
Concept of State in Western Political Thought: A Study of the Views of Kant and Hegel

Kafeel Ahmad Bhat

Research Scholar (Ph.D) Punjabi University, Patiala

ABSTRACT

This research endeavors to provide a comprehensive examination of the historical evolution and divergent perspectives concerning the concept of the State within the realm of Western political thought. The focal point of this study lies in an in-depth exploration of the ideologies presented by two eminent philosophers, Immanuel Kant and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. By meticulously analyzing their seminal works, this research aims to elucidate Kant's Idealistic theory, which underscores the State's absolute authority, stemming from its divine sanction. Conversely, it delves into Hegel's German idealism, wherein the State is envisioned as the zenith of individual liberty and the fulfillment of societal structures. Through this comparative analysis, this study seeks to illuminate the stark contrasts in their ideologies, offering insights into their profound impact on the trajectory of Western political theory. Furthermore, it aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the conceptualization of the State as not only a political entity but also a moral and societal institution of substantial significance.

KEY WORDS: *State, Ideologies, Theory, Society, Idealism, Liberty.*

INTRODUCTION

Western political thought concentrates principally on the history of the west and different issues confronting it. Political thought began with the Greeks. Its origin is associated with the calm and clear rationalism of the Greek mind. Man is a rational creature and has shown affinity to understand himself and institutions around him. He has started studying the physics, biological and social environmental and indulged theories about them. These speculations like State, its nature, purpose, functions, etc., have occupied important position in man's life. This speculation about the different problems connected with the State is generally designated, as political thought is as old as the State itself. Political thought is about the State, its structure, nature, and purpose. It is nothing but "the moral phenomena of human behaviour in society". It follows not much explanation of the occurrence of State as a justification of its continuation. The questions that political thought is forever stressed to answer are; what is State? Why we should obey it? What are the proper limits of authority and when may we refuse to obey it?

What is the State and why should we obey it? Simply there are two ways to define it. First, the State is an organism, organ or body of which men themselves are parts, it is actual and they are merely obstacles. The other is that, it is an instrument, which men produce for their resolutions. Political thought developed as a branch of philosophy in search of the principles of political community and the best way to govern it. The Organized States appeared first in the form of Greek cities. The next stage of development of political ideas occurred with the

confrontation between the church and the State in the medieval period and it was after the renaissance that people caught the attention of political theory as a result; ideas of limited government and democracy took place.

ORIGIN OF THE STATE

While trying to analyse the origin of State, Aristotle attempts at tracing it from two angles; Historical and Psychological.

Historical Origin of State:

Aristotle talks first of the family. To him, family is an association of husband, wife, children, and slaves, which is claimed to have been established by nature for the supply of their needs and wants. Of course, man and woman are complementary help contributory necessity to each other. They have no doubt a natural desire to continue their race by leaving behind them the image of themselves (children). The man is intended by nature to rule. If he lacks the power of foresight necessary to place himself as a ruler, he is meant to work with his body and so a slave. He of course needs others help for self-preservation. This is the position and composition of the family. The union of several families to aim at something more than the supply of daily needs makes a village. Similarly, when several villages come together to the extent of making self-sufficient and continuing its existence for the sake of good life, the State is born.

Psychological origin of the State:

Man is a political animal by nature. He has an end to achieve a good life_ physically, mentally, and morally. Since he is distinct from other beings by his rational nature. The instinct in man, since he is rational being, has driven him to live in a society. The family in which men live and the village, which has a collection of families, are incapable of supplying the material need. So men are compelled by nature to form a State, which alone has power and position to supply adequately material needs, together with providing them with facilities for mental and moral development. It is, thus, that man could develop himself only in the State. The State, therefore, “stands as the highest of all communities and embraces them all.”ⁱⁱ

DEFINING THE STATE

Introduction to the State tends, unremarkably, to begin by addressing the question of definition. The importance of defining the State is all the greater given that, as Dunleavy and O’ Leary note, “the State is not a material object, it is a conceptual abstraction.”ⁱⁱ As John A. Hall and G. John Ikenberry note in the useful introduction to the term, “most of human history has not been graced by the presence of States, it is only since the seventeenth century that human history has been graced by the concept of State.”ⁱⁱⁱ Etymologically, the notion of the State is derived from the Latin *Status* meaning literally social status, stature or standing, specifically of an individual within a community.^{iv} In the modern conception of the State, that still dominates contemporary State theory is indeed, the definition given by Max Weber, a famous German sociologist, who sought to evolve a ‘sociologist’ definition of State. As he said, “State cannot be defined in terms of its ends but he saw the State in terms of its organization and deployment of the means of coercion and physical force.” As he explained, “a political organization with continuous operations will be called a “State”.^v According to

Gramsci, “all those institutions and practices through which ruling class succeeds in maintaining the consensual subordination of those over whom it rules.”^{vi}

The word State has its origin in the Latin word *Status* which means ‘standing’ or ‘position’ of a person or a body of persons. The word State came to be understood during the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries, identical with the terms ‘sovereign’ or ‘king’.^{vii} The State has included from the beginning a reference to a land and a people. These references are also included when we use terms like Country, Nation, or Society. The State is one must be sure, neither country nor nation nor even society. When we speak of country, we enter the domain of soil, climate, seasons, and boundaries, and in short, all geography. Therefore, the word country is less a geographical term. The word State on the contrary, is primarily a political concept. A people living in a territory with a high degree of unity among the people, may be a State. If it is sovereign, it is a State and if it is under the dominance of another country, it is not the State. Unity in the nation is sought on grounds of emotions and their oneness, while in the State; unity is sought on the grounds of laws.^{viii} The State is peculiarly a politico-legal body responsible primarily for the enforcement and maintenance of law and order. Harold J. Laski had a definite point, which he had said, “the State is, for the purpose of practical administration, the government.”^{ix} A State is territorially organized, so it is called a country. A State signs the ballads of nationalism, so it is proclaimed as a nation. A State speaks for common values, traditions, and culture, so it is termed as a society. This is how the State comes to be used interchangeably for terms like country, nation, and society. A State can always claim the advantages associated with country, nation, or society whereas none of these can embark upon the State for similar gains. This is where the peculiar importance of the State lies.^x The State has what the country, nation, and the society do not possess. The State is supreme, supreme all over the associations settled on its domain. Its laws not only bind the individuals but also other associations.^{xi} The theory of State, therefore, is the theory that explains the appearance and growth of the institutions, which play their role in managing people’s affairs. It is a theory that explains the nature of political authority, the nature of law and the nature of objects for which these institutions of the State system exist. It is a theory that explains as to how the rulers would come to govern the people and to what ends.

A GENERAL CONCEPTION OF STATE

The conception of the State has to do with the nature and essential characteristics of actual States. The conception of the State can only be discovered by history; the idea of the State is called up by philosophical thought. The universal conception of the State is recognised when the many actual States, which have appeared in the world’s history, have been survived, and their common characteristics discovered. The highest ideal of the State is beheld when the tendency of human nature to political society is considered, and the highest conceivable and possible development of this tendency is regarded as the political end of humankind.^{xii} First, it is clear that in every State, a number of men are combined. In particular, States, the number may be very different, some embracing only a few thousand, others many millions; but we cannot talk of a State until we get beyond the circle of a single-family, and until a multitude of men (i.e., families, men, women and children) are united together. However, a real State cannot be formed until the single family has broken up into a series of families. Without a tribe, without a nation, there is no State. Secondly, a permanent relation of the people to the soil is necessary for the continuance of the State. The State requires its territory, nation, and

country to go together. Nomadic people, although they have chiefs to command them and law to govern them, have not yet reached the full condition of States until they have a fixed adobe. The Hebrew people received a political training from Moses, but were not a State until Joshua settled them in Palestine.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STATE

The concept of State has figured a central theme of traditional political theory. R.G. Gettel defined “political science as the science of the State” while as J.W. Garner claims, “political science begins and ends with the State.”^{xiii} It is significant that though some sort of political organization has existed since ancient times, such as Greek city-States and the Roman Empire, yet the concept of State as such is comparatively modern. The contemporary concept of the State owes its origin to Machiavelli, an Italian political thinker who expressed this idea in the early 16th century as, “the power which has authority over men” is termed as State.^{xiv} State is sometimes used to mean ‘political regime’ strictly speaking, though the term designates only regimes that invest supreme authority over particular territories or populations in a unified set of ultimately coercive institutions. So conceived, the State emerged in the west, where it came to supersede the more diffuse political structures of European feudalism.^{xv} Various definitions of the State have been appeared since the days of Ancient Greeks. There are, therefore, as many meanings of the State, as there are theorists who venture to define it. It is necessary to mention here some definitions by different western political thinkers that show as to how they have looked at this concept.

SOME DEFINITIONS OF THE STATE

- For Plato, “a State is a system of relationship in which everyone does his own business and where the job of the ruler is to maintain and even promote such relationships.”^{xvi}
- Aristotle defines the State in his politics as “an association of households and villages sharing in a life of virtue, and aiming at an end, which consists in perfect and self-complete existence.”^{xvii}
- A great thinker of Christian age, St. Augustine’s definition of the State as “a multitude of rational beings associated together in the harmonious enjoyment of that which they love”, a multitude of men brought together into some bound of agreement or a harmonious multitude of men.^{xviii}
- According to Nicola Machiavelli, “the State is an end in itself; social justice has no meaning for him apart from the great end of the salvation of the country.”^{xix} State according to Machiavelli is not a natural association in the sense in which Plato and Aristotle used the term, but arises because men find it necessary and useful for security of life and property and that its method must, in the last resort, be that of force and fear.^{xx}
- John Locke basis his State on the will of the individual who owns natural rights prior to the formation of the State. According to him, “the solemn duty of the State is to

preserve and protect the property and property rights of every member of the society upto the point at least where no harm was done to others.”^{xxi}

- Jean Jacques Rousseau speaks of the State, saying, “this public person, so formed by the union of all other persons, formerly took the name of a city, and now takes that of Republic or body politic; it is called by its Members_ State.”^{xxii}
- Jeremy Bentham, the founder of Utilitarianism, describes the State as “a law making body by a group of persons organized for the promotion and maintenance of happiness and acting through law to that end.”^{xxiii}
- Thomas Hill Green defines the State as “a body of persons, recognised by each other as having rights and possessing certain institutions for the maintenance of those rights.”^{xxiv}
- Karl Marx regarded the State as “the political organization of the class dominant in an economy whose purpose is to safeguard the existing order and consider the State as a means that has originated to protect the interests of the possessive class.”^{xxv}
- R.M. Maclever sought to distinguish the State from other kinds of associations in that “it embraces the whole of people in a specific territory and it has the special function of maintaining social order. It performs its function through its agent, the government that speaks with the voice of law.”^{xxvi}
- Frederick M.Watkins defines the State as “a geographical delimited segment of human society united by common obedience to a single sovereign.”^{xxvii}
- Geoffrey K.Roberts has tried to evolve a working definition of the State as “a territorial area in which a population is governed by a set of political authorities, and which successfully claims the compliance of the citizenry for its laws and is able to secure such compliance by its monopolistic control of legitimate force.”^{xxviii}
- Maclever, an American socialist, believes that “State is one of the associations among many others although it exercises functions of a unique character. He traces the origin of the State through the family, the institution of property, customary law, war, and conquest.”^{xxix}

ELEMENTS OF THE STATE

In the light of various definitions of the State, it is customary to identify the State by its fundamental elements, which include Population, Territory, Government, and Sovereignty.

- **Population:** The State is a human institution. The population is, therefore, an essential element of the State. However, the population can constitute a State only when it is united by the condition of interdependence, consciousness of common interest, and general regard for a set of common rules of behaviour and institutions. The population of a State needs not to belong to a single race, religion, language or culture. A homogenous population is no longer considered as an essential feature of the modern State, which claims to reconcile the interests of various groups of its citizens.

- **Territory:** Territory is another essential element of a State. Other associations either exist within the State or extend their sphere to several States, they do not need separate territory but the State must possess a territory where its authority is accepted without any dispute or challenge. A State comes into existence only when its population is settled in a fixed territory. The territory of State includes the land, water, and air space within its boundary. Territory symbolizes the sphere of sovereignty of the State. Territory provides for natural resources for the substance of the population of the State. Territory provides for a sense of security and immense opportunities for a fuller life for its residents; it is an object of sentimental attachment. People love and worship their motherland and are prepared to make supreme sacrifices for the protection and maintenance of the territorial integrity of their State.
- **Government:** Government is still another essential element of State. According to J.W. Garner in (Political science and government), “ government is the agency or machinery through which common policies are determined and by which common policies are determined and by which common affairs are regulated and common interests promoted.” If the State represents an abstract concept, the government is its concrete form. In other words, the government performs the authority of the State also.
- **Sovereignty:** Finally, sovereignty also constitutes an essential element of the State. Sovereignty denotes the supreme or ultimate power of the State to make laws or take political decisions, establishing public goals, fixing priorities, and resolving conflicts_ as also enforcing such laws and decisions by the use of legitimate force. Sovereignty denotes the final authority of the State over its population and territory. The State continues to exist so long as it is armed with sovereignty because of internal revolt or external aggression.^{xxx}

THEORIES ON THE ORIGIN OF THE STATE

The question about the rise of the State may be considered from two different points of view. Our intention may be either to examine the conditions and circumstances from which actual States have arisen or to discover the necessary cause, which lies at the basis of all States, which are Law and Justice. The first question is for history to answer; the second is for theory. History differentiates the different forms in which the State arises according to the various events. While as theory starts with the unity of the conception of the State, which requires also a unity of origin. Therefore, it is necessary to have a brief note regarding the origin of the State and the theories that developed time by time regarding the origin of the State.

Divine origin theory: The conception of the divine creation of the State may be traced back to ancient times. It was universal belief with the ancient people that the king is the representative of God on earth and the State is the bliss of God. Thus, the king had both political and religious entities. This is also regarded as the oldest theory about the origin of the State. The exponents of this theory believe that State did not come into being by any effort of man but God creates it. The king, who rules over the State, is an agent of God on earth. The king derives his authority from God alone. Obedience to the king is ordained to

God and violence of it will be a sin. The king is above law and no subject has any right to question his authority or his action. The king is responsible to God alone.^{xxxii}

Patriarchal theory: The principle exponent of this theory is Sir Henry Maine. According to him, the State is an accumulation of several families, which developed under the control, and authority of the eldest male member of the family. Edward Jenks, who is also a proponent of this theory, is of the view that the foundation of the State was caused by three factors_ male kingship, permanent marriages, and paternal authority. Through the process of marriage, families began to expand and they gave birth to gen which stands for a household. Several gens made one clan. A group of clans constitutes a tribe, confederation of various tribes based on blood relations for defending themselves against the aggressors formed one commonwealth, which is called the State.^{xxxiii}

Matriarchal theory: According to this theory, there was never a patriarchal family in the primitive society, and that the family came into existence only when the institution of permanent marriage was in trend. However, among the primitive society, instead of permanent marriage there was a sort sexual anarchy. Under that condition, the mother rather than the father was the head of the family. The kingship was established through the mother. One group of men was to marry the women of the other group.

Force theory of State: The exponents of this theory hold that wars and aggressions by some powerful tribe were the principal factors in the creation of the State. They rely on the off-quotes saying, “war brought the king” as the historical explanation of the origin of the State. A man physically stronger established his authority over the less strong persons. The strongest person in a tribe, therefore, made the chief or leader. The German philosophers like Hegel, Kant, and John Bernhard also support the theory of force as they said, “war and force are the deciding factors in the creation of the State”. Today in the words of Treitschke, “State is power; it is a sin for a State to be weak”. State is the public power of offense and defense. The grandeur of history lies in the perpetual conflict of nations and the appeal to arms will be valid until the end of history.

Social Contract Theory: The most famous about the origin of the State is social contract theory. The theory goes to tell that the State came into existence out of a contract between the people and the sovereign at some point in time. According to this theory, there were two divisions in human history. One period is before to the establishment of the called “the State of nature” and the other period is one after the foundation of the State called the “civil society”. The State of nature was bereft of society, government, and political authority. There was no law to regulate the relations of the people in the State of nature. There were three exponents of this theory_ Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean Jacques Rousseau, who differed about the life in the State of nature to civil society and the terms of the contract. They all however agreed that a stage came in the history of man when the State of nature was exchanged with civil society to lead a regulated life under a political authority. The crux of this theory is that men create a government for securing their pre-existing natural rights. That the right comes first, and the government is created to protect these rights. These ideas were based on the concepts of a State of nature, natural law, and natural rights.

Marxian theory of State: The Marxists are of the view that the State is a creation by the class struggle with the help of force. Therefore, it is altogether a different theory of origin of State with the recognition of force, which we have studied as a theory of the origin of State.

The Marxists began with the primitive society where there was no surplus wealth to quarrel with and so there was no State. However, with time, society was being split over hostile classes with conflicting interests. This class resentment was the root cause of the State. When agriculture was learned as an art of culture, there was ample food, which resulted in private property. The insoluble contradictions because of the division of labour became so acute that it was not possible for any class to keep reconciled in the State or to keep the quarrelling class under control. The most dominant class that controlled the mode of production came to establish the State to ensure its dominance over the other classes who did their modes of production. The State thus became an instrument of domination and oppression of one class over the other classes.

Idealistic perspective of the State: The idealistic theory of the state is known by several names_ absolute theory, philosophical as well as metaphysical theory. The first theory vests absolute power in the State, which regards the State as an ethical institution. The second gave stress and explains the States nature in philosophical terms. Its earliest trace is found in the writings of Plato and Aristotle. Both of them regarded the State as a natural and necessary element. They propagated the notion that the state is a self-sufficient entity that is identical to the whole of Society. In modern times, Immanuel Kant started Idealism from Germany but Hegel glorified this concept. Hence, idealistic tradition has a long history having its major exponents both in traditional and modern times who glorified the Idealistic concept of a State. The name “Idealist theory” seems to be best of all. It suggests that it seeks to define the State according to ideal nature. According to what it ought to be and what every actual State aspires to become even though they may be far from realising the norm. The idealist does not base his conclusions about the nature of the State and its institutions wholly or even mainly on the actual behaviour of men and women and they run their political institutions.^{xxxiii}The State has many aspects like sociological, political, economic, historical, legal, psychological, and ethical etc. According to idealism, the moral aspect outweighs all other aspects. The State is fundamentally and essentially the supreme means to a good life and only secondarily an association for legal action or an agency for the better production and distribution of wealth. Political philosophy thus becomes an ethical study. This is perhaps the reason why Prof. R. G. Gettel designates the theory as the idealist-ethical theory of the State.^{xxxiv}

According to the idealist theory, the State is based on will and not on force. This does not mean not to use force at all, it only means that the use of coercive authority is not the fundamental and essential attribute of the State as its essence lies in its being the embodiment of the general will of the people. We ought to obey the State, not because it costs us too much to disobey it or because of the services it renders to us, but because of the consciousness that it represents our true or higher self, and is the condition of the promotion of the common good of which our individual good is an integral part. In serving the State, we are loyal to our highest self.^{xxxv} In the recent political thought, the scholars of the school of idealism tried to take the State to a mystical height. The State was deified and the individual became a means. The State became a sacred, divine, mystical or metaphysical entity and the people were taught to exalt, glorify, and adulate it because it represented the realisation of the best and perfect condition of life. The result was that political theory reached very close to the world of ethics and metaphysics. Prof. J.W. Garner says, “Like ethics, political theory is concerned with what the thing is when its growth is fully developed; the political philosophers, therefore, may very properly idealise the State and deal with it in its imaginary splendor and perfection.”^{xxxvi}

The idealist tradition was based on the assumption that man is a social and political creature by nature as necessity. Isolated from the life of his fellow beings the life of an individual is a life against nature. The real nature of the individuals can be developed only in society. Only by living in society, a man can realise all that he has in him to be. He can develop his full self only by intercourse with his fellows by the realization of social duties and the fulfilment of social obligations. Therefore, to obvious benefits of security against violence and redress against injustice that the individual receives from the State, he owes it a debt of gratitude for its bestowal upon him of his own individuality in all its riches and with all its potentialities.^{xxxvii} Thus, Idealism maintains a close connection between ethics and politics and holds that no political progress is possible apart from the application of the highest moral principles to our individual and social lives.^{xxxviii} Its earliest trace is found in the writings of Plato and Aristotle. Both of them regarded the State as a natural and necessary element. They propagated the notion that the state is a self-sufficient entity which is identical to the whole of Society. Idealistic tradition has a long history having its major exponents both in traditional and modern times who glorified the idealistic concept of a State. Idealistic school of thought came into existence during 19th century. The German philosopher Kant gave prominence to the the idealistic thinking which reached to perfection in the hands of Hegel who supported absolutism by saying “State is the march of God on earth”.

IMMANUEL KANT (1724-1804)

Immanuel Kant, the great German philosopher was born at Konigsberg on 22nd of April 1724. His father was a poor saddler; his mother was an uneducated but intelligent pietist. After completing his education, he had to spend 9 years as private tutor to qualify himself from the university. In 1770, he was appointed as professor of logic and metaphysics in the same university. He had a very low opinion of women and did not marry. He died as a confirmed bachelor on 12 February 1804.^{xxxix}

His Idea of the State:

Kant’s philosophy was based on individualism. He could not give too much power to the State. Man is egoistic by nature. Their love for power, gain, and glory and effect of those glories is “the war of all against all”. Moral freedom should be promoted by individuals themselves and not by the State. It is the primary duty of the State to remove all barriers to liberty. In his treatment of “State and government”, there were three and two forms respectively. The three forms were autocracy, aristocracy, and democracy while as Republican and despotic were the other two forms of government.^{xl} According to Kant, there was no reason or moral sense in the primitive society. They were dominated by instincts of self-preservation, sexual desires, and a desire for glory and ego for dominating other people. At the same time, there was social intercourse; there was friendly co-operation and there was desire for company. Kant calls this as the unsocial sociability of humankind. This paved the way for a warfare in the primitive societies. It was due to the two kinds of instincts viz., to associate as well as to dominate. Both good and bad results were the outcome of that warfare. It forced the primitive men to develop his reasoning powers latent in him. The State of nature was so horrible. He willingly sacrificed his own lawless liberty and voluntarily submitted himself to the political State in which all men are subject to uniform laws. Hence, the creation of the political State is considered as a landmark in the history of human progress.^{xli}

Man developed from the savage condition to that of a life dominated by reason and moral law. According to Kant, this is not the apex in the evolution of human progress. The mutual antagonism of man brought into existence the creation of State. The mutual hatred of States will bring about a federation comprising of all States in the world, capable of creating eternal and everlasting peace.^{xliii} Kant provided the absolute power to State, in his view State is above all and no one can deny it. State is moral or ethical institution having the cultural and educational function whereas society is empirical or external in nature. The State for Kant is for the welfare of individuals and led expansion of final goods that are spiritual, moral as well as rational.

Kant's conception of the State is summed up by prof. de Ruggiero in these lines as he says, "the State is strictly legal organization, whose chief care is to ensure the possibility of an ordered co-existence of individuals. It personifies that universal law in which the free will of each may be reconciled with that of all other but the single individuals enabled by the State to co-exist are not its creation; they have their own autonomous ground, and their claim to existence forms the primary right belong every man simply as man".^{xliiii} According to Kant, force is a necessary element in the being of a State. He justifies State punishment of crimes. He does not give the individual the right to resist the authority of the State and revolt against it. The reason is that, according to him, the State is not based upon any original contract or consent of the people. Its basis is abstract, reason, and therefore it cannot be dissolved without destroying the law of reason.^{xliv} Kant shows the necessity for the State in the following way. He says that in order that the free moral will of an individual may function in a proper way, certain conditions have to be fulfilled. Men have to be protected from the evil effects of the acts of their fellow citizens, and the freedom of every individual has to be reconciled with the like freedom of others.^{xlv} The State thus becomes for Kant a condition of moral life. It is required to enforce the universal laws, which can be deduced from the categorical imperative of duty. In other words, Kant's political problem is simply the ethical problem stated in practical terms. The State exists to promote the exercise of freedom under universal law; it is an instrument through which the voluntary actions of individual persons may be harmonised in accordance with the universal law of freedom.^{xlvi}

GEORGE WILLIAM FRIEDRICH HEGEL (1770-1831)

Georg Wilhelm Hegel was one of the most influential thinkers of the early 19th century in the west, the one who had his disciples like Thomas Hill Green, Bradley and Banquet in England, Bismarck in Germany, the fascists in Italy and the Nazis in Germany. Hegel was born in Stuttgart in 1770. His youth went through the days of the French revolution for which he felt a warm sympathy for quite some time but soon came to condemn it.^{xlvii} C.L. Wayper writes in his "political thought" that, the most outstanding advocate of the organic theory of State and one of the most important and influential thinkers of modern history was Hegel. His father was a civil servant. In his school days, he was very bright and brilliant and hence he became a school prize-winner. Then he studies theology in the University of Tubingen. He fell under the spell of French revolution in his youth and declared it as "a glorious mental dawn". During this time, he was very thorough with the writings of Rousseau. He worked as a private tutor for some time, there he wrote about the life of Jesus. After serving as a private tutor for some time, he became a lecturer at the University of Jena in 1801. He published his three-volume work on "Science and logic" because of this work, he became the most loudly

acclaimed of German philosophers. He was then 47 years old when he became a professor at Heidelberg University. Here he wrote his “encyclopaedia of the philosophical sciences”, the fullest treatment of his general philosophical system that he ever produced. Hegel then shifted to Berlin University where he accepted the chair of philosophy. At Berlin, he did not consider himself under any obligation to enter into the conflicts of the politicians. Lastly, he died due to cholera at the age of 61.^{xlviii}

His idea of the State: The central point of Hegel’s theory is that the State is created by free will, and in turn sustains it. It sustains free will by maintaining the individual as reason and promoting his welfare, and by carrying back, the individual whose tendency is to become a centre of his own_ into the life of the universal substance. In other words, the State sustains freewill by sustaining personality and enabling the person to transcend himself by devotion to some good beyond itself. An individual is free only when he consciously identifies himself with the laws of the State. The philosophy of Hegel is to be found in his works “the phenomenology of spirit”, “logic”, “the philosophy of right”, and “the philosophy of history”. According to Professor Sabine, the significance of the political thought of Hegel centres around two points and those are dialectic as a method and the idealisation of the nation-State.^{xlix} Hegel’s model of State is neither French nor English. It is German as far as it, serves the German interest. Sabine puts the Hegelian model when he says, its government would be responsible to the monarch rather than to a national parliament; and its economic modernisation and expansion would take place not by *lassiz-faire* but under strong political guidance.^l Hegel comes to view the State as one of the latest link growing out of the development of various institutions. The State for Hegel grows out of the institutions of already existing civil society and the families, which lay at the base of such a society. Thus, the State is a higher stage of development.^{li} For Hegel, a State comes into being when there arises a genuine public authority, recognised as higher than the civil society, which embodies private interests, and as competent to guide the nation in the fulfilment of its historic mission.^{lii} Thus considering State as the highest, latest, and even the final form of the social institution, which is in the progress of their evolution and development, Hegel uses all admiring words for the institution of the State. For Hegel, the State is the highest stage, which men have reached through the ages. The existence of the State means coming nearer to the idea, the divine mind, reality or reason and since there is no further evolution according to Hegel, beyond the State; the State itself becomes the idea, the latest stage of development. The establishment of State is the march of God in the world. The Hegelian State is a whole of which the individuals are merely parts. The State has supreme right against the individual and the individual has supreme duty towards the State. There is no law above the State; there is no morality beyond it. The Hegelian State itself creates morality. It alone can tell what is good and what is bad for the individual. The real freedom lies in the State not out of it. The Hegelian State has no other obligation than its own safety. The State according to Hegel comes to control the confusion created in the society. This means that the Hegelian State stands for interests other than those of the society, i.e., the State interests are higher interests. Hegel’s idealisation of State is not what is to be doubted, for he thinks that the establishment of the State is a solution for all evils. The creation of State Hegel seems to tell us, means that bad things around would become good, passion would change into reason, irrational would turn into rational and contradictions and conflicts into peace and restoration. It accounts to, as John Plamenatz says, making extravagant and false claims for the State.^{liii} Hegel emphasized that the State is not a police State; instead, it must be regarded as part of man’s moral end.^{liv}

The first character of the Hegelian State is divine in origin, the second characteristic feature is the idea that individuals must be completely sub-ordinated to the State, and the wishes and desires must be rejected in favour of the will of the State. The third characteristic feature of the Hegelian State is that it was the embodiment of all reasons. It was rational in conception. The State was the incarnation of General will or the real will. True freedom for the individual consisted in obeying the laws of the State and cultivating the everyday habit of looking at the commonwealth as our substantive purpose and the foundation of ourselves.

Hegel's State is absolute, omnipotent, and infallible. The State is the march of God on earth. The State is God itself. It represented the last individual will and personalities of the individuals who formed it. As member of the State, he had freedom in the State. The State was the creator of all rights and as such, an individual had no rights against the State.

CONCLUSION:

The concept of State has figured as the central theme of traditional political theory. Various definitions of the State have been appeared since the days of the ancient Greeks. There are, therefore, as many meanings of the State, as there are theorists who venture to define it. We saw how the nature of the city-state and the predominantly rational character of the Greek mind determined the political speculation of Plato and Aristotle. The Greeks knocked the idea of State as an organism first. Man is a rational creature, and has shown attraction to understand himself and institutions around him. The State is the highest form of human association. It is necessary because it comes into existence out of the basic needs of life. It contains to remain for the sake of good life. It is a divine creation and the ruler is ordained by God to govern the people. It is an ethical institution, man's best friend, it got its independent will and personality. It is regarded as the creator and protector of the rights of the individuals. Immanuel Kant is regarded as the father of Idealistic theory. The various subjects dealt by Kant in his theory are as he provided the absolute power to the state. In his view, state is above all and no one can deny it. The state was omnipotent, infallible, and divine in its features. Its authority came from God and hence every individual have to obey him as obedience to its authority is sacred, it cannot be overruled on any ground even it seems illegitimate. To him state is moral or ethical institution having the cultural and educational function whereas society is empirical or external in nature. Kant lays much stress on the rights and duties of an individual. Rights are complementary to moral freedom. Therefore, he emphasizes more on the duty of an individual towards the state. Kant's philosophy was based on individualism. He could not gave too much power to the state. On other side, Hegel was a German idealist. He had great influence in his own country. His philosophy has made state to rise to mystical heights and held that German people have a divine mission to fulfil their relation to the rest of the world. His ideal state was identical with the German state of his days. In his attitude towards the state, he was an absolutist. According to Hegel, state is the system in which the family and the civil society find their completion and security. True freedom for an individual residing in a state consisted of obeying the laws of the state. State said to represent best in the individual will and personality of its own.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- i. Arora N.D, *Theory of State*, K.K. Publications, New-Delhi, 2006
- ii. Bluntschli Johan Kaspar, *The Theory of State*, Batoche Books Canada, 2000,
- iii. E. Asirvatham, *political theory*, IV Edition, S. Chand and Co. Ltd., New Delhi, 2004
- iv. Ebenstein William, *Great political thinkers*, Oxford and IBM publishing Co., 1960
- v. Gauba O.P., *Political theory and thought*, Sanjev offset printers, New Delhi, 2007
- vi. Hallowell, *Main currents in modern political thought*, University press of America, 1985
- vii. J.W. Garner, *political science and government*, American Book Co., New York, 1928
- viii. Joad C.E.M, *Modern political theory*, Digital library of India, New Delhi, 1924
- ix. Lister Michael and Colin Hay and David Marsh, *The State: theories and issues*, (ed.), Palgrave Macmillan New York, 2006,
- x. Laski J. Harold, *Grammar of Politics*, George Alien and Unwin Publications Ltd. London, 1925
- xi. Levine Andrew, *Political Keywords*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Australia, 2007
- xii. N. Jayapalan, *A comprehensive history of political thought*, Atlantic Publishers and Distributers Ltd., New Delhi, 2011,
- xiii. Plamenatz John, *Man and Society*, Vol III, Green and Co. Ltd., Longmans London, 1965
- xiv. Quoted from R.W. Carlyle and A.J. Carlyle, *A history of Medieval political theory in the West*, Vol I, William Books and Sons Ltd., London, 1930
- xv. Suda Jyoti Prasad, *A history of political thought*, vol. II, Publishing online by Cambridge University press, 2009
- xvi. Sabine, *A history of political theory*, Oxford and IBM publishing Co., Indian ed., New Delhi, 1973

REFERENCE

- i. N. Jayapalan, *A comprehensive history of political thought*, Atlantic Publishers and Distributers Ltd., New Delhi, 2011, p.23
- ii. Lister Michael and Colin Hay and David Marsh, *The State: theories and issues*, (ed.), Palgrave Macmillan New York, 2006, p.4
- iii. Ibid, pp. 4-5
- iv. Ibid, p. 6
- v. Ibid, pp.7-8
- vi. Ibid, p.69

-
- vii. Arora N.D, *Theory of State*, K.K. Publications, New-Delhi, 2006, p.7
- viii. Ibid, pp. 9-10
- ix. Laski J. Harold, *A Grammar of Politics*, George Alien and Unwin Publications Ltd. London, 1925, p. 11
- x. Ibid, pp. 11-12
- xi. Ibid, p.12
- xii. Bluntschli Johan Kaspar, *The Theory of State*, Batoche Books Canada, 2000, p.22
- xiii. Gauba O.P., *Political theory and thought*, Sanjev offset printers, New Delhi, 2007, p. 228
- xiv. Ibid, p.229
- xv. Levine Andrew, *Political Keywords*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Australia, 2007, p.214
- xvi. Arora N.D, *Theory of State*, K.K. Publications, New Delhi, 2006, pp. 1-2
- xvii. Ibid, p.2
- xviii. Quoted from R.W. Carlyle and A.J. Carlyle, *A history of Medieval political theory in the West*, Vol I, William Books and Sons Ltd., London, 1930, pp. 166-167
- xix. Suda Jyoti Prasad, *A history of political thought*, vol. II, op.cit, p.10
- xx. Ibid, p.16
- xxi. Jayapalan N. op.cit., p. 158
- xxii. Ibid, pp.2-3
- xxiii. Jayapalan N. op.cit, pp. 208-209
- xxiv. Ibid, p.4
- xxv. Ibid
- xxvi. Ibid, p.230 (see also *The Modern State* By R.M.Maclver)
- xxvii. Ibid (see also *International encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, 1968)
- xxviii. Ibid, p. 230 (see also *dictionary of political analysis*, 1971)
- xxix. Jayapalan N., *Comprehensive history of political thought*, op.cit., p.334
- xxx. Gauba O.P., *Political theory and thought*, Sanjev offset printers, New Delhi, 2007, pp.30-34 (see also, *Political science and government* by J.W. Garner)
- xxxi. <https://www.politicalscience.com/essay/State/theories-on-the-origin-of-State>
- xxxii. ibid
- xxxiii. Suda Jyoti Prasad, *a history of political thought*, K. Nath & Co., Meerut, 1973, pp. 72-73
- xxxiv. Ibid, pp.73-76
-

-
- xxxv. Suda Jyoti Prasad, op.cit, pp.73-76 (see also Barker, *Political thought in England*)
- xxxvi. J.W.Garner, *political science and government*, American Book and Co. New York, 1928, p.238
- xxxvii. Joad C.E.M, *Modern political theory*, Digital library of India, New Delhi, 1924, p.11
- xxxviii. E. Asirvanthan, *political theory*, IV Edition, S. Chand and Co. Ltd., New Delhi, 2004, p.47
- xxxix. Jayapalan N., *Comprehensive history of political thought*, op.cit., p.189
- xl. ibid
- xli. N.Jayapalan, *comprehensive history of political thought*, op.cit., p.190
- xlii. ibid
- xliii. Suda Jyoti Prasad, *a history of political thought*, Vol III, K. Nath & Co., Meerut, 1973, 7th ed. P.82
- xliv. Ibid, p.83
- xlvi. Ibid, p. 81 (see also Barker, *Political thought in England*, p.26)
- xlvi. Ibid (see also Hallowell, *Main currents in modern political thought*, p.248)
- xlvi. Arora N.D., *theory of State*, op.cit, p.229
- xlvi. Jayapalan N. op.cit, p.216
- xlix. Ibid, p.217
- l. Sabine, *A history of political theory*, Oxford and IBM publishing Co., Indian ed., New Delhi, 1973, p.232
- li. N.D. Arora, op.cit, pp. 232-233
- lii. Sabine, op.cit, p.591
- liii. Plamenatz John, *Man and Society*, Vol III, Green and Co. Ltd., Longmans London, 1965, p. 264
- liv. Jayapalan .N., op.cit, p.226