

2018

Defining 'Good': Exploring The Meaning of Politics And Its Relation To The Personal

Tarai Zemba
Scripps College

Recommended Citation

Zemba, Tarai, "Defining 'Good': Exploring The Meaning of Politics And Its Relation To The Personal" (2018). *Scripps Senior Theses*. 1109.
http://scholarship.claremont.edu/scripps_theses/1109

This Open Access Senior Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Scripps Student Scholarship at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scripps Senior Theses by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu.

Introduction

All of humanity holds a stake in the future of politics. No matter one's country of origin, economic circumstance, racial or cultural identity, or beliefs, the reality of political decisions, public policies and laws drastically influence the day to day lives of all people. This notion holds especially true as the United States undergoes a confusing and problematic shift in the nature of its political developments. With the election of Donald Trump to the Presidency in 2016, the country, its citizens, and the entire world have borne witness to a political reality in which a bigot with no political experience or knowledge has become the most powerful political figure in the entire world. President Trump's rise to such a position is perplexing and troublesome to those across the political spectrum of extremist conservative to extremist liberal. Yet, even more so are the horrifying similarities between his leadership style with that of past dictatorial regimes.

The current reality of President Trump is one that leads us to ask ourselves what politics can mean, and what it *should* mean for the future. Throughout history, numerous academics, political theorists and philosophers have debated and laid claims as to the purpose of politics and political power. Many such individuals, including Thomas Hobbes and Max Weber, have identified the true meaning of politics as obedience and domination over others. However, as I demonstrate, such an interpretation is incredibly dangerous, closely aligning with the historical values of authoritarian and totalitarian governments. With the falsification of this previously supposed political truth, we realize there is something else that must be at the heart of what it means to practice good politics.

Hannah Arendt provides a clear answer to this dilemma. Perhaps the most acclaimed political theorist in all of human history, this twentieth century thinker is most well known for her theories on oppression, freedom, political action, and specifically, totalitarianism. An extensive analysis of her many literary works exposes a much more productive explanation of politics than the presupposed acceptance of obedience and totalitarian power. Instead of these concepts, we discover that truly good politics can be achieved only through the realization and actualization of equality. This discovery pushes us to explore the ways in which such a form of politics can be achieved. As introduced by Weber and reconciled by Arendt, this golden key to this political utopia lies within the personal. Aspects of the personal — the internal characteristics and personal traits of the individual— is what ultimately influences the ability of the human to practice good politics. With this insight, we recognize that Arendt’s humanistic concept of ‘plurality’ can shed light on how true politics can be achieved within society. Further, through such recognition, we are able to illuminate the problematic nature of the US’ modern political reality beneath the power of Donald Trump, as well as the dangers that the world faces underneath the authority of such a personality.

What Does It Mean To Practice ‘Good’ Politics?

Before attempting to identify how to achieve ‘good’ politics, we must first find some clarity as to what good politics means and what the purpose of politics actually *is*. To do so, I shall examine some of the most influential political theorists of all time, beginning with one of the earliest modern philosophers: Thomas Hobbes. Although I do not agree with Hobbes’ interpretation of politics, his theories provide an important

jumping off point from which we can determine how to proceed with our analysis; often, it is just as productive to determine what something is *not*, as it is to determine what something *is*. As such, the exploration of Hobbes' flawed theoretical teachings work as an excellent platform in which we can determine what politics should not be.

An Englishman of the 17th century, Hobbes' academic explorations were often grounded within questions of societal, and thus, political, organization. Hobbes expressed a clear interest in exploring how human beings might be able to live together peacefully and avoid violence. Inspired by political unrest and conflict within his own community — events now identified as the English Civil Wars — Hobbes believed that civil war was primarily instigated by a communal disagreement regarding the commonwealth's authority (Finn). It was during this period of English civil unrest that Hobbes wrote one of the most influential and highly regarded pieces of literature on statecraft: *Leviathan*.

In *Leviathan*, Hobbes explains that the need for humans to form political societies is rooted in our own equally problematic nature. Hobbes posits that all humans share an abundance of incredibly aggressive and violent qualities, and thus, it is dangerous when we are allowed or given the freedom to behave according to these natural instincts. Hobbes states that all men are likely to engage in violence on account of three main issues. One, the competition of securing some commodity; two, the protection and defense of said commodity from the advancement of others; three, a search for personal glory in the eyes of others (88). In these ways, humans are interpreted as greedy, violent, self preserving entities with no regard for others' well-being. We do not seem to be

depicted as intelligent social creatures with consciences. Instead, we are all simple-minded and heartless, on a quest to protect one thing: ourselves.

Hobbes embellishes the natural inclinations of man by introducing the concept of the “state of nature.” The state of nature describes the original organization of the world as a space in which man has the ability to act on his personal desires of inevitable external destruction in the name of internal preservation. As such, the state of nature exists in a nonpolitical, or a-political context, where there are no rules to enforce man to behave otherwise. Thus ensues a state of chaos, in which every individual is perpetually at war with everyone else. This does not necessarily refer to literal warfare, but to the continuous disposition of mankind to engage in aggression with each other. Here we arrive at Hobbes’ infamous words claiming that the natural, un-manipulated life of man is “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short (93)” Such a life evokes a constant sense of danger that is not particularly appealing to mankind. As a result, as Hobbes suggests, mankind chooses to remove itself from the state of nature in search of something more safe and secure.

Due to this continuous state of violence, Hobbes’ primordial humans arrive at the position that in order to remove one’s self from the state of nature, mankind requires organized societal structures to keep him in place and dictate his behaviors so that he will not — and cannot — act according to his nature. In order for such structures to succeed, Hobbes finds that it is only logical to create and enter into social contracts with one another — which inevitably leads to the creation of the political state. A “social contract,” in Hobbes’ terms, is an agreement entered into by members of society, which confirms

that by living in a community, they will willingly adhere to its imposed rules and policies, such as respect for another's property or body (94). Such an agreement works to the advantage of all members, as all receive guaranteed protection of their properties (and selves) by the state in exchange for cooperating with its laws. For example, if citizen A steals a possession of citizen B, or goes so far as to murder citizen B (assuming both of these acts are against the law) the state will interfere to protect citizen B and remove citizen A from society (i.e. prison). Thus, through the arrangement of social contracts, we find ourselves exiting the state of nature in return for the promised security of governmental implementation. Of course, this requires the forfeiture of some liberties — such as that to murder another individual, or steal one's property — but most will find this is a fair trade that is worth it to make.

Though this serves as a guideline for all types of political organizations in general, “social contract theory” does not necessarily try to maintain that one type of rule is best. Whether a dictatorship or a democracy, what remains most important for social communities comes down to one political action: obedience. If, Hobbes claims, citizens are not obedient in regards to the laws and rules that the government puts in place, the community will not survive. Hobbes suggests that in order for such artificial political structures to succeed, citizens must exhibit and continuously practice obedience to their state's laws and customs. Hobbes notes:

“For the prosperity of a People ruled by an Aristocraticall, or Democraticall assembly, cometh not from Aristocracy, nor from Democracy, but from the Obedience...nor do the people flourish in a Monarchy because one man has the right to rule them, but because they obey him. Take away in any kind of State, the Obedience...and they shall not only not flourish, but in short time be dissolved” (233).

Here we arrive at a key point of interest for the purpose of my analysis. For Hobbes, the central concern of politics is the unwavering obedience of the people to the power of the sovereign and the laws that it chooses to enforce. Individuals must remain compliant and controllable so that they may be governed in a way that maintains peace and order for society. Hobbes thus implies a fear that without such obedience, our social contracts will lose their sense of validity, and we will be thrust back into our pre-historic state of nature once again. As I will demonstrate, however, this assumption is a grave mistake for the future of human wellbeing and political organization.

Max Weber is another important individual in political thought who demonstrates a similarly flawed understanding of politics. In fact, Weber's original thinking regarding political realism has led many academics to compare his theories with that of Hobbes. Additionally, as with Hobbes, such theories continue to influence the world of politics today. A Prussian born several generations later than Hobbes (1864 - 1920), Weber is one of, if not *the*, most important and influential social theorist of the 20th century (Kim). Weber's academic works contribute to a variety of disciplines, ranging from religion, economics and sociology to politics — though we are most interested in the latter. In order to better understand Weber's political ideologies, we shall explore his 1921 lecture at Munich University, which was later published as the literary work, *Politics As A Vocation*.

In Weber's 1921 lecture, Weber sets out to answer the question of what it can (and does) mean to participate in politics as a profession so that he may better understand the

political leadership of the state. Before diving into this exploration, however, Weber solidifies his understanding of the state, and therefore politics, as quite similarly to that of Hobbes — and equally problematic. According to Weber, politics is about domination, obedience, and the assertion of power — all of which cannot be obtained without the use of legitimate force. To begin, he identifies the state as a social structure imperative to the societal life of mankind, which organizes and facilitates total political “domination” over the communal body (80). In Weber’s eyes, all political institutions, including the state, exclusively exist as social spaces where men must necessarily realize their domination over other men. In order to succeed in achieving such domination, the state must assert force. Weber explains that a state is a human community which “(successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory” (77). Weber notes that although violence is not necessarily the ‘normal’ means utilized by the state, physical force is a legitimate tool that remains specific to it. Thus, we are faced with the second key piece to Weber’s theory of the state: its political organization of total authority is specifically founded upon force, and without such, its leadership, and thus power, would cease to exist.

To continue, Weber asserts that in order for the state’s organized domination to succeed, citizens must be trained to act as obedient machines towards those superior leaders who act as the dominators. Weber states that “human conduct [must] be conditioned to obedience towards those masters who claim to be the bearers of legitimate power” (78). Weber is referring to personal executive staff (who must cooperate with the leaders in order to enforce orders and assert control over citizens) as well as the actual

citizens themselves (whom the state's domination will be enacted upon). Additionally, in a tone incredibly reminiscent of Hobbes, Weber expresses anxiety that the state will cease to exist in lieu of anarchy if those who are dominated do not "obey the authority claimed by the powers that be" (77). Thus, through Weber's political lens, we examine politics in a way which over-emphasizes the importance of political obedience and docility to the problematic extent that Hobbes does — and thus evokes the same political concerns as to the implications for totalitarianism and dictatorship. This is, of course, an extremely problematic point in Weber's thinking — one which, as with Hobbes, I am incredibly reluctant to accept.

To elaborate on this point further, we shall analyze one particular quote in which Weber undeniably advocates for the passivity of citizens towards an authoritative and totalitarian-esque ruler. Weber states:

*"The honor of the civil servant is vested in his ability to execute conscientiously the order of the superior authorities, exactly as if the order agreed with his own conviction. **This holds even if the order appears wrong to him and if, despite the civil servant's remonstrances, the authority insists on the order.** Without this moral discipline and self-denial, in the highest sense, the whole apparatus would fall to pieces"* (87, emphasis mine).

In this quote, Weber blatantly encourages civil servants to blindly follow the political leader. Even if one's personal ethics and moral obligations do not coincide with that of the sovereign, the "honorable" individual will execute the sovereign's wishes without the slightest hesitation, as if such execution is of his own volition. In this way, Weber argues for the sovereign's administrative staff to ignore their own moral compass, to not think critically for themselves, or stand up for what they believe in — a materialization of self

denial which Weber peculiarly rewards as a “moral discipline,” though one is in fact ignoring their morale. This line of thinking is particularly concerning given the events of the Holocaust, in which administrative officials (such as Adolf Eichmann) carelessly followed Hitler’s antisemitic orders, even though such individuals did not necessarily hold the same beliefs. Such inattentive behavior is precisely what led to the genocide of millions of Jewish citizens — and cannot be condoned as simply part of ‘doing one’s job’ for the social and political order of society. In total, Weber’s understanding of politics boils down to one major concept: forceful domination. Similar to Hobbes, such a conclusion exposes an extremely problematic understanding of politics at its most basic, and leads us in the inherently destructive direction of totalitarianism. It is far too dangerous to define politics through the lens of Hobbes or Weber.

Hobbes’ and Weber’s decisions to emphasize obedience is the fatal flaw in their theoretical approaches to politics. Ironically, although Hobbes sets out to explain the organization of a community which might avoid the constant use of violence that is exhibited in the state of nature, such explanations of politics are incredibly dangerous in their many shared similarities with the very political structures that are the most violent and troublesome of all: dictatorships. Ultimately, if obedience is to be recognized as the true basis of politics, then we must in turn accept the numerous historical (and modern) accounts of genocide, violence, fear, oppression, and destruction that mass societal obedience has and will continue to evoke in the name of totalitarianism. By embracing obedience as one in the same as politics, we are embracing the problematic nature of authoritarian regimes that employ such methods and harm their population by doing so.

By encouraging the body-politic to blindly follow its leader, we reify and reinforce the validity of totalitarianism and tyranny as valued political arrangements. Is this a world that we want to live in? Where the central goal of politics might be the reign of a Hitler, a Stalin, a Mussolini, a Franco? Should such individuals — individuals who exploit citizen obedience at the detriment of their own wellbeing — be recognized as true “political” leaders? We cannot endorse Hobbes’ political views without endorsing such examples, and without permitting ourselves to be complicit with such horrendous acts of violence and oppression. Therefore, we must acknowledge that Hobbes’ and Weber’s societal standards are too low, and ultimately make the proactive decision to reject their claim as to the true basis of politics.

Clearly, neither Hobbes nor Weber have reached the heart of what it means to practice true politics. However, such focus on the power of the sovereign and obedience is not a mistake merely made by these two individuals — it is a mistake that has been made by many other political philosophers and theorists throughout world history. North African thinker Ibn Khaldun, of the fourteenth century, expressed a strong belief in the Arab practice of “royal authority,” in which “superiority and the power to rule by force” (284). Within such authority, one individual attains total power over his peers, and can execute such power using effective methods of coercion, thereby effectively controlling the violence and injustice inherent in human nature. Similarly, Italian renaissance philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli believed that the political leader’s only legitimate concern should be how to acquire and maintain power and authority over others, regardless of what unethical methods are used to accomplish such (Nederman).

An excellent example of this is Machiavelli's infamous idea in his work, *The Prince*, which states that it is much better for a political ruler to be feared than loved by one's subjects, as the dread of punishment never fails to keep individuals in line. Finally, twentieth century French theorist, Michel Foucault, advocated for the state's utilization of discipline —specifically, hierarchical observation — as a tool to mold its citizens into obedient units that can further its purpose as a political body. In *Discipline And Punish*, Foucault asserts that the gaze of peoples in superior positions can be used to keep those of inferior positions in line due to its ability instill a sense of fear and accountability of those in inferior positions that keeps such individuals in order. Thus, we can conclude that Hobbes's and Weber's flawed approaches to politics only contribute to a problem that stretches across a great deal of human thought. As such, it is important to recognize this pervasiveness because it provides urgency to the problem of understanding politics in an alternative, more productive way for humanity.

Equality As Political Alternative To Obedience

Recognizing the flaws in defining politics as obedience to a sovereign power, we remain faced with the challenging question of how to define politics. *How should we understand the concept of politics? How do we define it, and what does it look like?* The solution to this dilemma can be found through an analysis of Hannah Arendt's theories on politics and humanity. As exposed by Arendt, politics is far from an organized structure formatted with the simple purpose of external obedience, domination and the assertion of power. Instead, politics is quite the contrary, deriving its roots from equality between multiple persons. Arendt claims that politics is an open dialogue of discussion between

equals, which seeks to guarantee the equality for others as well. Ultimately, Arendt's beliefs regarding politics prove to be of a much more productive view in comparison to Hobbes and Weber, working to avoid tyrannical and violent positions of power, and striving towards justice and equity for all.

The virtue of equality is one of Arendt's most consistent narratives throughout the entirety of her works. Such consistency helps us to solidify and confirm her perception that equality is among the most important virtues of human life, and with it, politics. In 1929, at the very beginning of Arendt's scholarly career, Arendt wrote her dissertation, *Love And Saint Augustine*, in which she explores the life and works of Saint Augustine, an early Christian theologian and philosopher. In this piece, Arendt lays the groundwork for her interest in equality as a crucial and necessary point in the practice of politics.

Other academics, such as Sarah Elizabeth Spengeman, agree that it was this first study of Arendt's which had a remarkably lasting and influential effect on the remainder of Arendt's career. However, while Spengemen focuses on the concept of human plurality (which I will return to later), I hold that the most important building block in this essay for Arendt's future work is the concept of equality and love for one's neighbor.

In *Love And Saint Augustine*, Arendt explores Augustine's ideas on the human responsibility for equality by interpreting the derivative of the Christian commandment to practice "neighborly love." Ultimately, as Arendt learns from Augustine, the importance of loving all individuals stems from mankind's original state. Perhaps one could even refer to this a biblical "state of nature," though in a vastly different and more optimistic sense than that of Hobbes. As Arendt learns from the Christian theologian, "the reason

one should love one's neighbor is that the neighbor is fundamentally one's equal and both share the same sinful past" (106). To elaborate, mankind's equality originates in the common ancestry of Adam and Eve. If one has any biblical knowledge whatsoever, it is most likely regarding this story. We can probably all recall the decision of the first man and the first woman to disregard God's rules to not eat the infamous apple. Similarly, readers are most likely already aware of the fact that this decision is mankind's original sin, which ultimately leads to the forceful expulsion from the Garden of Eden. Thus, through Augustine, Arendt is exposed to the idea that everyone is deserving of love and equal treatment because we are all equally flawed individuals who derive from the same origins.

Although this reasoning may be accepted as sound for those of Judeo-Christian backgrounds, there are of course, other individuals who may be less inclined to accept such a religious explanation for the basis of equality. However, across all religious (and especially secular), spectrums, the overall message remains relatively unchanged; if we are all human, we all come from the same, we all are the same, and thus, are all deserving of the same. In a similar vein, Arendt's dissertation is not necessarily announcing her allegiance to Christian beliefs nor her acceptance of biblical narratives — in fact, she is of Jewish descent. Yet, this piece on Augustine *does* allude to her primary interest in exploring the importance of equality beginning with her introduction into theoretical literature. As such, the most important aspect we should take away from *Love And Saint Augustine* is the fact that Arendt is fascinated by the nature of human to human

interactions, and the basis of that nature. Thus, we arrive at a central focus of Arendtian politics: a discussion between equals.

Now that we have established a basis for Arendt's stress on equality, and where the validity of such a stress derives, let us examine such a concept within Arendt's direct discussions on politics. In Arendt's acclaimed book, *The Promise of Politics*, Arendt proposes that true politics is possible only when total equality among the polis is achieved. Arendt's views largely stem from her overwhelming solidarity with ancient Greek theology and politics. Arendt claims:

"The meaning of politics...is that men in their freedom can interact with one another without compulsion, force, and rule over one another; as equals among equals...managing all their affairs by speaking with and persuading one another" (117).

Arendt's ideas encourage us to begin to understand politics in a new way — as the interaction between men, rather than the domination and oppression of men. Though the Grecian context may have intended for only landowning, non-slave white men to partake in this vision of politics, the basis of their theologies can be applied to a much more equitable society today. As understood by the Greeks (and, likewise, Arendt), true politics means that men have the freedom to interact and debate with one another on an equal platform. Arendt's use of the word "freedom" is significant here, as such is another key theme for her understanding of politics. For Arendt, freedom is the ability to produce original action (for example, engaging in discussion) which ultimately permits politics to occur. Additionally, the use of the words "force" and "rule" signify Arendt's exact opposition to the political definitions given by Hobbes and Weber. This is because, only through the space between two equal individuals, can true dialogue flow through the

means of conversation. If those engaging in such dialogues are not interacting as equals — in other words, if a power dynamic is established, such as that of the dominant sovereign and the subordinate citizen — the notion of true politics fails to occur. As such, Arendt's notion of politics avoids the problematic political landscape of obedience, instead focusing on something far greater and more just for humanity.

In this way, Arendt sets a high standard for politics— a standard which does not come to fruition very often. Within a truly political space, no man is alpha, but instead valued equally to his peers. Such communal organization allows ideas to move fluidly and productively, and be discussed at great length. Thus, equality is a key value in the formulation of politics. As exemplified throughout history, however, true politics rarely occurs. Any snapshot of history will give you the same result: an exorbitant amount of tyrannical governments and dictatorships, and the brutal violence that accompanies them. Such so called “political” structures are actually the very antithesis of politics, as illustrated by Arendt. In tyranny, equality does not exist; there is only the dictatorial regime and its followers — despite what we might gather from Hobbes or Weber. Without equal representation and space for all individuals in political discussion, however, we fail to fulfill true political aims.

Due to Arendt's perfectionist attitude pertaining to politics — that without equality, politics is not even in *practice* — some individuals might become frustrated by the fact that such a conception of politics is nearly impossible to achieve. Though I can relate to this frustration, I maintain the importance of defining concrete goals for an improved society. Such groundwork is a necessary, crucial step to eventually reaching

and achieving such goals. Regardless of the fact that the goal seemingly has yet to be attained, and though it might be incredibly difficult to do so, the creation of such an explicit objective helps guide human history to the most productive and just political destinations. For the aim of a political space grounded in equality is to ensure that the political system embraces open dialogue, discussion, and debate in such a way that ideas can be analyzed and explored in an objective setting. Only through such politics are individuals able to speak their minds, have the opportunity to disagree with one another or express concerns, and engage with one another in a way that allows for constructive political decisions to be made that are beneficial to all — i.e. that treat citizens fairly, with equality in respect and love for the entire body politic. The intention of a political practice (where we accept equality as its foundation) is to dialogue in such a way so as to arrive at the best possible laws and decisions for all individuals.

It is important to note here that, although I stress Arendt's definition of politics as equality as superior to Hobbes' definition as obedience, Hobbes does recognize the importance of equality, and seems to value it as an important piece of society. Hobbes believes that politics (and the act of obedience towards the sovereign) can, in essence, preserve the natural notion of equality through its preservation of individual liberties. To state a drastic example: if everyone obeys the law of the sovereign to abstain from murder, then everyone's right to life is equally preserved. The same argument could be made for abstaining from thievery and protecting everyone's properties. However, despite this fact, Hobbes' problem is that he ultimately he fails to define politics as equality itself. Although laws are made to equally protect the rights of the body politic, Hobbes' stress

remains that good politics requires obedience, and likewise, that political action itself is attained only through obedience. As such, equality is not included in Hobbes' central discussion of politics itself, but more-so as an after thought and a bi-product of politics. Hobbesian politics maintains that everyone should be kept in line by means of an ultimate, sovereign power. Once such domination is imposed, a form of dominated equality (or, vertical equality) exists among the people. Arendtian politics, on the other hand, asserts the importance of participation equality (or, horizontal equality), in addition to employing such methods for the equality for all.

In sharp contrast to Hobbes, Arendt clearly *does* define politics as an interaction of equality, yet she also shows that it can be used to ensure equality in the treatment of others. As demonstrated by St. Augustine (and illuminated in Arendt's dissertation), humans are *deserving* of equal treatment due to our original position in the world and our status as flawed individuals — although this is not necessarily how nature always plays out. Equality is not a natural notion that men are born with. In her work, *On Revolution*, Arendt states that “isonomy” or, the equality of political rights, guarantees equality “not because all men [are] born or created equal, but, on the contrary, because men [are] by nature not equal, and [need] an artificial institution, the polis, which by virtue...[will] make them equal” (21). In this quote, Arendt exposes man's attempt to use politics as a method to attain equality despite his original position of inequality in the world. There is something unique about mankind that causes us to contemplate and reflect, and to think about whether our natural behaviors are wrong. Thus, Arendt demonstrates that individuals practice politics by engaging in interactions of equality, and that such

interactions should be used to create structures that work to secure and maintain the equality of others.

Achieving Politics Through The Personal

With the truth of Arendt's words expose, the question now becomes — *how can such a notion of equality as politics be achieved?* Although I profoundly disagree with Weber's assumed truths regarding the foundation of politics and the state, the remainder of his speech, *Politics As A Vocation*, does begin to point us in the right direction. Through his exploration of how men can achieve a successful career in politics, he questions why individuals choose to obey leadership in the first place. Weber then delves into the personal characteristics of men and how such characteristics might impact politics. The analysis of Weber's discussion exposes the large influence of the personal when it comes to politics, which will eventually bring us back to Arendt.

Weber states that there are three unique justifications for a community's willingness and ability to be dominated and follow some other authority. The first is the authority of what is "traditional" and perceived as the "eternal yesterday" (78). In other words, the societal recognition of tradition, habit, and perhaps melancholia for the past. The second is the authority of what is "legal," or the acceptance of logical and valid societal rules (78). The third, and for the purpose of Weber's article, most important authority is that of one's charisma. This "personal gift of grace" evokes the community's total devotion and trust in the specific and internal qualities of "individual leadership" (78). Even in a democracy, Weber asserts that citizens vote on a primarily emotional basis, depending on how they feel towards a particular politician. Thus, the

successful politician acquires a following of devoted persons primarily due to their internal characteristics. Others follow because there is something about these characteristics that causes them to believe in the leader. Without this sense of personal charm, the ability to assert authority and gather a significant number of followers remains elusive. Therefore, there is clearly something about one's personal characteristics which impacts their success in participating in what Weber defines as "politics."

Next, Weber identifies what personal qualities make someone a good politician — in addition to the internal charismatic nature that makes others prone to follow. According to Weber, there are three primary characteristics that make for a 'strong' and likewise, successful political personality: passion, a feeling of responsibility, and a sense of proportion (97). By "passion," Weber is referring to one's devotion to a particular cause. One must attain motivation to addressing and solving specific issues. By "responsibility," Weber means being responsible with the use of one's power. A politician must be responsible for the outcomes of his actions, and must not take this responsibility lightly. On the flip side, one's irresponsibility might come to form when a politician enjoys "power merely for power's sake" without a legitimate or worthy purpose (98). However, I would maintain that regardless of one's intentions, defining politics and a politician's purpose as attaining power and sovereignty over others is a dangerous position to assert, and a slippery slope to totalitarianism.

Nevertheless, we finally come to the matter of "proportion." Weber introduces this concept as the most important psychological quality of the politician, stating that one needs such a characteristic in order to exhibit responsibility as well. By "sense of

proportion,” Weber means the ability to always work and address issues with inner calm and peace, and to not let external realities impact this inner calm. Weber suggests the ability to achieve proportion can be attained by maintaining an objective perspective towards political matters, and avoiding one’s (in a sense, inherent) subjective lens. In this way, it seems that the so called ‘good’ politician must be able to strike some type of balance between passion towards a cause and utilizing objectivity in one’s political manner as well. One should not get too internally involved with any particular issue or cause, instead employing awareness for one’s personal biases. As Weber describes, the politician must at all times maintain some type of “distance [between] things and men,” and similarly, “distance towards one’s self” (98). To lack such distance is of grave concern for the politician, because one might get too riled up and internally invested in a particular issue, and therefore cease to rule in a so-called ‘responsible’ manner.

Though Weber’s argument attains validity, and though he is on the path to the right answer, he fails to go truly deep enough into what makes humans behave this way. How do we explain passion? What do we attribute to an individual’s ability to express objectivity? I interpret these as rather vague explanations and understandings into what makes a politician ‘great’ or even ‘good.’ Despite these critiques and concerns, and even though Weber is explaining how such forces can be employed by an individual in order to achieve total domination, he does expose the fact that the personal plays a large role in the actualization and realization of politics. This leads us to Arendt, who successfully executes a deep theoretical analysis into what aspects of the individual greatly influence politics. Through a confrontation of Arendt’s theories, we arrive at the conclusion that the

answer to what influences good politics can only be found through the understanding of humanity, and what it means to be human. To put it in Arendt's words, the "human condition." Before embarking on the journey of discovering how good politics is to be achieved, and thus a sense of political and societal equality, we must first embark on a journey of ourselves. Before understanding how the human experience impacts politics, we must first ask: *what does it mean to be human?*

Defining The Human Experience: Plurality

An extensive examination of Arendt's collective works makes it clear that she is mesmerized by what it means to be human. Not only is she fascinated by the realities of the human experience — she believes in the superiority of humans among other living things. In Arendt's work, *The Human Condition*, she claims that human beings are among "the most highly developed species of organic life," directly highlighting the humanistic lens with which she views the world and political concepts (11). In the same way that scientists split the atom, Arendt's literature strives to break apart the human experience and examine what it truly means to be human, especially in how it pertains to politics. In her exploration, Arendt identifies a key aspect of the human condition which provides mankind with the ability to elicit true *political* action: plurality. Through an analysis of 'plurality,' Arendt seeks to understand the human experience and with it, the very foundation of politics itself.

Arendt describes human 'plurality' or 'duality' (I will use the two terms interchangeably) as a key trait which is integral to the human condition and therefore politics. As she explains in *The Promise of Politics*, 'duality' is the uniquely human

ability to engage in a dialogue with one's self (20). One can form original thoughts and opinions, yet also ponder those thoughts and opinions without ever conversing with another person. This contemplation, Arendt argues, is crucial for forming one's conscience and thus for pursuing morality and justice as well. She states, "no man can keep his conscience intact who cannot actualize the dialogue with himself" (25).

Reflection on one's own thoughts and actions, as well as others' thoughts and actions, is necessary in order to determine how one ought to engage with the world. For example, if I am unable to thoughtfully contemplate my actions prior to my execution of them, I am unable to consider important consequences, such as how my actions might impact another individual. If I have harmed another individual, how can I express remorse for my mistake or compassion for this person without an ability to adequately reflect, or consider how my actions have in fact impacted this other person. If I am unable to engage in these conversations with myself, how can I possibly responsibly determine what actions to take? Thus, it becomes clear that human plurality teaches us how to live with ourselves, as well as how to live and interact with others in a community — important knowledge to have in order to practice Arendt's proposed definition of good politics. As Arendt states, "living together with others begins with living together with oneself" (21). If we cannot engage in these reflective conversations, demonstrating awareness of ourselves and our actions, the ability to live peacefully and productively with other members of society becomes impossible. Therefore, only through the experience of human duality can the central goal of politics itself be realized.

It is fascinating that Arendt explicitly promotes a personal characteristic for politics that Weber explicitly denounces. While Arendt stresses the importance of connecting with the self through pluralistic conversations in order to act responsibly (in both a political and nonpolitical manner), Weber blatantly argues that the 'good' political leader can only act responsibly by means of keeping a respective distance from his or herself. If we return to my earlier analysis of Weber's speech, we see his clear proclamation that the politician must exhibit such distance in order to maintain a sense of 'proportion' towards matters of the state. Weber seems to assert that if one is too in touch with one's personal political agenda, one's judgment may become clouded, and he or she may not be able to make good decisions on behalf of the state he or she is representing. In sharp contrast, Arendt asserts that only through the conversation with one's self, or the interaction with one's duality, can one truly explore whether or not a particular decision may benefit others, and thus serve the greater purpose of politics (equality). It is important to note that although Arendt and Weber do explore the influence of the personal in politics, they advocate for exact opposite personality traits within the individual who engages with politics. This distinction sheds light on the fact that while the notion of Arendt's politics requires human plurality, obedience-focused governments, such as those that Weber promotes as an inherent part of state politics, are inherently intertwined with lack of plurality.

In keeping with this line of thinking, Arendt claims that totalitarian regimes often do manipulate mass communities' lack of plurality in order to achieve and maintain their dominating power. In order to understand this point, we must first understand Arendt's

explanations of three different — though seemingly similar — concepts which all lie on the spectrum of being alone. Throughout the entirety of Arendt's works, she continues to relate political action (and problematic inaction) to solitude, isolation, and loneliness. To begin, Arendt demonstrates that plurality is always realized within solitude, and vice versa. Only through solitude, through the ability of being alone with one's self and one's thoughts, can one engage in the internal dialogue of duality. At times, Arendt goes so far as to suggest that the two are interchangeable, defining solitude *as* the “dialogue of the two-in-one” (36, *The Promise of Politics*). Thus, through plurality, one always remains connected to the self. Therefore, the experience of solitude is never one of being truly alone or lonely, for even when separated from other individuals, one remains in contact with the self (20). A central problem for politics, then, arises when this sense of solitude, and thus plurality, is destroyed. As Arendt demonstrates, when this key aspect of human condition is destroyed, politics quickly follows. Arendt furthers the discussion in her statement that the primary concern of totalitarian governments is to “eliminate all possibility of solitude” for its participants (24). Thus, it seems that totalitarianism movements are facilitated by individuals who cannot participate in a healthy relationship with themselves, and have therefore lost a sense of their own humanity. As such, these individuals lose the ability to think and reflect, and are merely left with their ability to act, or, follow orders of those in power.

Instead of solitude, totalitarian governments require both isolation *and* loneliness of the masses in order to be effective. In *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Arendt states that the totalitarian movement is always formed by “mass organizations of atomized, isolated

individuals” (323) who are lacking in “normal social relationships,” i.e. who exhibit loneliness (317). Isolation and loneliness, however, both lie on different points of the spectrum of being alone. Arendt identifies ‘isolation’ as the political inability to produce meaningful action, due to a lack of other individuals who are either not willing or able to join in the cause, whatever it may be (474). Isolation is a key factor in tyranny because it damages an individual’s sense of agency by destroying communal support. In this way, isolation removes the possibility to induce change or revolt, and provides a platform for the tyrant to easily assert control. ‘Loneliness,’ on the other hand, extends past politics into a more personal sphere of the individual self. It is characterized by Arendt as a feeling of desertion from all human companionship (474). This can refer to the experience between individuals, but it can also reference the relationship to one’s self; in other words, one’s plurality. This is where loneliness becomes most problematic to humanity, for in this experience, man loses his own sense of self. Thus, to feel truly lonely means to not be fully human. Without the ability to think independently, man’s total manipulation becomes an even simpler task, creating blind followers of the tyrant’s regime. In this sense, totalitarianism disrupts both the public sphere (through influencing political action) and the private sphere (through damaging personal identity and wellbeing).

This dangerous combination of isolation and loneliness is crucial for understanding totalitarianism, yet also worth noting is Arendt’s mention of the the “masses.” Interestingly, tyranny’s success is also only possible through mass groups of people. Arendt says,

“Totalitarian movements are possible wherever there are masses who for one reason or another have acquired the appetite for political organization. Masses are not held together by a consciousness of common interest and they lack that specific class articulateness which is expressed in determined, limited, and obtainable goals” (311).

Arendt paints a picture of the “masses” as a gigantic, disorganized body of individuals who, though they have internalized particular political motivations, are ultimately incapable of acting on them due to their isolated and lonely statuses. Therefore, it makes sense that such masses follow tyrannical leaders so loyally — they are attracted to the promises that such strong political figures make in terms of action and follow through. Though mass society consists of numerous individuals lacking in personal agency, when brought together under a dictatorial leader, these masses are able to exert enormous amounts of power. It is strange and even ironic that the totalitarian movement requires a large body of individuals — a community, in a sense — who are united only through their individual experiences of isolation and loneliness. Yet, as Arendt demonstrates, it is possible to experience these concepts when surrounded by people, just as through solitude, it is possible to be comforted by one’s own company even while completely alone. Again, Arendt’s explanation of totalitarianism highlights the significant danger that lack of human plurality can pose. This is important to note because through this understanding of totalitarianism as functioning with lack of plurality we see not only that plurality is needed for good politics but the incredible dangers of what can happen when plurality is not present. interestingly, obedience based regimes and lack of plurality are two sides of the same coin.

Plurality (Or Lack Thereof) In The Holocaust

Just as plurality is the key to the political utopia of equality, its absence is also the key to political and societal destruction, further highlighting its important role in the politician's psyche. In *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Arendt provides further insight into what might happen when this very sense of plurality is lost from the human condition. In this work, Arendt analyzes the rise and fall of Adolf Eichmann, a German Nazi official executed for actively participating in war crimes of the Holocaust, such as the mass deportation of Jews from Germany. Arendt's illumination of Eichmann's internal flaw demonstrates its great potential to cause disaster and total destruction for politics as well as the entire human race. Arendt identifies Eichmann's total disregard for others, his seeming lack of conscience, and ultimately, his failure to experience the human condition of plurality, as precisely the root causes of his politically destructive and toxic actions.

Much of Arendt's work follows the progression of Eichmann's trial on his contributions to the Holocaust. She recalls a particular moment of an interrogation, in which Eichmann defends his horrific actions with the reasoning (read: excuse) that he was simply doing what he was told.

"[Eichmann] remembered perfectly well that he would have had a bad conscience only if he had not done what he had been ordered to do — to ship millions of men, women, and children to their death with great zeal and the most meticulous care" (25).

In this passage, Eichmann claims that he does not feel guilty for committing war crimes because he was simply following the orders of his superiors (mainly Hitler). However, what Eichmann means to say is that he is incapable of expressing feelings of guilt because he has no conscience at all — or a faulty one at best. Eichmann clearly has no ability to ponder the consequences of his actions nor his role as a facilitator in the

Holocaust. Instead of engaging in a thoughtful dialogue with himself — such as “*how will this action impact the Jewish citizenry?*” — Eichmann functions as a robotic cog in an incredibly problematic system of oppression and violence. He is incapable of taking responsibility for his actions, perhaps because he is unable to realize that he has agency and power within himself to break from his commands and not participate in the horrors of the Holocaust. This is not to say that it would have been as simple as standing up to his Nazi counterparts and politely saying “no.” However, Eichmann clearly does not even have the internal capacity to reflect upon or even *acknowledge* the fact that he is a guilty party. In this way, Eichmann is exposed as a simple-minded man who can only blindly follow his superiors, and never triumphantly take the lead in the pursuit of justice, or at least some form of better politics.

Arendt delves further into Eichmann’s character than simply the trial, however, providing further evidence as to Eichmann’s lack of plurality and therefore conscience. A frequent point of reference for Arendt is Eichmann’s inability to speak. On a basic level, Eichmann does not know how to communicate with others. He is self obsessed, constantly brags, speaks in absurd cliches. Many times, in fact, he expresses total and complete disregard for the fact that others even *exist*, as demonstrated by his inability to keep track of Jewish history (which he played such an active role in) though he can recall major turning points in his career (53). In fact, he claims his “greatest grief and sorrow” to be his failure to advance farther in his position within the S.S. (33). How is it that a man who’s actions so violently impacted an entire people can remain so absurdly, at times almost blissfully, ignorant to the consequences of his actions? How can he evade

any sense of responsibility within himself, and only focus on his personal wellbeing? The answer lies within Eichmann's lack of plurality. Arendt elaborates:

*“The longer one listened to him, the more obvious it became that his inability to speak was closely connected with an inability to think, namely, to think **from the standpoint of somebody else**. No communication was possible with him”* (49, emphasis mine).

This is precisely what Arendt defines as Eichmann's fatal flaw. Of course, the inability to speak is a major problem when trying to exercise what myself or Arendt might refer to as “good” politics (as only through speech and action can we implement change in the search for justice). Yet it is the demonstrated inability to exercise his mind, and thus engage in a conversation with himself, that is Eichmann's true undoing. In this way, Eichmann is illustrated as a man who remains unable to imagine how his actions or words may impact others. He is a man without any internal conscience whatsoever, thereby failing to contemplate his actions or express any care and empathy for anyone besides himself.

Arendt's horrifying descriptions of Eichmann illuminate the great danger presented before the world when mankind loses his ability to think for himself. When man is unable to engage with his own psyche, we find that he is unable to engage with others' as well. Through this failure, man loses his empathy, compassion, and sense of responsibility to other human beings — in essence, his conscience, and his humanity. Further, through Eichmann we are given an excellent demonstration of the fact that obedience cannot possibly be defined as the ultimate gate keeper of good politics. Through the end, Eichmann routinely referred back to the fact that he maintained his position as a “law-abiding citizen” throughout the atrocities of the Holocaust (24,

Eichmann in Jerusalem). Not only do we realize through this analysis that law-conforming obedience can be incredibly problematic (which will further be exposed in my analysis of totalitarianism) — we uncover the truth that the failure to realize one's true humanity through plurality may lead to utter destruction and devastation for the body politic and millions of innocent civilians.

This is, of course, what was meant by Arendt's infamous though controversial phrase, "the banality of evil" (as mentioned in *Eichmann in Jerusalem*). As she explains, the world's most horrific atrocities are rarely executed by truly evil individuals. Instead, such events are often brought about by seemingly very average, normal people, who are merely incapable of realizing their own humanity through plurality. As Arendt explicitly states, Eichmann was never found to be clinically insane. Rather, he was a simpleton with an inability to think. He followed the orders of his superiors to a fault — not because of personal antisemitic beliefs, but because he always adhered to the law and did not think twice about whether or not it was just. His main concern was his own personal wellbeing as a citizen, his own advancement as a member of the S.S., and personal glory and gains through such advancement. He was unaware of himself in the context of history and unaware of the consequences of his actions in how they pertained to others. Through the end, he appeared completely unaware of his own responsibility in the perpetuation of a system of oppression and abhorrent violence. As Arendt states in *The Life of The Mind*, "the sad truth is that most evil is done by people who never make up their minds to be good or evil." Likewise, Eichmann never made a conscientious decision to commit evil. He had no conscience at all, and never thought twice about his actions. His story

demonstrates that when political actors lack their own human plurality, the result has the potential to be truly catastrophic for the entire state.

A Dangerous Void in Today's Politics: Trump's Lack of Plurality

Though Eichmann is a perfect example of the dangers facing society when a political figure lacks plurality, there are examples much more applicable to the modern world of politics that we find ourselves in today. One such example is the current President of the United States: Donald Trump. It is no secret that citizens and policy makers across the political spectrum are perplexed, shocked, and in many ways terrified by the manner in which Trump conducts himself within his position of POTUS. A recent Gallup poll, conducted in October of this year, pegged his approval rating at a measly 35% (Marcin). Clearly, most American citizens are frustrated and disturbed by Trump's behavior as commander-in-chief. So, how can we explain Trump's political (and nonpolitical) behaviors? What is it, exactly, that makes him such a poor politician for the country? Ultimately, Trump's etiquette as an adult individual demonstrates a gaping hole in the aforementioned crucial characteristic of the 'good' politician: plurality.

Trump's inability to realize his plurality can be traced back to his blatant failure to form relationships with others. In *Politico Magazine's* September 2017 issue, reporter Michael Kruse delves into the many ways in which Trump appears to be perhaps the most "lonely" president the country has ever seen. Kruse's article, "The Loneliest President," provides example after example of Trump's consistent inability to form any sort of social bond or relationship with other individuals. Of course, by employing the term "lonely," Kruse was not necessarily intentionally paying tribute to Trump's lack of solitude as

explained by Arendt. However, Trump's demonstrated difficulty in maintaining or even forming relationships with others *does* speak directly to Arendt's concerns regarding the inability to realize one's plurality. As Arendt states, "only someone who has had the experience of talking with himself is capable of being a friend, of acquiring another self" (20, *The Promise of Politics*). If you cannot communicate with yourself, you cannot communicate with others. It follows, then, that one who is incapable of forming friendships is likely handicapped by his or her own failure of truly understanding and engaging in dialogue with themselves. Equipped with this knowledge, we can better understand why Trump is incapable of deep social connections — he simply does not possess an ability to connect with himself, and thus cannot do so with other individuals either. This analysis works to demonstrate why Trump is incapable of ever being the type of politician who can achieve good [Arendtian] politics, yet it also leaves us with the horrifying implications and consequences of such failure.

Trump has always been lonely. To return to Arendt's understanding of 'loneliness,' such an experience is the feeling of total desertion of all human companionship, including one's self. We can find many examples of Trump's failure to form friendships and meaningful social bonds today. Through repeatedly attacking, bullying, and attempting to humiliate others, often in the name of bigotry, Trump has ostracized himself from countless individuals (ranging from political opponents to brief acquaintances). In Kruse's article, he names person after person within Trump's inner circle who has in some way echoed this fact, providing further validity to this identity. The author of Trump's biography, Tim O'Brien, referred to his subject in an interview as

“one of the loneliest people” he had ever met, adding that throughout Trump’s entire life, he had failed to form deep bonds or relationships with others. Trump’s former casino executive, Jack O’Donnell, repeated this sentiment, stating “he was and is a lonely man.” Another business associate once told *Newsweek* that, “friendship is not a part of his agenda.” One of the few individuals who has remained in contact with Trump over the years, Roger Stone, once claimed that Trump has been both psychologically and emotionally “lonely and isolated” since long before he assumed the presidency. Even Trump himself, in an interview with the *Washington Post*, at one point self-identified as the “Lone Ranger.” The sheer number of these statements is shocking to say the least, and addresses the undeniable truth that Trump does not connect with others, and thus must lack the ability (and perhaps even the will) to do so.

This failure to demonstrate some type of ability and willingness to connect with others is further exposed when examining the life of Trump from adolescence to adulthood. From the very beginning of Trump’s young adult life — a crucial developmental stage in which individuals begin to form the crux of their personal identity — he proved himself unable of forming true relationships. Kruse goes as far back into the past as Trump’s college experiences, acquiring input from past peers into Trump’s outsider status. Students confirmed that Trump neither made nor kept any friends while he was in college at Fordham University, nor later when he transferred to the University of Pennsylvania or began to attend the New York Military academy. One childhood acquaintance pointed to Trump’s uncomfortable competitiveness as a point of difficulty for being friends with him. Another, Sandy McIntosh, recalled memories in which Trump

refused to laugh at his jokes, or anyone else's. Says McIntosh, "you think of humor as a basic, empathic way that friendships are formed — and he just didn't" (Kruse). Not only does this quote specifically signify Trump's lack of empathy (a crucial piece of plurality) as demonstrated by his social interactions, it provides a vibrant example of Trump's failure to meaningfully engage and connect with others. Again, we see how Trump seems to lack the implicit self awareness necessary to participate in friendship, further illustrating his inability to connect with himself.

Acknowledging Trump's failure to realize his plurality, we are able to better understand and explain other problematic aspects of his personality. Perhaps the most disturbing of these aspects is the inability to compromise. Kruse points to the fact that once he became a businessman, Trump time and again professed his distaste for partners and shareholders, pointing to Trump's disdain for engaging in collaboration, compromise, or any type of dialogue that requires respecting others as his equal. Even the mere act of a handshake, a point of physical touch that signals respect, acknowledgment, and appreciation of another individual, has been accused by the President as being a "curse" of American society (Kruse). Additionally, instead of engaging in collaborative discussions with those of equal authority who may hold different beliefs, Trump continuously chooses to appoint family members (obligatory relationships; non friendships) and strong loyalists, and diligently works to remove individuals from positions when they are in disagreement with or threaten his agendas and policies. As such, Trump's governmental regime continues to move eerily close to totalitarianism, further proving the fact that even indirectly, lack of plurality and totalitarianism are two

sides of the same coin. Again, these examples work to further expose the fact that one, due to an inability to engage in internal dialogue, Trump cannot see from someone else's point of view, nor accept and respect other individuals as his equal, and two, as such, he is entirely incapable of participating in the type of politics which Arendt (and myself) praise.

Lack of plurality also explains Trump's constant state of paranoia and competitiveness. In a tone reminiscent of Hobbes' view of human life as "nasty" and "brutish," Trump views the world — and with it, humanity — through an incredibly pessimistic and competitive lens. Through this perspective, no-one can be trusted, and, it can be assumed that, quite frankly, everyone is 'out to get' you, your possessions, or both. In Trump's 2007 book, *Think Big*, he expresses anxiety over other individuals wanting what you already have, claiming that "[people] act nice to your face, but underneath they're out to kill you" (Kruse). Kruse highlights another one of Trump's previous quotes in which he explicitly states "I'm a non-trusting person." Trust is an important aspect of any relationship, especially friendship. Yet, Trump seems to reject any notion of depending on somebody else, for fear of exploitation, manipulation, backstabbing, or the like. Without an ability to understand himself or other individuals, it makes perfect sense that Trump behaves in such an aggressive manor. If he is incapable of pondering the perspective of another human being, it may seem perfectly reasonable and rational to assume such a competitive mindset. Regardless of reason, however, such a mindset remains incredibly problematic for political action. Obsession with eternal competition perpetuates a mindset of preserving one's own wellbeing at the expense of others, and

thus explains his apparent lack of compassion and empathy towards others. Trump does not accept responsibility for the wellbeing of others because he assumes they will turn around and take advantage of him. The acknowledgment of this fact provides a possible explanation for Trump's offensive mannerisms and personal etiquette (such as his offensive language towards women), as well as his blatantly oppressive racist, xenophobic and classist policies. Ultimately, such an analysis demonstrates that the failure of political officials to realize their plurality proves to be incredibly dangerous and destructive for all politically motivated action.

Where Do We Go From Here?

In conclusion, plurality is a key component of 'good' political practice. Acknowledging that true politics can only occur amid a dialogue between equals, political participants must possess certain personal characteristics that can only be attained through one's sense of plurality. Without such abilities, it becomes much more likely for the politician to act in irresponsible and incredibly destructive manners for the state. Further, not only does this void of plurality pose a serious threat to the future of human society — it eliminates the possibility of true political action ever occurring.

Interestingly, however, the influence of one's relationship with the self in matters of politics — or any other field for that matter — remains to be given serious validity and attribution for the course of human history. Although academic explorations may address the concept of the personal within politics, the matter of the personal is something which society, for better or worse, continues to suppress in hopes to claim superiority over the delicate nature of what it means to be human. Instead of working to curate a healthy

relationship with ourselves in order to achieve prosperity as a society, the human race — particularly in the US — continues to downplay the significance of internal wellbeing. An excellent example of this is the current state of secrecy and stigma regarding mental health. This is not to say that those who experience mental illness should be barred from participating in politics, but rather emphasizes the lack of public discussion regarding mental thought processes and the refusal to prioritize connection with the self. In rejection of this current societal reality, my analysis suggests that perhaps if we put more of an emphasis on personal, inner wellbeing for politicians, civil servants, and citizens, we would be able to have more confidence in our policy makers, and the future of politics for humanity.

References

- Arendt, Hannah. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report On The Banality of Evil*. Edited by Lotte Kohler. The Penguin Group, 1992.
- Arendt, Hannah. *Love and Saint Augustine*. Edited by Joanna Vecchiarelli Scott and Judith Chelius Stark. University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Arendt, Hannah. *On Revolution*. Penguin Group: Twentieth Century Classics, 1965.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. The University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Life of The Mind*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, 1977.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harcourt, Inc., 1994.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Promise of Politics*. Edited by Jerome Kohn. Schocken Books, 2005.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited by Edwin M. Curley. Hackett Publishing Company, Inc., 1994.
- Finn, Stephen. "Thomas Hobbes: Methodology." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy (ISSN 2161-0002)*.
- Foucault, Michel. "Panopticism" (From Discipline And Punish). *The Foucault Reader*. Edited by Paul Rabinow. Pantheon Books, 1984.
- Gutting, Gary. "Michel Foucault." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Stanford University, 2014.
- Khaldun, Ibn. *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*. Translated by Franz Rosenthal, Princeton University Press, 1958.
- Kim, Sung Ho. "Max Weber." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Stanford University, 2012.
- Kruse, Michael. "The Loneliest President." *Politico Magazine*. 15 Sept. 2017.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. *Machiavelli: The Prince*. Edited by Quentin Skinner and Russell Price, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Marcin, Tim. "Donald Trump's Approval Rating Plunges As Popularity Nears All-Time Low In Latest Polls." *Newsweek*, 21 Oct. 2017.

Nederman, Cary, "Niccolò Machiavelli." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Edward N. Zalta. Stanford University, 2014.

Spengeman, Sarah Elizabeth. "Saint Augustine and Hannah Arendt on Love of the World: An Investigation Into Arendt's Reliance on and Refutation of Augustinian Philosophy." *Curate.nd.edu*, University of Notre Dame, 2015.

Weber, Max. "Politics As A Vocation." *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. Pp. 77–128. Translated and edited by C. Wright Mills and H.H. Gerth. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.