

Thomas Paine's Dethronement of Hereditary Succession, For The Reign Of Popular Sovereignty.

TSALA MBANI André Liboire¹, KUKWAH Ezekiel BANGHA²

1 (Department of philosophy, psychology, sociology, Professor-University of Dschang, Cameroon)

2 (Department de philosophie, Psychologie, Sociologie, Doctorate-University of Dschang Cameroon)

ABSTRACT: In Thomas Paine's view, hereditary succession is a hindrance to the establishment of a politics that respects the people. Paine criticizes hereditary succession because it is an obstacle to, freedom, justice and as well the development of the people. His thinking invites reflection on the foundations of power and the origin of authority, as well as on the role and place of government in political life. He seeks to limit the power of the monarch in favor of a government, based on the reason and informed consent of citizens. However, an analytical and critical approach shows that his vision has significant limitations, notably that of, underestimating the role that, government can play in protecting individual rights and freedoms. Instead of thinking about limiting government, this article proposes a reformation that can minimize abuses of power and inequalities. Thus, for legitimate and effective governance, citizen participation, and accountability are crucial elements.

Keywords: freedom, government limitation, hereditary succession, justice, State.

Résumé : Dans la perspective de Thomas Paine, la succession héréditaire est un frein à la mise sur pied d'une politique qui respecte le peuple. Thomas Paine critique la succession héréditaire, car elle est un obstacle à la liberté et à la justice. Sa pensée invite à une réflexion sur les fondements du pouvoir et l'origine de l'autorité, ainsi que sur le rôle et la place du gouvernement dans la vie politique. Il cherche à limiter le pouvoir de la monarchie en faveur d'un gouvernement fondé sur la raison et le consentement éclairé des citoyens. Mais une approche analytique et critique montre que sa vision comporte des limites importantes, notamment en sous-estimant le rôle que le gouvernement peut jouer dans la protection des droits et de la liberté individuelle. Au lieu de penser à une limitation du gouvernement, l'article propose une réforme qui peut permettre de minimiser les abus de pouvoir et les inégalités. Ainsi, pour une gouvernance légitime et efficace, la participation citoyenne, et la reddition de comptes sont des éléments cruciaux.

Mots clés : État, justice, liberté, limitation du gouvernement, succession héréditaire

I. INTRODUCTION

Hereditary succession was a common practice in most European countries during the time of Thomas Paine especially the case of England. This practice was often seen as a guarantee of political stability and continuity of government. However, this approach also sparked many criticisms from those who believed that hereditary succession was an archaic practice that limited freedom and equality for the living and, the next generation of those to come. In this context, Thomas Paine emerged as a central figure in criticizing hereditary succession, and played a crucial role in the rebirth of human rights and equal opportunity between States and others, humans and others. Paine is best known for his book *Common Sense*, which played a major role in promoting American independence and criticizing the monarchical system. It is in this context that, this article examines Paine's arguments regarding hereditary succession and its impact on governance.

Thomas Paine's thinking is thus in line with these two thinkers, who thinks, government by succession is unjust and will cause several ills to society. In this article, we will examine Thomas Paine's arguments against hereditary succession and its implications for governance. This leads us to raise the issue of the legitimacy of government through succession. For Paine, hereditary succession, or the transmission of power from generation to generation within the same family, is based on luck rather than merit, and does not guarantee that leaders are competent or benevolent. Furthermore, Paine asserts that government is a necessary evil because it is needed to protect individual rights and maintain social order. This explains why he asserted that; the society is good and a blessing as compared to government because; "government even in its best state is but a necessary evil; in its worst state an intolerable one"¹. However, he argues that government should be limited and citizens should

¹ Thomas Paine (1918), *Common sense*, New York, Published by Peter Eckler, P.6

have direct control over their leaders. Paine views democracy as the most just and effective form of government, as it allows citizens to choose their leaders and actively participate in decision-making.

Despite the significance of the critique of hereditary succession, there are still gaps in the overall understanding of the scope and relevance of Thomas Paine's ideas in this context. This study seeks to fill these gaps by thoroughly examining Paine's arguments against hereditary succession and evaluating their impact on later political thought. Consequently, we are prompted to reflect on the issue of the foundation of popular sovereignty. Does Paine not deceive himself by asserting that sovereignty is the work of representative systems, knowing that in representation, the people do not truly govern?

The study will employ a methodological approach based on textual analysis of Thomas Paine's works, along with contemporary historical documents to contextualize his ideas within the political framework of the time. Understanding Paine's critique of hereditary succession is essential for informing current debates on the legitimacy of political power and the conception of governmental systems. This research will contribute to a better understanding of the philosophical foundations of modern democracy. Our work will revolve around three axes. The first will examine Paine to highlight his influence on the thoughts of hereditary succession; the second will argue that from Paine's perspective, popular sovereignty is not possible in a government by succession; finally, we will identify the shortcomings of this hypothesis.

II. PAINE'S MOTIVE OF REJECTING HEREDITARY SUCCESSION

An author deeply rooted in his context, it remains challenging to identify the influences that shaped his thinking. Unraveling the foundations of his reflection proves to be a delicate task. As Philp emphasizes in the introduction to "Rights of Man" and "Common Sense," the author of these works does not present himself as a scholar engaging in abstract theory. The formation of Paine's political theory seems to stem from contemporary circumstances, evolving in reaction to the political conflicts of his time. Paine does not construct an abstract theoretical system; instead, he resolutely dedicates himself to devising pragmatic solutions for concrete issues. It is worth noting that Paine acquired his knowledge through self-education, and his frustrations stemmed not only from personal setbacks but also from his unwavering determination to defend ideals that clashed with the conventions of his era. His life was a testament to the difficulty of maintaining radical convictions in a world often resistant to change. Although his ideas later found resonance in the human rights movement, Paine endured years of solitude and disdain for daring to express his vision of a more equitable and just society. It is evident that the motivations behind Paine's thought are more contextual than theoretical.

2.1 Slavery in the New World and Control of Its Resources

Slavery in the New World, encompassing the Americas after Christopher Columbus's discovery in 1492, has been a fundamental aspect of the region's economic, social, and political history. Europeans introduced slavery to America to meet the growing demand for labor in sugar, tobacco, cotton plantations, and other lucrative crops. Control of resources was a key element of this endeavor. Europeans exploited the natural wealth of the New World, such as sugar, cotton, tobacco, and precious metals, using slave labor to maximize production. Colonies were established and structured around these resources, with economies dependent on the forced labor of slaves.

The triangular trade emerged as a complex economic system involving Europe, Africa, and the Americas. Europeans traded manufactured goods for slaves in Africa, then used these slaves to exploit the resources of the New World. The harvested products were then shipped to Europe to complete the trade cycle. This exploitation of resources and labor had profound consequences on New World societies. Indigenous populations were decimated by diseases brought by Europeans, while African slaves were forcibly transported to work in inhumane conditions.

Slavery also had political implications, contributing to the formation of stratified societies and the perpetuation of institutionalized racism. The struggle for independence in many regions of the New World was often linked to the issue of slavery, with abolitionist movements emerging over time.

As Enlightenment ideas and humanitarian movements gained influence, the abolition of slavery became a major political objective. Thomas Paine was a staunch opponent of slavery. In his thinking, he harshly criticizes the institution of slavery, considering it incompatible with the ideals of freedom and equality. This is why he stated that Britain came with her Army to enforce her tyranny, has declared that she has a right not only to tax, but to bind us in all case because by their cowardice and submission to them, "the sad choice of a variety of evils; a ravaged country, a depopulated habitation without safety and slavery without hope. Our homes turned into barracks and bawdy-houses for Hessians"². The rule of Britain was cruel that frustrated a lot of persons coming from different parts of Europe to be tempted of leaving the New World again. Paine argues that every

² Paine Thomas (2003), *American Crisis*, London, Vol,1 tenth edition, produce by Norman M. Wolcott: Oxford University PRESS, P.12

individual is born with inherent, inalienable natural rights, and he views slavery as a fundamental violation of these rights. He writes in this vein: "Human rights are not gracious concessions granted by governments. They are inherent to our nature³." Paine believed that governments should be subject to checks and limits to prevent abuses of power and ensure justice and fairness for all. He advocates for the emancipation of slaves, emphasizing that all men are equal and that slavery is a blatant injustice. Although his ideas had a significant impact on the political thought of his time, it is important to note that the abolition of slavery in the United States only occurred several decades after Paine's death, during the American Civil War on 1809.

2-2- Paine's Perspective on Protecting Future Generations

No generation should have the right or power to impose its influence on future generations, especially in political matters and regarding the inherent rights of humanity. Before delving into these rights individually, Paine ensures their preservation; even within society, human rights remain eternal and inalienable. Human rights must be apprehended objectively, meaning they exist independently of human action or will. This is precisely why Paine opposes Burke's view that rights can be deprived of future generations. Paine declares that he has "no intention to propose petitions to claim the rights of the people. Whatever those rights are, the people must possess them, and no one has the power to take them away or grant them⁴."

It seems that Paine is subject to contradictions or, at least, apparent inconsistency when addressing the eternity and non-transferability of human rights on one hand and the impossibility of declaring these rights in 1689 in Britain while imposing them on future British generations. How does Paine propose to resolve this contradiction? To answer this question, he invokes, despite all Burkean controversy, the need for regular revision and amendment over time for any human work or text, be it the text of the Declaration of Human Rights or legal texts and laws. Unlike Britain, America and France have established a period for the revision of their constitutions because:

It is perhaps impossible to establish anything that combines principles with opinions and practice, which the progress of circumstances, through a length of years, will not in some measure derange or render inconsistent; and therefore, to prevent inconveniences accumulating, till they discourage reformation or provoke revolutions, it is best to provide the means of regulating them as they occur⁵.

Unlike Burke, Paine incorporates change into his political system, assigning it a crucial role in both evolution and management. Establishing and preserving freedom are imperatives according to Paine, who advocates for the abolition of despotic government in favor of a representative government. He believes that political and social freedom can truly exist only within the framework of a representative system. He considers that it is only in such an environment that the individual can flourish. This freedom, initially individual and then extended to the social realm, plays a crucial role in guaranteeing national sovereignty, thus contributing to the happiness and prosperity of society as a whole: "There is a general principle that distinguishes freedom from servitude, which is that any hereditary government imposed on a people is a kind of slavery, whereas representative government is synonymous with freedom⁶."

In his book, Paine refers several times to the Marquis de Lafayette to compare him to Burke, thus illustrating his noble commitment to the natural principles of government and the Revolution led in the name of human rights, whether in America or France⁷. Paine refers to Lafayette on two distinct occasions; first in his work *Rights of Man* in 1791, and then more briefly in his letter to the recipients, stating that "for a nation to be free, it is enough that it wants to be⁸." Paine emphasized on the nation's responsibility, also highlighting its autonomy in political freedom. He asserts that it is the right to freedom that gives the nation the means to establish itself and justifies any recourse to revolt.

III. PAINE AGAINST HEREDITARY SUCCESSION TO THE NEED OF POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY

The critique of hereditary succession dates back several centuries in political philosophy, and Thomas Paine drew extensively from this tradition to develop his own critique of this practice. According to Paine,

³Paine Thomas (1894), *Right of Man; Being an Answer to Mr Burke's Attack on the French Revolution*, London, J.S Jordon, No 166, p. 182.

⁴ Thomas Paine (1998), *Letter addressed to the Addressers*, in *Rights of Man, Common Sense and Other Political Writings*, Edited with an introduction and notes by Mark Philp, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1998, p. 340.

⁵ Paine Thomas (1894), *Right of Man; Being an Answer to Mr Burke's Attack on the French Revolution*, London, J.S Jordon, p. 261.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 254.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 94-95 and 147.

⁸ Letter addressed to the Addressers, Op. Cit., p. 366.

hereditary succession is an unjust practice that favors an elite at the expense of the people like early said. Moreover, he argued that the government, while a necessary evil, must be reduced to its simplest form to protect individual rights and freedom. In this second part of our analysis, we will delve into Paine's thoughts by examining his conception of a government centered on succession and why he considered the government a necessary evil.

3-1- The Theory of Revolution and the Rejection of Succession in Politics

The theory of revolution is a common idea among others that, got the attention of several thinkers who were interested towards rejecting any perspective of human domination. Ideas were diverse on this subject. From Burke's point of view, the revolution was nothing more than a disturbance that leads to nothing. In contrast to Burke, Paine believes that the French Revolution is indeed part of the movement of revolutions of its kind with peoples interest as objective. However, he does not perceive it as dangerous or harmful. According to him, these revolutions are inevitable, given the situations of the governments that provoke them. Furthermore, Paine hopes that this multitude of revolutions will ultimately generate an international revolution, with the final goal being the "total extirpation of despotism and governmental corruption"⁹. While a national revolution is always desirable, Paine asserts that only an international revolution represents the ultimate means to establish a free and egalitarian government. Paine's attitude towards the revolution reflects his perspective on political change in general.

Unlike Burke, who favored stability and established order, Paine attaches crucial importance to political upheaval, considering it an active and essential agent. He praises political change, breaks with the past, and categorically challenges the right of one generation to rule over posterity, explicitly rejecting Burke's postulate: "There never did, there never will, and there never can exist a Parliament, or any description of men, or any generation of men, in any country, possessed of the right or the power of binding and controlling posterity to the 'end of time'¹⁰." Burke's presumption, Paine believes, is tyrannical and contrary to the just principles of freedom and equality because "man has no property in man, and no generation can bequeath to the next the right to bind and control it"¹¹. Due to the central importance Paine places on reform and change, it seems entirely logical that this perspective also influences his conception of political regimes.

Paine rejects monarchy as unnatural. According to him, the fundamental principle of monarchy, based on hereditary succession, is both unnatural and meaningless. A regime that relies on national ignorance rather than reason and popular consent cannot justify its existence, as it is incapable of ensuring the happiness of the nation. Paine goes so far as to qualify monarchical governments as "bad," emphasizing their ability to corrupt the intrinsic nature of man, providing no significant benefit. According to Paine;

Our eyes must be closed to reason; our understanding must be strangely degraded not to see the folly of what is called monarchy. Nature has made some of her works with a soul of order, but this is a mode of government contrary to nature, which turns the progress of human faculties upside down and forces adults to be governed by children and wisdom by folly¹².

Like Wollstonecraft, Paine reacts to Burke's sentimentalism by adopting language borrowed from the Enlightenment. He seeks to restore the foundations of politics on rational principles and recognize the active role of human reason: "What is called monarchy has always seemed to me a stupid and contemptible system"¹³, he says, concluding his perception and opposition to monarchy with examples from France and America because "in America, it is considered absurd, and in France, its decline is such that only the goodness of the man who embodies it and the respect inspired by his person still preserve a semblance of existence"¹⁴. The fate of these monarchical and aristocratic regimes is, according to Paine, inevitably ephemeral, as they prove powerless against the emancipated individual who, guided by reason, claims his rights and will end by successive revolutions to any harmful regime. At the same time, Paine rejects the idea of a mixed regime, fervently defended by Burke in his Reflections because, in his eyes, this type of government is the most corrupt of all, as it's considered separately, are either representative or hereditary¹⁵. Monarchical regime and the representative principle are, according to Paine, incompatible: "To unite representation with what is called monarchy is to make an extravagant government. Representation is in itself the delegated monarchs of the people and cannot

⁹ Paine Thomas (1894), *Right of Man; Being an Answer to Mr Burke's Attack on the French Revolution*, Op. Cit., p. 268.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 204.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 235.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 234.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

¹⁵ Thomas Paine (1795), *Dissertation on First Principles of Government*, New York, second edition, printed and sold by Daniel Isaac Eaton, p. 38.

stoop to share that with another¹⁶." Paine examines the aristocratic regime with the same perspective because it also relies on the hereditary principle. Although aristocracy may be slightly preferable to monarchy, this is mainly due to statistics; it is more likely to find someone competent and benevolent among several individuals than among a single monarch.

However, according to Paine, this system goes against nature, as instead of ensuring the happiness of man, it perverts and alters his own essence. Moreover, the aristocratic government relies solely on meaningless noble titles, like nicknames without real meaning or consequences. He states that "titles are nothing but nicknames, and nicknames are titles. This is a fairly harmless thing in itself, but it denotes in human character a certain vanity that degrades it, for it diminishes man in great things and makes him mimic women in small things¹⁷." To be considered good and legitimate, a government must aim at both individual members of the nation and the nation as a whole, according to Paine. He explains that this type of government would be a Republic, characterized by its commitment to the public thing. Paine makes it clear from the outset that the Republic is not a model of government, such as monarchy or representative government, but rather a characteristic of governments describing their goals and main areas of interest that appear as the "sign of both the form and the public principle of government¹⁸." According to Paine, the government must adopt a republican form, meaning that it must be founded and directed according to republican principles, constantly aiming for the common good. In this sense, he compares it to democracy. Paine believes that democracy is no longer an appropriate regime, being impractical in a state of large scale. Thus, he asserts: "If one considers democracy as the basis while rejecting corrupt systems such as monarchy and aristocracy, the system that naturally emerges is that of representation¹⁹." In this regard, the representative regime emerges as a natural alternative, although its concept is ancient. It is the "oldest that has ever existed, founded (as it is) on the original and intrinsic rights of man²⁰."

3-2- Operational Rules of Popular Sovereignty

The operational rules of popular sovereignty are the principles and mechanisms that guide the effective implementation of the concept of popular sovereignty within a political system. Popular sovereignty is based on the idea that power emanates from the people, and these operational rules aim to materialize this idea. In one of his final writings on October 17, 1806, titled "A Challenge to the Federalists to Declare their Principles," Paine emphasizes the fundamental nature of principles in defining political groups²¹. The "old names of Whigs and Tories" have been replaced by "Republicans" and "Federalists." The latter are the heirs of those who rejected the foundational principles of the Republic. Party designations have no content in themselves; it is their principles that are decisive.

The term "Republican" carries meaning in itself, even if not particularly positive, limited to its opposition to monarchy. In contrast, the term "Federalist" seems devoid of meaning, being an empty expression. It can be applied to a group of federated thieves for committing a crime or to any other association. When individuals form political parties, it is common for them to articulate their principles; however, the Federalists do not disclose their convictions. One can conclude either that they have none at all or that they are too detrimental to be articulated. Republicans, on the other hand, openly declare their principles: defense of representative government, promotion of peace between nations, opposition to war and power politics, rejection of a fiscal-financial system favoring one part of the population over others, etc. The foundational principle lies in the conviction that sovereignty "resides in the great mass of the people." Thus, Republicans reject any form of hereditary government or aristocracy considered "natural."

The solid foundation of republican government rests on the natural equality of individuals and fundamental human rights. It distinguishes itself from monarchy due to its grounding in human reason and rational operation, thus moving away from any dependence on national ignorance. "The representative system is based on society and civilization; and for a guide, it has nature, reason, and experience²²," and it "is intended to produce the wisest laws, as it gathers wisdom wherever it is found²³." According to Paine, representative government is the perfect form because it is a government "based on a moral theory, on a system of universal peace, and on the inherent and hereditary rights of man," and because "its progress" concerns not just

¹⁶ Thomas Paine, *Rights of Man*, Op. Cit., p. 233.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 131.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 229.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 232.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

²¹ Paine Thomas (1806), *A Challenge to the Federalists*, edition Philip S. FONER, tome II, p. 1007-1010.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 227.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 228.

individuals but entire nations, promising a new era for mankind²⁴." Through representative government, Paine envisage the future of humanity and opens new perspectives towards the social well-being of peoples.

Paine emphasizes his choice to remove this specific notion from the list of rights derived from natural rights. Instead, he insists on the fundamental importance of political equality and rights as the true foundation of representative government. Paine seems to favor the idea that political equality, rather than a specific right, should be the cornerstone of any representative government system. This may reflect his belief that democracy and authentic representation rest on the equality of all citizens before the law, rather than on specific rights stemming from nature. "The true and the only true basis of representative government²⁵" and "It is by a strange mixture of tyranny and cowardice that exclusions have been put into practice, and they still endure²⁶."

IV. POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY IN PAINE: AN IDEAL PUNCTURED BY REALITY

Thomas Paine's conception of popular sovereignty, though grounded in an enlightened democratic ideal, inevitably grapples with the complexity of the real world. Paine, a fervent advocate for human rights and a major player in the American Revolution, champions the sovereignty of the people as a cornerstone of a just and harmonize society. However, this ideal, laden with hope and promises, cannot escape the complexities of political and social realities. The challenges of implementing popular sovereignty, the inherent tensions in real democratic processes, and the necessary compromises emerge as obstacles capable of puncturing the theoretical ideal of an unalterable people's sovereignty. Thus, in Paine's view, popular sovereignty remains an ideal punctured by the contingencies of reality, while still embodying a fundamental aspiration for justice and equality.

4-1- Thomas Paine's Political Abstraction

Popular sovereignty, as elaborated by Thomas Paine, has often been the target of criticism, especially regarding its perceived overreliance on immediate circumstances. A fundamental critique argues that Paine's theory has depth, focusing excessively on the specific events of his time rather than proposing universal political principles. In reacting to the political conflicts of his era, Paine formulated his ideas to address the urgencies of the moment. However, this focus on immediate circumstances raises concerns about the theory's ability to withstand the test of time. By concentrating on specific events, Paine's theory risks becoming obsolete as political contexts evolve. The principles articulated in a particular moment may not be suitable for different situations, compromising the long-term effectiveness of popular sovereignty as Paine conceived it.

The lack of consideration for long-term implications can also be interpreted as a flaw in constructing a robust political theory. Paine's ideas, while relevant for his time, may be perceived as insufficiently thoughtful about the long-term consequences of implementing political principles based on circumstantial events. This critique raises the question of whether a political theory should be more abstract and universal to remain relevant across generations.

The reactive nature of Paine's theory also has implications for the stability of political institutions. If popular sovereignty is rooted in specific events, it may be subject to fluctuations and frequent changes based on the whims of current events. This can compromise a society's ability to establish durable political institutions and maintain the necessary stability for effective functioning. As evident, the critique of political abstraction in Paine's theory highlights the inherent risk of an approach that is too reactive and circumstantial in constructing political principles. While his ideas had a significant impact in his time, the limitations associated with their temporal specificity raise questions about their applicability and durability in the ever-evolving political landscape.

However, Paine's theory did not find agreement to Burke and Gottfried. Edmund Burke, in his response to Paine's book *The Rights of Man*, criticizes the argument that hereditary succession is absurd by stating that; "hereditary succession is an institution that serves to preserve the heritage of freedom²⁷". Similarly, Johann Gottfried Herder opposes Paine's arguments by valuing succession in the acquisition of power. He writes in this regard: "Nations, like families, need a hereditary leader who is rooted in the history of the nation and who has the necessary authority to embody the values of the nation²⁸". Thus, we cannot accept Thomas Paine's political thinking as gospel truth.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 213.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 396.

²⁶ Thomas Paine, *Letter addressed to the Addressers*, Op. Cit., p. 377.

²⁷ Edmund Burke (1790) *Reflections on the Revolution in France and the Proceedings in Certain Societies in London, Relative to that event in a Letter Intended to have been sent to a gentleman in Paris*, New York, p. 96.

²⁸ Johann Gottfried Herder (2017), *Ideas for the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*, translated and edited by Gregory Martin Moore, New, 2017, p. 139.

4-2- Political Participation and the Future of Popular Sovereignty

Citizen participation is an essential element of an inclusive democracy. It is “the process by which citizens influence decisions that affect their lives²⁹.” Active and engaged participation allows for the consideration of a diversity of opinions and perspectives, leading to more just and balanced decisions. Citizen participation helps strengthen the legitimacy of decisions made by governments and institutions. When citizens have the opportunity to express themselves and contribute to the decision-making process, they are more likely to accept the choices that are made. Feeling heard and considered increases their confidence in the political system and the institutions in place. Thus, citizen participation contributes to reducing mistrust in the government and promoting a relationship of trust between citizens and elected officials. In participation, there is a guarantee of the fair consideration of the various interests and needs of the population. By giving a voice to all citizens, regardless of their social, economic, or cultural status, public dialogue highlights perspectives often ignored or underestimated. This leads to more balanced and representative decisions that reflect the diversity of society. For example, in the development of public policies, citizen participation allows for the consideration of issues specific to certain communities or marginalized groups, thus enabling appropriate measures to meet their needs. A democracy that claims to be such must implement political participation at all levels. In fact, it constitutes the heart of democracy. It is in this direction that Pateman asserts: “Citizen participation is essential to democracy³⁰.”

It is clear that to make democracy effective, all segments of society must be involved. Such participatory politics strengthens citizens’ sense of responsibility and engagement with society. Being involved in decisions that concern them, individuals tend to feel more connected to political and social issues. They are then more inclined to stay informed on these matters, participate in discussions, and exercise their duty to vote. Thus, citizen participation contributes to shaping a more informed and engaged population, which is essential for a vibrant and dynamic democracy. A democracy whose goals can be achieved. It is rightly believed by Fung that “citizen participation can be effective in achieving the desired outcomes³¹” in governance. Its effectiveness will lie in public dialogue.

Public dialogue is an essential tool for raising awareness among the population about the social and economic issues affecting our society. Indeed, it highlights existing problems, explains them clearly and concisely, and provides concrete examples to illustrate their impact on our daily lives. Through this awareness, citizens are encouraged to realize the importance of these issues and their role in problem-solving. One of the great advantages of public dialogue is that it provides an open and inclusive space for discussion, where all voices can be heard. Experts, policymakers, activists, and ordinary citizens can share their views, experiences, and knowledge, creating a deeper and more understanding of social and economic issues. The people, as major actors in social evolution, must be kept informed of everything that happens. They must have access to information.

Access to information is crucial in democracy and citizen participation. From Loïc Blondiaux’s perspective, “Information is an essential public good for participatory democracy³².” Blondiaux emphasizes the crucial role of information in participatory democracy. He reminds us that access to information is a fundamental right of citizens and is necessary for participatory democracy to be effective. By allowing citizens access to accurate and up-to-date information, public dialogue removes obstacles to information and facilitates understanding of the issues. This openness to information promotes decision transparency and strengthens trust between governors and the governed. With access to information, citizens stay informed about decisions made by public authorities. Through the dissemination of clear and understandable information, citizens can understand the motivations behind political choices and evaluate their relevance.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this article has thoroughly examined Thomas Paine's critique of hereditary succession in politics, shedding light on his deeply rooted rejection of this practice through various aspects of his life. Through the analysis of his journey, we observed that the main motives of rejecting hereditary succession has been a consistent thread throughout his life, reflecting his unwavering belief in justice and equality. By exploring how this critique transformed into an advocacy for popular sovereignty, we emphasized how Paine sought to establish a political order where power is genuinely held by the people. However, this ideal aspiration inevitably faces the complex realities of practical implementation. Popular sovereignty in Paine's vision, while a

²⁹ B. R. Barber (1984), *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*, Berkeley, University of California Press, p. 2.

³⁰ Carole Pateman (1970), *Participation and democratic theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 2.

³¹ Archon Fung (2004), *Empowered participation: Reinventing urban democracy*, Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press, p. 1.

³² Loïc Blondiaux (2011), *La démocratie participative*, Paris, France: La Découverte, p. 16.

powerful ideal, is also subject to the compromises and challenges of the real world. In summary, Paine's legacy remains a source of inspiration for the struggle for social justice, reminding us of the constant need to reassess and adapt our ideals to the complexity of reality. Thus, Paine's intellectual legacy continues to prompt us to consider how we can reconcile enlightened ideals with the pragmatic contingencies of political governance.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Thomas Paine (1918), *Common sense*, New York, Published by Peter Eckler.
- [2]. Thomas Paine (1894), *Right of Man; Being an Answer to Mr Burke's Attack on the French Revolution*, London, J.S Jordon, No 166.
- [3]. Thomas Paine (1795), *Dissertation on First Principles of Government*, New York, second edition, printed and sold by Daniel Isaac Eaton.
- [4]. Edmund Burke (1790) Reflections on the Revolution in France and the Proceedings in Certain Societies in London, Relative to that event in a Letter Intended to have been sent to a gentleman in Paris, New York.
- [5]. Johann Gottfried Herder (2017), *Ideas for the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*, translated and edited by Gregory Martin Moore.
- [6]. Wollstonecraft Mary (1976, *Défense des Droits de la Femme*, trad. Marie-Françoise Cachin, Paris, Petite Bibliothèque Payot.
- [7]. Alexis de Tocqueville (2000), *Democracy in America*, London, Vol 1 introduce by John T. Morgan: Perennial classics.