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One Pager 2- Social Democracy vs Moderate Democracy

Social democracy is explained by Mulgan as being a “type of welfare state democracy” where “its citizens use collective mechanisms to distribute” basic material needs unto one another. Martha Nussbaum specifically sees Aristotelian thought as conforming to social democratic philosophy, claiming that Aristotle advocates for redistribution of wealth to support the people. Whereas, Mulgan redirects Aristotelian politics toward moderate democracy, a mixture between oligarchy (for the rich) and democracy (for the poor). Aristotle’s thought only took into account the free males of the polis, which is incompatible with *modern* democracy. However, under a cultural and historical context, natural inequalities dismissed, Aristotle agrees with the collected wisdom of the polity and predicts stability with a more inclusive citizen body. Aristotle sees justice as something that can be distributed in order of the amount of virtue in one’s life where political rights and honors be distributed to those with virtues. Aristotle might be considered a democrat because his purposed policies favor the working middle class, as the power is in the hands of the polity. However, social democracy should favor the exploited lower class. Mulgan argues that if Aristotle is a social democrat, he would have relied a great more upon personal rights. Aristotle justifies this through natural inferiority of women and slaves which is determined through a natural lottery, where no one has a choice. Aristotle argues that the polity must distribute the material and social order to develop the morality and virtues of its citizens based upon their capabilities. So, if a slave, lower class member is born with a great capability and virtue they will never gain freedom. This is counterintuitive to democratic justice. Or may we as scholars, just as we do with ancient Greece, dismiss the lower class as a commodity that must be.