
RESEARCH ARTICLE

Misogyny and Western Political Philosophers: An Analytical Study

Ajay Kumar¹ ✉ Mithlesh Yadav² and Vivek Kumar Tripathi³

¹Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Ramanujan College, University of Delhi, Delhi, India

^{2,3}Project Assistant (Scholar Graduate Level), Department of Political Science, Ramanujan College, University of Delhi, India

Corresponding Author: Ajay Kumar, **E-mail:** ajayshweta.ak@gmail.com; ajay.kumar@ramanujan.du.ac.in

ABSTRACT

The tradition of political philosophy has been the greatest and oldest tradition to understand the origin of the family, society, and the state, which is clearly visible in the thoughts of Western philosophers, but in this tradition, misogyny has also been revealed. Western philosophers, from Socrates to John Rawls, have been pioneers in doing so. Western philosophical heritage rests largely on the notion of a natural inequality of the sexes. Women could not be included as equals within political philosophy until deeply held assumptions about the traditional family, its sexual roles, and its relation to the wider world of political society were challenged. This was only a major reason for the emergence of independent feminism. In the present study, therefore, an attempt is being made to find out the misogynistic ideas of western philosophers for which descriptive and analytical approach has been adopted. As a result, it is acknowledged that the misogyny of Western philosophers has been the only reason for the emergence and development of independent feminism because of which most feminists are still standing in line to counter this misogyny and to challenge their gendered interpretations to promote gender equality in the world.

KEYWORDS

Family, Gender, Inequality, Marriage, Patriarchy, Rights Subordination, Women, Western Philosophers

ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 14 December 2022

PUBLISHED: 18 December 2022

DOI: 10.32996/pjps.2022.2.2.5

1. Introduction

The Tragic Story of a woman begins with western mythology in which the first woman's creation was added to misfortune, the only example of which is Pandora. In a poem by the ancient Greek poet Hesiod around 700 BC, "*Works and Days*" tells a story in which a woman was created to punish humans named Pandora because till then, the man was alone on earth and was enjoying happiness. The man was not familiar with painful cold, hunger, disease, old age, death, etc., then Zeus asked Hephaestus (a god of fire and patron of craftsmen) to create a woman to punish Prometheus, who was the father of mankind who had a conflict with Zeus, and then Hephaestus created a woman out of clay and breathed life into it, all deities decorated and send her on earth with a jar (which became a box in later literature). Epimetheus (Prometheus' brother) fell in love with Pandora against the warning Prometheus not to accept any gift from Zeus. One day Pandora opened the jar, from which the seven evils (greed, envy, wrath, gluttony, sloth, pride, and lust) flew out over the earth. Hope alone remained inside the jar (Geoghegan, 2008). That's why even today, people are keeping this hope against any evil. This story is famous in India as "*Bhanumati ka Pitara*". By the creation of this myth, Greeks made women a secondary creature to man. Thus, the woman was considered a misfortune from centuries ago, which later appeared in the thoughts of western philosophers also.

Western Philosophy refers to philosophical thinking in the occidental world stretching from Ancient Greece and Rome, extending through central and Western Europe. Western philosophers manifested an objective understanding of the subjective narrative in their works. One such narrative that has been discussed quite often is "the existence and position of women" in society. Their positional role has been undermined in the social realm, which hierarchically considers women in a lower stratum than men. As Susan Okin (1979; 2013) observes that "the great tradition of political philosophy consists generally speaking of writings by men,

Copyright: © 2022 the Author(s). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by Al-Kindi Centre for Research and Development, London, United Kingdom.

for men, and about men". In the early literary writings of western philosophers, the idea associated with the freedom and nature of women coincided with great skepticism and prejudices. This led to the formation of feminist perspectives of women to a great extent.

2. Objective of the study

To find out the misogynistic views in western philosophers' thinking.

3. Hypothesis

Independent feminism has emerged due to the misogynist views of western political philosophers.

4. Methodology

Taking as a perfect individual like men, as a crucial unit of society, and regarding the important roles of the woman in the state, in the history of Western philosophical thoughts, women's existence is hardly visible, and if so, in the form of misogyny or prejudices. It seems that the thoughts of these western political philosophers have contributed to the neglecting of the role of women in the family, society, and state. Therefore, the descriptive and analytical study has been used to explore the connection between women's neglected social background in the thoughts of western political philosophers and, as a counterpart, the development of independent feminism.

5. Description of misogynistic views from Socrates to John Rawls

From Socrates to John Rawls, all western philosophers are placed in the category of major and great thinkers for their thoughts on family, society, and the state, but their thoughts show how misogynist they are, which can be described as following:

5.1. Socrates constructs a form of a Weaker Woman

Although Socrates (470-399 BC), a Greek philosopher, allowed women to enter the ruling class, he uttered that women would always be weaker than men. As he tries to turn women into men by equally participating in the political community, he ignores the peculiar natures of each and thus undermines the perfection of the political society in the Republic. He considers that women and men have the same nature in respect of guardianship of the state, save insofar as the one is weaker and the other is stronger (Brisson, 2012). He believes that the only difference between men and women is physical strength (Smith, 1983). He suggests that women should have the same pursuits and activities as men, but women are inferior to men in all of them.

He suggested that men and women differ only as much as bald men differ from those with long hair, i.e., superficially and not about their natures (Burns, 1984). Disregarding the sexual qualities of the females, he concentrates only on physical strength and finds that since women are weaker than men, they will be given lighter tasks. However, while he does give women this opportunity to participate in the protection of the city-state with men and recognizes only differences, he goes on to argue that there is no area except such absurd ones as weaving or cooking in which the male is not superior to the female. This is clearly seemed, for Socrates ignores the peculiar biological qualities that women, and women alone, have. The female is superior to the male of any species in the ability to bear children; even those women least skillful in this task do it better than any man-except perhaps for Zeus. Thus, Socrates ignores the potential of women (Saxonhouse, 1976).

Although he believed that behind the success or failure of a man, there is a lot of woman's contribution while telling about marriage, Socrates taunted women that "by all means, marry. If you get a good wife, you will be happy. If you get a bad one, you will be a philosopher" (Bryan, 2014). Here Socrates creates confusion about the role of women. These ideas of Socrates are found in Plato's work *Timaeus* (Robinson, 1999).

5.2. Plato ignores the Sexual Identity

The major concern of Plato (427-348 BC), a Greek philosopher and disciple of Socrates, was only sexual equality among the guardians in his ideal text *Republic*. Preserving a common harmony of interests in the state requires that the guardians relinquish those particularistic relationships that tend to stimulate acquisitiveness and selfishness in love. For the sake of it, the guardian class can possess no property, no children, and no spouses, and breeding, lactation, and childcare must be communally managed. Since the republic is drafted to preserve efficiency and moral goodness throughout society, individuals must be located within the social hierarchy without reference to family or sexual origin according to their achieved skills, competence, and wisdom. Plato says that women are physically weaker than men, but this is not sufficient reason to exclude them from warfare. Further, he mentions that women who had got training shall still perform lighter duties because of their physical weakness. The role of women in Plato's political philosophy is at odd both in the negative and oppressive role of women in Athenian philosophical thought and broader Platonic corpus, which shows the natural inferiority of women as Socrates (Brisson, 2012). Plato advances that men and women may serve coequally in the guardianship of the state. Yet however progressive his ideas on the role of women were, evidence still suggests that Plato did not stand for a liberal philosophy that could elevate women to equal status as men. For example, Plato

does not value woman because he talks about temporary sexual relations, which is treated as private property in the Greek city-state, and they belong to the world of the *idios* (a person who was not in the public eye, who held no public office), not to the community or the *koinonia* (these are associations of various kinds, guilds of craftsmen, groups of worshippers, federations of states, groups of magistrates) (Bubeck, 2000).

5.3. Aristotle favors Superior Man

Aristotle (384-322 BC), an ancient Greek philosopher also known as the father of political science, believed that women were inferior to men; in his book *Politics*, he writes, "as regards the sexes, the male by nature superior and the female inferior, the males were the rulers, and the females were the subject" (Sparshott, 1985). He viewed men and women as naturally different, both mentally and physically. He went on to say that women are mischievous, jealous, prone to dependency, and less helpful. Aristotle was critical of the Spartan model, which provided unrestricted freedom to women resulting in the disunity of society. He said one side, men were made martial and ascetic, and on the other side, women were left uncontrolled. He had the view to include women as a part of society but exclude them from political life as in his *Theory of citizenship*; he didn't grant citizenship to women. He mentions women, along with family, belong not to the public sphere but to the private sphere as he claims a proper place for women is the home controlled by their husbands. Women being mothers, gave their whole time to rearing children, thus having no time for leisure, which becomes a disadvantage for them as Aristotle considered political life to be only for those who have the enjoyment of leisure (Schollmeier, 2003).

Aristotle described females as incomplete males, which he calls "women as infertile males". Males are described as having a particular ability, whereas a female is described as having a particular inability. Women were considered to be colder than men and thus less perfect than men. Hotter people were considered to be more intelligent and highly spirited, whereas colder were considered to be less intelligent and subject to domination. In sexual reproduction, the male was shown as an active partner, whereas the female was shown as the passive one. In marriage, the husband was shown as superior and dominant, whereas the wife was shown subjected to him. Aristotle did not advocate the equality of men and women; still, he granted specific roles to women in society within the family and home. Women were given the role of wife, mother, and homemaker to preserve and stabilize the family, giving birth, rearing, and further educating children (Femenías, 1994).

Thus, Aristotle defined the nature of women as coincident with social roles. His tautological reasoning is quite obvious. For Aristotle, the monogamous family system ensures that the souls of "superior" men will be encapsulated in their progeny, while women's bodies are simply the matter in which the male form grows. Because goodness is equivalent to the performance of a predetermined function, the good woman reaches her moral heights in service to her husband and the care of her sons (Held, 1982).

5.4. Continuity of Women Subjection in the Medieval Age

The middle age or medieval period is regarded as from the fifth century to the late fifteen century, clearly between the fall of the Roman Empire and starting of the Renaissance. From the very beginning, Rome was a man's state. There was a great distinction between the conduct of the men and the women. Man's freedom of action was considerably greater than women's. Some acts of men were often regarded as crimes when committed by the opposite sex (Bradley, 1990). "If you were to catch your wife" was a principle laid down by Cato, the censor, "in the act of infidelity, you could kill her with impunity without a trial; but if she were to catch you, she would not venture to touch you with her finger, and indeed she had no right" (Johnson, 2011).

Thus, women were regarded as inferior in legal terms in comparison to men. Roman males did not think of women as their equals, but neither did they hate them, whereas Roman women were closely identified with their perceived role in society, mainly the duty of maintenance of the home and nurturing a family (Cartwright, 2014). In the eye of many Stoics, including Epictetus, Cicero, Musonius, and Seneca, women were observed as ultimately dependent on men for their success. Although Epictetus does not accept women more than sex objects, he still defines women's goodness in terms of how they appear to men. He does not believe that women are valued for their modest, decent, and discreet behavior. For the Stoics, The lived reality of women's lives is that they are good and efficient homemakers, and to fulfill this purpose better, education in virtue simply allows them. St. Aquinas was found as the best supporter of Aristotle of his view of women. In his text, *Summa Theologiae* Aquinas declared that women are defective and misbegotten. Aquinas asserted that females are inherently subordinate to males. He believes that this subjection existed even before sin, this subjection is not an outcome of the fall but part of the created order, and this subjection is actually for their own good and benefit. He adds that without women's subordination, good order would not have been possible in a human family. Women in the family should be governed by those wiser than themselves. And since in men, the discretion of reason predominates, So by such subjection, women are naturally subject to men (Popik, 1979). St Augustine's texts, *Confessions* and *City of God*, express his ideas that women are more closely related to the corrupt body than men, making their subordination both natural and commendable. As he asserted that man's soul has two forces, one is dominant and deliberates, while the second one obeys because it is subject to a kind of guidance. Similarly, women have been created for men. In her mind and intelligence, she is equal to man, but in sex, physically, she is subject to the reasoning authority of mind—a man's virtue, by which she is inspired

to have good conduct. In Augustine's view, the woman's subjugation to man incarnates the spiritual hierarchy that man must attempt to attain within his own soul. In persisting on both woman's rational equality and physical subordination, Augustine advises that women realize a split between their rational soul and their embodied existence that men do not realize (Schott, 2008).

5.5. Machiavelli as Modern or Misogynistic in Nature

Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) was an Italian political philosopher, realist, and statesman of the renaissance period but misogynistic. His modernity dichotomizes mankind with its virtues. Machiavelli views this dichotomy in his conception of '*virtù*' and '*fortuna*'. '*Virtù*' and '*fortuna*' are central concepts in both *The Prince* and *The Discourses*. He portrayed *virtu* as masculine and dominating and *fortuna* as feminine and weak. Thus, he had gendered both terms. '*Virtù*' means a quality comprising energy, effectiveness, virtuosity, wisdom, bravery, strength, and ruthlessness, so he associated the term with men, whereas '*fortuna*' means luck, so he related the term with women to show their untrustworthy and deceitful nature. Machiavelli compiled his text *The Prince* after facing much turbulence in his life because of the unstable governing structures and, more precisely, incapable rulers of the Florentine State. In his text, Machiavelli questioned how one could become a Prince and how he should maintain and control his state. He thus constructed his text to outline how a Prince ought to act and how the rule should be upheld. For this, he advises his prince that *luck favors the brave*. Therefore he should acquire the qualities of manhood, that is, *virtu*, and he should not sit on luck, i.e. *fortuna*. He views all the qualities associated with power and smartness with masculinity, whereas he views all the qualities associated with kindness, emotion, and stupidity with feminine character. By giving the example of the river, he likens its unpredictable and destructive nature, whose will cannot be contained, to characteristics that *fortuna* contains, who is expecting to decimate the Prince when he least expects it. According to Machiavelli, *fortuna* shows her power when valor has not prepared to oppose her, and on the contrary, she turns her forces where she knows that restrictions and defenses have not been raised to oppose her. As a result, one of the resurging qualities of a Prince must be for him to constantly be ready for *fortuna* to strike and to subjugate 'her' with his virtuousness, as she will reveal herself when the Prince is not ready. Machiavelli crafted *virtù* and *fortuna* in direct opposition to one another, with *virtù* characterizing the masculine and domineering ruler who is not under threat to utilize his brute strength to oppress that of *fortuna*. Here it is marked that male is shown to be the ruler, whereas the female is subjected to be ruled and provide needed services to the ruler. He further goes on to equate *fortuna* to a 'lover' of any man who has the willingness to have her as he mentioned, 'she is, therefore, always like a woman, a lover of the young man because they are less alert, more violent, and command her with more courage. Here he shows that woman doesn't have control even over her own body and wishes she is subject to the will of the man. Overall he presents a naive and second-class picture of women (Marcina, 2004).

5.6. Hobbes as a Proto-Feminist or Else?

Thomas Hobbes was an English philosopher of the 17th century best known for his political philosophy written in his most famous text *Leviathan*. He is known for his '*Social Contract Theory*' in which he justified political arrangements as an agreement made by rational, free and equal persons. Patriarchal theorists, such as Robert Filmer, argue that men's mastery over women is god-given, and this does not come from men's physical superiority, who granted Adam dominion over Eve. Adam's, and by extension, all men's, superior physical strength (and, as many thought, greater rational capacity) is perhaps a gesture of man's natural dominion, but this source is not fixed in Hobbes's view. Hobbes is sometimes considered a proto-feminist in that men and women are perceived as equal in the state of nature. Eventually, men are able to conquer women and establish their dominion through contracts (Mitchell, 2010). Hobbes is a proto-feminist because the subordination of women is not justified by their natural weakness but through contracts to which they must consent. Hobbes's views on women can be traced from his articulation of the state of nature. He mentioned men and women are equal in the state of nature, as nature provides no reason for inequality of rights and privileges. Women were shown as capable as men. For Hobbes idea of female subjugation was the *social construct*. Further, in the state of nature, there would be domination of women as she had the authority to announce the father of the child. In projecting the 'constitution of civil society', Hobbes characterized families as male-dominated as the father had exclusive jurisdiction in all matters. This shows his justification for patriarchy, which faded away from the conception of such women as free individuals. Hobbes never criticized patriarchy openly. His concept of the commonwealth was created and dominated by fathers. Succession rights were made available to males because they were seen as people of wisdom and courage. Women also lost their ability to participate in the affairs of the state. This shift from equality to male domination was justified by claiming that it would remove the chances of conflict between males and females in civil society. Hobbes can be seen as a proto-feminist as he didn't justify the subjugation of women as a natural consequence but as a part of the social contract which women have to follow. He denies that males have any natural right of domination over women and claims that the relationship between them is based on a contract that led to the subjugation of women by men (Sreedhar, 2012).

5.7. Locke Favors Only Adam

John Locke (1632-1704) gives important status to women. He criticizes patriarchy while upholding the rights of men. In his text "*Two Treatises of Government*", Locke diplomatically denounced the patriarchal system as being tyrannical both within the state and the family; he believed in this regard that each, in its own way, a violation of natural rights. While narrating the story in Genesis,

Locke insisted on Eve's inclusion in the grant of "Dominion over the Creatures, or Property in them", and he also denied that God had granted Adam "Political power over... [Eve]". Similarly, Locke cited the notion of the social contract to aim a shift from a patriarchal to a contractual form of marriage: he declared that marriage "leaves the wife in full and free possession of what by contract is her peculiar Right, and gives the husband no more power over her life than she has over his" (Nyland, 1990). A wife preserved the freedom to separate from her husband; however, he also suggested that, except for female rulers, women should allow their husbands ultimate control over their affairs. Although he provided the economic right to the women conditionally, women had no probability of citizenship, propertied or not; they had the right to preserve property brought with them into the marriage but received no control at all over the income they, or their husbands, produced thereafter. Men had proper control over family matters; their decisions were the rule to be obeyed even in matters of "common Interest" since they were "the abler and the stronger" (Di Biase, 2020). Although Locke believes women to be rational beings as capable of reason as men, feminist scholars deny that Locke attributed women to a level of rationality identical to that of men.

5.8. Rousseau verifies Women is only for Domesticity

Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), a Genevan philosopher, is considered one of the key philosophers of the Enlightenment period; he supported the patriarchal family. He believes the family is a natural institution and the oldest of all societies. It was based on natural relationships of love and affection and originated from the biological process of procreation and the natural differences between the sexes. The family provided the blueprint for other social institutions that were natural. Within the family, age preceded youth, and males had a natural authority over females. He believes that a good woman is one who stays only in the circle of the family and avoids social distractions and political preoccupations. He believes that men and women differed in virtues; on the one side, a man's virtue was his rational capacity, while on the other side, a woman's virtue was her sexuality, which meant chastity, gentleness, and obedience. Since the functions of men and women differed, their education would also have to be different (Pateman, 1980).

Although his texts *'Emile', Or 'Treatise on Education'* show that he was concerned for "equality among men," his loyalty was not to women's equality. While Rousseau is often appreciated for his thoughts on human equality, the reality is that he did not believe women deserved equality. According to Rousseau, women needed to rely on men for their well-being since they were less rational than men. Rousseau argues that the "Value of women ought to be determined by the opinion that men have of them. Women's apparent worth is their real worth; women are the unique object in the world that ought to be subjected to the rule of opinion". Rousseau was in favor of a traditional sex-roled society. His position on women is reflected in his views of men over women.

According to Eva Figes, Rousseau's aim "to keep woman firmly back in the home" was guided by a desire to suppress women and the related self-serving belief that their role should be confined to bestowing 'domestic entertainment' for men (Figes, 1986). Rousseau nevertheless agreed with their views of women as "permanently subversive of political order" and enthusiastically subscribed to their notion of a "sexual contract" between men and women that wrecked women to a condition as slavery. Léon Abensour describes Rousseau as the "leader" and "chief" of the "anti-feminist school." because as a disparager of women, uniquely antifeminist for his times, Rousseau denied women "all capacity, all political rights" (Rosenblatt, 2002). Once it is acknowledged that man and woman are not and should not be constituted the same, either in character or in temperament, then they should not have the same education too. He pointed out that little girls loved to play with dolls and took to sewing rather than reading and writing; women's duty and natural responsibility is to provide care; hence their education should be designed to assist them in becoming more adept at doing so. He also manages to present a thorough and cogent framework for the dutiful education of women. He didn't believe that socializing process could be a trait in children's development. Rousseau believed that the method by which nature had made and gifted both men and women should be taken into account while educating and instructing them. He says that a woman's only responsibility is to take care of others; therefore, "her education must, in this sense, be distinct from a man's education." He further argues that "a woman's chief role in life is to be a wife and mother; hence she does not need the same kind of education as men do". Even though Rousseau is frequently hailed for his ideas on human equality, he did not think women deserved equality. Rousseau believed that because women lacked the same level of reasoning as men did, they had to rely on males for their well-being.

He believes that a woman has an identity only in relation to a man, and a woman is specially made for man's delight. If the woman is made to please and to be in subjection to man, she ought to make herself pleasing in his eyes and not provoke him to anger. Rousseau considered women as a source of sexual pleasure. Nature had made women the stimulator of men's passions; because of it, men had to strive and please them if their desires were to be satisfied. In this sense, men were dependent on women, who controlled men through their gentleness, their kindness, and their tears to get what they wanted (Fermon, 1997). Therefore, as long as men were dependent on women for love, women would get what they wanted. In his textual interpretation, Rousseau envisions for the boy *Émile* an education aimed to foster independence of mind and spirit, autonomy and self-sufficiency, while his companion-to-be, *Sophie*, should be educated to please *Émile* and so fulfill her feminine efficiency. Thus, Rousseau understands women as "nothing" or a "pleasing doll" against men.

5.9. Bentham accepted Legal Rights but denied Political Rights

Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) is regarded as a legal reformer and patriarch of English Utilitarianism. He advocated an end to the double standard in sexual matters and argued for personal freedom that would enable women to get divorced. Bentham was particularly unhappy with how women were treated during his lifetime. His behavior is exactly in line with his worldview, which abhorred ambiguous language used by men to justify and excuse treating women as though they were slaves. According to Bentham, the legal problems of marriage encouraged him to examine marriage contracts and apply his principles to them. While Bentham believes that marriage for life is the most "natural" state of affairs, he also asserts that being trapped in an abusive or loveless marriage is terrible and that women should be allowed to divorce (or dissolve a marriage, as it was called then) if they so choose. He asserted that to live under the constant authority of a man that one despises is already a kind of slavery, and to be constrained to receive males' embrace is suffering too great to be tolerated even in slavery itself. Jeremy Bentham's statement, "let there be no distinction between the sexes", summarizes his thoughts on relations between the sexes. His utilitarianism treated the female sex and male sex as equals, with equally valid preferences and equal capacity to act rationally in their own interests. The first volume of his "*Constitutional Code*", his greatest work, was published in 1827. He answers the evident question, "Why exclude the entire female sex from all participation in the constitutive power?" Bentham dismissed the claim (in an 1814 article on government in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* supplement) that women were incapable of rationally exercising the right to vote (Williford, 1975). He also admitted that women's suffrage was not politically attainable in his time. Thus, He does not say it is wrong but that the time is not right. Bentham backs away from any stern support for giving women the right to vote. His reluctance to grant suffrage to women lies on the assumption that they would be unable to vote effectively due to the intense opposition of men. Terence Ball argued that Bentham almost certainly was not a feminist; rather, his ultimate exclusion of women from suffrage had its origin not only in tactical choices but in acceptance of what he assumed to be women's inferiority (de Champs, 2022).

5.10. Hegel differentiates Intellectual and Ethical Frame of Both Sexes

Hegel (1770-1831) is one of the most important philosophers and idealists of western philosophy during the 18th century. Hegel describes in his text *Phenomenology of Spirit* women's function in the form of guardian of the "sacred claims of the family," and his analysis disclosed the role of women in performing relationships between the family, civil society, and the state in his famous text *Philosophy of Right*. Hegel, it is argued, perceives a woman as by nature destined to perform the role of passive embodiment as nurturing the family values, while her male counterpart perceives the challenge of progressively transcending natural quickness, which creates a cultural sphere of free moral action, of art, science, religion, politics, and philosophy as he assumes that a man is naturally capable of many activities in comparison to the power of a woman. The more important of these activities are—the struggle for existence and abstract thinking, such as we find in theoretical science and philosophy. Hegel's reasoning is suspect; to begin with, it is not true to say that woman is incapable of abstract reasoning (Padia, 1994).

In Hegel's account, only men are able to leave the family for civil society and full citizenship in the state, while women must stay home to preserve the family. Hegel would empower men to liberate themselves for higher and more universal ends by confining women to the family. Hegel's preservation of biologically-based gender roles within the family appears philosophically unmotivated, imposition of his personal sexism as a German husband (Stafford, 1997).

For Hegel, gender is something that defines women only in two particular contexts, as either a sexual partner or a mother, because in other contexts in which women can act, the traditional gender hierarchy and its consequences for women seem arbitrarily inflicted upon them. Further, Hegel's inclusion of traditional gender roles in his concept of the family threatens more than the *Philosophy of Rights*. In the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Hegel argues that the marriage relationship is the primary and immediate form in which one consciousness recognizes itself in another. Marriage is built upon reciprocal recognition; one cannot achieve recognition without another who gives it, and one cannot achieve full recognition unless that other is equal. For Hegel, the marriage contract transcends the traditional contract. Hegel's marriage contract creates an ethical bond, where spouses consent to make themselves into one person. One spouse does not own the other; both spouses are joined through love—not through the appropriation of property (Kane, 2015). For instance, he asserts in *Philosophy of Rights* that although women are capable of education, they are not made for activities that require a universal faculty, and for example, as the more advanced sciences, philosophy, and certain forms of artistic production, likewise, although women may have happy ideas, tastes, and elegance, they cannot attain to the ideal. The distinction between the male sex and the female sex is like that between animals and plants. Men are like animals, while women are like plants because their development is more peaceful, and the principal reason is the vague unity of feeling. When women hold the government, the state is at once in peril because, according to Hegel, women determine their actions not by the demands of universality but by arbitrary propensity and opinions. This means that Hegel considers the position of women subordinate to men in every situation and for every activity because of the intellectual and ethical frame of mind of men and women, respectively (Hegel, 2018).

5.11. Marx and Engels: Endless Capitalism can never end the Patriarchy

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels were revolutionary socialists of the 19th century and are referred to as the most important philosopher and social critics of modern times. In *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, written in 1844, Marx argued that "Women's position in society could be used as a measure of the development of society as a whole" (Brown, 2014). Marx argued that women were systemically suppressed by the ruling class and treated solely as second-class citizens. Marx argued that the real foundation of paternal power was laid with the initiation of private property. However, in his book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, Engels went further in exploring the position and nature of women within the framework of capitalism. In identifying the nuclear family structure as the source of women's oppression, Engels' essay was recognized as ground-breaking for its time.

As Engels believes that primitive societies also beyond modern society, where both sexes were based on equality; there was a sexual division of labour whereby women were given domestic work and men was for agriculture and husbandry, but even in the pairing family (which was not the same as strict monogamy), this did not involve subordination; the women was descent and supreme of the home, Engels called this 'mother right'. Society was matriarchal instead of patriarchal. This egalitarian position was transferred by the development of wealth as a new source in the male sphere of activity, in which the domestication of animals and the breeding of herds were included. As some men attained property and power over others, their position within the family was strengthened, and they desired to pass their property to their children; to follow this model, they had to overthrow the traditional order of inheritance and ensure strict monogamy on the part of each woman, who became the mere possession of her husband, the means of producing heirs. In Engels' vivid phase, 'The overthrow of mother right was the world historical defeat of the female sex'. The male took charge in the home also; the female was devalued and reduced to subjugation; she became the slave of male's lust and the sole instrument for the production of children. This means that the subordination of women coincided with the first private property and class society, for it was then that women lost control in the home and became economically dependent upon men; it also implies that women's oppression has no other material cause – it is a component of class society, but not a necessary or permanent feature of human relationships (Engels & Untermann, 2021). As a result, Engels concluded that the abolition of private property would mean an end to sex oppression, for men would no longer have any motive to exploit women. The dominion of the male in marriage is the simple repercussion of his economic supremacy, and with the abolition of the economic supremacy will disappear of itself.

The universal pattern of family development from the first human societies is questionable, which is given by Engels; both sexes were based on equality, which put a question mark on this concept, and; early men's wanting to leave their property to their heirs was also assumed rather than explained. Engels' assumption that it must have been men who created the first wealth has also been challenged, for it seems likely that women were the first cultivators who both provided subsistence and produced the first surplus. The assumption that women are naturally responsible for home and family also obscured Engels' understanding of contemporary society and led him to ignore the labour performed by women in pre-capitalist economies. He saw the problems a woman faced in trying to combine paid work with domestic responsibility, but he never really analyzed the implications of this 'dual oppression' or suggested that it could be alleviated with male help. Similarly, his approach permitted little room for perceiving the sex-specific oppression of women as workers; particularly, he failed to indicate why women were paid so much less than men. He also failed to investigate the implications of male objection to female labour; his opinion that capitalist development would continue to draw more women into employment disregarded the success of some parts of the workforce in achieving the 'family wage' (that is, a wage sufficiently high to maintain a dependent wife and children) (Kittay & Alcoff, 2008).

Engels has been further criticized for his views on human sexuality. For instance, he rejected the hypocrisy of the double standard of morality that appreciated chastity in female sex while condoning widespread prostitution and his idea that morality may be dependent on economic needs provide a ground for earlier analyses. However, he consistently accepted that men's sexual needs are naturally greater than women's, without raising a question of whether this too might be an expression of economic and social conditions: thus, he assumed that it was women and not men who originally found group marriage 'demeaning', and he consistently narrated of a woman 'surrendering' or giving herself to a man. Thus, the use of this kind of language would appear to exclude the idea of sexual activity based on equality and reciprocal pleasure. He also believed that sexual activity is naturally heterosexual and described homosexuality as an 'abominable practice', and it is clear that it would not be fit in a socialist society. At the same time, his stress on economic motivation often led to an oversimplification of sexual morality and behavior. For example, he thought that in a socialist society, when children are the liability of the whole community, there will no longer be the anxiety about the "consequences" which today prevent a woman from giving herself completely to the man she loves; the possibility that effective contraception might let also get rid of this anxiety, or that a 'woman' might simply not wish to become pregnant, seems not to have traversed his mind. Similarly, while the family may serve an important economic function, limiting it to this function is highly doubtful; thus, it ignores important psychological functions, and it denies the possibility of oppression within the proletarian family. This economic reductionism also ignores the enduring consequences of the different sexual needs that Engels took to be 'natural'. He asserted how women were abducted and 'sexually used' in the later stages of primitive society, but he did not observe

that this contradicted his affirmation that such societies were based on equality between the sexes, nor did he raise questions on its impacts on the future; the possibility that male sexuality might continue to pose a threat to women in socialist society was never raised; unlike many contemporary feminists, neither Marx nor Engels ever observe rape as a source of men's power over women.

Marxist feminists argued more limitedly for the end of one particular hegemonic system, which is called capitalism. They employed Engels' claim, which is raised in *"The Origin of Private Property and the Family"*, that women's oppression would end once capitalist oppression ended, a view endorsed by Rosa Luxemburg. But contemporary Marxist feminists Nancy Hartsock reversed that argument by claiming that capitalism could not be destroyed until women were liberated (Hirschmann, 2008). In other words, whereas Marxists argued that capitalism was the foundation for patriarchy, Marxist feminists argued that patriarchy was the foundation for capitalism (Kittay & Alcoff, 2008).

5.12. Mill provided Legal Rights but in the Domestic Cage

In view of the modern renaissance of the women's movement in the western world, it seems especially relevant to remember and pay tribute to the very significant influence which John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) had in the early struggle for women's rights. It is well-known that, as a parliamentarian for Westminster, Mill induced the first substantial debate on women's suffrage in the House of Commons, and it is generally acknowledged that his publication, *The Subjection of Women* in 1869, was a catalyst for the suffrage movement in Great Britain. He was a distinguished philosopher who was concerned with the broadest and most profound issues affecting the life of man in political society. Individuality, liberty, justice, and democracy were his values, and at the root of his whole philosophy was his belief that the utilitarian goal of '*the greatest happiness of the greatest number*' could not be achieved without the greatest possible advancement, moral and intellectual, of the human race. But Diana Coole has argued that thus he stressed the benefits to men and to society, and Mill had moved away from the stronger affair that can be based on equal rights arguments. She claims that his utilitarian orientation opens the door to compromise, for if it could be manifested that sex equality was not a means to the greatest happiness, then logically, it would have to be relinquished, for rights are now means to social well-being instead of absolute ends intrinsic in every individual (Bryson, 2016).

Susan Moller Okin rejects the claims that Mill made in his theory which was related to the immutable nature of women. From the beginning, Mill attacked those legal hindrances which prevent women from achieving their individual abilities. He explicitly rejected the neo-Aristotelian claim that biological differences explain female subordination, asserting that social and legal barriers prevent men from knowing a woman's true nature. He agreed that women seem to be in many ways inferior to men, but he asserted that this was a result of social pressure and faulty or non-pragmatic education. Women, therefore, must be given the same opportunities as men; only then will we acknowledge their correct abilities, and only then will society find the full benefit from the talents of all its members. This implied that legal discrimination against women was wrong in principle; in particular, women's legal enslavement in marriage must be stopped, women must be allowed free access to education and employment, and allowed to vote and hold political office (Bryson, 2016). But, on the contrary, Mill pursued the Aristotelian legacy in his loyalty to the patriarchal family by claiming that the traditional sexual division of labor is most natural and "most appropriate" for women by reducing the value of women's domestic labor in the family, and by restricting women's property rights (these should be earned only through market exchange), and he totally ignored the pattern that familial organization restricts women from effective citizenship in the state. Thus, although Mill challenged some customary blockades to women's equality, he still adopted a dual standard that imposed additional responsibilities on women, such as the duties of marriage, housewifery, family care, as well as the "rights" of wage labor as Okin claimed that, once again, by Mill, woman's capability was confined within a socially defined, male-dominated family vision (See, 1982).

5.13. Kant: The Woman is not Rational as Man

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) is the leading figure in modern political philosophy. He amalgamated early modern rationalism and empiricism and set the terms for much of nineteenth and twentieth-century philosophy, which has continued to operate as a significant influence today in political philosophy and some other fields. But Kant also made denigrating remarks about women. These remarks are scattered throughout his manuscripts, although the majority can be found in two texts: the 1764 *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime* and the Lectures on "*Anthropology From A Pragmatic Point of View.*" Some briefer comments can be found in other lecture series, the essay on *Theory and Practice*, the *Metaphysics of Morals*, and elsewhere. The first two texts shown are Kant's most systematic treatment of the sexes and hence, arguably, are those on which Kant's feminist critics have focused.

For instance, Kant believes that the virtue of a woman is a beautiful virtue, but man ought to be a noble virtue. Women could avoid evil not because it is unjust but rather because it is ugly. For them, virtuous actions imply that they are morally beautiful. Women have nothing of duty, compulsion, or obligation because they are intolerant of all commands and all bad-tempered or morose constraints. Further, he said that women do something because they love to, and the art lies in making sure that they love only what is good. He hardly believes that fair sex is capable of principles. Women are naturally fearful, weak, and passive. Since men are, obviously, stronger and more courageous, it's only reasonable for them to be in charge. He thought that women had so many

good qualities, such as they were very sound at running a household and they were really good at seducing men (Sticker,2020). Pauline Kleingeld opposed him, that he damned women with faint praise. Kant differentiates men and women, such as he claims that men and women are not even 'of the same kind, and he calls women a 'domestic animal' (Kleingeld, 2017). Barbara Herman provides evidence that he was unable to distance himself from the prejudices of his time. He certainly bought into a highly gendered conception of human beings. Kant believes that women lack something fundamental for being full human beings, such as rationality or moral agency (Herman, 1993; Mikkola, 2011). First, he believes that women lack rationality, which is a prerequisite for morality, and to do so innately. Second, Kant denied women the capacity for morality by denying them human dignity and worth. Concisely, Kant has a dim view of women as being innately morally deficient. Susan Moller Okin and Hannelore Schröder, and other feminists confirm the same.

Susan Mendus said that "in his influential introductory survey of Kant's various claims, he often appears to indulge in thoughtless endorsement of the prejudices of his time and an uncritical acceptance of the dogmas of others – especially Rousseau". Mendus observed Kant's integrated into four types: women's legal status as second-class ("passive") citizens; the function of monogamous marriage as the only correct context for expressing sexual desire; the requirement for a hierarchical relationship between husband and wife; and the fundamental difference between the nature of a woman and that of a man. Kant's treatment of marriage, she says, "is notorious, embarrassing to moral philosophers and philosophers of law alike (Mendus, 1992). Few people have had nice words to say about it, and at least one commentator described Kant's ideas as 'shallow and repulsive'." (Palmquist, 2017).

5.14. John Rawls ignores the Feminist Theory of Justice

Rawls' understanding of the idea of justice is based on equality – the minority does not cease its freedom to the majority. His Theory of Justice is usually considered an attempt to reconcile liberty and equality as well as to solve the problem of distributive justice by bringing back the idea of the social contract based on principles of justice. He conceptualizes an original position with a veil of ignorance to arrive at the aptest principles for the distribution of a set of primary goods required in every society. But Rawls' theory has also received much criticism from multiple academic zones in which some feminists are included. Susan Moller Okin, in her famous text "Justice, Gender and the Family," found that most philosophical projects on justice, including Rawls', rarely consider the functioning of the family as being significant for any discussion on justice. First, if the family is part of the basic structure, how can it also be a voluntary institution, equivalent to a church or a university? The family is a basic institution, for it has such a pervasive impact on everyone from the beginning of human life, while the church or the university has not. Rawls requires clarification if he indeed observes that these institutions are not different (Okin, 2005). Here Nussbaum's views are similar to that of Okin. Rawls considers the family as 'private' and justice as an idea related to the 'public' sphere. This assumption ignores the fact that the family and its functioning is itself, to a very great extent, constituted by the 'public' realm of laws and institutions and ideas of justice that constitute it. Carol Pateman considers that Rawls's scheme is only for the heads of households—who are mostly to be men—who come together and allow to accept the principles of justice, thereby leaving women out. Pateman labels Rawls' social contract as being patriarchal (Ginzburg et al. 2022). Carol Gilligan argues in her work 'Ethics of Care' that Rawls' model of a self-interested, autonomous, rational and individualistic person is typically related to male conception, which has left very little scope for values and functions like nurturing, caring, cooperation, and empathy that are typically related to female's qualities (Tronto, 1987). Thus, Carol Gilligan argues that female qualities are not described in Rawls' original position (Okano, 2016).

6. Conclusion

The findings of the study have discovered a strong correlation between misogynistic ideas propounded by western philosophers and its influencing factors to generate independent feminism. The foundation of women's misfortune has been laid by western philosophers, due to which they were not considered equals in front of men. Their nature has always been underestimated than that of men. They were given such roles, which would always give them a secondary status in the family, society, and state from earlier to the modern age. Therefore, all political philosophers are blamed for ignoring women's role in the family, society, and the state, who acted as a catalyst for those feminists who ripped apart the so-called political philosophers and criticized them for keeping a foundation for independent feminism. In the past decades or more, as a result, feminism has influenced philosophical history in numerous ways. To examine the changing conceptions regarding woman's nature and of the feminine gender and its exclusions in western philosophical history, many feminist scholars have done a tremendous job, such as Genevieve Lloyd, Michèle Le Doeuff, Luce Irigaray, Prudence Allen, Andrea Nye, Nancy Tuana, Elizabeth Spelman, Penelope Deutscher, Moira Gatens, and Karen Green. Contributors of the edited volume "*Feminism and Ancient Philosophy*" (by Julie Ward) and edited volume "*Engendering Origins: Critical Feminist Readings in Plato and Aristotle*" (by Bat-Ami Bar-On) created a feminist perspective for the reading of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Lucretius, and the Stoics and contributors of the edited volume "*Woman and the History of Philosophy*" (by Nancy Tuana) reinterpreted the major political philosophers' writings such as Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Kierkegaard, or Nietzsche. Female political scholars such as Nancy Sherman, Annette Baier, Robin May Schott, and Barbara Herman re-examine classical ethical interpretations given by Aristotle, Hume, and Kant (O'Neill, 2007). Some other feminist thinkers reject the theories based on standard histories of the philosophy of science and investigate the interrelations between women, gender,

and the rise of early modern science. Not only did some scholars such as Susan Okin and Carole Pateman challenge ancient histories of social and political philosophy from a feminist lens. Simone de Beauvoir and Mary Wollstonecraft did not lag behind in challenging the essential concepts created by prominent political thinkers such as Aristotle and Jean Jacques Rousseau, and Edmond Burke. Here, the purpose of the study and our hypothesis seems to be fulfilled. However, this study also had some limitations because it was correlated with the origin of patriarchy, sexist comments by western philosophers, and historical criticisms regarding women's role in family, society, and the state. Hence, the generalization of the findings is limited to a similar context and issues. But even then, this study provides a manifesto for those scholars who require studying family, society, and the state so that they can think before interpreting that women are equal partners in all these institutions, and the current study might be helpful to society and the state, especially in making policies regarding women-related issues.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

- [1] Bradley, S. P. (1990). *The status of women in Roman and Frankish law*. Rice University.
- [2] Brisson, L. (2012). Women in Plato's Republic. *Études platoniciennes*, (9), 129-136.
- [3] Brown, H. (2014). Marx on gender and the family: A summary. *Monthly review*, 66(2), 48-57.
- [4] Bryan V. (3 March 2014). Five Reasons Why Socrates was a terrible Husband. Available at <https://classicalwisdom.com/people/philosophers/five-reasons-socrates-terrible-husband/#:~:text=Socrates%20is%20often%20credited%20with,you%20will%20be%20a%20philosopher.%E2%80%9D>
- [5] Bryson, V. (2016). *Feminist political theory*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- [6] Bubeck, D. (2000). Feminism in political philosophy. *The Cambridge companion to feminism in philosophy*, 185.
- [7] Burns, S. (1984). Women in Bloom. *Dialogue: Canadian Philosophical Review/Revue canadienne de philosophie*, 23(1), 135-140.
- [8] Cartwright, M. (24 February 2014). The Role of Women in the Roman World. Available at <https://www.worldhistory.org/article/659/the-role-of-women-in-the-roman-world/>
- [9] Cited in Rosenblatt, H. (2002). On the "Misogyny" of Jean-Jacques Rousseau: The Letter to d'Alembert in Historical Context. *French Historical Studies*, 25 (1), 91-114.
- [10] de Champs, E. (2022). The interests of women in Bentham's late constitutional thought.
- [11] Di Biase, G. (2020). Locke on women's rationality. *Philosophical Inquiries*, 8(2), 9-30. Available at <https://polsci101.wordpress.com/2009/11/11/lockes-view-of-women/>
- [12] Engels, F., & Untermann, E. (2021). The origin of the family, private property and the state. In *Politics and Kinship* (pp. 217-223). Routledge.
- [13] Femenias, M. L. (1994). Women and natural hierarchy in Aristotle. *Hypatia*, 9(1), 164-172.
- [14] Fermon, N. (1997). *Domesticating Passions: Rousseau, Woman, and the Nation*. Wesleyan University Press. P.24.
- [15] Figs, E. (1986). A Man's World. In *Patriarchal Attitudes* (pp. 17-34). Palgrave, London.
- [16] Geoghegan, V. (2008). Pandora's box: Reflections on a myth. *Critical Horizons*, 9(1), 24-41.
- [17] Ginzburg, C., Davis, N. Z., Szijártó, I. M., Magnússon, S. G., de Larivière, C. J., Rawls, J., ... & Pateman, C. (2022) MICROHISTORIES AND SOCIAL CONTRACT ETHICS. *BIG AND LITTLE HISTORIES*, 102.
- [18] Johnson, G. (May 25, 2011). The Woman Question in White Nationalism. Available at **Counter-Currents.com**
- [19] Hegel, G.W.F. (2018). *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A.V. Miller, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1977), #474, p.287.
- [20] Held, V. (1982). "The Radical Future of Liberal Feminism" by Zillah R. Eisenstein (Book Review). *Signs*, 7(3), 696.
- [21] Herman, B. (1993). Could it be worth thinking about Kant on sex and marriage?.
- [22] Hirschmann, N. J. (2008). Feminist political philosophy. *Feminist Philosophy*, 145.
- [23] Kane, L. W. (2015). On Hegel, Women, and the Foundation of Ethical Life: Why Gender Doesn't Belong in the Family. *CLIO: A Journal of Literature, History, and the Philosophy of History*, 44(1).
- [24] Kittay, E. F., & Alcoff, L. M. (Eds.). (2008). *The Blackwell guide to feminist philosophy*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [25] Kleingeld, P. (2017). The problematic status of gender-neutral language in the history of philosophy: The case of Kant. In *Immanuel Kant* (pp. 99-115). Routledge.
- [26] Marcina, V. (2004). Machiavelli, Civic Virtue, and Gender. *Feminist Interpretations of Niccolo Machiavelli*, 309-336.
- [27] Mendus, S. (1992). Kant: an honest but narrow-minded bourgeois. *Essays on Kant's political philosophy*, 166-90.
- [28] Mikkola, M. (2011). Kant on moral agency and women's nature. *Kantian review*, 16(1), 89-111.
- [29] Mitchell, M. (2010). *The problem of women in Hobbes's "Leviathan"* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill).
- [30] Nyland, C. (1990). John Locke and the social position of women.
- [31] O'Neill, E. (2007). Justifying the Inclusion of Women in our Histories of Philosophy. *Feminist Philosophy*, 17.
- [32] Okano, Y. (2016). Why has the ethics of care become an issue of global concern?. *International Journal of Japanese Sociology*, 25(1), 85-99.
- [33] Okin, S. M. (2005). Justice, gender, and the family. p.27
- [34] Okin, S. M. (2013). *Women in western political thought*. Princeton University Press.
- [35] Padia, C. (1994). Plato, Aristotle, Rousseau and Hegel on Women: A Critique. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 55(1), 27-36.
- [36] Palmquist, S. R. (2017). Egalitarian Sexism: A Kantian Framework for Assessing the Cultural Evolution of Marriage (I). *Ethics & Bioethics*, 7(1-2), 35-55.
- [37] Pateman, C. (1980). Women and consent. *Political theory*, 8(2), 149-168.

- [38] Popik, K. M. (1979). *The philosophy of woman of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Doctoral dissertation, Verlag nicht ermittelbar). Available at <https://carolyncustisjames.com/2013/08/06/thomas-aquinas-on-women/>
- [39] Robinson, T. (1999). Arete and Gender-Differentiation in Socrates/Plato and Aristotle. *Areté*, 11(1-2), 71-81.
- [40] Saxonhouse, A. W. (1976). The philosopher and the female in the political thought of Plato. *Political Theory*, 4(2), 195-212.
- [41] Schollmeier, P. (2003). Aristotle and women: Household and political roles. *Polis: The Journal for Ancient Greek and Roman Political Thought*, 20(1-2), 22-42.
- [42] Schott, R. M. (2008). Feminism and the History of Philosophy. *Feminist Philosophy*, 43.
- [43] See, K. O. S. (1982). Feminism and Political Philosophy.
- [44] Smith, N. D. (1983). Plato and Aristotle on the Nature of Women. *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 21(4), 467-478.
- [45] Sparshott, F. (1985). Aristotle on women. *Philosophical Inquiry*, 7(3/4), 177-200.
- [46] Sreedhar, S. (2012). Hobbes on 'The Woman Question'1. *Philosophy Compass*, 7(11), 772-781.
- [47] Stafford, A. M. (1997). The Feminist Critique of Hegel on Women and the Family. *Animus*, 2, 64-92.
- [48] Sticker, M. (2020). The Case against Different-Sex Marriage in Kant. *Kantian Review*, 25(3), 441-464.
- [49] Tronto, J. C. (1987). Beyond gender difference to a theory of care. *Signs: journal of women in culture and society*, 12(4), 644-663.
- [50] Williford, M. (1975). Bentham on the Rights of Women. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 36(1), 167-176.