to the use of positivism, the researcher becomes a pluralist, since he experiences and sees a multiplicity in his research process. The pluralists who study positivism tend to conduct many surveys among the public, in order to collect information. The positivist pluralists seek to explore the power on the **visible level that can be seen**, and engage in a **concrete act of power: how a causes b to act through the use of force: to do something he did not intend to do** if power had not been exerted on him. According to this approach, it can be argued that if in 2011 there was a social protest and today it does not exist - this means that there is no longer a social conflict.

Criticism of the approach: Limiting the scope to overt and visible conflicts does not take into account the fact that politics often takes place in layers hidden from the eye (the fact that there is no Ethiopian demonstration does not mean that they no longer have problems - perhaps they are just afraid ...). Empirical methodology will almost always lead us to more positive conclusions about what is happening in society.

What actually happened to social sciences and political science - the emphasis shifted from the literature to the discipline? The discipline won the profession. The methodology has increased, and instead of exploring the power we are investigating things that can be measured. Then there is more discipline, everything is more quantitative, but it is at the expense of the professionalism and dealing with what needs to be dealt with is the power. This is according to Dr. Navot, while recognizing that there are others in the field of political science that will explain otherwise.

The second dimension of power - prevention of action:

Is developing as a critique of the pluralistic approach. Two researchers, Bacharach and Berze, published an article criticizing the pluralistic approach and the way it understands power. They note that the more interesting dimension of power **is the invisible dimension of non-decision-making.**



That is, to bring the weak to a situation in which he expects his defeat and refrains from acting, on the assumption that there is no point in acting: the consciousness was built by virtue of power relations. The weak knows and expects exactly what is expected of him. The problem with this dimension is that there is a tremendous difficulty in exposing it, and we must find appropriate ways to investigate it (journalists of Yediot knew exactly what Noni Moses expected from them, without him telling them directly).

The third dimension of power - creating a false consciousness:

The third layer of power relies on a distinction between **real interests** and **preferences and desires**. It is a situation in which the power holder causes the ruler to want things that are contrary to his real interests and serve the ruler. This is actually creating a false consciousness in the ruled.

The ruler manipulates the ruled over time (for example, by exposure to biased information) and thereby transmits it to "**consciousness redesign**". When you claim that someone is going through a redesign of their consciousness, you can make opposing claims:

1. What a person wants is what is good for him and another person is not in a position to decide what is good for others.
2. The observer does not properly understand the interests.

The fourth dimension of power - faceless power:

A layer based on non-personal mechanisms such as religion, culture, language, and tradition that bring us to a state in which **something looks natural even though it is not natural** (men do not wear skirts). It is very difficult to get out of this dimension of power because most of us are blind to it and therefore trapped within it.

For example, LGBT: In the ancient world, male intercourse did not define identity, religions have made it immoral and forbidden, and today, even when we come out of the LGBT community, being gay is okay, But male intercourse becomes a self-definition of a person ,and it stems from an external source.

State:

- **Machiavelli:** He tended toward the realistic approach that claims that power lies mostly in the elites and very little in the public. He coined the idea of "the autonomy of politics." Politics has its own rules that make it separate. He separated morality from religion and politics. Science is its job, not to be good or bad, but to be a reality even if it is cruel. The ruler has the right and **obligation to 'hurt'** (to lie to the



public) only in the amount that the surgeon needs to heal. If the ruler hurts out of pleasure for pain he will fail.

- **Max Weber** defines a state as an organization with exclusive and legitimate control over organized means of violence when it contains this control over a given population and defined territory: an organization that has a **legitimate monopoly** over the use of organized **violence** against a population in a given territory (and thanks to the territory). In the heart of the state (in terms of violence): army, police, and prisons. Legitimacy is the key to the state, with history proving that those who impose authority often gain legitimacy as well. Examples:
 - Altalena Affair: If Ben Gurion had allowed the Irgun to take some of the weapons, he would have dismantled the principle of the state according to Weber.
 - Lebanon is not a state, because of the legitimate exercise of power by entities that are not the state.

Different approaches to questions based on power - and power structure - whether it is centralized or decentralized.

- The elitist approach sees power as centralized, coming from above.
- The pluralistic approach sees power as decentralized, coming from below.
- The Marxist approach - centralized, both from above and below.

Pluralist approach: does not see the state as the sole source of power, but rather sees a multiplicity of sources of power (political system). It does not ask how individuals perceive or gain power (it interests the elitist), for them the main idea is how the individual can influence. The emphasis is on negative freedom, how to prevent governmental interference. The sovereign is incapable of representing the totality of society.

Marxist approach:

The state has power but it is controlled by the owners of capital / power. Politics is a matter of class struggle over control over material resources. The material resources are objective, and the struggle stems from their own arrogance. Game Amount 0 - Either there is or is not. Structural perception in this sense of the premise of limitations to human activity. The identification between the political and the state is not one piece. Within Marxism there are 2 prominent approaches:

1. **The instrumental stream** - capitalists view the country as an instrument for increasing their power / capital. Means: bribery, lobbyists, maintenance of the media, financing of political campaigns



2. **The structural stream** - the state represents **the collective interest of the wealthy**. The strengthening of a single capitalist can harm capitalism itself (and thus in a country ruled by the wealthy) that harming the false representation of free competition is liable to bring about a revolution, and therefore the state imposes restraint on capitalists as individuals in order to preserve capitalism as a system. The power of wealth owners is structural.

The elitist approach:

The elite has two dimensions, one quantitative and the other qualitative. The first is the structure of power - the way power is divided. **An elite is a minority group that is in a position of controlling the majority disproportionately, not necessarily wealthy, for example, politicians.** The qualitative dimension concerns the characteristics of the elite itself, with one of the most prominent being the access to resources. The types of capital according to which elites organize are different. Political capital (the ability to decide collective matters). Under what conditions money becomes capital.

The philosophy of science:

Even before that in the 16th century **Martin Luther** challenged the Catholic Church and Catholic doctrine. Within the Catholic Church a struggle developed around 1520. Luther, who grew in the Catholic Church, was mainly opposed to an idea in which it was possible to obtain a place in the World to come against good deeds in this world. According to Luther's approach, everyone will go to hell, and God will send a small number of people to heaven arbitrarily.

Luther creates a **reality in which there is no more certainty** - there are now two concepts, Catholic and Protestant. In this climate, too, the preoccupation with doubt arises, which receives political significance. There are questions of right or wrong, religious authority is cut off from the institution of truth, and this opens the door to secularism, science and rationality. In the next century, the preoccupation with doubt has expanded - Descartes and in the 18th century philosopher David Day.

In all this there is another argument between rationalists who believe that our source of knowledge comes from the brain

David Hume, a Scottish philosopher, was an empiricist. He was a significant skeptic and tried to understand how something we think is true. David Day engaged in induction - the way to draw and know things about the world. This is a method of deduction from individual cases. **The deductive approach** assumes, for example, that since the dawn of history the sun has sunk, it can be concluded that it will



continue to sink. He claimed that induction was a failure, since **it was not possible to conclude necessarily from past actions that they would continue in the future**. Induction has no rational validity. There are also things that have existed in the past for many years and will not continue to exist only because of this.

At the beginning of the 20th century, a group was formed around Wittgenstein's writing and an essay he published in 1922, which becomes a constitutive text of a group called the **Viennese Circle** or logical positivism. One of the important arguments of this group is that what gives things meaning is that they are based on **units that are verifiable empirically**. Language must be explored as a way of empirically verifiable units. Any claims in a language that cannot be empirically verified are nonsense. If we talk about the state, we have to talk about it in a measurable manner

In his article.

Karl Popper attempts to say what the boundary between scientific theory and non-scientific theory is.

Popper argues against the principle of verification. He claims that all the theories that try to verify things are not necessarily scientific theories. **The principle of verification** is not a principle that characterizes scientific activity and scientific theory. The examples Popper talks about are three theories that were popular at the time: Marxism, psychoanalysis, and Adler's individual psychology. Popper argues that all three look like scientific theories, presenting themselves this way, but they are pseudo-scientific and not really scientific. Because every fact given to them proves to them that they are right, by way of examples and empiricism.

Popper says that what distinguishes between scientific and non-scientific theory is the **ability to refute the theory empirically**. Only a theory that sets conditions for its refutation is a scientific theory, and the more it can point to a state of affairs in the world that can refute it, the more scientific it is. If she can explain everything, she is less scientific. If one cannot refute an idea then it is not a scientific theory (evolution). The scientist has to perfect his theory and formulate the conditions that if they happen in the empirical world he can say he was wrong.

According to **Dawn and Kevin**, they wrote during the 20th century, when there is a conflict between empirical findings and theory, it is impossible to tell whether the theory is wrong or that something else is wrong. When examining a theory, a set of assumptions is examined with it, and when there is a clash between them and the empirical finding, it is impossible to know what is true. In other words, according to their approach, Popper's theory is also refuted.



Quinn calls it Holistic pragmatism. Checking a set of claims. Examine the possibility that you are deceived by pragmatic considerations. There is no rational criterion as Popper presents, to distinguish between scientific theory and that which is not.

If Quinn is right, then there is no reason to abandon a theory.

Thomas Kohn continues the line of Dawn and Quinn and takes him a few steps forward. In his opinion what makes science thrive is its **dogmatism**. He opposes Popper's idea of refuting things in science all the time and thinks that science's **ability to cling to an example gives it its power**. The moments when science becomes normal are when it is institutionalized, people agree on premises, do not challenge them and solve riddles while accepting the axiomatic assumptions. If science begins to challenge the premises it will look like social sciences.

Popper - the principle of refutation

Cohn - Dogmatism.

Lakatos goes into a discussion between Popper and Kohn and believes that a good scientific theory is being tested in its predictive ability. The ultimate test of a good theory is its ability to predict facts. Science, due to its methods, is a better predictor of reality. It's a bit like Popper's principle of refutation, but not 100 percent.

Goes on to Oden and says that theories can be distinguished in that the fundamental principles of theories are not refuted, and people accept them in dogmatic ways. We need to examine what dogmatic assumptions give rise to theories from which good predictions are born that help us deal with interesting problems.

The debate cooled down in the 1980s because it became clearer that a sharp distinction between what is scientific and what is not was not established; and science is characterized by methodology, empiricism, and theories that have good predictions and help us solve problems.

Thinkers:

Socrates:

- Love of wisdom is a way of life (and not a technical manner)
- Ironic method - I know nothing but the fact that I am aiming for the ideal = truth
- Socrates worked in analogy between things, even if they seemed very far apart



- They argued against him that he corrupts the younger generation (because he is such a good philosopher that he succeeds in changing opinions)
- **Connection to Apology:**
 1. Everything requires examination - including the word of God
 2. You must be committed to clarifying the truth
- The death of Socrates was fully controlled just as his life - calm and peaceful

Plato:

- Lives in ancient Greece, a fifth and fourth century BCE, a student of Socrates. These are the years of the Polyphonic Wars, 430 - 405 BC. The background - a war with the Persians. There were not yet real states but state cities (Polis) and at the heart of the Peloponnesian Wars there is a violent struggle between Sparta and Athens.
- Accuses Athens' deplorable democracy of the death of Socrates and therefore dislikes it
- **Theory of ideas** - brings the abstract idea in heaven to earthly things - going from the general to the specific.
- Reality is dynamic and changing the Idea - Static and permanent one has to become professional and engage in something
- Democracy is a state of injustice (because the leaders are not skilled and qualified)
- **3 layers to the human soul:**
 1. The layer of lust - the low common denominator of the public (they are the leaders of Athens according to Plato)
 2. The layer of activism and heroism
 3. The rational level of thought - of the philosopher (who should be a leader according to the political)
- An irresolvable tension between the collective aspect (the politics advocated by Plato) and the personal aspect (his method of study is one-on-one Socratic), **and therefore two options arise from Plato:**
 1. Personal and mental as a result of the Socratic method of study
 2. Collective - the state in the center (politically)
- **In his work State = Politic** Plato teaches the shape of the proper celestial state
- The ideal education system is censorship - exposing the people only to certain contents that are in the best interests of the people.



- **3 social layers:**

1. **The philosopher king**, who does not want to be king at all (conforms to the rational element of man) every person has to specialize in something and politics also requires professionalization, and therefore philosophers should lead the state.

2. **The warrior guards** (the heroic and activist level) - the status of the guards may not have private or family property. Prevent a conflict between personal and state interests. The status of the guards is exclusively the state at the top - **platonic communism** (only for the status of the guardians and not from an ideological-social conception but from a political conception). Modern communism, on the other hand, shares the entire nation and derives from social rather than political goals.

3. **The common people** (the hedonistic dimension of the human soul).

Aristotle:

- Plato's student
- Man is a political animal and part of its nature is to be political. In his view, it is not natural to remain silent in the face of injustice, and we really need to come and talk about injustices, certainly if they happen to us.
- Speech is important to politics. Through speech, you can get something new out of a group of people.
- The Marxist conception that tries to politicize all economic life has its roots in Aristotle. Aristotelian thinking has an element that Marx took later on that speaks of the ability to transform. Revolutionaries in general and Marxist revolutionaries in particular believe in the ability to make a significant transformation in people - and this is an Aristotelian concept, the revolutionary potential embodied in the human race.

- **The State According to Aristotle:**

- The state is more important than the sum of the details from which it is composed - the state above all else.
- The accepted conceptions perceive the state as a compromise - and therefore the state is not everything.
- **The state as an object according to Aristotle.**
- Today - the state is a means to achieve the goal - the happiness of individuals.
- The size of the country should be medium - to create a sense of belonging
- Initial partnership in the state of nature => The state is also natural.
- Man is a political and political animal



- The state above all - the rule must first divide

Aristotle rejects the Platonic view of a number of reasons:

A. A conservative argument - if Plato's division was working, someone would have thought of it before.

Do not invent the wheel

B. Without private property there is no motivation to work => the deterioration of the economy. Of course, private property should also not be overstated - through the Aristotelian Golden Way (middle road).

C. In order to enable charity and help others, there must be private property. When there is only justice (fair and equitable distribution of assets) and there is no room for altruism - the society misses the fact that it is less emotional.

D. **In Aristotle's opinion, a state consists of a number of circles** - a person has the circle of the family, the circle of the village and the circle of the state. Each circle strengthens the connection to the one above it. Plato - wants to put only the collective = state in the center. You want to discard the rest of your circles.

E. **Those who love everyone do not like anyone.** According to Plato, there is no private property and / or private family, so everyone loves everyone, but it is not real.

F. **The middle class is essential for the existence of democracy** - the reduction of the middle class cause's revolutions in the regime. More poor => They have nothing to lose => the potential for a radical and charismatic dictator who will seize power.

Cicero:

Lives in a time when Rome is another republic and loses its republican character and becomes an empire. He operated between 70-30 BC. He places great emphasis on the **importance of speech by the leader**, because the great leader in the Roman conception is able to take a group of people, even one that experiences itself as separate and conflicted, and by speaking, to bring them into cooperation. By doing so you're constructing their self-conception and define their interests, what is right for them and what they want. The great leader is not only a logician, **it is not the art of logic, but the art of speech**, which also includes the ability to turn to man and see him. A rhetorical ability that also has a specific, unique and specific aspect.

Even with Cicero and others before him in Aristotle, there is the combination of speech, leadership and justice.



The Judeo-Christian thought -

Gives us two important things: **the human will and the idea of equality**. Until Christian theology there was no concept of will as a force in itself. They spoke of honor, instinct, etc.; and the assumption was that one who does evil is because he is not smart. Christian thought adds the element of will as a factor in understanding human and political behavior - the assumption that people do bad things because they want, not because they do not understand what needs to be done. There is also a claim that in the ancient world there was no guilt, there was only shame. If you did something wrong you did not feel guilty, you only felt ashamed.

In the ancient world, there was no mention of equality. The thought of Christian Hinduism introduced the idea that from a moral point of view, human beings are equal, in the sense that we are all worthy.

Thomas Aquinas

- Scholasticism - a concept that combines religion and philosophy. He read the Bible from a philosophical angle.

Aquinas adopts Maimonides' ideas as follows:

1. **Philosophical reading of Revelation** - to use wisdom to interpret revelation
2. **Influenced by the Guide of the Perplexed to Maimonides** - the transcendence of reason over man's urges
3. **Man is a political-social animal** (both learn that from Aristotle, as opposed to August Janus who views politics as a necessary disease of humanity)
4. **Politics is not the ideal** - God is the ideal both at the level of the individual and at the level of the state, which acts as a means to the supreme purpose of God (as opposed to Aristotle who sees politics and the state as an ideal)
5. **Religion Overcomes Politics** - You must not obey a king who offends religion. Both support a synthesis between religion and politics, but when there is conflict, they go with religion.

Points relevant to Aquinas only:

- There is a clear hierarchical system:
 1. **The eternal law** - the way the world works. Axioms like the world exists.
 2. **Divine Law** - Divine revelation and command
 3. **Natural law** - human wisdom and morality
 4. **Human law** - social and political laws.
- Each step in the hierarchy is based on the previous one



- **Conflicts:**
 1. **Between human law and natural law** - must obey the natural law
 2. **Between human law and divine law** - according to Aquinas is preferable to divine law
- Despite these clashes, Aquinas supports conflict reduction by compromise

Machiavelli

- He lived in Florence in the 15-16 century, that is, a period between the ancient world, the end of the Renaissance, and the New World.

Politics and the greatness of the republic are the most important things. The highest human motivation is glory - **the glory of the Republic**. The emotion that drives fame. You cannot do a good thing for reasons that are not selfish - because the assumption is **that man is fundamentally bad** - thinking about the exploitation of power, tyranny, etc.

- Among the first to formulate politics as the **science of power**. People are evil - egoists, think of themselves, have no elements of altruism, no human love. The thinking of most people is short-term and they almost always prefer the short-term profit. All the science of politics is the **art of taking the worst stuff that people work with and reaching big things with it**, greatness. That is why **we must learn to do evil**, in order to eventually achieve good results (the greatness of the Republic). The end justifies the means.
- There is no impediment to the need to behave morally, and in this respect he develops the science of modern politics. If necessary: **lie, tie, bribe, etc.** In politics, these methods must be used to succeed and realize the republic's goals. The problem is just getting caught.
- Knowing to do evil according to Machiavelli is to do evil for the Republic, only. Those who do not want to do it will not **enter politics**. The ultimate test for failure or success is only the test of outcome. Machiavelli is the result - the result determines the political and moral value of your actions.
- His book "The Prince" seeks inspiration from the prince Bore whom he adored (symbolizes a combination of talent and magic with immorality)
- 2 significant connections:
 1. **Prince** - presents the ideal prince image - the rule of a worthy monarchy
 2. **The ideologies** - a republican government that combines aristocracy and moderate democracy (through a sovereign)



Thomas Hobbes

- Published his book *Leviathan* almost 140 years after Machiavelli. During this period, Europe has become a battleground, and people are becoming philosophical and politically interested in achieving peace. Hobbes is a peace thinker. He does not think of the greatness of the republic, but how to achieve order, stability and peace and prevent war.
 - In the Center for the **Right to Life and Security**, Hobbes also believes, like Machiavelli, that people are not good, but they can also be made to behave well. And therefore - centers everything in the state. Emphasis on security is not expressed in aggression. Man needs security. Security is vital to the economy, investment and growth. This, too, is modern thinking. Hobbes is not a liberal, in the sense that he believes in the concentration of power in the state, as a way of making people behave well, despite the initial instinct there. The conspicuous connection - **the Leviathan** - supports absolute monarchy - a strong political framework in which all the power is in the hands of one ruler
 - **Hobbes' natural state:**
 1. Individualism
 2. Human beings are basically equal
 3. Universalism - human beings without reference to religious, political or other frameworks
 4. Rationality - all human beings are rational and instrumental beings (serving their own interests)
 - **In Hobbes' world there is an emphasis on instrumental rationality** (as opposed to moral temporality as practiced in liberalism and in the teachings of Aristotle and John Locke)
 - **The state of nature of human beings is immoral. They behave like animals. Without a political framework there is violence and mutual harm => it is very easy to move from the state of chaotic nature to state and law.**
 - **The mere transition to statehood comes from considerations of instrumental rationalism (egoism) - it is worth giving up freedom (the state of nature) in order to gain security (in the state situation)**
 - People are willing to pay a huge price for security
 - The best regime for achieving security - an absolute regime with no restrictions on powers (unlike Locke)
- Things that weaken a community:**
- **The opinion that there is more than one sovereign** - a distinction between spiritual and secular is meaningless, since there are actually two different kingdoms and each subject to two masters. In the



struggle between the rule of religion and the rule of the state, there is a great danger **of civil war and disintegration.**

- **Mixed government** - separation of powers is a recipe for disaster (as opposed to Locke who invented the separation of powers)

John Locke

- The first known **liberal modernist**. He is one of the philosophers who influenced the development of the American Constitution and laid the foundations for the science of modern politics - liberal. Locke places **private property** in the center of his thought.
- The father of empiricism (from the word empirical = tangible) - people learn from reality through their senses
- He is considered the father of liberal thought

Comparison between Locke and Hobbes:

- The distinctions between the state of nature and the state of the state through the social contract are acceptable to Locke
- The political situation is artificial and is also acceptable to Hobbes
- Hobbes' assumptions about Locke's individualism, equality, universality, and rationality.

Differences:

1. **Moral rationality** (as opposed to Instrumental according to Hobbes). Most humans are also moral in their natural state. So why switch to country mode? Because there are a minority of immoral people and there is nothing to do with them in the state of nature. A law is required to punish them through the state.
2. **According to Locke, the state of the state is based on the state of nature. The state is improving the state of nature** (unlike Hobbes, who thinks that the natural situation is contrary to the political situation - chaos in order and the rule that people are rational - instrumental and therefore have no morality)
3. **Companies arose to upgrade natural life => To power is not allowed to prejudice the natural rights of humans** (which existed before him). Hobbes, on the other hand, believes that what is important is creating security, even at the expense of trampling on natural rights.

Natural Rights: Every person is born with them in another state of nature:

1. Right to life



2. Right to liberty

3. The right to property (in the broad sense - what I create is mine)

- Locke supports the restriction of power through the separation of powers, as in Spain and Rome.

2 Justifications for separation of powers:

1. **Liberal Place** - John Locke wants separation of powers to protect human rights

2. **Republican place** - Sparta, Rome - because it is good for the republic.

- **Liberal democracy** - a synthesis between democracy and liberalism. The collective in the center - the people's sovereignty and the majority's decision.
- The more liberal a society is, the more it will care about human rights and vice versa.
- **Liberalism returns to Locke - the individual precedes the state, which is a means of realizing the individual.**
- Alongside the democratic and liberal aspect, there is also a Republican aspect. Again the question is in the dose between 3.

Rousseau:

- Rousseau develops a very democratic and republican approach, but is anti-liberal.
- Man is a political animal (like Luke)
- A struggle between two human tendencies: egoism and altruism.
- There are two types of possible rules in the company:

1. **The general will** - the sum total of egoistic interests. Majority opinion, classical Athenian democracy.

2. **The generally will** - what is good for the public. Republican. What is the right thing to do (IDF service)

According to Russo, laws must be enacted according to the general will. It's anti-liberal - what about those people who do not want the collective good? "We will force them to be free."

The majority determines the good of the state (republican perception).

- **Both Locke and Rousseau believe that the individual is above all else.**
- **The difference:**
 - Rousseau - Republican perception - the public good (total of individuals) determines
 - Locke - a liberal approach - the good of the individual determines.

On the social contract:

- Like Hobbes, believes that the state of nature is not possible, and without the state and the social covenant, man would have been extinct.



- Each individual submits himself and all his rights to the public at large => The individual has no right to demand anything from the state
- All as one body

The sovereign:

- There is a double commitment:

1. The individual towards the state
2. The state towards the individual

- **The sovereign is not allowed to harm the state** (because the social contract empowered him and harms the state = violation of the social contract)
- The sovereign is in fact the sum of all his citizens => The sovereign cannot harm ourselves => The sovereign cannot harm his citizens
- Unlike the sovereign, the citizen can oppose the general will, but the same opponent will "be forced to be free."

Montesquieu (a combination of Rousseau and Locke):

- Trying to create a republican and liberal society alike. Seeing the good of the individual as well as the common good.
- There is room for this integration between republics and liberalism - again everything depends on dosage.

Adam Smith and David Hume

Hume is heavily influenced by John Locke, but there are other things that are added to it - two criteria:

1. **Wealth of Nations.** Wealth is a prerequisite for good politics. This principle is the basis of political economy. In Day and Smith - Machiavelli's imperialism is converted into economic success. Smith states that states are jealous of one another in wealth, and a race for economic success can lead to military deterioration. In other words, we have converted the military conflict into wealth and trade, but in itself it could lead us back to a military conflict over trade wars.

2. **Moderation** - moderation. Science and politics is a science of anti-enthusiasm. In other words, the science of politics is intended to make the public moderate. Teach him, instill skepticism in him.

Liberals emphasize the issue of institutions. Among other things, he examined the question of what is more important: good people or good institutions. According to David's approach, the day of the answer



is that institutions are more important than people. Institutions are formal or informal arrangements that offer incentives to act in a way that becomes habitual. The science of politics seeks to create incentives for people who are not good, based on their bad qualities, so that they will mobilize to serve the public. The assumption is that most people are selfish, motivated by personal interests, and hence the importance of providing appropriate incentives.

Representation of this approach is found in the American Constitution, which deals with incentives to the institution of the presidency; a reluctance to act and a lack of significant power for the administration, but to leave it on the free market. According to this thinking, man is not a political animal but an economic animal. The energies of the individual are in the economy, and therefore we must aspire to a government with power, but not in a way that sabotages the market forces. The first person to come up with this idea is **Adam Smith**, who is a political scientist and a philosopher of morality. He believes that in order for the administration to allocate forces optimally, it should let the market run with as little intervention as possible. The role of the government is to allow the market to function, and the market will reach the least bad balance when the administration's intervention is reduced. Modest regimes would be discussed by Smith, for failure.

From the beginning of the 19th century, major research approaches and key ideas about politics are beginning to develop. The reason for this is that industrialization, the industrial revolution, and the transition from the early stages of the industrial revolution to its more mature stages are beginning at this time, from a capitalist era to an industrial capitalist age. **At the same time, with all the progress - poverty intensifies, hunger and a decline in life expectancy.** During this period the transition takes place, and then talented researchers have the opportunity to see and see things in their making, to see them ripen, and we can say that we live to this day under the most important event - industrial capitalism.

Alexis de Tocqueville

Is a French aristocrat who wrote in the period between 1830 and 1850. He travels to the United States and talks about the time for new political science, wrote one of the most important studies on American democracy, and began to lay the foundation for modern political science, One of the dangers of democracy is that democracy encourages conformism and mediocrity (this is what the public will choose again and again), and contradictions in democracy lead to populism - a vulgar democracy - Anti-elitism: In



the populism of the democratic revolution, it won all the elites . A. Turkeville suggest the idea that we cannot locate rules in politics, **because in politics there is a mechanism, but not illegal.**

In 1840 Turkeville published his book Democracy in America. During that period, Europe was burning. In 1848 Europe was burning (the Spring of the Nations) and Karl Marx published the Communist Manifesto. Americanism is a broad, complex and dynamic cultural concept that is sometimes used to describe how the United States and its people see themselves and define their identity, and sometimes describe the way they perceive themselves as " Where the United States is perceived from outside, by the rest of the world

James Bryce

In 1888 listed the following ideas as characteristics of Americanism and American culture:

- Define "sacred" rights
- The source of sovereignty is the people
- The government is restrained by law and the people
- Local government is preferable to a central government
- The majority is more intelligent than the minority
- The preferred government is the one with the least power

The Marxist / Classist Approach (Karl Marc)

Western society consists of two classes. **One very small status of the wealthy and the second - all the rest.** According to this analysis, if one wants to understand significant political elements, one must understand who controls the economy and what economic interests are. Imperialism - also derives from economic considerations. The state serves the interests of the owners of capital and capitalism and not the interests of the public. Believes that the source of our problems is first and foremost in the economy, and that **the rich preserve their power to control the poor. Democracy preserves power in those who have.** Sometimes the state will sacrifice specific financiers to **preserve the class interests** of capitalism and the exploitative class. The electoral system is a good invention of the bourgeois class, because it perpetuates its power and gives an advantage to those who run successful campaigns (wealthy people or friends of rich people). Once the upper class understands that democracy does not harm its power, it supports it. Therefore, Marx believes that a revolution must be made in the economy, and that we understand that



we are required not for **a market economy, but for an economy that is entirely managed by human beings**. According to this analysis, we have adopted a method that contradicts itself - and we cannot get rid of it. The contradiction is that we create an economy and a politics in which man is both a producer and a consumer, and as producers we exploit the workers who work for us, who are also the consumers. Because the workers earn little, they also have no way of spending money on consumption. In addition, the free market system leads to competition, in which the losers are financially harmed. Therefore, we need to reach an economic model in which everyone produces together and earns together. In the science of Marxist politics it is assumed that human beings are not selfish, but historical beings - they change according to circumstances. This is an important assumption that underlies the concept - and is not accepted by the liberals. Marxist thinks that human nature is not permanent and therefore change of economic arrangements will bring about a change in human nature.

- Takes the base of Luke and Rolls and intensifies them. We must take care of the general welfare not by narrowing the gaps, but by **eliminating the economic gaps altogether - there are no classes and everyone is equal (communism)**
- The modern bourgeois society that was founded on the fragments of feudal society did not abolish the classes, but merely established new classes - bourgeoisie and proletariat. The state administration runs the affairs of the bourgeoisie and acts as a working committee of the bourgeoisie
- Everything becomes cosmopolitan - material and spiritual production (like art) alike (through the development of modern means of transportation that make the world much smaller)
- The bourgeoisie forces itself on the whole world and creates a world in its image and image. The village was subdued in favor of the city. The means of production and property are concentrated in the hands of a few financiers
- **Production began with feudalism, but feudal property relations limited production forces and had to be reduced-an act done by the bourgeoisie**
- **Overproduction epidemic** - too much supply and less demand => The company is returning to a state of barbarism (hunger, general war of destruction, as if they took all the means of subsistence)
- The weapon that subjugated feudalism is now directed against the bourgeoisie **itself (the overproduction of the bourgeoisie)**
- Development of the bourgeoisie => The development of the proletariat that requires work and the work of the proletariat increases the capital of the bourgeoisie



- Workers = Proletarians are commodities like any other trade, and therefore they are also vulnerable to market fluctuations.
- The small workshop turned into a large factory a mass of workers enslaved as soldiers and subject to industry
- **Because the bourgeoisie has declared profit as a purpose (capitalism), it is petty and hostile to proletarians**
- The bourgeoisie's proletarian war consists of two stages:
 1. War against the petty bourgeoisie (landowners). It actually serves the senior bourgeoisie.
 2. The proletariat grew, and then began to fight against the bourgeoisie itself through labor unions and other alliances.
- **The bourgeoisie is in constant war:**
 1. Against the nobility
 2. Against the bourgeoisie itself (competition between industrial and commercial interests)
 3. Against the bourgeoisie of foreign countries (who exports more)
 4. Of course, against the proletariat as described above.
- **Only the proletariat will bring revolution against the bourgeoisie, because only he has nothing to lose!** He has no property. It has no national character because the bourgeoisie has stripped the society of any national affiliation. Because there is nothing to lose, there is a state of revolution on the part of the proletariat
- The bourgeoisie can no longer be the dominant class in society and impose the conditions that are legally convenient for society
- The condition for the existence and rule of the bourgeoisie class is the accumulation of capital by individuals. The source of capital - the salaried workers, ie the proletariat itself.
- The dignity and triumph of the proletariat is guaranteed (it will abolish all classes, including its own.)

The Elliptical Approach

The aim of this approach is to clarify the dominance of the mechanisms of control of the state as a means of shaping political life. In other words, this paradigm determines that political organizations in general and elites in particular are the main designers of the country's priorities. This approach holds that power is in the hands of a few, and those who decide the agenda are the leaders of the elite. The aspiration of the elite is to acquire sources of power such as the army, money, land ... and it does so through an organized bureaucratic system designed to serve its interests. Control is not conditional on legitimacy, consensus or



internalization of values, but on the ability to enforce that political power creates. A change in power will be created only in a situation in which there will be a struggle between different elites, following which the political formula in society will change.

*The political formula is the same moral and legal basis that the ruling elite provides to its citizens in order to justify its rule. This formula is a fundamental principle in society and on the basis of which the elitist government is in fact **established**.*

Observing the approach to the company according to Michel's:

A. Unit of analysis - organizations / power center.

B. Who controls? The elites

Third. Characteristics of the dominant group - a fixed and homogenous group whose entry is blocked.

D. The reason for the stability of the system - effective supervision by organized bureaucracy and manipulation to convince the public that the elite is the most skilled and popular control.

E. The level of analysis - relations between organizational structures.

The approach grows as a critique of Karl Marx's approach. According to this approach, power is not concentrated among the wealthy, and there is no room for changing the economic system. **Those who rule are the political elite**, and the abolition of the free market as proposed by the Marxists will further increase **the political power of the ruling elite without a force** that will balance it and the country will become the worst dictatorship, since there will still be a minority government - even if it is not the capitalists. The abolition of the free market will lead to the violent and cruel dictatorship of a minority interested only in maintaining its control without anyone standing between it and what it wants to achieve. In such a situation, the politician will liquidate all the wealthy and the public will not have the strength to stand up to him. **The elite** in this case (a tiny minority that controls everything else) **will gain power by gaining legitimacy**, for example: presenting an external / internal threat, giving new content to the concept of democracy, and limiting the system of checks and balances.

The elite operates with cruelty and rigidity (with a personality structure different from most people) and it is closed to the outside entrance - they do not join, except in case it chooses to join an opponent in order to neutralize its power.

The Pluralistic Approach



Assumes that people are rational meaning that they take care of themselves = selfish. But in order to avoid anarchy, we must respect core values and **rules of the game**. Because only in this way can **liberal democracy** be maintained (only **they really believe** in it) because society **is important** to them. Makes it clear that the relationships between individuals and groups are what shape politics. This approach perceives society as a political game between various interest groups that maintain cooperative and competitive relationships. Each group has its own power and there is no built-in preference for the group one on the other, that is, the different groups balance each other. According to this approach, every group in the country can come to power and reach the power bases of the government, since the government is replaced by the relative strength of the groups at a given moment. The groups in the company compete with each other, try to advance their interests, and a group that will advance its interests in the best possible way will decide the struggle. The main basis of the approach is open competition between the different groups, all of which have equal opportunity to rise to power.

Observing the approach to society according to **Dahl**

- A. The unit of analysis - the group and its interests to come to power.
- B. Who controls? Individuals who lead the ruling group. Details are grouped in alternating groups.
- C. The characteristics of the ruling group are composed of different groups and are open to new groups.
- D. The reason for the stability of the system is consensus and the internalization of values.
- E. Level of analysis: The approach analyzes the relations between groups and individuals, that is, relations between individuals and political institutions such as social organizations and parties.

The approach **is against the elitist approach**: in their view, **there are no** elites defined, an elite **cannot be clearly defined**, and there is no clear criterion for the elite, which is a kind of ghost. Therefore, at the methodological level, the elitist approach is failing, in the absence of an option to define who is exactly an elite.

Argue that in democratic and liberal countries **there must be and also a decentralization of power**, and that there should not be too much centralization. At the basis of **political life there are values and interests**. There are people who come to politics in an attempt to advance their moral and material interests, and try to form alliances in order to advance these interests - those who succeed in creating a



group large enough to support their interests / values - it produces the change. Therefore, the values, preferences of the public should be investigated as scientifically as possible. The Behavioral Revolution speaks of investigating public preferences in the most scientific way possible - the study of public behavior and politicians.

The Rational Choice Theory:

Believes that behind the choice of the individual there is a rational process: the individual knows what he **wants**, knows how to gather **information**, and knows how to choose the means to reach the goal (what he wants). Everything is **subjective**. The basic assumptions of the approach:

- The rational approach is ontologically fundamental, and positivist in the epistemological sense.
- This approach also deals with the actual behavior of individual individuals (**agents, organizations, companies, countries**), with the aim of **identifying the legality behind these patterns** of behavior.
- The approach is characterized by methodological individualism - political reality is based on private decisions that always act rationally in order to maximize their private interests. In other words, the whole is only the sum of its parts and there is no general interest that does not come from a private interest. The approach is characterized by methodological individualism - political reality is based on private decisions that always act rationally in order to maximize their private interests. In other words, the whole is only the sum of its parts and there is no general interest that does not come from a private interest .
- "Methodological idiosyncrasies" - it seems obvious that everyone will take care of his own interests. This seems obvious, but there are many reviews about this approach.
- The conclusion is that public policy should be **based on incentives** for action that promotes the common good and punishment for action contrary to the general good. If you want to understand how people behaved in the political world, you have to calculate the benefit versus the price - if the benefit exceeds the price then they will choose the benefit, that is, where the lowest price, even if there is a price, the highest benefit is what people choose.
- Variations of the rational choice theory:
 - The general and non-binding means that each person can determine his own preferences and find what serves his preference, to match means to goals. This approach has no high analytical value
 - that rational choice theory begins to reduce the scope of people's preferences and to say that people want to maximize only their own interests.



- The players want only money and power, politicians want only to be elected - nothing else interests them. In fact, the statement is that people are egoists and that nothing interests them except their narrow interest
- The theory of rational choice can "dress" on a number of paradigms-elitist, pluralistic, and even Marxists who have used it. In other words, it is not only an approach that stands on its own, but also **a point of view for other approaches.**

Social Choice:

There is only one way to take all the results and reach a single result. In fact, you can achieve any result you **want**. The structure of the public's preferences cannot be objectively reflected, but rather how the **commentator**, the one who summarizes the voices, presents them. This means that all the power is actually in the head of the system (which decides how it was agreed) and not in the public

For example, determining the percentage of blocking as a way of influencing the final outcome - regardless of the public's desire.

Public Choice Theory

Assumes that: a. the players are rational. B. In the political world there are four types of actors: **politicians, bureaucrats, interest groups, and the general public**. Each of the four players is rational according to his interests:

1. The most important thing for **politicians** is to **be elected** / to retain control after they have been elected.
2. **The bureaucrats** want power, they want to move forward and get as many powers as possible and get to the next job.
3. **Interest groups** - want to promote their interests, each within their own sphere, including those who wish to promote a particular interest (which is actually at the expense of the public), and try to promote it through lobbying and lobbying
4. **The public is not familiar with the facts**, because a rational person does not spend time studying subjects that are not affected by service.



On the face of it, the politicians must take care of the general public (in order to be elected). **But the public is rational and therefore does not understand anything about the proposed policy** (and how it really affects his life.)

The only ones who are familiar with policy (macro decisions) are interest groups when it comes to their interests. In order to be **elected a politician has to satisfy the interest groups that "screw the public,"** because they will reward him if he serves them and not the public: help him with donations, a sympathetic press, and so on.

According to this approach, the bureaucrats are not well versed in all the details. They learn from journalism and academia - which are also biased by interest groups. At best, they receive information "chewed" (and biased) directly from groups of interests. In the worst case, there are bureaucrats who see the desire to move to the private market within the same interest group and act in a biased manner. **In other words, no one promotes the public interest.**

The public has two kinds of ignorance:

A. **Rational ignorance** - do not delve into reports and information

B. **Rational irrationality** - when information is needed that reinforces what they think anyway. This is particularly prominent on Facebook - all the information you get is from people in your torch and you just "reverberate" yourself, and become narrower and more cerebral.

Therefore, if **the politicians and bureaucrats always act in the interests of the ignorant and the public too ignorant to understand this**, the normative conclusion of the public choice is that the state's least authority to make decisions and to leave as much power as possible to the market forces by constitution, privatization, deregulation, Strongest property rights: as little power as politicians.

Historically, this approach was developed by the Chicago School of Economics, a group of economists from the University of Chicago, among them Milton Friedman.

American approaches grew within a capitalist climate and were partially funded by **corporations and financiers**, who were working with full intent to reshape the American citizen's position and gain **economic** profits. Capitalists "buy" researchers who design opinions. The Public Choice Theory approach was funded by financiers who understood its economic potential.



In Israel in recent years there is a phenomenon similar to that in the United States: **Keren Hatikva**, the Ecclesiastes Forum - all funded by American millionaires with an economic conservative agenda that seek to promote economic interests and merge them with political and ideological interests. The owner of the capital is **Ayelet Shaked** - working with the Ecclesiastes Forum, the "Shiloach" newspaper, **Keren Hatikva**. According to **Dr. Navot**, since the current power in Israel is on the right, there is an interest in funding right-wing research institutes that support deregulation, privatization, etc. At present the situation is asymmetrical compared to the left, And that the academy is undergoing a process of corruption.

The influence of capital-government (out of rational interest: capitalists want more free market and less regulation -> right (economic) interest<- Right-wing funding -> More power for right-wing politicians -> Rule

Game theory:

Theoretical models that predict how **rational** actors will behave mainly in the **political** world. Refers to **strategic** players, that is, each player thinks about the other side, assumes that the other side is rational and that the other side is doing the same for him. Since the rational choice approach deals extensively with the way our decision-making is influenced by our assessments of what others will decide to do and how the other side chooses to act, the more we know the other side, the better we will analyze.

Example:

The establishment of the joint list is based on an understanding of the players in the field who understand that there is a desire on the part of the other side (**Lieberman**) to raise the threshold, so their answer is to bring them to the union. **Lieberman**, for his part, did not raise the threshold to make them unite. If he wanted to unite them, he would raise to 5 percent - because then they would certainly have reached the union. He preferred to raise to 3.25% - 4 seats - because he knew that then there is a dilemma whether to unite or not, because there are Arab parties that can exceed the threshold in such a situation. This led the Arab lists to a dilemma - but in the end they decided to unite, against **Lieberman's** expectations.

Reviews against access:

- General criticism - meaning it actually comes from the approach itself. The rational researchers realized that there was a problem with one of the basic assumptions. "The assumption of perfect rationality" (rational researchers assume that the individual has all the information, the emotional distance and the



whole time to decide and make the right consideration). The researchers know that no one has all the information, all the time, and the emotional distance to predict that a person will choose the most rational choice. Political decisions are usually taken under pressure of time, and scholars of the rational approach accept this criticism and call it the assumption of limited rationality, rather than the "perfect assumption of rationality."

- Psychological criticism - They claim that the person acts out of emotions and impulses such as fear, love, dependence, hatred, revenge that prevent us from acting rational self-interest. In other words, is it a complex, instinctive, emotional, and not rational, calculated, and cannot make proper consideration of cost versus benefit?

The prisoner's dilemma

A branch within "game theory". An example of a rational approach, developed to succeed in predicting people's behavior. A theoretical dilemma that was not examined in the field.

Briefly: Two robbed a bank and a guard was killed. The police have proof of the breach but no evidence of the murder. Two prisoners are held in solitary confinement. They were told that if they both admitted to the crime, each prisoner would receive eight years in prison. If neither of them pleads guilty, they will receive one year in prison. If only one prisoner confesses to the crime, the prisoner will be released as a state witness and the prisoner who does not confess will receive 20 years in prison. Each of the suspects has two methods of action - to admit or not to confess.

A rational paradox that causes a person who is in a situation to do the calculation of cost versus benefit, rather than of the collective.

A rational actor always pays to admit that no matter what the other one does, **his condition will always be better if he is informed.** It would always be irrational not to inform. **In other words, the individual rationale leads to an irrational result of the collective (and thus to self-harm).**

If you want to avoid such situations

Neo-pluralism

Influenced by the crises of the 1960s and the Chicago School, and by the fact that politicians do not seem to be serving the public, so they argue: **There is a structural advantage to economic power** (corporations). In other words, economic inequality flowed into the realm of political **capital-government-newspaper**



The neo-pluralists have not completely lost faith in liberal democracy, but claim it requires correction. For example: the amendment of the press laws, the creation of public communication channels, restrictions for owners of capital to hold channels of communication, limiting contributions, limiting lobbyists.

Structural Pluralism

Individual behavior is largely a **derivative of the society and culture** to which it belongs. Social structures, norms, ideologies, rules and conventions all play an important and sometimes decisive role in our elections. A person belonging to a certain group cannot move to another group, and his very presence in the group dictates a reality that is difficult to get out of. "The behavior of the individual is essentially the result of **social structures**, and in terms of the individual, **choice is actually an illusion** and therefore there is no use in the rational choice approach based on individual choice." Belonging to a group **dictates political behavior** and the political horizon, since there is a company's report about black-and-white groups.

Liberal society thinks it is open and egalitarian, but in practice there are heterogeneous groups that are not equal. The theory is largely descriptive and has not always been able to explain the roots of group formation. "It's great that you're a professor and a researcher and a poet, etc. - first of all you're an Arab there you belong to." **There is a lot more discrimination and sectarianism than what the pluralists want to believe**

Neo

Marxism / Frankfurt School

The Frankfurt School is just the **opposite of Public Choice (and opposes it!)**. It goes against a free market, corporate involvement in academia and research, and against instrumental rationality. To a great extent, this is a school that has grown up historically against the background of the thought that the failure and danger of **fascism are not a specific event** but something embedded in modern thought (not deviation from it) and in the thought of enlightenment.

The people of the Frankfurt School use materials that are normally not dealt with - they reach the areas of psychoanalysis, Freud, Marx, Weber, Heidegger, etc. They take a number of significant sources and combine them in a unique way in an attempt to crack the roots of failure that we all share - the failure of the Enlightenment, the modernity, the failure of universal liberal thought. The people of the Frankfurt school are in favor of some of the values of the Enlightenment - they favor equality and humanism, but they are **against instrumental rationality, which sanctifies efficient / cost-effective processes that are at the**



heart of Western thinking. This is because the extreme of rationality is fascism. Human nature has a tendency to violence and attraction to authority (**Freud**)

The Frankfurt School sanctifies the criticism and therefore believes that the purpose of art is to challenge the thought and allow us to draw inspiration and to believe that it can be different. This is the important and political role of art - to allow every day difficulty to see an alternative and others. Good art instills unrest, makes you think. Once a person lives in a society without art, he thinks of all in a one-dimensional way, making only considerations of efficiency and usefulness in all his actions.

The problem with this theory is that it is **very critical, but weaker in producing solutions.** They were not ready to play the game of giving solutions - because this is rational and instrumental.

Two major researchers - **Herbert Marcuse** and **Jurgen Habermas**.

The Frankfurt school develops from Freud and Marx, but differs from Marxism - its focus is not on economics (as opposed to Marx), but on culture as a formative factor. In their view, cultural phenomena are the core and reflection of society.

The Foucault's approach

There is a great similarity between **Foucault's** approaches to the Frankfurt school. They grow in parallel, respond to the same events, affect each other and have a lively dialogue. In essence, **Foucault** takes the criticism in a more pessimistic and less practical direction - thus criticizing the Frankfurt School as well. **Foucault sees everything (not just economics) in a prism of power, and in essence puts the fourth dimension of power,** to his view, all who and what we are - from the construction of power. There is no real authenticity. **Behind each facade there is only a struggle for power.** Since power = politics, then everything is political and subject to struggle with other players.

Foucault wants to create other power relations. For example - we know a dichotomous definition of men and women, but we can also create a third type (Diverse)

Extensions - full details about the thinkers

Aristotle

- Plato's student
- Man is a political animal and part by nature to be political. In his view, it is not natural to remain silent in the face of injustice, and we really need to come and talk about injustices, certainly if they happen to us.



- Speech is important to politics. Through speech, you can get something new out of a group of people.
- The Marxist conception that tries to politicize all economic life has its roots in Aristotle. Aristotelian thinking has an element that Marx took later on that speaks of the ability to transform. Revolutionaries in general and Marxist revolutionaries in particular believe in the ability to make a significant transformation in people - and this is an Aristotelian concept, the revolutionary potential embodied in the human race.
- **Continuity of the teachings of Plato and Socrates:**
 1. The importance of intellect - philosophy as a journey to the study of truth
 2. .Rationality in the center
 3. .Considerable weight for politics and collectives (because they are Greek thinkers). Man is a political animal.
 4. .Importance of morality. There is a great affinity between ethics and politics
 5. .The centrality of the law
- **Differences between Aristotle and Plato:**
 1. Aristotle is a biologist and Plato mathematician. As a biologist, Aristotle adheres to understanding reality as it is. Plato The mathematician tries to understand from the abstract to reality.
Aristotle goes the way of induction - from the individual to the general. From reality to truth.
Plato goes the way of deduction - from the general to the individual. From the idea to reality.
 2. Aristotle is conservative and at most a reformer, while Plato is radical.
Aristotelian thought is of small changes - slowly but surely. Corresponds to Western perceptions today.
This is a non-revolutionary world.
 3. Aristotle is a follower of collective learning; Plato - Individual Learning (Socratic by way of ping-pong)
 4. Aristotle gives great importance to laws and legal thinking. It stems from being a practical person.
 5. Aristotle mainly asks purposeful questions; Plato - causal and abstract questions
- According to Aristotle there is a hierarchy of purposes - striving for a certain purpose, which is only the way to striving for a higher and higher purpose and so on. What is important is that the means be compatible with the purpose.
- **The State According to Aristotle:**
 - The state is more important than the sum of the details from which it is composed - the state above all else.
 - The accepted conceptions perceive the state as a compromise - and therefore the state is not everything.



- **The state as an object according to Aristotle.**
- Today - the state is a means to achieve the goal - the happiness of individuals.
- The size of the country should be medium - to create a sense of belonging
- Initial partnership in the state of nature => The state is also natural.
- Man is a political and political animal
- The state above all - the rule must first divide

Criticism of the country according to Plato:

- The state is not only a collection of people intended to serve it, but consists of various individuals
- The state is not everything. One should also allow other circles of family and home.
- What is common is usually less treated. Since the majority is preoccupied with his personal affairs and less with the common matters.

Aristotle's politics, major directions:

1. .Normative - what is appropriate?

Plato argues that the political is the right one (the king of a philosopher and a society with three classes - guardians - philosophers, guards and commoners)

Aristotle rejects the platonic conception of a number of reasons:

- A. A conservative argument - if Plato's division was working, someone would have thought of it before.
Do not invent the wheel
- B. Without private property there is no motivation to work => the deterioration of the economy. Of course, private property should also not be overstated - through the Aristotelian Golden Way (middle road.)
- C. In order to enable charity and help others, there must be private property. When there is only justice (fair and equitable distribution of assets) and there is no room for altruism - the society misses the fact that it is less emotional.
- D. **In Aristotle's opinion, a state consists of a number of circles** - a person has the circle of the family, the circle of the village and the circle of the state. Each circle strengthens the connection to the one above it. Plato - wants to put only the collective = state in the center. You want to discard the rest of your circles.
- E. **Those who love everyone do not like anyone.** According to Plato, there is no private property and or private family, so everyone loves everyone, but it is not real.



F. **The middle class is essential for the existence of democracy** - the reduction of the middle class causes revolutions in the regime. More poor => They have nothing to lose => The potential for a radical and charismatic dictator who will seize power.

2 . The second direction in Aristotle's politics - empirical-factual-objective-neutral - reality should be described as it really is. Be objective.

- Functionalism - a central stream in the social sciences that was influenced by Aristotle's views. They ask what the purpose of everything is.
- Republicanism - Aristotle did not develop a republican conception, but rather incorporated some of his teachings into their conception:
 1. The importance of constitutionality
 2. A limited and involved regime - Spartan-inspired separation of powers
 3. Elitism - a classic republican is an elitist as Aristotle was
 4. Strong institutions => Strong republic

1. **Thomas Aquinas**

- Scholasticism - a concept that combines religion and philosophy. He read the Bible at a philosophical angle.

Maimonides - also true of Aquinas:

- He is also a Scholasticist who reads the Bible philosophically
- In the center of his philosophy - striving for human transcendence beyond reason. Aristotelian vision. Reason distinguishes man from animals and it is the one who must control man (and not emotion)
- When the Torah speaks of God in humanity, it is "speaking Torah in human language" - that is, the personification of God so that the "people" will understand it
- The biblical text must be read in a meaningful sense and not be satisfied with Pasht (God is not angry, the people have sinned, God is not happy, the people have done a good deed)
- When science contradicts the sages, it is necessary to follow science (since the sages were astute according to what they knew at the time, while science is continually renewed), there are three possibilities for these cases:
 1. The text is always right - and hell with science
 2. Science is always right - and the text is nonsense
 3. Maimonides' way of trying to interpret the text in light of the new scientific discovery.



- Maimonides recognizes stalkers as a method - he constantly contradicts himself (**Aquinas does not contradict himself!**)
- Maimonides believes in the free choice of human beings
- **The supreme purpose - the internal. The commandments are a means of politics that leads to internal and private faith.**
- A person must be moral and physically healthy to worship God and reach spiritual ascension
- Maimonides supports the appointment of a king for the sake of creating social unity
- The prophet is supreme - connecting an impressive intellectual ability with a simulated force (imagination) worthy
- **Moshe is better than Muhammad.** Why? Moses has fewer sexual urges and therefore is in a higher spiritual place

Aquinas adopts Maimonides' ideas as follows:

1. **Philosophical reading of Revelation** - to use wisdom to interpret Revelation
2. **Is influenced by the Guide of the Perplexed to Maimonides** - the transcendence of reason over man's urges
3. **Man is a political-social animal** (both learn that from Aristotle, as opposed to August Janus who views politics as a necessary disease of humanity)
4. **Politics is not the ideal** - God is the ideal both at the level of the individual and at the level of the state, which is used as a means to the supreme purpose of God (as opposed to Aristotle who sees politics and the state as an ideal)
5. **Religion prevails over politics** - it is forbidden to obey the king who offends religion. Both support a synthesis between religion and politics, but when there is conflict, they go with religion.

Points relevant to Aquinas only:

- There is a clear hierarchical system:
1. **The eternal law - the way the world works.** Axioms like the world exists.
 2. **Divine Law** - Divine revelation and command
 3. **Natural law** - human wisdom and morality
 4. **Human law** - social and political laws.



- Each step in the hierarchy is based on the previous one
- **Collisions:**
 1. **Between human law and natural law - must obey the natural law**
 2. **Between human law and divine law - according to Aquinas is preferable to divine law**
- Despite these clashes, Aquinas supports conflict reduction by compromise

Machiavelli

2. He lived in Florence in the 15-16 century, that is, a period between the ancient world, the end of the Renaissance, and the New World.
3. Politics and the greatness of the republic are the most important things. The highest human motivation is glory - **the glory of the Republic**. The emotion that drives fame. You cannot do a good thing for reasons that are not selfish - because the assumption is that man is **fundamentally bad** - thinking about the exploitation of power, tyranny, etc.
4. Among the first to formulate politics as **the science of power**. People are evil - egoists, think of themselves, have no elements of altruism, no human love. The thinking of most people is short-term and they almost always prefer the short-term profit. All the science of politics is the **art of taking the worst stuff that people work with and reaching big things with it**, greatness. That is why we **must learn to do evil**, in order to eventually achieve good results (the greatness of the Republic). **The end justifies the means**.
5. There is no impediment to the need to behave morally, and in this respect he develops the science of modern politics. If necessary: lie, tie, bribe, etc. In politics, these methods must be used to succeed and realize the republic's goals. The problem is just getting caught.
6. Knowing to do evil according to Machiavelli is to do evil for the Republic, only. Those who do not want to do it will not enter politics. The ultimate test for failure or success is only the test of outcome. Machiavelli is the result - the result determines the political and moral value of your actions.
7. His book "**The Prince**" seeks inspiration from the prince **Borce** whom he adored (symbolizes a combination of talent and magic with immorality)
 - 2 significant connections:
 1. **Prince** - presents the ideal prince image - the rule of a worthy monarchy
 2. **The ideologies** - a republican government that combines aristocracy and moderate democracy (through a sovereign)



1. Machiavelli is a long-term Republican, but in crisis situations, there is a need for a princess
 2. **Politics is a profession to be studied.** Aristotelian vision of growth from practice rather than the ideal
 3. **Moral considerations of personal morality (he favors public virtues)** - there is no room for moral considerations - private politics. He is not against morality, but is denied it. There is no room for giving up / turning to me a second (Christian morality) in public morality, but other qualities such as decisiveness.
 4. 2 different worlds - private morality and political ethics.
 5. Machiavellism is associated with opportunism (because morality is not easy to project), but that was not his goal. He wanted to use an immoral view in favor of the state and was not an opportunist.
- **Realistic politics - There are two schools of thought:**
 - **Idealistic** - the basis of politics should be ideals
 - **Realistic** - politics is the good of the real state and the security of the nation. This is a Kabbalistic approach - the end sanctifies all means. The State of Israel is also managed in this realistic approach.
 - **Realism** does not have to be offensive, and idealism does not have to be defensive (for example, the US attacked in Iraq for idealistic reasons of the establishment of democracy in the world; Sparta was a very realistic country and yet did not embark on many wars)
 - **Balance of power** - realistic idea. A number of superpowers that balance each other.
 - **Religion** - There is no place for religion in leadership, unless religion serves the state.
 - **It is important to build a citizen's education for good public qualities (virtu):** determination, public interest before the individual, admiration and the welfare of the homeland, etc. One must give great weight to man's evil inclination, and one must not rely on his good inclination
 - An eternal struggle between Virto and Fortuna:
 1. **Virtu** - virtues of virtue
 2. **Fortuna** - the fickle goddess of fortune. Interested in immediate gratification only.
 - The more the company invests in the education of Virto (good public virtues), the longer it can last in the fight against the Fortuna
 - Machiavelli's doctrine is secular and gives considerations to this world (and not the next one). It is necessary to establish a state in this world with Virto as strong as possible.
 - **The prince should be bad to succeed (because most people are not good)**



The ideal of the Prince: On the one hand they will be afraid of you because of the bad qualities (decisiveness, killing, etc.) and on the other hand, you will be honored for your good qualities. These are the virtues of fox (survival and cleverness) and lion (courage.)

• **Machiavelli sees the country as a target** (as opposed to liberalism that places the state as a means to realize the rights of the individual)

From the book "The Prince" / Machiavelli:

- The world has more bad people than good => Prince must be educated to be bad.
- **Better to be stingy than generous** - you need money for wars and therefore if a prince is generous, he will have to collect heavy taxes, which will inevitably lead the people to hate him. Therefore - it is better to accustom the people to stinginess - because that way you cover your expenses.
- **Before elections** - be generous; **after being selected**, you will be stingy for the above reasons • **Generosity leads to contempt and hatred of the people.** Stinginess does not lead to hatred, but only to contempt. => **Better to be stingy.**
- **Better to be cruel than compassionate; It is better to excite and will look without hatred (and if possible also with love)**
- How arousal will look without hatred? The prince is forbidden to rob the property and wives of his citizens and subjects.
- **2 types of wars that the Prince has to fight:**
 1. Through law and trial - human beings
 2. Through violence - through the animals (fox and cunning lion strong).
- •The Prince must know to walk in 2 ways
- •The prince must be seen as good in the eyes of the people, but he must also "turn over" and be bad when necessary.
- **What matters is the result. The end sanctifies all means.**
- **The prince buys honor through large war factories**
- The prince must know to put himself on someone's right or to disobey him. His lover or his enemy. Because they value a prince with solid opinions - for better or for worse. Not to be neutral.
- The prince should love the people, but beware of harming his position (that he will not be considered "one of the guys.")



- The Prince should engage the people in amusement during the appropriate period of the year

Thomas Hobbes

- Published his book Leviathan almost 140 years after Machiavelli. During this period, Europe has become a battleground, and people are becoming philosophical and politically interested in achieving peace. Hobbes is a peace thinker. He does not think of the greatness of the republic, but how to achieve order, stability and peace and prevent war.
- In the Center for the Right to **Life and Security**, Hobbes also believes, like Machiavelli, that people are not good, but they can also be made to behave well. And therefore - centers everything in the state. Emphasis on security is not expressed in aggression. Man needs security. Security is vital to the economy, investment and growth. This, too, is modern thinking. Hobbes is not a liberal, in the sense that he believes in the concentration of power in the state, as a way of making people behave well, despite their initial instinct.
- The conspicuous connection - **the Leviathan** - supports absolute monarchy - a strong political framework in which all the power is in the hands of one ruler
- **Luke, by contrast, wants a limited king. The power should be in the hands of Parliament. He is the father of the revolution of the constitutional monarchy and the separation of powers. All power must not be in the hands of one ruler.**
- Hobbes' premise is very similar to liberal thought, but the system of government he proposes is exactly the opposite of liberalism.
- Human beings are born individual, equal and rational.
- **Hobbes' natural state:**
 1. Individualism
 2. Human beings are basically equal
 3. Universalism - human beings without reference to religious, political or other frameworks
 4. Rationality - all human beings are rational and instrumental beings (serving their own interests)
- **In Hobbes' world there is an emphasis on instrumental rationality** (as opposed to moral temporality as practiced in liberalism and in the teachings of Aristotle and John Locke)



- The state of nature of human beings is immoral and behaves like animals. Without a political framework there is violence and mutual harm => It is very easy to move from the state of chaotic nature to state and law.
- The mere transition to statehood comes from considerations of instrumental rationalism (egoism) - it is worth giving up freedom (the state of nature) in order to gain security (in the state situation).
- People are willing to pay a huge price for security
- The best regime for achieving security - an absolute regime with no restrictions on powers (unlike Locke)
- **Maslow scale - hierarchy of social needs:**
 1. Elementary and basic needs (water food, etc).
 2. Different social needs
 - .Of course, when the Nazis have to choose between the two basic needs, they win (see Holocaust value (...)
- **There is a great similarity between Hobbes, Machiavelli, and Augustine - people always return to their animal instincts in the state of nature.**
- All individual assumptions: Augustine - man versus God. Hobbes - a man against himself (secular).
- The social covenant bridges between the state of nature and the state of the state
- The purpose of the laws - satisfying individual needs of security
- Although the state is an artificial product, there is also room for a collective and therefore people have to serve it.
- Society is a collection of individuals. I live for myself through the state and society.
- The idea of a modern state (defeated by its pioneers) is secular. There should be concentration, why?
- **Reasons for state concentration:** The middle class has evolved - and wants more rights and not to depend on a particular noble merely because he lives in the case in his territory. Therefore, the bourgeoisie (the middle class) inject money into the king and in return provides them with rights.
- **The wars between Catholics and Protestants weaken the Church => reinforces the centrality of the state.**
- Hobbes challenges the absolute kings because in his opinion the legitimacy comes from the people and not to God (as was customary at the time)
- Hobbes wants absolute monarchy and uses it for a democratic platform



- The monarchy is absolute, but it is not tyranny. The moment the king does not deliver the goods, Kerry does not defend the people - then this is a despot who can be ousted.

Additions from the book " Leviathan " / Hobbes:

- Humans are born equal - the weakest person is capable of killing the most powerful (through tricks, alliance with others, etc).
- **Equality leads to insecurity** - people want the same things and on the way to realize their purpose, they try to destroy or subjugate each other.
- **Insecurity leads to war**
- 3 reasons for a fight:
 1. Competition (because all human beings are equal)
 2. insecurity (arising from the same competition)
 3. Attempts - Every person tries to show that he is better
- Outside of the political situation, there is always a war of everything in all - people owe the country to terror and power, otherwise there is a state of chaos
- **The Troubles of the War of Existence (without the Government):**
 - There is no room for applause, because it is not certain that we will benefit from the fruit of our labor (because someone will steal us / kill us / rape our women, etc).
 - Unceasing fear of death by force => A lonely and meager life of loneliness.
 - People walking armed and locking their doors is a state of potential war
- Therefore, it is clear that we need a state of law that is agreed upon by everyone, even though there are places in the world where there is no such state and therefore they live in an animal manner as described.
- **In war, there is no such thing as injustice** - force and deceit are the two main dimensions of war. Justice is a trait that relates to people in a social situation and not to people in the warlike solitude of the state of nature.
- **What leads people to their propensity for peace?** The fear of death, a rush to a life of well-being and hope to achieve them with diligence.



- **The purpose of the community - the security of the individual** (which is not provided by natural law) requires an energizing force that will threaten people to preserve natural laws such as the Ten Commandments.
- **In order to prevent war**, there should not be too large a gap between the number of people in my country and the number of people of the enemy state. Thus, the "balance of power" that prevails in the world will be completed.
- Animal consent is natural because there is no competition between them, envy and hate => Animals are satisfied with the natural state, while human beings are required to move into the state through a social contract. There are also many people who think themselves wise and worthy of leadership than their friends - the man becomes a nuisance who is at ease.
- The leadership of the state should be handed over to one ruler known as "Leviathan" in Hobbes' book.
- **2 types of communities:**
 1. Community on the basis of the establishment - a ruler elected by agreement
 2. Community based on acquisition - a tyrant ruler who threatens and rules by force

Things that weaken a community:

- **The opinion that there is more than one sovereign** - a distinction between spiritual and secular is meaningless, since there are actually two different kingdoms and each subject to two masters. In the struggle between the rule of religion and the rule of the state, there is a great danger of civil war and disintegration.
- **Mixed government** - separation of powers is a recipe for disaster (as opposed to Locke who invented the separation of powers)

John Locke

- **The first known liberal modernist.** He is one of the philosophers who influenced the development of the American Constitution and laid the foundations for the science of modern politics - liberal. Locke places **private property** in the center of his thought.
- The father of empiricism (from the word empirical = tangible) - people learn from reality through their senses



- He is considered the father of liberal thought
- Comparison between Locke and Hobbes:
 1. The distinctions between the state of nature and the state of the state through the social covenant are acceptable to Locke
 2. The political situation is artificial and is also acceptable to Hobbes
 3. Hobbes' assumptions about Locke's individualism, equality, universality, and rationality.
- Differences :
 1. **Moral rationality** (as opposed to Instrumental according to Hobbes). Most humans are also moral in their natural state. So why switch to country mode? Because there are a minority of immoral people and there is nothing to do with them in the state of nature. A law is required to punish them through the state.
 2. **According to Locke, the state of the state is based on the state of nature.** The state is improving the state of nature (unlike Hobbes, who thinks that the natural situation is contrary to the political situation - chaos in order and the rule that people are rational - instrumental and therefore have no morality)
 3. **Companies arose to upgrade natural life => to power is not allowed to prejudice the natural rights of humans (which existed before him).** Hobbes, on the other hand, believes that what is important is creating security, even at the expense of trampling on natural rights.

Natural Rights: Every person is born with them in another state of nature:

1. Right to life
 2. Right to liberty
 3. The right to property (in the broad sense - what I create is mine)
 - Locke supports the restriction of power through the separation of powers, as in Spain and Rome.
- 2 Justifications for separation of powers:
1. **Liberal Place - John Locke wants separation of powers to protect human rights**
 2. **Republican place - Sparta, Rome - because it is good for the republic.**
- Liberal democracy - a synthesis between democracy and liberalism. The collective in the center - the people's sovereignty and the majority's decision.
 - The more liberal a society is, the more it will care about human rights and vice versa.
 - Liberalism returns to Locke - the individual precedes the state, which is a means of realizing the individual.



- Alongside the democratic and liberal aspect, there is also a Republican aspect. Again the question is in the dose between 3.

Additional information on John Locke:

Property:

- Every person owns their body, and only they have a right to their body
- The work creates my property
- Taking part of the common property, as it is - abandoned in its natural state and its work - creates ownership of that piece of property. You do not have to ask permission from anyone to expropriate that part of the property from the public authority.
- There is a limit to the amount of personal property of each - as much as he can work and enjoy his fruits
- The fact that a person gains property through work is harmless to others because there is enough for everyone.
- God has designated earth in the world to work by man => It is forbidden to envy the lands that others have already worked and made them their property, and if they intervene in it, it is clear that the intercessor wants to enjoy the work of others.
- **When land belongs to the state, no person can take a piece of land without permission from the owners of the joint holding**, that is, the citizens of the state according to the land laws of that country.
- **However, before the state, in the natural state - there is no need for permission to work on land and turn it into property.**
- By turning a plot of land into a property through his **work, he increases the common property of the people** (since cultivated land is 10 or 100 times more cultivated than that area in a pit state.)
- It is the work of the land that creates most of the useful land products
- The very existence of a social contract means giving up all of the common lands of everyone and entrusting them to the sovereign or the state for safekeeping.
- If a person spoils his land, he destroys the property
- The use of money began when people were willing to accept anything that could be held without spoiling for useful necessities such as food



- Money allows people to own land that is too large for them to work and enjoy their fruits.
- When there is an administration, the laws regulate the right to property (not work as in the natural situation)
- The wise prince will be able to protect the labor of his subjects from oppression by force.

Goals of Political Society and Government:

- The main purpose of the association of persons to the state of the state is to preserve their property (including life, liberty and assets)

What is missing in the natural state?

1. A fixed law known to all
2. A judge known to all and impartial (in the natural situation, every person is the judge and executor of his affairs)
3. Power to issue the judgment into practice

Therefore, despite all the privileges in the natural situation, it is bad for human beings and they are encouraged to establish society.

What's in the natural state?

1. The power of every person to do what he deems necessary to preserve himself and others in accordance with natural law. If there were no degenerate people, there was no need to establish a society.
2. The power to punish those who violate this law.

The scope of the authority of the legislative branch = the supreme authority in the state

- The legislative branch is sacred and cannot be changed by the ruler: The goal is to preserve society and every person within it (so long as it is consistent with the public good.)
- The legislature has no arbitrary control over life and property.
- It has limitations:
 1. It is forbidden to kill subjects
 2. It is forbidden to deliberately steal property
 3. It is forbidden to contradict a natural law (which is eternal)
 4. The law should be fixed (the principle of legality)



5. It is forbidden to take property, but only to collect taxes with the consent of the subjects
6. The legislature is not allowed to transfer its authority to another body

The legislative, executive, and federal authorities in the community:

- Laws can be legislated in a short period of time, and therefore there is no requirement for the legislative branch to be present at all times
- **The legislative** branch should be separated from the executive.
- **Also, to distinguish between an executive and a federal authority (although in practice it is difficult to distinguish and it is usually the same people:**
 - **Executing** - responsible for enforcing the law within the state
 - **Federative** - responsible for the law on the outside. To foreigners and foreigners.

The disintegration of a government

- If the legislator tries to deprive the people of their property or harm their welfare - **the people are not allowed to obey it and establish a new legislative body** (because this is the legislator's betrayal of the trust that the people gave him)
- The same applies to the ruler - the person who harms the people => the people is not obligated to him.
- **When the legislator acts contrary to the purpose for which he stands - he is guilty of rebellion. If he convenes a government that the people did not authorize him to convene - he is guilty of a state of war, the use of force without authority.**
- Just as the legislative authority (by coups) abolishes the legislative authority (by reversibility), so too does the legislator rebel when they deny the trust of the people by being accessible to the welfare and / or property of the people.
- If the people reach the conclusion that the government is trying to assassinate their choices - it is legitimate to replace the government.
- Any person who uses force without a right within a society - puts himself in a state of war - whether a citizen or a ruler or legislator.
- When it is not clear whether the government / legislature is trying to harm the people, the people will be the judge to be determined in this matter (it is he who gave the mandate to the legislator / ruler in the first place.)



- Rights are always personal and therefore the state is forbidden to harm them for the common good (because the rule is only a collection of individuals)

Criticism of Luke (from Zinsser's book): A society of selfish individuals without a general purpose is liable to deteriorate into chaos. Free competition between uncoordinated individuals will also make a name in the market itself.

A comparison between John Locke and Rousseau:

- Rousseau develops a very democratic and republican approach, but is anti-liberal.
 - Man is a political animal (like Luke)
 - A struggle between two human tendencies: egoism and altruism.
 - There are two types of possible rules in the company:
 3. **The general will** - the sum total of egoistic interests. Majority opinion, classical Athenian democracy.
 4. **The general will** - what is good for the public. Republican. What is the right thing to do (eg, IDF service)
- According to Russo, laws must be enacted according to the general will. It's anti-liberal** - what about those people who do not want the collective good? "We will force them to be free".
- The majority determines the good of the state (republican percept)
- **Both Locke and Rousseau believe that the individual is above all else.**
 - **The difference:**
 - Rousseau - Republican perception - the public good (total of individuals) determines
 - Locke - a liberal approach - the good of the individual determines.

On the social contract:

- Like Hobbes, believes that the state of nature is not possible, and without the state and the social covenant, man would have been extinct.
- Each individual submits himself and all his rights to the public at large => The individual has no right to demand anything from the state
- All as one body

The sovereign:

- There is a double commitment:



- The individual towards the state
- State towards the individual
- **The sovereign is not allowed to harm the state** (because the social contract empowered him and harms the state = violation of the social contract)
- The sovereign is in fact the sum of all his citizens => The sovereign cannot harm ourselves => The sovereign cannot harm his citizens
- Unlike the sovereign, the citizen can oppose the general will, but the same opponent will "be forced to be free".

On the civil religion

- The religious and civil disobedience is the same. Multiculturalism => Multiculturalism => Religious and political intolerance.
- The reason for the persecution of the Jews - they refused to recognize the God of the countries in which they lived - it was considered an uprising against the leader
- The gods fought for human beings (people pray for gods to lead them to victory)
- Jesus founded the Kingdom of Heaven under the same conditions of polytheism
- **There is a conflict between obedience to religion and obedience to the state**
- Many peoples wanted to keep the polytheism, they did not succeed and Christianity conquered everything
- The kings of England made themselves the heads of the Church - which in effect turned them into officials (because they were not allowed to effect actual changes)
- The interest of religion will always prevail over that of the state
- Religion is divided into 3:
- **The religion of man** - the natural faith between man and God. **The proper religion according to Rousseau. Only man and God without the Church mediating between them** (as is customary in Christianity)
- **Civil religion** - a religion of a state with special institutions and rituals (like the church). Advantage: Because it unites the worship of God with the love of the laws => God's work = the work of the state => The homeland is the object of admiration of the citizens. In this case, death for the homeland is martyrdom. And breaking the law means heresy.
Disadvantage: It misleads people and makes them superstitious. Rejects the true faith of God from empty ritual rituals.



- **Religion of the priest** - a religion that gives two kinds of laws and therefore creates opposites that do not allow people to be both heavenly and good citizens. **Rousseau's worst kind.**
- **Christianity cannot succeed from two flavors:**
 1. Enough appetite for one government that will seize power by force, and it will be anti-Christian to oust him.
 2. There is no spirit of battle due to faith in Divine Providence
- The state may determine laws not as part of religion, but rather as national laws. Those who refuse to accept them are the sovereign's right to expel him from the state as an anti-social person (and not as heretics as in countries that combine religion and state). **Who denies the laws of the state - deserves the death penalty! - It's a very serious sin.**

Montesquieu (a combination of Rousseau and Locke):

- Trying to create a republican and liberal society alike. Seeing the good of the individual as well as the common good.
- There is room for this integration between republics and liberals - again everything depends on dosage.

John Rawls

If humans were behind a "**screen of ignorance**" (they would not know if they were a poor / rich man / woman, etc.) - then there would never be capitalist perceptions that it could come to their detriment.

The veil of ignorance leads toward socialism

Edmond Barak – Conservatism

- Politics should be practical and not abstract because human society is too complicated to make generalizations.
- Barak was not a philosopher, but a learned and practical man who learned from political practice
- Therefore, most of his writing comes in pamphlets dealing with specific subjects in England in the 18th century
- Although Barak is identified with conservatism, he was not an enemy of reform.
- **There is no room for theory in understanding the state, but only practice.**



- It may be that what does not work out theoretically is part of a socially indifferent balance that has been achieved through years of trial and error until the present situation is achieved.
- If social institutions successfully carry out human-interest pressures, they have passed the test of practice and are therefore relevant.
- If the institutions fail to satisfy the requirements of the people - comes statute of limitations and the institutions will expire. Their non-conformity to society will remove them from the world and therefore there is no need for reversals.
- **Rationalism (general theories) encourages fanaticism** - because what is legitimate in one place is considered shocking elsewhere - the end of theories to clash and provoke bloody wars.
- **A strong right (= the importance of historical precedent, i.e. learning from practical and concrete experience) is the surest guide for political action**
- Individual thinking is always based on limited experience and should therefore be viewed with suspicion. On the other hand, mankind as a whole (= human experience = the right of possession) is wise and can and should be learned from it for the future.

Adam Smith (from Zisser's book, Chapter 3)

- **The Invisible Hand:** Spontaneous actions of individuals create an efficient and prosperous free market together
- **The efficiency of capitalism** - the free market is based on price, supply and demand - correlates activities of people who do not know each other better than any planned method
- **Individualism above all.**

John Stuart Mill

- The liberal world is not ready for tyranny, nor for the tyranny of the majority (which can impose its views on the minority and therefore have a duty to protect minority rights in the country.)
- **Liberty is utilitarianism** - a multiplicity of opinions guarantees the truth
- **Freedom = Truth**

Mill's attitude toward freedom of expression and expression:

- If people of opinion X are silent, you cannot be certain that they are wrong.



- Even if they are wrong, it may be that in the wrong view there is a part of the truth (that it is very difficult to reach the truth as a whole and can be complemented by opposing opinions)
- Even if there is a general view of the truth as a whole, and will not allow conflicting views => will create a situation that those who hold the prevailing opinion will not understand the reasons in their opinion and believe only that this is the custom for years.
- Without dissenting views, the prevailing view is that they do not struggle for it.
- The true morality of the public debate - to respect each person regardless of his or her views and to allow for a multiplicity of opinions.

Positive vs. Negative - Isaiah Berlin

- **Negative freedom:** I am free as long as I'm not denied X. The more options the better.
- **Positive freedom:** I am free as I am more X. As I realize myself or restrict myself I am more free.
- Repressive regimes based on positive freedom - I am free when I obey a tyrant.
- **John Locke establishes a perception centered on negative freedom** - do not limit me. This is expressed in three levels:
 1. **Religious - the message of tolerance** - to prevent the persecution of minorities. We must not force, but only persuade. The church must not preach religious values through the state. **Religious Tolerance - The majority suffers and does not impose their Protestant way, but only by persuasion.**
 2. **Political** - Locke's separation of powers
 3. **Economic** - Capitalism - a sacred right to the property of every person. Any liberal approach that embraces property rights must be somewhat capitalist. Again the dosage question.
- Nozick - takes property freedom to extremes - it is forbidden to harm property and collect any social taxes. The only thing there is - voluntary contributions.
Capitalistic and principled arguments must be distinguished from practical ones:
 1. **A principled / philosophical argument** - like Locke or Nozick - is not because it is more effective, but it is moral to not infringe the freedom of property
 2. **Practical argument** - Capitalism is necessary for the profitability of society. The market should act without impact.

Locke's opponent - John Rawls



If humans were behind a "**screen of ignorance**" (they would not know if they were a poor / rich man / woman, etc.) - then there would never be capitalist perceptions that it could come to their detriment.

The veil of ignorance leads toward socialism

Karl Marx

- Takes the base of Luke and Rolls and intensifies them. We must take care of the general welfare not by narrowing the gaps, **but by eliminating the economic gaps altogether - there are no classes and everyone is equal** (communism)

Burgers and Proletarians:

- The modern bourgeois society that was founded on the fragments of feudal society did not abolish the classes, but merely established new classes - bourgeoisie and proletariat.
- The state administration runs the affairs of the bourgeoisie and acts as a working committee of the bourgeoisie
- The bourgeoisie severed the feudal bonds => There is no connection between man and his friend other than emotionless money.
- The bourgeoisie lowered honor and holiness in professions such as medicine and law and turned them into salaried workers for all intents and purposes
- Maintaining the mode of production was the first condition of existence for all industrial classes (since without production there is no proletariat, and without proletariat - no bourgeoisie)
- Everything becomes cosmopolitan - material and spiritual production (like art) alike (through the development of modern means of transportation that make the world much smaller)
- The bourgeoisie forces itself on the whole world and creates a world in its image and image
- The village was subdued in favor of the city
- The means of production and property are concentrated in the hands of a few financiers
- Production began with feudalism, but feudal property relations limited production forces and had to be reduced-an act done by the bourgeoisie
- Overproduction epidemic - too much supply and less demand => The company is returning to a state of barbarism (hunger, general war of destruction, as if they took all the means of subsistence)
- The weapon that subjugated feudalism is now directed against the bourgeoisie itself (the overproduction of the bourgeoisie)



- **Development of the bourgeoisie => The development of the proletariat that requires work and the work of the proletariat increases the capital of the bourgeoisie**
- Workers = Proletarians are commodities like any other trade, and therefore they are also vulnerable to market fluctuations.
- The small workshop turned into a large factory a mass of workers enslaved as soldiers and subject to industry
- **Because the bourgeoisie has declared profit as a purpose (capitalism), it is petty and hostile to proletarians**
- **The bourgeoisie's proletarian war consists of two stages:**
 1. War against the petty bourgeoisie (landowners). It actually serves the senior bourgeoisie.
 2. The proletariat grew, and then began to fight against the bourgeoisie itself through labor unions and other alliances.
- The same organization of workers was hurt internally because of the competition between the workers (for jobs), but always got stronger than before the dispute.
- **The bourgeoisie is in constant war:**
 - a. Against the nobility
 - b. Against the bourgeoisie itself (competition between industrial and commercial interests)
 - c. Against the bourgeoisie of foreign countries (who exports more)
 - d. Of course, against the proletariat as described above.

In all these wars, the bourgeoisie uses the proletariat as a weapon, in effect educating the proletariat and handing over weapons to its destruction at the end of the day.
- As before, part of the nobility was transferred to the bourgeoisie, and now some of the bourgeoisie is moving to the proletariat.
- **Only the proletariat will bring revolution against the bourgeoisie, because only he has nothing to lose!** He has no property. It has no national character because the bourgeoisie has stripped the society of any national affiliation. Because there is nothing to lose, there is a state of revolution on the part of the proletariat
- The bourgeoisie can no longer be the dominant class in society and impose the conditions that are legally convenient for society



- The condition for the existence and rule of the bourgeoisie class is the accumulation of capital by individuals. The source of capital - the salaried workers, i.e. the proletariat itself.
- The dignity and triumph of the proletariat is guaranteed (it will abolish all classes, including its own)

Edmond Barak – Conservatism

Precedent and right:

- Politics should be practical and not abstract because human society is too complicated to make generalizations.
- Barak was not a philosopher, but a learned and practical man who learned from political practice
- Therefore, most of his writing comes in pamphlets dealing with specific subjects in England in the 18th century
- Although Barak is identified with conservatism, he was not an enemy of reform.
- **There is no room for theory in understanding the state, but only practice.**
 - It may be that what does not work out theoretically is part of a socially indifferent balance that has been achieved through years of trial and error until the present situation is achieved.
- If social institutions successfully carry out human-interest pressures, they have passed the test of practice and are therefore relevant.
- **If the institutions fail to satisfy the requirements of the people - comes statute of limitations and the institutions will expire. Their non-conformity to society will remove them from the world and therefore there is no need for reversals.**
- Human practice and experience will almost always be won over time, while theory can be tempted by all kinds of hallucinatory ideologies (such as Nazism.)
- Barak goes against theorists like Rousseau. He mocks and calls their profession "social metaphysics" and **the end of the theoretical ideas always fail for a number of reasons:**
 1. They are simple, while social life is always complex
 2. They are based on hypothetical ideals while social life is always based on concrete experience
 3. They claim rationality and eternity, while society is practical and unique
 4. They claim that societies are created by means of a "social covenant" (the exercise of our sovereign will) and exist in its right, but in practice companies are developing in a long and exhausting process of trial and error.



- **Rationalism (general theories) encourages fanaticism** - because what is legitimate in one place is considered shocking elsewhere - the end of theories to clash and provoke bloody wars.
- **A strong right (= the importance of historical precedent, i.e. learning from practical and concrete experience) is the surest guide for political action**
- Individual thinking is always based on limited experience and should therefore be viewed with suspicion. On the other hand, mankind as a whole (= human experience = the right of possession) is wise and can and should be learned from it for the future.

Approaches and Schools of Thought - 9th Meeting - 24/12/2018

When reading opinion articles written by journalists or a civilian and not a researcher - it should be taken into account that the text will contain several approaches, not necessarily in a coherent manner. The more the article will be written by an academic or a manager in the field, the assumption is that it will be more coherent. For example, writing from a pluralistic approach and finishing with saying that the power lays with the wealthy indicates an internal contradiction.

Reading Analysis:

"It is Political, Dummy", Ha'aretz, Avirma Golan, 18.12.2018

The "No Right, No Left" protest returns once again: one against the price of cottage cheese, once against the gas, then against the corruption and now against the price increase. Without politics, they scold whoever waves signs against the government. This is a demonstration against the rich who are profiting at our expense, and we are not leftists. Thanks to its apolitical image, the revolting protest of 2011 attracted hundreds of thousands of people seeking relief from the news. Sometimes you could even say that these protests accomplished something. Now, for example, Minister of Finance **Moshe Kahlon** decided to extend the tax exemption on household electronics, mobile phones and baby products. Public pressure is having an effect, it's a fact. This is a false and harmful form of success, as well as the comparison to the Yellow Vests in France. Not only because of the enormous difference between us and them in everything related to history and the nature of the protest. The French protest against the rise in gas prices broke out mainly in the periphery, where dependence on a private car is critical for the purpose of earning a living. True, that protest is not right or left, but it is also and especially, very political and solidarity-like in nature, and goes against the president who is cut off from the weak classes and the working class. Presumably, this is also the argument of the protesters here against **Netanyahu** and **Kahlon**. In fact, they only protest against the rising prices. But the rise is only one layer of the policy that is crashing citizens and society as a whole here. Before it in the hierarchy, you can find the elimination of public services (education, health, housing,



welfare, etc.), the erosion of wages and the tax burden. And that's without even mentioning the priority that places the settlements and the military control of the neighboring population.

Wage in Israel is relatively low and has been steadily eroding. A high percentage of workers earn minimum wage and less, while indirect tax is much higher than that of the OECD countries and stands at 39% of total taxes collected compared to the OECD average of 33% of total taxes. Indirect taxes are known as regressive. Their effect is greater with the decline in income: the smaller the income, the greater part of it is devoted to consumption.

For years we have been told that opening up the market to competition between importers will reduce the prices of products and life will be better. And what will happen then? All of a sudden we'll have to manage with the eroding wages, the unattainable housing, the parents' payments for education and the privatized medicine, and consoling themselves on the cell phone, with a light (and deadly) loan from the credit card company and a cheap airline ticket? This is a miserable illusion that absolves the government of responsibility and allows it to continue crushing the middle class, deepening the gaps and throwing people into the cycle of poverty.

A protest focusing on the "cost of living" is not just an apolitical one. It cooperates with a brutal policy of inequality that harms social resilience and, ultimately, growth. This is the desired policy for the **Netanyahu** government, which is kicking at basic civil rights and distributing benefits only to those who have proven loyalty. Against this policy is a political protest that not only revolts but also demands a totally opposite policy. As long as the opposition is headed by two millionaires, one gets rich from turning a public service into a private monopoly and the other from a predatory television channel. Both are competing with the government, and among them are more right-wingers.

Answers - class analysis:

1. Does a "demonstration against the rich who earn at our expense" express the fact that the demonstrators agree with a Marxist analysis?

Answer - the demonstrators are not Marxists. The fact that they talk about rich people, economic matters, exploitation, does not necessarily mean that they are Marxists. She only says that he is demonstrating against the rich at the moment. A pluralist can talk about things like that; they just want to take a bigger bite of the pie, not to turn the whole system around. In other words, all the approaches can relate to the economy, and that does not necessarily mean that they are Marxists. Every political researcher also refers to the economy, and that does not make him a Marxist. What makes a person a Marxist is if he believes that economics is the basis for everything, and there is a fundamental inequality in society. The Marxist wants to change the system from the ground up - and this is not the approach of the demonstrators. A demonstration about the cost of living in a world where you want to maintain a free market is not a Marxist demonstration.



2. What is the difference between the demonstration in France and the demonstration in Israel, according to Golan?

The common denominator of the two demonstrations according to Golan is the cost of living. However, the demonstration in France is an accusatory finger against the president and us - there is really no finger of blame. As soon as you do not point to blame, it makes the demonstration non-political and greatly distorts a change. This means that we do not offer an alternative or call for an alternative. There is something very weak here. The demonstration in Israel is not really against the system or against the government. You cannot cut the cost of living from any other context. It is hard for her even with the fact that the demonstrators in Israel do not want to identify themselves politically. She is not willing to accept this. In her opinion, the fact that the protesters want to bring everyone, not to upset anyone, makes them like a strategic player. They try to anticipate everyone's reaction, and are afraid if other leftists do not come. As strategic players they hide their true position and play it not leftists to understand as many people as possible - and Golan tells them that the technique they try not to take a stand is bad, everyone knows what they are doing and this pretense of leftists in disguise is not authentic. They are political people who hide their position from strategic considerations, to bring more people - and Golan says that the only thing that will help the demonstrators is to stand firm, to be right - and then join them, rather than hide what they really think.

3. Offer an empirical and normative critique of the difference between the demonstrations as Golan presents it.

Empirical - in both places, both Israel and France can argue about the facts. In France, too, there is no clear political approach, but rather a mixture of opinions that have crystallized against the cost of living, and it is not certain that there is a clear leftist agenda for which Golan is directed. Golan's diagnosis that in order for the demonstration to be successful it should be identified with a camp - not necessarily true, because from looking at the world many demonstrations that were identified with one camp or another failed.

Empirical criticism allows us to examine whether what the other is saying at the factual level is indeed true - in what he supports his facts and whether there is a basis for things. We need to examine the factual basis for what was written. Often, when a person makes unsubstantiated empirical assertions, it is not for nothing - but because of a political perception, a theoretical perspective, and so forth. The mistake will be in the same direction - the same basic assumptions that the person is trying to develop. Factual errors - do not necessarily mean that there is no logic in what a person says, but only that it is not possible to support things factually.

Normative - one can argue against Golan's claim that only a political approach will bring salvation. The tendency of critical theory is to go to the very edge (fringe) - everything that is not close to the edge is not good enough, and even harmful, it preserves the status quo, makes politicians adapt themselves to maintain their rule, thus dissolving the real problem and preserving the system. A small improvement of



the situation - is not good enough and may make us miss the real crisis. One of the framers of this approach is Lenin - the more bad it is, the better. There is also an argument here about the motivation of people - if not very bad for us, we will not really try to improve. Therefore, all the small profits are worse than the lack of repair at all, because it distances us from the possibility of leaving the real pit we are in (according to the Golan approach).

4. According to Golan, *"a protest that focuses on the "living wage" is not just an apolitical one, but it cooperates with a policy of cruel inequality that harms social strength and ultimately growth."* Analyze this sentence using the third and fourth dimensions of power.

In the third dimension of power, the government causes the public to focus on the cost of living, to demonstrate in favor of an open market, despite the fact that it is contrary to its interest, because it means reducing public services to the citizen.

In the fourth dimension, we all think that everything is related to competition and a free market. It is a fourth dimension rather than a third, because it has been the premise of all society. It's built into all our ideological mechanisms - that's how we think the problem is that there's no competition, and there's concentration.

The main analysis is of the fourth dimension of power - because we have to explain how we reached such a situation that no matter what happens, the prevailing ideology is capitalism and competition. Golan also talks about the fact that this is the axiom of the public, without talking about what caused it.

Pluralists tend to be careful when talking about a third and fourth dimension of power.

Golan - tries to activate the first dimension of power and convince its readers.

5. What would **Avirama Golan** say if she were asked about **Theda Skocpol's** article?

Theda Skocpol talks about the state as an actor. Bring the state back to the center of analysis. This is not a Marxist, elitist or pluralistic approach. This is an approach called neo-institutionalism. According to many approaches, there is no special place for the state - the state is reduced and under other forces, there is no such category of state. Marxists - refer to the state as the "executive committee" of the wealthy and those who serve the capitalist approach and capitalists. It has no independent category. The pluralists talk about different groups of interests, but no country is a major player. The approach of returning the state to the center is a research approach that comes as criticism of the Pluralist / Marxist / Elitist analysis. According to this approach, these approaches miss the possibility that there is such a body as the state, whose role is first and foremost its bureaucracy - the army, the police, the courts, the ideal of the rule of law, the ministries. The state is not subordinate to anyone, and embodies the state interest which is an interest in itself. For example, order and security, international legitimacy, growth that is not necessarily for the benefit of the wealthy, the preservation of values, etc. It is the power that draws its strength from itself,



from the need of people in it. According to this approach, there can be societies in which the state has relative autonomy from all those who have power in the country. For example, the High Court of Justice can deal with matters that the wealthy, the Knesset, etc. oppose, such as building a private prison, expelling terrorists, etc. According to this approach, there are people who have governmental power and they use it to promote what they perceive as the public interest, They are not necessarily elected officials, their power derives from state authority, they do not serve groups in society and they are not enslaved to the wealthy.

Neo-Institutional - one who focuses on the power of institutions.

Skocpol is a kind of neo-institutional, which not only talks about institutions but also puts the country at the center. It does not necessarily mean that it is always the state that will be powerful and will win the politicians. Rather, it will tell the investigator to examine the relative strength of the state, the relative autonomy of the state (from other forces) and its capabilities (resources, for example). When examining the political reality from the point of view of **Skocpol**, we examine the autonomy and capabilities of the state.

Another thing that touches **Skocpol's** theory concerns the historical aspect - it is an approach of institutional history. For example, when examining the war on corruption in the historical perspective, it was the politicians who established the CPA after 1974 to deal with public corruption, and then they lost control of the process - for example, bankers, for example, and then politicians. And that is to understand how power has been created for the state, to examine it on a historical level, and then we will discover that this is an unintended historical matter that has changed - and now it is no longer possible to close the National Unit for Fraud Investigation (NFI). Therefore, the politicians' solution - to try to weaken the NFI. For example, to establish a unit like Lahav (although it could eventually come back to haunt them).

Avirama Golan talks about the powerful as actors and not the state as an actor. Golan has no state. There are groups, periphery, center, rich. To her liking - **Skocpol** does not understand what she says, there are people who are in the bases of power, and there are civilians. It can come from a Marxist or pluralistic approach - it is the people who are ignoring the state from their analysis.

6. How would you define Golan's analytical approach?

Golan is not elitist - since it can be seen that in her opinion power is found in the public and not only in elites. Anyone with public expectations is not an elitist. In the elitist analysis, the main criticism is the elites. Between the lines there is pluralism, but also elements of critical theory and Marxism. It criticizes the existing order - and pluralist is less inclined to criticize the existing order. She seeks a revolution, an uprising, a change in world order. However, one must remember the medium in which she writes - a senior publicist is usually not a Marxist. Even if she is Marxist - it will not be clearly written in her articles. It should be remembered here that it is not always possible to determine fully. If it is possible to determine entirely whether this is a critical theory, Marxism, etc. What is clear, is that there is something radical in the text .



Approaches and Schools of Thought - Meeting No. 10 - 31/12/2018

Pluralists don't only talk about how power is distributed. They believe and assume that the basis for political life is people's values, preferences, and aspirations. People bring their values, dreams and aspirations to politics, in order to promote those values and dreams.

Amos Oz - an example of a pluralist, with an approach of dreaming and having an ideal. In fact, he and **Shimon Peres**, who are significant ideologues of the left, are from the upper class. Looking at society in the macro, we see society as one organ without structural conflict.

The Labor movement that **Amos Oz** and **Shimon Peres** are symbols of is always looking for an idealistic figure who will catch as many dreams as possible. In practice, according to a **Marxist** analysis, its world of values serves the wealthy, and it has to make a reckoning with itself - what it wants to be. The Marxist claim is that the ideological system serves an economic interest, and there is a clash between its ideals and the fact that it represents people of a high economic class who are not interested in raising taxes and maintaining a welfare policy.

Dr. Navot's claim is that **Netanyahu**, in fact, relative to previous prime ministers, is the one who is least connected to the wealthy, one of the reasons being that he grew up in the United States and has a political base there. He always had donors from the US and when he came to Israel, he kept in touch with them, and as a result he was less in contact with Israeli financiers, so **Netanyahu's** politics look completely different, too, to the existing capitalists, and that made him an exceptional politician - an outsider - almost all that he is going through is that Israeli financiers are trying to eliminate him politically, because they do not like the fact that he is connected to other financiers.

Israeli politics from a pluralist-functional point of view

From this point of view, Israel's peak was during the 'Yeshuv' period, when Jewish immigrants starting settling the land. The point of establishment of the state is the point where everything started to deteriorate, so that is the beginning of normalization. Another dramatic point of deterioration is the Six-Day War - when the period of overload began, and we are in the shadow of the Six-Day War. This is the attitude of the labor movement. The assumption underlying the point of view is that until the establishment of the State, during the Yeshuv period, a consensual democracy developed here - based on consensus and compromise rather than on majority rule. The settlement understood that in the absence of a sovereign state, its path is to compromise and not to adopt the approach of "judging the mountain."



Therefore, the most important dream is the Zionist dream that overrides all the particularistic values and finds what unites them and not what separates them, which also contributed to the success. The project is a multiplicity of idealistic people who came from the various 'Aliyahs', and although they are idealists, they are willing to compromise and understand that the good of the Zionist project requires compromises and battles. In fact, it is a pluralistic "paradise" - consideration is given to opinions, there is no coercion. Things began to deteriorate after the establishment of the state. People have moved from a dimension of closeness to a model of realization and individualism. Many immigrants from Arab countries came to the State of Israel, who did not undergo modern socialization processes, and this also affected the political leadership that underwent adaptation to the new situation. **David Ben-Gurion**, who was a very important leader, becomes a burden on the system. He is old and bored, dealing with trifles, and making bills for the freedom movement, not talking to Begin. From a pluralistic functional point of view, this is not good. In the short period between 1963 and the Six-Day War in 1967, when **Eshkol** was prime minister, there was a short period in which pluralism was again in good shape; as of 1967, the Watershed Affair, things are beginning to deteriorate. The system depends on the fact that there will be agreements on the political rules of the game and on the core values, and since 1967 these two conditions have not been met. The debate over borders is intensifying. There is no agreement on the demos (people) - who is the Israeli collective, whether it includes Palestinians. This affects the democratic process, since the democratic minimum is that the overwhelming majority of the country's senior permanent residents will have the right to vote. It is not possible to democratize the lives of others without giving them the right to vote. The functionalists are in favor of democracy and believe that this is the only possible method. Israel did not decide it was a democracy, on the contrary, it always saw itself as a democracy. So its conduct in the territories places it in a kind of "schizophrenia". We as a collective do not know what to do in the territories (Gaza as an example). The collective is divided, it does not agree on the basic values and therefore is no longer a member. From this point of view, we are in the midst of significant blasts that we cannot get out of - and this is beginning to be felt especially after the first intifada. As long as the Palestinians behaved moderately, we did not feel the need to make decisions - and then came the intifada, refusal to serve in the territories. From here came the idea of autonomy and Oslo in the days of Rabin - but Oslo was not accepted either because we do not accept the rules of the game. As far as the opponents are concerned, they oppose not only Oslo, but also the rules of the game - in their eyes it is impossible to make such a decision by an elected government, and we need a government. When you do not agree on the rules of the game - here is where the troubles start, and in this case, things ended in murder. The murder is



symptomatic of the deep disagreement Israel has faced since 1967; and today in 2018 we still do not know what to do with the territories and do not know how to decide what to do - and this is an extraordinary burden.

Another point - the increasing legalization of life. This is a process that has been going on in the entire Western world since the 1960s and is linked to growing public mistrust - due to events such as the Vietnam War, Watergate, the media consumption that makes the public more critical and to lose faith in politicians. The most available substitute - judges. Commissions of inquiry headed by judges, the state comptroller is a former judge. All this leads to judicial activism as well. The significant doctrinal changes in Supreme Court rulings are already in the 1980s, even before the Basic Laws. These changes are part of a process of legalization that is part of a process of loss of trust in politicians and reform by the legal system. This creates yet another burden on the political system. On the one hand they generate trust.

On the other hand, judges, legal advisors, etc. have a certain type of thinking and tools. It changes life and makes them more formal, which is a problem - because there are situations and problems that cannot be solved formally and institutionalized. The most obvious example is the enlistment of yeshiva students into the army. Until judicial activism, this was solved in the form of "Israbloff" - the Defense Service Law allows the Minister of Defense to grant exemptions in special cases, and the ultra-Orthodox actually protected the shadow of this law and rejected the service without formally declaring that Israel is not an egalitarian state. Sometimes such solutions are good, but when there is judicial activism and state critic it is impossible to do so. So methods that could have been used in the past are no longer relevant today. The problem is that it is not really possible to solve the problem of enlisting Yeshiva students legally, and this creates additional burdens on the system. That is why Israeli democracy is in danger. The society is very heterogeneous, the feeling - especially among the left - is of an approaching catastrophe, because they see the processes of radicalization and do not understand how it can be solved.

Paradoxically, **Ayelet Shaked's** move to reduce legalization is a necessary step, precisely from a pluralistic, functional point of view, because it is not possible that the main decisions will be taken by the judicial system, while in many cases the "gray" and the scope of action taken by the legal system are required. From this point of view, the struggle against the judicial system is required. Of course it would have been better if the justice system had been "folding" of its own accord, but there was no chance that it would happen; and therefore the solution is to begin to change the judicial doctrines, to bring judicial activism into another proportion to enable the system to govern.

The analysis is based largely on the writings of researchers **Horowitz and Lissak**.



The rise of populism in Israel and the world according to a functionalist - pluralistic explanation: Anyone who studies what is happening in the world, in any approach, agrees that something new is happening in the world now. There is an increase of right-wing populism, which is characterized by a kind of rhetoric and political style based on a dichotomous separation between the "good public" - the people and the corrupt elite composed of the establishment, the banks, the United States, Hollywood and the ivy league (The Left). In the United States these are the progressive and the liberal. Other countries that have undergone such a process - Germany, Brazil, Poland, Hungary, the United States and Donald Trump - are the most prominent enemies of this phenomenon - liberal democracy - and this concrete elite. It is the establishment that is being talked about, who is destroying the people, the media, the courts, etc. This process is very similar to the rise of fascist movements, but at the moment the accepted and more precise terminology is populism.

Additional points of view for observing Israeli politics

(Focusing on the exam)

There are four different ways to look at politics. The most diagnosed approach is the pluralistic and functionalist – it does not perceive power as concentrated (as opposed to Marxist and elitist approaches). It is the most "sympathetic" and positive approach. Another criterion for comparison - which approach thinks the public has the most influence? Of course, the pluralistic approach. Public groups have the basic possibility of organizing and influencing. The elitist approach, on the other hand, thinks that there is something undemocratic and open here, and not the story we are told. The public does not have the power that pluralists say it has. When the public goes to vote, its experience is that of a pluralist - "the sorrow of the world on your shoulders" - but the elitists and Marxists believe that you do not really have the real power to influence and determine your fate. They believe there is no real democracy. With the elitist - at most you can approach the competition between elites and choose which elite will control you. How will the elitist analyze politics in Israel? The standard elitist analysis says that there was one elite here, **Mapai**, and then the 1977 elections followed with the change of power. According to the elitists, the explanation must be rooted in **Mapai**. It is not in the Likud or the public. The elite has destroyed itself. The generation of the founders, with the love of power and the fear that the younger generation will inherit it, is corrupting the younger generation politically. It sent it to the political desert - the military, the public administration, the economy, outside of the political life. The older generation stuck to the chairs and



when Golda Meir resigned- took the power, Rabin, the future generation. Because it had been degenerated for many years-when it came to power it lost it. It continued to govern as much as possible from the outside - through the institutions, the courts, the banks. In the elitist analysis, the explanation is never the public. The same thing is happening now - **Netanyahu** is degenerating his entire second generation and leaving only the party's entourage.

The elite controls - at best it will determine which elite controls and at worst there are no alternatives left. Democracy from an elitist point of view is either a method of obtaining legitimacy or a struggle between different elites. The elite wants the public to vote, because that is what allows it to continue to rule and make the public accept the rules of the game. Democracy is a sophisticated method of obtaining legitimacy, and anyone who goes to vote contributes to the formula working. An example: In 2005, **Sharon** founded Kadima. **Mofaz** competed for the leadership of the Likud and **Peres** competed for the Labor leadership. They were both asked to commit that if they lose they will not leave the party. **Mofaz** sent flyers to the voters with a promise that he would not leave the Likud, and in effect left immediately after losing to Kadima. **Peres** lost the Labor Party and moved to Kadima. It turns out that the difference between **Mofaz and Peres** is not that great - both of them found themselves easily in Kadima. It is already a play, grotesque - but the show does not present itself as such.

Marxists also believe there is no democracy. The only possible democracy is when we change the economic system and have economic equality. As long as we do not do this, we will accept politicians who represent the interests of the wealthy and do everything possible so that the public will not understand it. People will always choose to be sophisticated enough to play the rules in a way that the public will not understand, but they are always the people who will keep the capitalist system. In fact, all the heads of the major parties today represent capitalism and the interests of the wealthy - **Netanyahu, Livni, Lapid**, etc. The only one who is a Marxist is **Ayman Odeh** who is not really in the significant political game. Thus Marxists do not really have democracy. The difference between the approaches: In the pluralists the basis is ideas, values, dreams, desires, and aspirations of the individual. Everyone gets organized, finds his party that suits his ideas. The basis is conceptual, ideological, values, cultural. Representing **Amos Oz**. How to take all the ideas and make them coherent. The more ideologically homogenous the group, the easier it is. A society in trouble is a society that has no consensus on core values. According to this approach, capitalism is not necessary, but good, because it is competition, multiplicity, decentralization of power, not dictated to you, it can be expressed. There is a similarity in the logic of politics and the market. The more people believe in pluralism and preferences, the less they believe it is possible to run the business in a planned manner, and



the best way to manage it is not to interfere. The assumption is that there is also a market that is cut off from politics.

If you are a pluralist - when the world changes and there are no clear values, it creates confusion - the Internet, changes in the distribution of information. Changes in communication are very talkative to pluralists. If the world becomes less value-based, it affects the individual.

For the elitists, the basis is not only ideational, intellectual, cultural but much more political and organizational. Highlight the organization's theme. A large part of the power of the elite stems from the fact that it is small. Except for people easier to get organized.

Marxists - the basis is economics. Being determines consciousness. Being in the job market causes ideas to begin to develop. The Marxist thinks of matter - materialistically.

The Marxists will say about neo-institutionalism that they are "one big bullshit." The country has no power, it's all capitalists, capitalists.

The neo-institutional, historical, state-centered as appears in Skocpol's article argues that the state is a power with at least relative autonomy in certain societies. It invites you to check whether there is a state with relative autonomy and its power. The state is the bureaucracy - military, security, court, etc. With Marxist it cannot be at all.

In Skopol's approach there is one of all three methods. The dramatic difference is that the pluralists do not really have power for the state. The state is a construction and within the framework of the government everyone has his opinions. There is a multiplicity of opinions; there is not really a single bloc. The High Court of Justice is a collection of opinions of judges: the government is a collection of ministers, each of which has its own preferences, all in a way that reflects the forces of society. When the prime minister wants to extricate himself from the gatekeepers of his choice, the institution that has power will rise up against the chosen gatekeeper.

For example, according to this approach, what is of interest to the High Court of Justice as a body is power and power, it is capable of making decisions contrary to the private opinions of the justices. Therefore, when the politicians try to reduce his power, he reminds them that they need him (for example, judgments that legitimize conduct on the international scene in a manner that prevents the arrest of senior members of the defense establishment). According to Skocpol's analysis, the Supreme Court has weakened as politicians think they no longer need legitimacy in the international arena, for example because they will think they can control what is happening in the EU (such as the connections Netanyahu has with international leaders in a way that bypasses international organizations). In this situation, the state is losing



its power, which means that even according to the historical neo-institutional approach, a state can weaken or become stronger.

Focused material for the exam on thinkers:

There are classical thinkers, pre-modern. Here we have to distinguish between **Plato** and **Aristotle** and to know **Machiavelli**.

Machiavelli stands between the old and the new world - and there are those who will say that he is one of those who created the new world, because his thinking looks at politics with a moral view that differs from that of the private sphere. In Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, in the end, these are monistic (uniform) approaches in terms of morality. Machiavelli says that there are two moral systems here that are not on the same logic. A good politician should sometimes lie, bribe, and threaten, use violence - do bad things for the greatness of the republic.

Hobbes - the father of modern politics, by focusing on human rights in particular, such as the right to life – everything surrounds the human being. This is the beginning of modern thought.

In addition, we must recognize what liberalism is, the difference between liberalism and democracy, the fusion of liberal democracy.

Liberal democracy - one of several possibilities. It can be viewed as an unnecessary combination of the democratic and liberal elements. These are two different phenomena that developed differently and are based on another idea and did not necessarily have to connect. Democracy grew in ancient Greece and liberalism in England from the Magna Carta. In the 18th century, the democracy that was created is in effect a liberal, representative democracy. This is a system that combines two elements that over the years have been different, to one regime, which includes the democratic procedure that embodies public sovereignty and public power, even to the non-rich parts of the people and the liberal idea that represents property rights, liberty, etc. There is a tension between these two approaches that is expressed when the public wants things that are not liberal. For example - if the Knesset enacted a law prohibiting Muslims from praying in the State of Israel. From a democratic point of view this is a demonic desire, and if it has power it must be expressed. From a liberal point of view, there is a violation of Muslim rights and dignity. In a liberal democracy, we try to resolve this tension. There are theories that when there is a clash between the will of the people and human rights, human rights are increasing. Other theories will say that



democratic procedures will prevail. Another theory can say that in depth one needs to understand that democracy and liberalism complement each other, and if there are real human rights, freedom of the press, opposition, etc., one supports the other - people will want to preserve human rights and democracy will express their rights. Democracy and liberalism are interdependent and cannot exist without one another. After all, how can the demos (people) really gain power if there is no freedom of the press and he cannot receive information? For example, **Aharon Barak** likes to present this. The fourth theory is Agonism and conflict, which says that there is a conflict between democracy and liberalism, and it cannot be solved once and for all.

The exam on January 15 will be composed of 50 American questions.

The exam will be on the lectures and on some of the reading materials in the syllabus. There will be separate questions about the lectures and articles. 30 questions about the lectures and 20 questions about the articles (5 questions per article)

The questions about the articles - **Karl Popper**, **Robert Dahl** on the Behavioral approach, **Teda Skocpol**, **Pépère Carlefer** - article in English: *Structural power and political science*

Conceptual questions. The issue of dimensions and strengths, the subject of approaches - there are four main approaches. Pluralistic, functionalist, Marxist, elitist, and the historical neo-institutional approach of **Theodore Skocpol** and its variation of "state-centered."

Four ways to look at political life.

The different thinkers.

There will be no questions about Kohn, Russo, and Hume.