

that what the state should aim at is not the mechanical unity resulting from similarity, but that he ought to have aimed at what we might call an organic unity, a unity in diversity, a unity which is consistent with a difference in the immediate interests & positions of the several individuals who compose it. eg. "a state is not made up of some kind of men but diff^t kinds of men, for similars do not constitute a state."

sadly that Communism will not attain even the end of unity of sentiment, which Plato had made the one object to be aimed at, because the state of things which Plato desires will be one in which there is no strong personal interest of any kind. - here he probably exaggerates - one will have to distinguish between various kinds of common property. where collective ownership means only a sort of alternate personal enjoyment we can agree without doubt that it will not arouse any strong sense of harmony. yet where the object shall be enjoyed by all at same time eg. public park, where a common feeling should not grow up. Aristotle's criticism is right to extent that common ownership is not of itself sufficient to create a strong harmonious interest. -

We may pass over his criticism of community of wives - easy task to show difficulties which will arise. The common property we may distinguish 4 main arguments. He begins by distinguishing