SOCIAL CONTRACT THINKERS (HOBBES, LOCKE, ROSSEAU)

DR. DHAWALE J. S.

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

ARTS & SCIENCE COLLEGE, SHIVAJINAGAR, GADHI

Learning Outline

- I. Background on "Social Contract" Theories
- II. Thomas Hobbes' Leviathan
- III. John Locke's Second Treatise on Civil Government
- IV. Jean Jacques Rousseau's Social Contract
- V. Synthesis of Social Contract Theories

STATE OF NATURE

- SON
- A state of affairs in which man is at his most natural.
- No political or social order.

SOCIAL CONTRACT

 A theory, or set of theories, typically addressing the questions of the origin of society and the legitimacy of the authority of the State over the individual.

• Early proponents, 17th to 19th centuries, like Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau, differed in their views. But these three, especially Rousseau, have been the most influential up to the present.

CONTEXT

- Born a twin of fear" because his mother went into premature labor out of fear that the Spanish Armada was about to attack England.
- Lived through the tumultuous English Civil War, a conflict between the Monarchists and the Parliamentarians.
- Wrote Leviathan in 1651, near the end of the war.
- witnessing violence gave him a dim view of the human nature.

HOBBE'S PHILOSOPHY

 Life in the SON was "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" and fear was a constant companion.

• The SON Is a violent place, one of "war of every man against every man."

 Hobbes states that the worst aspect of the SON is the "continual fear and danger of violent death." • Because of the dim SON, humans are self – interested.

 All acts of humans is motivated solely by the desire for self – preservation and to pursue our desires as maximally as possible.

• Human Nature : Egoistic, self -interested

THE LEVIATHAN

• For Hobbes, the only way to get rid of the SON is to have a leviathan, a sovereign, who will enforce law and order.

 A social contract is formed in which everyone agrees to surrender some of their rights, like the right to kill, to someone powerful, for protection of their life.

People will surrender some of their rights, as long as others would also cede theirs,
 which would give powers to a sovereign made up of the collected rights of his subjects.

• Society becomes possible because, whereas in the SON there was no power to enforce order, now there is an artificially and conventionally superior and more powerful person who can force men to cooperate.

• While living under the authority of a sovereign can be harsh, it is at least better than living in the SON. Resisting the Sovereign is not justified because it is the only thing which stands between us and going back to the SON.