Available on: https://jsshrs.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3051-3561 P-ISSN: 3051-3553

Journal of Social Science and Human Research Studies

Volume: 01 Issue: 04 October-2025

# The Structure of Power in Jean Jaque Rousseau

**Njoku Ugochukwu Roland (Ph.D)**
Imo State University PMB 2000, Owerri Nigeria
**Biaduo Declan Uche**
Imo State University PMB 2000, Owerri Nigeria

**Published Date: October 08, 2025**

**ABSTRACT:** This study examines the structure of power in the political philosophy of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, situating his thought within the broader Enlightenment discourse on legitimacy, sovereignty, and the foundations of political authority. Drawing on primary texts such as The Social Contract and Discourse on Inequality, as well as contemporary scholarly interpretations, the work explores Rousseau's conception of natural and civil freedom, the general will, and the indivisibility of sovereignty as the cornerstones of legitimate political order. Rousseau's distinctive differentiation between sovereign power, government, and the people is analyzed to clarify how he envisioned the distribution and limitation of authority within a community bound by social contract. The study also addresses the tension between individual autonomy and collective will, highlighting debates about whether Rousseau's framework is fundamentally democratic or susceptible to authoritarian interpretations. Comparative analysis with Hobbes and Locke further illustrates the uniqueness of Rousseau's account of power as rooted in collective legitimacy rather than coercion or mere consent. Finally, the work evaluates the contemporary relevance of Rousseau's theory, considering its impact on revolutionary thought, constitutional design, and modern democratic practices, while acknowledging the challenges posed by pluralism and globalization. By systematically unpacking Rousseau's structure of power, this study demonstrates the enduring significance of his political philosophy in ongoing debates about freedom, equality, and the legitimate exercise of authority in society.

**KEYWORDS:** Rousseau, power, social contract, general will, sovereignty, political philosophy

## INTRODUCTION

Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778) stands as one of the most influential political philosophers of the Enlightenment, whose reflections on liberty, sovereignty, and social organization continue to shape contemporary discourses on democracy, governance, and power. His theory of the social contract offered a radical departure from the individualist models of Hobbes and Locke, emphasizing collective sovereignty as the legitimate basis of political authority. The core of Rousseau's philosophy of power lies in his insistence that true freedom is only possible when individuals submit themselves to a collective body that expresses the general will. Power, for Rousseau, is not the coercive force of a ruler over subjects but the moral and political authority of the people constituted as a sovereign whole.

The structure of power in Rousseau's thought is complex, involving several interrelated distinctions: between the sovereign and the government, between legislative and executive functions, and between individual will and the general will. Unlike Hobbes, who saw power as rooted in fear and authority vested in a monarch, or Locke, who emphasized individual rights and consent, Rousseau advanced a more holistic and communitarian framework. His conception redefined sovereignty as inalienable, indivisible, and rooted in collective self-legislation, while the government was reduced to a subordinate instrument for carrying out the sovereign will.

### Philosophical Background of Rousseau

Rousseau's reflections on power were deeply shaped by the intellectual currents of the Enlightenment, a period characterized by critical inquiries into authority, human nature, and the foundations of legitimate political order. He was born in Geneva, a city-state with a republican tradition, which influenced his sensitivity to questions of civic participation and autonomy. Geneva's mixed constitution, balancing popular sovereignty with magistrates' authority, provided him with a living example of both the promise and challenges of collective self-government (Dent, 2019).

Rousseau's early philosophical influences included classical republicanism, Christianity, and the modern contract Arian tradition of Hobbes, Locke, and Montesquieu. He admired classical models of civic virtue, especially the Roman Republic, while also critiquing the inequalities and corruption that had emerged in modern societies. In his Discourse on the Origin of Inequality (1755), Rousseau traced the corruption of natural freedom to the development of private property and the emergence of social hierarchies. Power in this context became coercive, serving the interests of the wealthy elite rather than the collective good. This critique laid the groundwork for his later attempt to reconstruct political authority on a new foundation in The Social Contract (1762).

Unlike Hobbes, who justified absolute sovereignty as necessary for peace, Rousseau argued that political authority must rest on the free agreement of individuals who collectively create a moral community. He diverged from Locke by rejecting the idea that sovereignty could be divided or

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

delegated; for Rousseau, power belonged wholly to the people as a body. Montesquieu's separation of powers influenced Rousseau, but he reworked it to emphasize the distinction between the legislative (sovereign) power and the executive (government) power, with sovereignty remaining indivisible and supreme (Wokler, 2021).

Thus, Rousseau's philosophical background reveals a thinker deeply engaged with his predecessors, but intent on forging a radical alternative. His project was to establish a theory of power that reconciled freedom and authority by grounding political legitimacy in collective self-rule.

**Rousseau's Concept of Power**

At the heart of Rousseau's philosophy is the idea that political power must be legitimate, and legitimacy can only be derived from the free consent of individuals who constitute a political community. For Rousseau, natural power defined as the strength of an individual to dominate others is unstable, unjust, and ultimately insufficient to sustain political order. He famously wrote that "the strongest is never strong enough to be master all the time, unless he transforms strength into right and obedience into duty" (Social Contract, I.3).

Rousseau distinguished between two forms of freedom and power:

1. Natural freedom and natural power: In the state of nature, individuals are free because they are independent and guided by their basic needs. Power here is limited to physical capacity. However, this freedom is fragile, insecure, and subject to inequalities of strength.
2. Civil freedom and political power: In society, true freedom emerges when individuals consent to a collective authority that secures equality and justice. Political power is no longer the imposition of the strong upon the weak but the expression of the general will, which guarantees liberty through obedience to self-imposed laws.

For Rousseau, power becomes legitimate only when it is derived from the social contract, where each individual alienates their rights to the whole community. Unlike Hobbes, this alienation does not create a sovereign ruler distinct from the people; instead, it forms a collective body politic in which each citizen is both sovereign and subject. Thus, power is redefined as self-rule through collective legislation.

This redefinition marked a fundamental shift in the understanding of political authority. Power is no longer a tool of domination but a structure that embodies freedom, equality, and mutual responsibility. As Bertram (2020) observes, Rousseau sought to dissolve the contradiction between freedom and obedience by grounding both in the concept of the general will. In this framework, the coercive aspect of power is minimized, since citizens obey laws they have themselves prescribed.

**The General Will and Collective Sovereignty**

Perhaps the most distinctive aspect of Rousseau's political theory is his concept of the general will, which serves as the foundation of collective sovereignty and the ultimate source of legitimate power. The general will is not merely the sum of individual preferences or the will of the majority; it is the common good that transcends private interests and represents the moral unity of the community.

Rousseau carefully distinguished the general will from the will of all. The will of all is a mere aggregation of individual desires, often conflicting and driven by self-interest. The general will, by contrast, reflects the shared interest in preserving freedom, equality, and justice. It is discovered through deliberation, where citizens set aside their private concerns to consider what is best for the community as a whole (Cohen, 2018).

The authority of the general will is absolute, indivisible, and inalienable. Rousseau argued that sovereignty, which is the exercise of the general will, cannot be divided among institutions or delegated to representatives. Unlike Locke's emphasis on representation, Rousseau insisted that the people must directly participate in making laws, for only then is the general will authentically expressed. In his view, "the moment a people gives itself representatives, it is no longer free" (Social Contract, III.15).

This uncompromising stance has generated much debate. Critics argue that Rousseau's conception of the general will risks suppressing minority voices in the name of collective unity. Supporters, however, note that Rousseau's emphasis on civic virtue, education, and deliberation provides safeguards against tyranny. The general will is not imposed from above but emerges from the active participation of free and equal citizens.

The general will also underpin Rousseau's idea of collective sovereignty. Sovereignty belongs to the people as a whole, not to a monarch or a parliament. It is indivisible because the community cannot be split into partial sovereignties without undermining its unity. It is inalienable because no individual or group can legitimately transfer the general will to another authority. Power, therefore, resides permanently in the collective body politic, with institutions serving only as executors of its decisions (Putterman, 2022). Through the general will, Rousseau created a model of power that is simultaneously democratic and normative.

**The Structure of Power: Sovereign, Government, and Citizens**

Rousseau's most systematic account of political power appears in The Social Contract, where he carefully distinguishes between the sovereign (the legislative authority of the people), the government (the executive that enforces laws), and the citizens (who are both subjects and members of the sovereign). This tripartite model forms the backbone of his structure of power.

**Sovereign Power**

The sovereign is the collective body of citizens exercising the general will. It is absolute in authority but limited in scope, since it can legislate only in terms of general laws that apply equally to all. The sovereign cannot make decrees for particular individuals or groups, for that would violate equality and undermine the universality of law. Rousseau's sovereign thus represents a form of collective self-rule where the people legislate for themselves under the guidance of the general will.

**Government as Executive**

The government, by contrast, is not sovereign but an intermediary body tasked with implementing the laws passed by the sovereign. It may take the form of monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy, depending on the size and character of the state. However, regardless of form, its legitimacy derives entirely from the sovereign. Rousseau emphasized that governments tend to usurp power over time, turning from executors into rulers. To guard against this, he insisted on regular assemblies where the people reaffirm their sovereignty and hold the government accountable (Bertram, 2021).

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

**Citizens as Dual Agents**

Citizens occupy a dual role in Rousseau's structure of power. As members of the sovereign, they participate in legislating the general will. As subjects, they obey the laws enacted by the sovereign. This duality expresses Rousseau's central paradox: individuals achieve true freedom not by resisting authority but by submitting to laws they have themselves created. Power is thus both collective and individual, binding and liberating.

**Limits and Challenges**

While Rousseau's model elegantly distinguishes between sovereignty and government, it raises difficult questions about feasibility. How can large modern states ensure direct citizen participation? How can the general will be discerned amid pluralism and conflicting interests? Rousseau acknowledged these challenges, suggesting that small states were best suited to his model and emphasizing the need for civic education and public religion to sustain unity.

**The Structure of Power in Jean-Jacques Rousseau**

In Rousseau's framework, the structure of power is not only about the broad distinction between the sovereign, the government, and the citizens; it is also about the intricate ways in which authority is mediated through laws, magistrates, and institutional checks. These elements define how power is organized, exercised, and preserved against corruption.

**The Role of Law**

For Rousseau, law is the purest expression of the general will. Unlike decrees or commands that serve particular interests, laws must be general in both scope and application. They apply to all citizens equally and reflect the shared interest in justice and freedom. Rousseau insisted that "the law is an act of the general will" (Social Contract, II.6).

The function of law is twofold: to establish the framework of political authority and to regulate the conduct of citizens. It is through law that individuals become citizens, bound by obligations but also protected by rights. Law transforms natural freedom into civil freedom by creating a moral order in which liberty is preserved through equality. In this sense, the law is not an external constraint but an embodiment of collective self-rule.

Modern scholars like Cohen (2020) emphasize that Rousseau's conception of law anticipates constitutionalism: laws are higher than rulers, and rulers themselves are subject to the laws. This principle prevents arbitrary rule and ensures that political power remains anchored in the collective will rather than personal ambition.

**Magistrates and Administration**

While the sovereign legislates, the government administers. Within the government, magistrates or officials carry out the laws and manage the daily affairs of the state. Rousseau recognized that different forms of government-democracy, aristocracy, monarchy could serve this administrative function, provided they remained subordinate to the sovereign.

Rousseau was not naïve about the risks of governmental corruption. He observed that governments tend to accumulate power and elevate themselves above the sovereign. When this occurs, magistrates cease to be executors of the general will and become rulers in their own right, leading to tyranny. To counter this, Rousseau proposed mechanisms such as regular assemblies, periodic renewal of authority, and even the right of citizens to dissolve a corrupt government (Riley, 2019).

The administration of power, therefore, requires constant vigilance. Rousseau's structure highlights the fragility of political authority: sovereignty is absolute in principle but vulnerable in practice. Without safeguards, the government can usurp the power that properly belongs to the people.

**Limits of Power**

Although Rousseau insisted that sovereignty is absolute, he also set significant limits to its exercise. The sovereign may legislate only in general terms; it cannot issue commands that single out individuals or groups. Furthermore, the sovereign cannot deprive citizens of their fundamental rights as participants in the general will. If it did so, it would cease to represent the general will and lapse into despotism.

In this respect, Rousseau's theory strikes a balance between absolute and limited power. Sovereignty is absolute in that it is indivisible and inalienable, but limited in that it must remain general and oriented toward the common good. As Wokler (2021) notes, Rousseau's framework anticipates modern doctrines of constitutional limits and human rights, even as it maintains a strong emphasis on unity and indivisibility.

**Critiques and Interpretations**

Rousseau's theory of power has inspired admiration and criticism in equal measure. On the one hand, it is celebrated as a cornerstone of democratic thought, providing a powerful justification for popular sovereignty and civic equality. On the other hand, critics argue that his conception of the general will risks authoritarianism, since it allows the community to override individual rights in the name of collective unity.

**Democratic Interpretations**

Supporters of Rousseau emphasize his insistence on direct participation, equality, and civic virtue. They argue that his theory provides a model for participatory democracy, where citizens are actively involved in shaping laws and policies. In this view, Rousseau's general will is not oppressive but liberating, since it represents the conditions of freedom for all (Bertram, 2020).

**Totalitarian Criticisms**

Critics, however, have long associated Rousseau with the dangers of totalitarianism. Isaiah Berlin (1969), for example, warned that Rousseau's doctrine of the general will could justify coercion in the name of freedom. If the general will is equated with the true interests of citizens, individuals may be "forced to be free" (Social Contract, I.7), which critics interpret as a license for authoritarian control.

These criticisms became particularly salient in the aftermath of the French Revolution, where Rousseau's ideas were invoked to justify radical measures. Although Rousseau himself emphasized civic education and deliberation, his rhetoric of unity and indivisibility has been accused of providing ideological cover for coercive regimes.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

**Contemporary Reinterpretations**

Recent scholarship offers more nuanced readings. Cohen (2018) and Riley (2019) argue that Rousseau's general will should not be understood as a monolithic or infallible entity but as a regulative ideal that guides democratic deliberation. In this view, the general will does not erase pluralism but channels it toward the common good. Rousseau's emphasis on civic virtue and small-scale communities suggests that he recognized the challenges of diversity and sought ways to reconcile them with unity.

Thus, interpretations of Rousseau's structure of power oscillate between democratic and authoritarian possibilities. His legacy remains contested, reflecting both the promise and perils of grounding political authority in collective sovereignty.

**Comparative Perspectives: Rousseau, Hobbes, and Locke**

To fully appreciate Rousseau's theory of power, it is helpful to compare it with the two other great social contract theorists: Thomas Hobbes and John Locke.

**Rousseau and Hobbes**

Hobbes's Leviathan (1651) presented power as the necessary antidote to human conflict in the state of nature. For Hobbes, individuals surrendered their rights to an absolute sovereign-whether monarch or assembly in exchange for security. Power in Hobbes's framework is centralized, coercive, and oriented toward peace rather than freedom. Rousseau agreed with Hobbes that natural freedom is insecure, but he rejected Hobbes's solution. To Rousseau, Hobbes's sovereign reduces individuals to passive subjects, stripping them of freedom and equality. Rousseau instead envisioned sovereignty as collective and democratic, where individuals remain free because they obey only the laws they prescribe for themselves. Thus, while Hobbes saw power as domination, Rousseau redefined it as self-rule through the general will (Dent, 2019).

**Rousseau and Locke**

Locke's Second Treatise of Government (1689) advanced a more optimistic view of the state of nature, where individuals retained natural rights to life, liberty, and property. Government was established by consent to protect these rights, and sovereignty could be divided among institutions. Representation allowed large societies to function while maintaining legitimacy.

Rousseau diverged sharply from Locke on two points. First, he rejected Locke's emphasis on property as the foundation of political society, seeing it instead as the source of inequality and domination. Second, he denied that sovereignty could be divided or delegated. For Rousseau, representation undermines freedom because it separates citizens from direct participation in lawmaking. While Locke saw consent as sufficient for legitimacy, Rousseau insisted on collective self-legislation.

Thus, Rousseau's structure of power occupies a middle ground between Hobbes's authoritarianism and Locke's liberalism: more democratic than Hobbes, but more collectivist than Locke.

**Contemporary Relevance**

Although Rousseau wrote in the 18th century, his theory of power remains strikingly relevant to contemporary debates about democracy, legitimacy, and governance.

**Popular Sovereignty and Democracy**

Rousseau's insistence that sovereignty resides in the people continues to inspire democratic movements worldwide. His critique of representation resonates with calls for participatory and deliberative democracy, where citizens play a direct role in decision-making. In an era of political alienation and declining trust in institutions, Rousseau's vision of active citizenship offers a powerful reminder of the importance of engagement (Putterman, 2022).

**Constitutionalism and Rule of Law**

Rousseau's emphasis on the supremacy of law anticipates modern constitutionalism, where laws are higher than rulers and serve as the foundation of legitimate authority. His insistence on general, non-discriminatory laws aligns with contemporary principles of equality and human rights. At the same time, his warnings about governmental usurpation remain relevant in contexts where executive power threatens to erode democratic institutions.

**Challenges of Pluralism**

One of the greatest challenges for applying Rousseau today is pluralism. Modern societies are far larger and more diverse than the small republics Rousseau envisioned. The idea of a unified general will may seem unrealistic in multicultural, pluralistic societies. Critics argue that Rousseau's model risks suppressing diversity in the name of unity. However, deliberative democrats reinterpret the general will as a process of inclusive dialogue where diverse voices converge on shared principles.

**Global Governance and Collective Action**

Rousseau's theory also offers insights into global governance. Issues like climate change, pandemics, and inequality require collective action that transcends individual states. The idea of a general will can be applied metaphorically to the international community, suggesting that humanity must develop shared norms and institutions to secure common goods. Rousseau's emphasis on mutual responsibility and the transformation of individual interests into collective commitments remains highly pertinent (Cohen, 2020).

## CONCLUSION

Rousseau's theory of power, articulated most fully in The Social Contract, represents one of the most profound attempts to reconcile freedom and authority. By grounding political legitimacy in the general will and collective sovereignty, Rousseau redefined power as self-rule rather than domination. His structure distinguishes carefully between the sovereign (the people), the government (the executive), and the citizens, with law serving as the embodiment of the general will.

While Rousseau's framework is elegant and inspiring, it is also fraught with tensions and ambiguities. His insistence on indivisible sovereignty raises concerns about pluralism and minority rights, while his skepticism about representation limits the applicability of his model to large, modern states. Nevertheless, his vision of participatory democracy, civic equality, and constitutional rule continues to shape political theory and practice.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

In the end, Rousseau's legacy is double-edged: he offers both a radical democratic ideal and a warning about the dangers of collective unity suppressing individuality. Yet it is precisely this tension that makes his theory of power so enduring and thought-provoking. In an age of democratic crisis and global interdependence, Rousseau's reflections remain as relevant as ever.

**REFERENCES**


1) Bertram, C. (2020). Rousseau and the social contract (2nd ed.). Routledge.
2) Bertram, C. (2021). Rousseau's political philosophy and contemporary democracy. Political Studies Review, 19(3), 350–362.
3) Cohen, J. (2018). Rousseau: a free community of equals. Oxford Studies in Political Philosophy, 4(1), 95–116.
4) Cohen, J. (2020). Rousseau and constitutionalism: law, sovereignty, and democracy. Political Theory, 48(4), 523–549.
5) Dent, N. J. H. (2019). Rousseau: an introduction to his psychological, social and political theory (Rev. ed.). Routledge.
6) Riley, P. (2019). The legitimacy of Rousseau's social contract. The Review of Politics, 81(2), 183–205.
7) Putterman, L. (2022). Rousseau's general will and the problem of collective choice. Economics & Philosophy, 38(2), 271–296.
8) Wokler, R. (2021). Rousseau: A very short introduction. Oxford University Press.


License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Corresponding Author: Njoku Ugochukwu Roland (Ph.D)