

The “rigorózní” thesis focuses on the evaluation of Rousseau’s legacy. It is based on the confrontation of two adverse pictures of his ideas. The first image sees Rousseau as a thinker who prepared with his original concepts fertile ground for diverse undemocratic regimes and ideologies. These always declare their allegiance to the loftiest ideals but only to perpetrate the biggest crimes and to deprive people of their liberty. The second image sees in Rousseau an uncompromising critic of social injustice who saw the only possibility for redemption in liberty and equality. In this case he was one of the most important thinkers who inspired people on the road to the victory of democracy and an author whose original ideas still keep to inspire and to fascinate. I argue in favor of the second picture. Rousseau’s critique of the moral crisis is based on the disunity of modern social man. This disunity stems from the incessant conflict between our natural nature and the social state. Rousseau saw the only solution in the adaptation of the original nature to the new social state. This can be achieved only through an affective bond to a political whole. Just so can man keep his liberty which represents the basic value of his existence. In society it is no more a case of absolute freedom but of conscious obedience to law. The law is enacted by all citizens, each of which has the same legislative, economic and social power to others. Liberty then consists in our share on the formation of a society of equal citizens.