Conditions for the sustainability of democracy according to Aristotle

Умови стійкості демократії за Арістотелем

Jacek Mrozek * A

Corresponding author: PhD, Director of the Elk Campus Branch, e-mail: j.mrozek@op.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-7260-3308

Piotr Gawliczek A

Ph.D, Assoc. Professor, e-mail: pgawliczek@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-0462-1168

A University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Poland

Яцек Мрожек * A

Corresponding author: Ph.D, Директор філії Elk Campus, e-mail: j.mrozek@op.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-7260-3308

Пьотр Ґавлічек A

к.т.н., доц. професор, e-mail: pgawliczek@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-0462-1168

A Вармінсько-Мазурський університет в Ольштині, Польща

Purpose: to present the national security environment from the perspective of the main assumptions formulated by Aristotle. This was he, who examined 158 constitutions of states, and he also undertook the work of describing the known regimes in detail. He can be considered the first thinker to approach the entire spectrum of political and social issues in a scientific manner.

Method: the research was conducted using the following general scientific and special methods: the historical method during the study of the examination of constitutions by Aristotle; the method of analysis and synthesis related to the functioning of the state by Aristotle, abstract-logical method – for formulating theoretical generalizations and research conclusions.

The results of the study: are related to Aristotle's indications, that a democratic system can be a matrix for other forms of government and of utmost importance is to preserve sustainability. The intention was not to develop or to reject the existing theories, but it was possible to formulate the assumption, that democracy, as we know it, has been a specific system whose durability depends on specific virtues and goods, most often called liberal.

Theoretical implications: the practitioners can learn from the paper, that following Aristotle, the virtue of moderation should be incorporated into the cross-section of liberal political values for the benefit of the sustainability of democracy and the citizens who participate in its achievements. In this respect, the relationship between politics and ethics was revealed, which is characteristic of the classically understood philosophy of politics.

Practical implications: the findings could serve as the research streams related to deeper analysis of the democratic systems, and the relations with the essence of the democracy of ancient Athens and looking for inspiration and parallel solutions for the political culture of current liberal democratic societies.

Papertype: theoretical.

Key words: democracy, state system, Aristotle, social theory.

Мета роботи: представити середовище національної безпеки з точки зору основних припущень, сформульованих Арістотелем. Він дослідив 158 конституцій штатів, а також взявся за роботу з детального опису відомих режимів. Його можна вважати першим мислителем, який науково підійшов до всього спектру політичних і соціальних питань.

Метод дослідження: дослідження проводилось з використанням таких загальнонаукових та спеціальних методів: історичний метод під час вивчення експертизи конституцій Арістотеля; метод аналізу та синтезу, пов'язаний з функціонуванням держави за Арістотелем, абстрактно-логічний, метод – для формулювання теоретичних узагальнень та дослідницьких висновків.

Результати дослідження: пов'язані з вказівками Арістотеля, що демократична система може бути матрицею для інших форм правління, і надзвичайно важливим є збереження стійкості. Намір не полягав у розвитку чи відкиданні існуючих теорій, але можна було сформулювати припущення, що демократія, як ми її знаємо, була специфічною системою, довговічність якої залежить від конкретних чеснот і благ, які найчастіше називають ліберальними.

Теоретична цінність дослідження: практики можуть дізнатися з статті, що, слідуючи Арістотелю, чеснота поміркованості повинна бути включена до перерізу ліберальних політичних цінностей на користь сталості демократії та громадян, які беруть участь у її досягненнях. У цьому відношенні було виявлено співвідношення між політикою та етикою, характерне для класично розуміючої філософії політики.

Практична цінність дослідження: результати можуть слугувати дослідницькими потоками, пов'язаними з глибшим аналізом демократичних систем і зв'язків із сутністю демократії стародавніх Афін, а також пошуком натхнення та паралельних рішень для політичної культури сучасних ліберальних демократичних суспільств.

Тип статті: теоретична.

Ключові слова: демократія, державний устрій, Арістотель, соціальна теорія.

1. Introduction

Aristotle can be considered the first thinker to approach the entire spectrum of political and social issues in a scientific manner. His political views were initially shaped by the influence of Plato and his stay at the Academy, where Aristotle spent twenty years, first as a student and then as a teacher. Already following his own path, Aristotle adopted the rational attitude of a philosopher who studies

the various forms of state systems and creates his own socio-political theory on this basis. The system is the life of the state, Aristotle argued, and its manifestation is a reflection of the concrete political situation of a nation. In order to determine the regime close to the most optimal, Aristotle examined 158 constitutions of states, and he also undertook the work of describing the known regimes in detail. The only extant one is 'The Political System of Athens', treating democracy. Also, in his Politics, Aristotle deals with varieties of democracy. In this article, we will look at the classical understanding of democracy, exemplified by Athenian democracy. We will consider – following Aristotle's indications – to what extent a democratic system can be a matrix for other forms of government and how to preserve its sustainability. First, however, we will outline Aristotle's socio-political theory as well as the figure of the philosopher himself.

2. Results and discussion

2.1. Aristotle – life and links to politics

Aristotle was born in 384 BC in the small town of Stagira located on the frontiers colonised by the Greeks, where Macedonian influence was as strong as Greek. Aristotle's origins marked his lifelong association with both Greece and Macedonia. Nicomachus, Aristotle's father, was court physician to the Macedonian king. After the early loss of his father, Aristotle was sent to Athens, the centre of Greek culture and the greatest intellectual centre of the age. Plato's Academy became his home for many years and the place where his philosophical talent flourished. When the leadership of the Academy was taken over by his nephew Speusippus after Plato's death, Aristotle left Athens for Asia Minor. In Assos, under the patronage of Hermias, a former pupil of Plato, Aristotle began his independent scholarly activities. An attack by the Persians and the extermination of Hermias, forced a move to Mitylene. Aristotle considered setting up his own school. He even began preparations to open in Athens, the later famous Lyceum. Meanwhile, the philosopher's fame and authority attracted the interest of the Macedonian ruler Philip, who offered him an offer to teach his son. For three years, Aristotle became the tutor of the future Alexander the Great. Aristotle stayed in Alexander's entourage until his expedition to Asia, was highly respected by the royal couple and could be counted on to support his own scholarly work. In the young Alexander, Aristotle tried to inculcate Panhellenic ideas, although his influence on the future ruler, especially in the governance of the state, was nevertheless limited. Alexander's violent personality was at odds with Aristotle's temperate attitude, so much of the sage's advice went unheeded (Arystoteles, Polityka, 2001). Although Aristotle succeeded, for example, in forcing Alexander to be gentle with occupied Athens, for which he even had a monument erected.

Favour in Athens, to which Aristotle returned in 335 BC, did not find favour at all. As a supporter of the Macedonian monarchy, being on close terms with the new coloniser, he was not welcome. This did not discourage Aristotle from founding his own school, supported financially by Alexander. The Lyceum was founded in a different part of Athens from Plato's Academy, in a grove dedicated to Apollon Lykysius. It was also of a different nature to Plato's school, differing in the systematic pedagogical preparation of its founder, the rigorous approach to the subjects studied, and the collective scholarly work of the entire centre. While the Platonists were mainly interested in metaphysical issues, the school of Aristotle developed a scientific and practical approach, among the disciplines most concerned with nature, logic and mathematics, practical sciences: politics, ethics, rhetoric, poetics, and others. Alexander's sudden death in 323 changed the fate of the school. Aristotle faced even more hostility in Athens, he was even threatened with a conspiracy and trial, as in the case of Socrates. He therefore moved to Chalkis, where his family (son Nikomachus and a daughter from his first marriage) were staying, where he soon died (Aristotle, On the life and works of Aristotle, 2001; Aristotle, Testament, 2001).

2.2. The basis of Aristotle's socio-political theory

In the cognitive layer, social theories deal with the scientific explanation of relationships and dependencies of the social world, empirical facts and processes occurring, they systematise and unify existing knowledge, detect inconsistencies in the currently functioning model of empirical reality, formulate new research problems and directions of action. On the other hand, in the practical layer, they indirectly influence the transformations occurring in the world, model and predict the emergence of new structures, states or social processes (Z. Hull, 2003). Elements of an elaborate socio-political theory can be found in the thought of Aristotle, who, as Kazimierz Leśniak – an eminent commentator and translator of the philosopher's works – notes, marked out a new direction in research, "concentrating all his attention on the method of strict and rational cognition of reality. No result seemed certain to him if it was not justified if its rationale could not be given" (Leśniak K., 1989). Aristotle based his theory on a strict analysis and definition of concepts, as a naturalist he highly valued the observation of phenomena and comparative studies and took an analogous approach to social reality and its manifestations.

The most prolific period in Aristotle's work falls during his leadership of the Lyceum. At that time, the works mark an independent position from Plato's, which assumes in political matters that the state arises from nature, formed by human beings, beings who are inherently social (zõon politikón). A community formed by nature raises a simple analogy with the natural world, but there are primordial differences between human and animal community: "man is a creature made to live in a state more than a bee or any animal living in a herd, this is clear. For nature, as we say, does nothing without purpose. Well, man is the only one of living beings endowed with speech" (Aristotle, Politics, 2001). Linguistic ability is the basis for the creation of culture, for it is speech that makes it possible to determine what is useful or harmful, and just or unjust.

We owe the classical conception of the relationship between politics and virtue to Aristotle, this relationship explicit in Platonism, Aristotle develops and clarifies. When Plato describes the ideal state, justice is the leading virtue, thanks to which man was able to develop wisdom, fortitude, and moderation, which constitute ethical courage (arete). Without justice, there would be no state – as classical political philosophy assumes, placing an equal sign between the virtue of the citizen and the virtues of the state. This thesis was further strengthened in Aristotle's work by the division into distributive and equalizing justice, the former referring to the distribution of, for example, honours, money, positions among members of the state community, while the latter occurs in various types of interpersonal relations in which exchange is mandatory. Equalizing justice differs significantly from distributive justice because it is governed by arithmetical proportion, in accordance with the prevailing principle of absolute equality, which dictates that each individual should be treated equally, regardless of his or her merits and values.

In the cognitive layer, social theories deal with the scientific explanation of relationships and dependencies of the social world, empirical facts and processes occurring in reality, they systematise and unify existing knowledge, detect inconsistencies in the currently functioning model of empirical reality, formulate new research problems and directions of action. On the other hand, in the practical layer, they indirectly influence the transformations occurring in the world, model and predict the emergence of new structures, states or social processes. Elements of an elaborate socio-political theory can be found in the thought of Aristotle, who, as Kazimierz Leśniak – an eminent commentator and translator of the philosopher's works – notes, marked out a new direction in research, "concentrating all his attention on the method of strict and rational cognition of reality. No result seemed certain to him if it was not justified, if its rationale could not be given". Aristotle based his theory on a strict analysis and definition of concepts, as a naturalist he highly valued the observation of phenomena and comparative studies and took an analogous approach to social reality and its manifestations.

The most prolific period in Aristotle's work falls during his leadership of the Lyceum. At that time, the works mark an independent position from Plato's, which assumes in political matters that the state arises from nature, formed by human beings, beings who are inherently social (zõon politikón). A community formed by nature raises a simple analogy with the natural world, but there are primordial differences between human and animal community: "man is a creature made to live in a state more than a bee or any animal living in a herd, this is clear. For nature, as we say, does nothing without purpose. Well, man is the only one of living beings endowed with speech". Linguistic ability is the basis for the creation of culture, for it is speech that makes it possible to determine what is useful or harmful, and just or unjust (Aristotle, Politics, 2001).

We owe the classical conception of the relationship between politics and virtue to Aristotle, this relationship explicit in Platonism, Aristotle develops and clarifies. When Plato describes the ideal state, justice is the leading virtue, thanks to which man was able to develop wisdom, fortitude, and moderation, which constitute ethical courage (arete). Without justice, there would be no state – as classical political philosophy assumes, placing an equal sign between the virtue of the citizen and the virtues of the state. This thesis was further strengthened in Aristotle's work by the division into distributive and equalizing justice, the former referring to the distribution of, for example, honours, money, positions among members of the state community, while the latter occurs in various types of interpersonal relations in which exchange is mandatory. Equalizing justice differs significantly from distributive justice because it is governed by an arithmetic proportion, in accordance with the prevailing principle of absolute equality, which dictates that each individual should be treated equally, regardless of his or her merits and values (Banaszczyk T., Studies in Aristotle's Socio-Political Theory, 1985).

In the social theory of Aristotle – a continuator of Platonism and at the same time its critic – two approaches merge, on the one hand an empirical and naturalistic position; on the other, the aftermath of metaphysical speculations elevated from Plato's Academy. The first position prevails when Aristotle, as a researcher, perceives that the state is formed by ancestral communities formed from families, from families arise villages, which in turn merge into cities, provinces, etc.; the second prevails when he proclaims the primacy of the idea of a state prior to man. It reads as follows: "by its very nature the state is prior to the family and each of us, for the whole must be prior to the parts" (Aristotle, Politics, 2001). To get rid of the contradiction in this contradictory argument, Aristotle sets the primacy of expediency – the good and the useful are the ultimate goal of the state community, although at the same time they are the starting point for the need to create a state for the functions of defence, cooperation, consolidation of national identity, etc. Both practical observation and idealism affirming the highest good can thus be reconciled.

From the assumptions of Aristotle's philosophical system, more detailed political solutions and issues arise. According to him, state systems are "the framing into a certain order of powers in general and, above all, of a supreme power over them all. This supreme authority is everywhere the government of the state, and therefore the state system is expressed in the government. This is what I mean by the fact that, for example, in democratic states the people hold supreme power, while in oligarchic states, on the contrary, a small number of people do. Thus we say that in these cases the regimes are different (…)" (Aristotle, Politics, 2001). According to Aristotle's hylemorphism, the definition of a state and its political system can be considered in terms of matter and form, where the properties of a state such as its surface area, location, population, etc. are its material features, while its political system is its formal feature. The form (eidos) is the essential constitutive element of an entity, in this case a state, and it is this that determines its essence, i.e. defines its definition. The fact that a state is described as such and not as another political system depends on the form that exists beforehand and makes it possible to determine what the state actually is. Individual regimes like democracy, oligarchy, monarchy, as well as their combinations, are valued by Aristotle according to the extent to which they realise the highest good. Against this

background, extreme formations, based on a single social stratum, which are mainly guided by the good of those in power, fare worst. This is, according to Aristotle, a perversion of the supreme idea of the state; such regimes include tyranny (tyrannís), oligarchy (oligarchía) and democracy (demokratía). The philosopher, on the other hand, counted the kingdom (basileía), aristocracy (aristokratía) and politeia (politeía) or otherwise timocracy (timokratía) among the proper systems. The unequal distribution of wealth in the absence of a vision of the overall good of the state leads to degeneration and degeneracy of regimes, in which case benefits accrue either to the individual or to a few, or to a particular stratum of society.

Although Aristotle has his preference for a political system (according to him, a combination of democracy and oligarchy is the best), he accepts that the political system of each state is a product of its specific historical and cultural conditions. Regimes are understood in a dynamic dimension; hence Aristotle's interest is focused more on regime change and the factors ensuring the permanence of particular types of regime, rather than pointing to a single version of the ideal state. It does not follow from Aristotle's theory that democracy is the right system for every state, nevertheless it is certainly one of the basic models of state device, approaching the optimal system, i.e., the polytheia. In the Politics, Aristotle illustrates what the device of a polytheia consists in, i.e. the best of states using 'intermediate' solutions, e.g. taking over from oligarchic rule the principle of filling posts by election, and from democracy the fact that this does not depend on a wealth censor (Aristotle, Politics, 2001).

2.3. The image of Athenian democracy

The model of the democratic system for Aristotle was, best known to him, the democracy of Athens. For Western culture to this day, it is the most representative example of classical direct democracy. The history of Greek democracy can be traced back to the reforms of Solon, who in 594 BC undertook to resolve a political and economic crisis (Aristotle, The political system of Athens, transl, 1973). We know from Homer's Iliad and Odyssey that Greece had previously had a monarchical system of government. This gradually developed into the rule of an aristocracy, the archons (archon). Solon abolished the privilege of birth, replacing it with a property census based on land ownership, and introduced the rule of the council as the highest administrative authority, composed of 400 members (representing each stratum of Athenian society). This ensured that even the poorest class of the population had a say in the People's Assembly and the People's Courts.

Many factors shaped the democratic identity of Greek society, these included the transformation of agrarian society into an urban, commercial one. The insular nature of Greece was of great importance, which determined the sailing of the seas and the crossing of the Aegean area. The specific geopolitical conditions meant that the Greeks did not seek to concentrate power or create superpower structures to ensure their security. The high mobility of Greek society, resulting from the pursuit of colonising adjacent territories, gave rise to cultural diffusion, and encouraged the formation of new social groups: merchants, soldiers, craftsmen. These conditions gradually developed a far-reaching isonomy (equality) in Greek society (Słupik T., 2017). The tendency towards isonomy of the lower classes could not be blocked by the autocratic (tyrannical) governments introduced from time to time. Thus, 'the dynamics of the transformations described, resulting in increasing social differentiation, a rich array of new possibilities for action, led to the emergence of a new type of political consciousness based on a model of distributed power. This was of fundamental importance for the emerging political order' (Słupik T., 2017). This model proved fertile for non-political activity, trade, crafts, spiritual culture, sport, and shipping flourished. Increased activity was manifested by the middle and low classes, with whom the aristocratic circles had to reckon, and it was democracy that became the result of a compromised public order. It became in the interests of the upper classes to work out a more equitable distribution of wealth,

inhibiting rebellions, and allowing the emancipation of the less wealthy. The expression of legal protection for the lower classes undoubtedly proved to be the far-sighted reforms of Solon and Cleisthenes.

Following Solon's reform work, Athens took an important step towards democracy, although it did not introduce it de facto. As a result of the contest between three parties: the conservative right, the left of the smallholder highlanders and the centre party, the tyranny of Pisistratus, who had ambitions to establish a hereditary monarchy, won out for the time being. This was put to an end by the assassination of his successors and the establishment of a republic with an even territorial division, weakening the traditional family-tribal structure. The next reformer Cleisthenes based his reform on the middle class, the symbol of its power became the famous victory at Marathon, but it was not until Pericles that the principle of payment of offices was introduced, making it possible for even the poorest to participate in government. From Pericles' changes dates the real democratic system in Athens.

The term democracy means government by the people (demos), in ancient Athens this referred to citizens i.e., people with full civil rights, men enrolled in one of the Attic municipalities, whose parents, both father and mother, were native Athenians. Women, slaves and freedmen, as well as foreigners living in the city, in other words fellow citizens (metoicans) (Aristotle was also a metoist in Athens.), did not enjoy citizenship rights. Every citizen over the age of twenty could participate in the People's Assembly and decide the fate of the state. The experience of adjudicating in assemblies (ekklesia), meeting four times a month, where at least six thousand people made political decisions together, was for every citizen a concretised social participation: "The Greek apprehended his city-state not abstractly, but quite concretely, and on more than one occasion, having stepped out onto the Acropolis, he could cover the entire territory of his microscopic city-state with his eyes, right up to its border ramparts. This is why the concept of parliamentary representation never occurred to the Greeks" (Kumaniecki K., 1948). The most important decisions of political importance, judgements on war or peace-making, international policy, the size of the military contingent, the granting of citizenship rights and a host of others were taken with the direct participation of the people. Restrictions on popular power were virtually non-existent, constituting a kind of omnipotence. The People's Assembly was convened approximately every 10 days, while the Council, elected by lot, was the permanent deliberative body.

Already in its origins, the democratic system developed institutions to ensure its continuance and protection. In ancient Athens, this included the 'shell court' – a kind of safeguard against an attack on the democratic system, which was more an expression of the Athenian people's fear of absolute power (absolutum dominium). It consisted of an annual popular vote; anyone with the right to vote could then write on a clay shell the name of a citizen who seemed to them to be dangerous to the state. If the name was on 6,000 shells, a sentence of expulsion from Athens was passed. In fact, more often than intended, this institution of social ostracism had the opposite effect, and prominent politicians such as Themistocles were not infrequently its victims (Kumaniecki K., 1948). Another device was election by lot, a keenly used means of implementing the principle of equality in Athenian democracy. As a result of the draw of lots, most offices were filled in Athens, with the exception of some military and treasury posts, elected by open ballot by a show of hands. However, the greatest expression of the democratic nature of power was collegiality: the multiplicity of offices meant that power could be distributed among many people. The supreme authority in the state consisted of nine archons and this college was severely limited, its powers being reduced to administrative, judicial, and priestly authority. Almost all state functions were carried out collegially, usually with nine people representing all social strata. The selection of these collegia was done by lot from among those who applied themselves.

Not all principles of Athenian democracy were universally accepted and were criticised by some of the nobility and the intellectual elite derived from it. In Plato's dialogue entitled The

Politician, the critical words are stated: "That never a multitude, of whatever sort of people it may be composed, will attain such knowledge and be unable to manage reasonably in the state" (Plato, Politics, transl, 1956). Plato would have been happiest to see philosophers rather than the people at the head of the state, as he wrote about in his State. There he likens democracy to a human being who, although beautiful and shimmering with different colours: "he lives from day to day, thus indulging every desire that comes his way. Sometimes he gets drunk and gets intoxicated by the music of the flutes, sometimes he drinks only water and loses weight, sometimes he takes up gymnastics, sometimes he does nothing at all and cares for nothing, and then he supposedly takes up philosophy. He often takes to politics, gets carried away, says the same thing, and does the same thing. If he sometimes starts to envy some military people, he throws himself in that direction, and if he envies those who make money, he throws himself in that direction again. Neither some order nor necessity is present in his life" (Plato, The State. With the addition of the seven books of the Laws, transl, 1958). The disorder accompanying democracy was deplored in antiquity, perceived as less able to respond quickly to threats in the face of wars and crises, which would have been better handled by a state with centralised power. Monarchical sentiments resonated in the speeches of Demosthenes, a prominent democrat, criticising the lengthiness of Athenian debates, but mainly in the voices of the opponents of democracy: "It is precisely in the people that indecision and meanness are greatest, for poverty, as well as the lack of education and upbringing caused by it, leads people rather to evil", wrote one critic (Kumaniecki K., Warsaw 1948). The hasty decisions of the People's Assembly, influenced by the speeches of politicians deliberately taking advantage of the prevailing mood among the people, nicknamed 'demagogues', are precisely an example of the vagaries of the machinery of democracy. In Athens, the mechanism of democracy was even blamed for Athens' defeat in the Peloponnesian War. This was compounded by the lack of a positive alternative to democracy during the short-lived rule of the aristocracy in 411 and 401 BC, full of police terror and external support by the hated Sparta. The Athenian democratic system that followed was gradually degraded. Reforms that heavily shallowed ideas of equality, such as the introduction of allowances for participation in the ecclesia, proved decisive. Athenian democracy was unable to effectively counteract the growing crisis following the Peloponnesian War and the internal chaos, ultimately demonstrating its impotence in the face of oncoming Macedonian power.

2.4. Conditions for the functioning of a democratic system according to Aristotle

The emergence of Athenian democracy necessitated the theoretical elaboration of the operating principles of a new model of public order, as well as the foundations of a new type of civic identity. The relationship between rights and economics (distribution of wealth) played a great role here, and within this framework the virtues of justice and wisdom grew in importance. Citizens' expectations of sanctioned law coincided with the formation of a civic consciousness of complicity in governance and the realisation of democratic values in the name of the common good. Athenian citizens "were thus becoming capable of adopting attitudes of solidarity based on the equality that had just been established. (...) The orientation of many citizens towards politics created a previously unknown space in which they could feel themselves to be citizens who identified with a place, formulating expectations both of themselves and of the institutions that had just been established. Politics was becoming a completely pioneering area that had a public meaning, was based on certain values, in which group and individual interests were present, ambitions were bubbling. In this new space, citizens were able to move freely on the basis of elaborated rules. The emerging public sphere of citizenship produced a completely new model of identification, of belonging to a place where previously, however, personal relations between enemy and friend or blood ties had dominated" (Słupik T., 2017). The breakthrough of the new social arrangements required a gradual getting used to the institutions and tools of democracy, as well as the observation and study of its functioning in

terms of the operation of the community as a whole and of the state in the space of international contacts. The efficiency of individual institutions, laws and devices required elaboration[1]. Aristotle's socio-political theory is a response to these needs. The fact that it was written at the declining moment of Athenian democracy makes it material for valuing prototypes of democratic devices, contributing to a better understanding of the operation of the momentous 'experiment' that was the Athenian system in its time. But the viability and development of any state is determined by a spectrum of internal and external factors. The defeat of Athens did not unequivocally derail the achievements of the democratic system. The direct democracy created by the Greeks became an unprecedented example of the creation of a new model of social engagement and a new type of social consciousness. In practice, it was followed by the development of appropriate political institutions and the need to create a whole new range of concepts or even a new social theory.

Aristotle's mature conception seeks to detect and describe the factors of state duration, taking into account both the phenomena happening in a given society and describing their structure – the way they are organised. Aristotle's socio-political theory does not deviate fundamentally from his metaphysical position. Aristotle seeks the determinants of social life in the universe of principles governing social life, which is ethics. Political life is only one way of acquiring virtue – conceived as an end in itself, and the state is meant to serve this end. However, Aristotle's contemporaries' modes of organising the state community understood and embraced this ideal to a small extent: 'some of them – like Sparta – aimed at military victory; others aimed at mercantile wealth; but most had no specific goal. Nevertheless, each appealed to some conception (largely unarticulated, operational) of the right individual as citizen whose character and conduct best served the preservation of the community and its way of life' (Galston W., transl, 1999). Thus, in Aristotle's theory, systematic analysis and testing of opinions are an essential component of the pursuit of ethical-political knowledge, with the most practical aim possible, which is to improve the functioning of the state within the framework of the prevailing system. Greek political theory does not separate the individual good from the communal good; it sees a connection between the perfection of each citizen and the perfection of the state, and assumes that the closer a person approaches eudaimonia, the better he or she will function in the community and the better the community will become as a whole. For example, valour – the readiness to fight in defence of one's country, in which one may die – is an individual attribute that is also a political virtue. Similar considerations apply to other virtues such as loyalty, justice, friendship or, fundamental among them, obedience to the law.

Democratic states are guided by a specific type of virtue, and it is virtues conceived in an instrumental way that are considered as a means to preserve democratic societies and institutions. In Book VI of the Politics, Aristotle considers how best to set up a democratic state, how to sanction by law the ideas of: equality, freedom and justice: "law in democratic terms consists in taking a number, not a value, as the basis of equality. And if one puts the law in this way, the crowd is necessarily the deciding factor and what the majority enacts is ultimately settled and is thus the law. For they say that each citizen must have equal rights, with the result that in democracies, the poor are more important than the rich; after all, they represent the majority, and that which the majority enacts has the force of law" (Aristotle, Politics, VI, 1317 b). Democracy is defined as a community with a significant degree of relevant institutions and characteristics, contemporaries include: a universal constitutional court; a society recognising pluralistic valuation; a predominantly market economy; a protected sphere of privacy and individual entitlement (Galston W., transl, 1999). Aristotle in the Politics lists the following known devices of a democratic state:

---

[1] Athenian democracy was not the first democracy in the history of mankind; however, its importance for Western civilisation and especially for modern democracies, which regard its achievements as the foundation of a liberal political culture, should be emphasised.

"All officials are elected from among everyone.

Everyone lords over everyone and everyone over everyone in turn.

Offices are filled by lot and that, either all of them or those which do not require any particular experience or skills.

Offices are not subject to any wealth censuses, or only to a very low one.

No office may be held twice by the same person, or only a few times or in a few cases, with the exception of military posts.

Offices are short-lived (...).

Judges shall be everyone, or they shall be appointed from among everyone (...)

The People's Assembly decides on all matters, or at least on the most important ones (...)" (Aristotle, Politics, VI, 1317 b).

Aristotle then goes on to distinguish between four types of democracy that can exist in individual states: 1) a democracy in which government depends on a low property censure, but the loss of property is equivalent to the loss of access to office; 2) a democracy in which all citizens can take part in government if they are unprincipled, but otherwise the law rules; 3) all citizens can take part in government, but the lack of the necessary income to do so makes it necessary for the law to rule; 4) the same principles apply, only power is exercised by the people and not by the law. The last-mentioned democracy represents the most perfect form of democracy, the highest offices being held in it by the consent of the people by the ablest and most prominent citizens (Aristotle, Politics, VI, 1318 b).

Since Aristotle is particularly concerned with the problem of the permanence and preservation of regimes, the issue that requires attention is everything that ensures the continuity of a given formation. Here, let us formulate indications on the basis of Aristotle's general recommendations, having regard to basically every political community. The generality is dictated by a certain distance from specific examples, since Aristotle makes a distinction between the degree of precision and generality of judgements that can be expected in mathematical and logical discourse, and in political and moral discourse. Even the best conception of political philosophy must expect a high degree of generality if it is to be a practical science:

- The rule of law – Aristotle believes that rights should be exercised, customs should be taken into account and balance should be sought, which is a fundamental condition for sustainability. Every state should establish a high status for the rule of law, as the rule of law is a condition for the permanence of the polity, and the observance of the law is as much about ordinary citizens as it is about the system makers (Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, I, 1094b; Galston W., transl, 1999).

- The search for the "golden mean" – An ever-present strand of Aristotelian ethics is the avoidance of extremes, so a polity should temper its own extremes and seek compromise solutions. In a democratic system, the essence of its sustainability is not to gravitate towards extreme democracy, but to enrich itself with elements of oligarchy; a mixed system brings it closer to the perfect system, the polytheia.

- Isonomy – the permanence of the regime is ensured by equality of rights, the realisation of the idea of distributive justice, awarding to each what is due to him "according to merit" should be the dominant feature of the community. In a democratic system, such a criterion is liberty; in an oligarchy, wealth or good birth; in an aristocracy, it is ethical courage. For Aristotle, a moderate democracy based on the middle class is the best political system. He writes more about it in the Politics, presenting the polytheia, or perfect state (Narecki K., 1994).[2] In states where the middle class is predominant, the political system can be more durable thanks to the intermediate state, as it balances the extremes of the poor and the rich. The permanence of the system is guaranteed

---

[2] Aristotle uses the term 'polytheia' in two senses, it is the perfect state, the best possible system, in the second sense it is any state system.

here, according to Aristotle, by the low probability of the extreme social classes joining together against the middle layer (Aristotle, Politics, 2001).

- Education – Aristotle states: "The most important thing, however, for ensuring the permanence of regimes, more important than all that has been mentioned here, though today everywhere neglected, is education adapted to the regime" (Aristotle, Politics, V, 1310 a). If a political system is not grounded in customs and traditions, it cannot be counted on to last, the philosopher goes on to proclaim. By education, Aristotle means both the education of the young and the socialisation of adults. The profoundly humanistic pedagogical thought of the Greeks grew out of the conviction that human predispositions should be nurtured, for everyone is born equipped with a whole range of potential abilities. Some of an individual's predispositions should be developed, others abandoned, such as the capacity for cruelty. It becomes the duty of the state to educate its citizens according to the principle – the better the citizens, the better the state as a whole. In this way, ethical courage (arete) can be considered a civic virtue; besides the obvious individual benefits, it has a social significance. The formation of civic awareness and social influence was seen in practical skills, especially in the art of speech. It is a mode of wider influence that nowadays fills the media space. "Rhetoric is, as it were, an offshoot of dialectics and from that kind of ethical study which may rightly be called politics," (Aristotle, Rhetoric I, 1356 a; Słupik T., 2017) – wrote Aristotle – which is why, as an important part of civic education, it provides the tools to defend the system and the permanence of the state.

- Consent – the preservation of the polity depends to a large extent on the concord and co-existence of the citizens themselves; it is on them that the duty of social unity rests, of which the philosopher writes in the Nicomachean Ethics: "on the other hand, one speaks of concord in a state when its citizens hold the same views, on what is useful to them, aim at the same goals and act in accordance with jointly adopted resolutions. Consent, therefore, is said to be between people in respect of what is to be done, and between them in respect of that which is of great importance and may be enjoyed by two opposing parties or [even] by all (...) Consent, therefore, is friendship among fellow citizens and is usually regarded as such, since it concerns what is useful and what belongs to life" (Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, transl, 2007). From this it can be seen that Aristotle understands the state as a caring community grounded in shared moral convictions and nurturing a particular way of life (Galston W., transl, 1999). The extent to which the citizens themselves accept the primacy of the good determines the moral condition of the state, which is why Aristotle makes the condition: 'Such agreement prevails among righteous men; for these agree with themselves and one another, being, so to speak, of one disposition (for the will of such men is always directed towards the same thing and is not a plaything of opposite currents like [water] in a strait of the sea' (Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, IX, 1167 b). If there is no consensus, the functioning of the whole system can be disrupted and even changed by a coup. In a democracy, the causes of upheaval are most often, according to Aristotle:

a) an erroneous understanding of distributive justice, based on the principle of proportional equality;

b) because of the wrong selection (composition) of citizens, not as many as necessary for the people to have the upper hand;

c) because of the impoverishment of the masses; d) because of the debauchery of demagogues, putting personal interest before the good of the whole (Banaszczyk T., Studies in Aristotle's Socio-Political Theory, 1985). The instability of the democratic system was already recognised in antiquity; Plato too pointed out that it tended to develop into its opposite.

a clear vision of the goal – the state of internal security of the state is a complex phenomenon, sometimes the seeds of change and upheaval become difficult to detect: "Disorders arise not about small things, but from small things, the object of the struggle, however, is great things" (Aristotle, Politics, V, 1303). A credible theory of the good, implemented in a democratic

state, must take such situations into account and should therefore focus on the goals of the state and not on the emotional states of which the crowd is capable in its collective experiences.

3. Conclusion

Throughout history, many theorists and researchers have relied on Aristotle's social theory, drawing on his classical definition of man as a social being. The achievement of this theory is certainly the recognition of the dynamics of social phenomena and processes, the treatment of politics as a practical science, linked to virtue ethics, education, and the formation of attitudes. These are all elementary assumptions of the science of the state, also serving contemporary philosophers of politics and representatives of the social sciences. According to Aristotle's theory, the permanence of a polity is a qualitative factor, largely determining the identity of the state. Aristotle's reception of democracy itself can be described as largely objective, containing universal elements, despite the fact that, after all, it comes from the ancient world and takes into account its realities. Aristotle draws attention to the proper device of democracy, so that it resists upheaval but also approaches polytheia – the ideal of the state as understood by Aristotle. Many of these solutions are already historical anachronisms today, and it is therefore impossible to equate direct Athenian democracy, which was Aristotle's model, with modern democracies. Yet the accuracy of systematisation, that is, the famous grouping and ordering by genus and species, the precise conceptual construction starting from the language of discourse to then give a definition, that is, the whole research methodology, have permanently entered the compendium of science, including the social sciences. Aristotle's discovery is to see the general phenomenon of the impermanence of regimes and the reasons for their transformation, and to attempt to systematise the problems involved. In studying the democratic system, Aristotle does not limit himself to describing models of democracy but seeks improvement solutions to ensure its sustainability. He sees them in a mixed system based on the middle class, in a combination of rule by the people and oligarchy. More than two thousand years later, a similar model of democratic government has spread as a positive model almost all over the world. It should not escape notice that the modern model of democracy has evolved towards and is gravitating decidedly more towards the oligarchic. Once again, Aristotle's realism has proved to be extremely far-reaching. This only highlights the research value of the philosopher's concept, seeking above all moderation and a 'middle way'. In his Nicomachean Ethics, Aristotle invoked one of the architects of Athenian democracy in defining human happiness, which is not just an individual matter but the goal of the state, "is a man reasonably equipped with external goods, who has nevertheless performed the most morally beautiful – in Solon's opinion – deeds and shown himself to be temperate in life". Perhaps, following Aristotle, the virtue of moderation should be incorporated into the cross-section of liberal political values for the benefit of the sustainability of democracy and the citizens who participate in its achievements.

4. Funding

5. Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, translated by. Daniela Gromska, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2007.

Список використаних джерел

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, translated by. Daniela Gromska, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2007.

Aristotle, *Letter to Alexander the Great*, translated by. Bogumiła Świstalska, in: the same, Complete Works, vol. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2001.

Aristotle, *Politics*, translated by. Ludwik Piotrowicz, in: the same, Complete Works, vol. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2001.

Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, translated by. Henryk Podbielski, in: the same, Complete Works, vol. 6, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 2001.

Aristotle, *The political system of Athens*, translated by. Ludwik Piotrowicz, PWN, Warsaw 1973.

Aristotle, *Testament*, translated by. W. Olszewski, in: the same, Complete Works, vol. 6, PWN Scientific Publishers, Warsaw 2001.

Banaszczyk T., *Studies in Aristotle's social and political theory*, Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, Katowice 1985.

Galston W., *The goals of liberalism*, transl. A. Pawelec, Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy Znak, Warsaw 1999.

Hull Z., *Scientific theory, its cognitive status and functions*, "Humanities Sketches", vol. 3, no. 1-2, 2003, pp. 123-137.

Kumaniecki K., *Athenian Democracy,* Państwowe Zakłady Wydawnictw Szkolnych, Warsaw 1948.

Leśniak K., *Aristotle*, Wiedza Powszechna, Warsaw 1989.

Plato, The State. With the addition of the seven books of the Laws, transl. W. Witwicki, PWN, Warsaw 1958.

Plato, *Politics*, translated by. W. Witwicki, in The Sophist, The Politician, PWN, Warsaw 1956.

Dictionary of Aristotelian Terms, compiled by. K. Narecki, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warsaw 1994.

Słupik T., *The birth of democracy in classical Greece at the time of the reform of Cleisthenes and Pericles,* "Studia Politicae Universitatis Silesiensis" 2017, Vol. 19, pp. 35-68.