

Phil 176/276G: Historical Philosophers—American Philosophy

Professor: Aaron Zimmerman

Email: aaronzimmerman@ucsb.edu

Studies of philosophy in America should start with an investigation of the philosophical aspects of the belief systems of indigenous people: the Native Americans who lived in distinct tribes with distinct languages and cultures for the roughly twelve thousand years before Europeans crossed the Atlantic. But our focus in this course will be the philosophy of the USA, insofar as there is such a thing.

Many accounts of the philosophy of the settlers focus on [John Edwards](#) and the impact of [Calvinist](#) ideas about “predestination” and “election” by God. Grappling with Calvinism led early American thinkers to philosophical reflection on the nature of a person’s will (or capacity for choice, decision and intentional action) and the degree to which our wills are determined by our creator and so “unfree.” Similar concerns shape the contemporary debate about free will, though worries about predestination by God have been largely replaced with worries about the determining force of the universe’s initial conditions and the laws of nature as described by contemporary physics.

We are not going to focus on these issues however as the founders didn’t embrace Calvinism as a group, and Calvinism doesn’t seem to play a large role in the country’s founding documents: the Declaration of Independence, the Federalist papers and the US Constitution. (Those interested in early American ideas about free will should consult Kuklick’s text.)

John Locke’s theory of natural rights was formulated one hundred years before the American Revolution to argue for the illegitimacy of a Catholic king he did not want forced upon England. But it was Locke’s theory (among other things) that the founders seized upon when arguing they had good reason or just cause for declaring and fighting for independence from the homeland. And it was this same theory that abolitionists seized on when providing a comprehensive rationale for ending slavery in America. Indeed, Locke’s ideas continued to find their echoes in the struggle for civil rights after reconstruction.

We begin this course with an assessment of Locke’s philosophy and the degree to which it is encoded in our founding documents. Since this

philosophy assumes the existence of a God who created humans, an examination of it will help set the stage for our discussion of Darwin's theory of evolution and its impact on the philosophy encoded in our founding documents, which was a major preoccupation of philosophers in the subsequent century.

Handout #1: Notes on John Locke's *Two Treatises of Government*

A. 1st Treatise

1. The Goal

Locke begins by telling us his goal: to argue that William has "consent of the people; which [is] the only one of all lawful governments." The William of whom he writes is King William III of Orange Nassau who assumed the throne in the "Glorious" Revolution of 1688

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Glorious_Revolution

William overthrew James II of England, who was a Tory and the last Catholic king of Britain.

According to Locke, in arguing for the legitimacy of James II, Sir Robert Filmer is "an advocate for slavery; or the weakness to be deceived with contradictions dressed up in a popular style and well turned periods. For if any one will be at the pains himself, in those parts which are here untouched, to strip sir Robert's discourses of the flourish of doubtful expressions, and endeavour to reduce his words to direct, positive, intelligible propositions, and then compare them one with another, he will quickly be satisfied there was never so much glib nonsense."

CF. 2.14.179 "it being out of a man's power so to submit himself to another as to give him a liberty to destroy him; God and Nature never allowing a man so to abandon himself as to neglect his own preservation. And since he cannot take away his own life, neither can he give another power to take it."

1st Questions: Locke says he is opposing an argument for "slavery" to the monarch James II. This slavery is supposed to consist in James' lacking "the consent" of those he commands. What does slavery have to do with James II's unpopularity (i.e. the lack of consent in question)? What does

governance by an unpopular ruler have to do with the practice of buying and selling people for profit and commanding them as people command domestic farm animals?

Though Filmer is already dead at this point, Locke tells us that the doctrines Filmer formulated to justify James' rule are then being "preached up for Gospel," by the church authorities, "though they had no better an author than an English courtier."

2. Locke's Rendering of Filmer's Case for James II

Premise: "No man is born free"

Conclusion: "All government is absolute monarchy."

"Men are not born free, and therefore could never have the liberty to choose either governors, or forms of government." Princes have their power absolute, and by divine right; for slaves could never have a right to compact or consent. Adam was an absolute monarch, and so are all princes ever since.

The monarch is supposed to have the rights of a father over his family, having inherited this right from Adam. But Locke complains that Filmer's case for inheritance is silly and Filmer does not adequately describe the nature of fatherhood and its relation to the norms in question: i.e. a father's prerogatives (ignoring his duties or obligations).¹ Nor has Filmer explained how these prerogatives might change as the size of his "family" grows in size and complexity.

3. Locke's Case Against Filmer's Defense of James II in Some Detail

According to Locke, Filmer asserts, "Adam and the patriarchs had absolute power of life and death, p. 35. Kings, in the right of parents, succeed to the exercise of supreme jurisdiction, p. 19. As kingly power is by the law of God, so it hath no inferior law to limit it; Adam was lord of all, p. 40. The father

¹ Locke posits "natural" obligations to children at §89, "For children being by the course of nature born weak, and unable to provide for themselves, they have by the appointment of God himself, who hath thus ordered the course of nature, a right to be nourished and maintained by their parents; nay, a right not only to a bare subsistence, but to the conveniences and comforts of life, as far as the conditions of their parents can afford it. "

of a family governs by no other law than by his own will, p. 78. The superiority of princes is above laws, p. 79.... A perfect kingdom is that, wherein the king rules all things, according to his own will, p. 100. Neither common nor statute laws are, or can be, any diminution of that general power, which kings have over their people, by right of fatherhood, p. 115. Adam was the father, king, and lord over his family; a son, a subject, and a servant or slave, were one and the same thing at first,” and §50 “every man that is born is so far from being free, that by his very birth he becomes a subject of him that begets him.”

First Objection: The nature of fatherhood could hardly offer the kind of justification that would lead men not already dominated by a monarch to consent to that domination. If the sons of an abusive father have the power to rid themselves of his abuses, by freeing themselves from him in one way or another, they cannot be expected to reconcile themselves to his abuses on the grounds that, after all, he is their father.

Questions: When, if ever, do justifications of existing circumstances persuade people not to exercise their power to alter those circumstances? Must all effective justifications appeal to the interests of those to whom they're addressed? We should try to keep these questions in mind when we discuss Jefferson's justification of the revolution and the Federalists arguments for incorporation as a united states with a founding constitution.

1st Objection to Filmer deepened: Parents do not make their children in the way an artisan makes a craft; they don't have the rights to destroy a creation that is not truly their own in the way an artifact is owned by the artisan who created it. “Those who desire and design children, are but the occasions of their being, and, when they design and wish to beget them, do little more towards their making than Deucalion and his wife in the fable did towards the making of mankind, by throwing pebbles over their heads.”

Further deepened with a feminist element: Mother and father share equally in creation. There is no argument from joint creation to absolute *paternal* power.

2nd Objection: The relationship between (a) y's merely being the father of x and (b) the propriety or justice of anything y should do to x, is obscure.

Principle of Absolute Paternal Authority: If y is the father of x, then nothing y does to x can be unjust.

Locke: This is-ought principle is not self-evident and not entirely coherent. “What such necessary connexion there is betwixt Adam’s creation and his right to government, so that a “natural freedom of mankind cannot be supposed without the denial of the creation of Adam,” I confess for my part I do not see.”

2nd Objection Deepened — OBJECTION from NATURAL LAW: Nature teaches that parents do not have absolute power over their children. Indeed, if we try to read our obligations off the natural order, we will infer that parents are obliged to advance their children’s wellbeing over even their own.

§56 “The dens of lions and nurseries of wolves know no such cruelty as this: these savage inhabitants of the desert obey God and nature in being tender and careful of their offspring: they will hunt, watch, fight, and almost starve for the preservation of their young; never part with them, never forsake them, till they are able to shift for themselves. And is it the privilege of man alone to act more contrary to nature than the wild and most untamed part of the creation? doth God forbid us under the severest penalty, that of death, to take away the life of any man, a stranger, and upon provocation? and does he permit us to destroy those he has given us the charge and care of; and by the dictates of nature and reason, as well as his revealed command, requires us to preserve? He has in all the parts of creation taken a peculiar care to propagate and continue the several species of creatures, and makes the individuals act so strongly to this end, that they sometimes neglect their own private good for it, and seem to forget that general rule, which nature teaches all things, of self-preservation; and the preservation of their young, as the strongest principle in them, overrules the constitution of their particular natures. Thus we see, when their young stand in need of it, the timorous become valiant, the fierce and savage kind, and the ravenous, tender and liberal.”

Locke adds to this the bible’s report of God’s growing disgust and eventual prohibition of child sacrifice.

“Be it then, as sir Robert says, that anciently it was usual for men “to sell

and castrate their children,” O. 155. Let it be, that they exposed them; add to it, if you please, for this is still greater power, that they begat them for their tables, to fat and eat them: if this proves a right to do so, we may, by the same argument, justify adultery, incest, and sodomy, for there are examples of these too, both ancient and modern; **sins, which I suppose have their principal aggravation from this, that they cross the main intention of nature, which willeth the increase of mankind, and the continuation of the species in the highest perfection, and the distinction of families, with the security of the marriage-bed, as necessary hereunto.**”

I have bolded this passage, because I want you to see how Locke’s case against monarchy is premised in a **divine anthropogeny** (or study of the origins of humans), which is in turn wedded to a moral epistemology of natural law. According to Locke, we can figure out what is good for us by figuring out what our creator intended for us and we can figure out what our creator intended by carefully studying his creation. The most relevant parts of this creation are the animal world. So Locke winds up arguing from **biological premises** to the injustice of absolute monarchy.

NATURAL RIGHT: See too §86 where our desire for self-preservation is interpreted as God’s way of communicating our right to the means of self-preservation.

“Man had a right to an use of the creatures, by the will and grant of God: for the desire, strong desire, of preserving his life and being, having been planted in him as a principle of action by God himself, reason, “which was the voice of God in him,” could not but teach him and assure him that pursuing that natural inclination he had to preserve his being, he followed the will of his Maker, and therefore had a right to make use of those creatures which by his rear son or senses he could discover would be serviceable thereunto. And thus man’s property in the creatures was founded upon the right he had to make use of those things that were necessary or useful to his being.”

NATURAL RIGHT: And §88 where a natural desire for the welfare of one’s children is used by Locke to argue for their natural right to an inheritance (a prime source of economic inequality).

“God planted in men a strong desire also of propagating their kind, and

continuing themselves in their posterity; and this gives children a title to share in the property of their parents, and a right to inherit their possessions.”

NATURAL RIGHT: And §101, where inheritance is again grounded in natural law.

“If one should ask, by what law has a father power over his children? it will be answered, no doubt, by the law of nature, which gives such a power over them to him that begets them. If one should ask likewise, by what law does our author’s heir come by a right to inherit? I think it would be answered, by the law of nature too.”

NATURAL RIGHT: And §2.16.190 “Every man is born with a double right. First, a right of freedom to his person, which no other man has a power over, but the free disposal of it lies in himself. Secondly, a right before any other man, to inherit, with his brethren, his father’s goods.”

A question that will persist: How good is observation of “nature” as a premise from which to argue for a policy recommendation or normative claim of obligation? Do other animals (and/or early humans) teach us what is natural for us? Does an action or institution’s being (in some sense) “natural” for us increase or provide evidence in favor of its being good or rational for us to pursue that action or retain that institution? Is this inference helped if we infer, with Locke following Grotius et al., what God has planned for us from our observations of animal behavior and other aspects of “nature”? These questions become paramount when we consciously observe Hume’s dictum that we must always articulate and scrutinize inferences from “is” to “ought.”

Difference with Pragmatism: Locke articulates a positive theory of natural rights in the 2nd Treatise, but he does not offer his ideas (or assert them) as one ethic among many: i.e. one way of thinking about what is valuable and why we should pursue it that his audience can accept or explore or work into their current moral thinking if they are sufficiently convinced of its attractiveness. Instead, **he argues for his theory of natural rights as *the truth about morality***, a truth he thinks he can infer from his observations of nature because they provide ample evidence of our creator’s intentions. One of the things we’ll want to discuss is whether Darwin’s theory of our origins undermined not just Locke’s particular theory of our rights and their origins,

but *any* attempt to articulate a single scheme of values, rights and so on. Does Darwinism leave us with moral relativism or at least “pluralism” of one form of another? Might Darwinism even imply “fatalism” understood as the thesis that natural selection explains historical change, nature does not select on the basis of virtue (as we conceive of virtue), and so the adoption of a morality (whatever its impacts on the life of this or that person) could never explain historical change at some relevantly expansive time-scale?

Darwinian Fatalism: People will embrace whatever moral theory or guide to action best promotes their reproductive fitness (or the reproductive fitness of their kin group) in the context in which they find themselves. If moral truth or validity is not defined in terms of reproductive fitness, the truth or validity of a moral view is irrelevant to its adoption. Though individuals may try their best to figure out what is really right and really wrong, such thinking is either irrelevant to what they do or predictable on the basis of natural selection for reproductive-fitness-enhancing moral ideologies (and against fitness-diminishing ideologies) irrespective of their truth or validity (unless these semantic concepts are defined in terms of reproductive fitness).

Darwin actually thought that “*natural*” *forces of selection lead to the evolution of greater virtue*, where the virtue in question is not defined in terms of reproductive fitness but was instead left at the intuitive level where it more or less aligns with the list we have from Aristotle.

“When two tribes of primeval man, living in the same country, came into competition, if (other circumstances being equal) the one tribe included a great number of courageous, sympathetic and faithful members, who were always ready to warn each other of danger, to aid and defend each other, this tribe would succeed better and conquer the other. Let it be borne in mind how all-important in the never-ceasing wars of savages, fidelity and courage must be. The advantage which disciplined soldiers have over undisciplined hordes follows chiefly from the confidence which each man feels in his comrades. Obedience, as Mr. Bagehot has well shewn, is of the highest value, for any form of government is better than none. Selfish and contentious people will not cohere, and without coherence nothing can be effected. A tribe rich in the above qualities would spread and be victorious over other tribes: but in the course of time it would, judging from all past history, be in its turn overcome by some other tribe still more highly endowed. Thus the social and moral qualities would tend slowly to advance and be diffused throughout the world...It must not be forgotten that although a high standard of morality gives but a slight or no advantage to each individual man and his children over the other men of the same tribe, yet that an increase in the number of well-endowed men and an advancement in the standard of morality will certainly give an immense advantage to one tribe over another. A tribe including many members who, from possessing in a

high degree the spirit of patriotism, fidelity, obedience, courage, and sympathy, were always ready to aid one another, and to sacrifice themselves for the common good, would be victorious over most other tribes; and this would be natural selection. At all times throughout the world tribes have supplanted other tribes; and as morality is one important element in their success, the standard of morality and the number of well-endowed men will thus everywhere tend to rise and increase.... In regard to the moral qualities, some elimination of the worst dispositions is always in progress even in the most civilised nations. Malefactors are executed, or imprisoned for long periods, so that they cannot freely transmit their bad qualities. Melancholic and insane persons are confined, or commit suicide. Violent and quarrelsome men often come to a bloody end. The restless who will not follow any steady occupation—and this relic of barbarism is a great check to civilization—emigrate to newly-settled countries; where they prove useful pioneers. Intemperance is so highly destructive, that the expectation of life of the intemperate, at the age of thirty for instance, is only 13.8 years; whilst for the rural labourers of England at the same age it is 40.59 years. Profligate women bear few children, and profligate men rarely marry; both suffer from disease. In the breeding of domestic animals, the elimination of those individuals, though few in number, which are in any marked manner inferior, is by no means an unimportant element towards success. This especially holds good with injurious characters which tend to reappear through reversion, such as blackness in sheep; and with mankind some of the worst dispositions, which occasionally without any assignable cause make their appearance in families, may perhaps be reversions to a savage state, from which we are not removed by very many generations. This view seems indeed recognised in the common expression that such men are the black sheep of the family.” Darwin, *Descent of Man*

But Darwin’s thesis is based on an incredibly “Panglossian” or overly optimistic reading of history. Did the European colonists really succeed in their “competition” with native Asians, Africans and Americans because of the greater virtue of Europeans in contrast with native Asians, Africans and Americans, as Darwin maintained they did?

Locke’s 3rd Objection to Filmer: The bible says God gave humans as a species full power over the “irrational animals,” but it cannot be justly interpreted to have given Adam (and his male successors) political power over all people.

“If God made all mankind slaves to Adam and his heirs, by giving Adam dominion over “every living thing that moveth on the earth,” ch. i. 28, as our author would have it; methinks sir Robert should leave carried his monarchical power one step higher, and satisfied the world that princes might eat their subjects too, since God gave as full power to Noah and his heirs, ch. ix. 2, to eat “every living thing that moveth,” as he did to Adam to have dominion over them; the Hebrew word in both places being the same.”

4th Objection: The bible says that after the flood God gave the Earth to Noah and his sons in common and commanded them to be fruitful and multiply. It did not give the Earth to Noah to distribute as he pleased.

§41-2: “God, who bid mankind increase and multiply, should rather himself give them all a right to make use of the food and raiment, and other conveniencies of life, the materials whereof he had so plentifully provided for them; than to make them depend upon the will of a man for their subsistence, who should have power to destroy them all when he pleased, and who, being no better than other men, was in succession likelier, by want and the dependence of a scanty fortune, to tie them to hard service, than by liberal allowance of the conveniencies of life to promote the great design of God, “increase and multiply:” he that doubts this, let him look into the absolute monarchies of the world, and see what becomes of the conveniencies of life, and the multitudes of people...we know God hath not left one man so to the mercy of another, that he may starve him if he please: God, the Lord and Father of all, has given no one of his children such a property in his peculiar portion of the things of this world, but that he has given his needy brother a right to the surplusage of his goods; so that it cannot justly be denied him, when his pressing wants call for it: and therefore no man could ever have a just power over the life of another by right of property in land or possessions; since it would always be a sin, in any man of estate, to let his brother perish for want of affording him relief out of his plenty. As justice gives every man a title to the product of his honest industry, and the fair acquisitions of his ancestors descended to him; so charity gives every man a title to so much out of another’s plenty as will keep him from extreme want, where he has no means to subsist otherwise: and a man can no more justly make use of another’s necessity to force him to become his vassal, by withholding that relief God requires him to afford to the wants of his brother, than he that has more strength can seize upon a weaker, master him to his obedience, and with a dagger at his throat offer him death or slavery.”

Question: Is this not a biblical argument against colonialism and slavery?

5th Objection: According to the bible, children are obliged to honor their parents. This is in fact inconsistent with an absolute fatherly authority that is retained in the absence of explicit delegation to another, as it would have to be were it to ground the absolute power of a monarch descended from Adam.

This can be shown (§64) by the inability of a grandfather to release his grandson from honoring said grandson's father. Cf. §75-77.

§65 “If therefore this command, “Honour thy father and mother,” concern political dominion, it directly overthrows our author's monarchy: since it being to be paid by every child to his father, even in society, every father must necessarily have political dominion, and there will be as many sovereigns as there are fathers: besides that the mother too hath her title, which destroys the sovereignty of one supreme monarch. But if “Honour thy father and mother” mean something distinct from political power, as necessarily it must, it is besides our author's business, and serves nothing to his purpose.”

CONCLUSION of the argument against Adam's having been given the moral authority to rule over all men: “If creation, which gave nothing but a being, made not Adam prince of his posterity: if Adam, Gen. i. 28, was not constituted lord of mankind, nor had a private dominion given him exclusive of his children, but only a right and power over the earth and inferior creatures in common with the children of men: if also, Gen. iii 16, God gave not any particular power to Adam over his wife and children, but only subjected Eve to Adam, as a punishment, or foretold the subjection of the weaker sex, in the ordering the common concernments of their families, but gave not thereby to Adam, as to the husband, power of life and death, which necessarily bet longs to the magistrate: if fathers by begetting their children acquire no such power over them; and if the command, “Honour thy father and mother,” give it not, but only enjoins a duty owing to parents equally whether subjects or not, and to the mother as well as the father: if all this be so, as I think by what has been said is very evident; then man has a natural freedom, notwithstanding all our author confidently says to the contrary; since all that share in the same common nature, faculties, and powers, are in nature equal, and ought to partake in the same common rights and privileges, till the manifest appointment of God, who is “Lord over all, blessed for ever,” can be produced show any particular person's supremacy; or a man's own consent subjects him to a superior.”

6th Objection to Filmer: Even if Adam had this power, there is no coherent story of how it might have passed from Adam to James II. (§98 “paternal power, being a natural right rising only from the relation of father and son, is as impossible to be inherited as the relation itself.”)

§111 “Our author informs us, that the divine ordinance hath limited the descent of Adam’s monarchical power. To whom? To Adam’s line and posterity,” says our author. A notable limitation, a limitation to all mankind: for if our author can find any one amongst mankind that is not of the line and posterity of Adam, he may perhaps tell him who this next heir of Adam is: but for us, I despair how this limitation of Adam’s empire to his line and posterity will help us to find out one heir. This limitation indeed of our author will save those the labour who would look for him amongst the race of brutes, if any such there were; but will very little contribute to the discovery of one next heir amongst men, though it make a short and easy determination of the question about the descent of Adam’s regal power, by telling us that the line and posterity of Adam is to have it, that is, in plain English, any one may have it, since there is no person living that hath not the title of being of the line and posterity of Adam and while it keeps there, it keeps within our author’s limitation by God’s ordinance.”

It isn’t even true that first-born sons have a “natural” right to whatever political power (or dominion over others) their fathers’ have managed to acquire.

§93 “All that a child has right to claim from his father is nourishment and education, and the things nature furnishes for the support of life: but he has no right to demand rule or dominion from him: he can subsist and receive from him the portion of good things and advantages of education naturally due to him, without empire and dominion. That (if his father hath any) was vested in him, for the good and behoof of others: and therefore the son cannot claim or inherit it by a title, which is founded wholly on his own private good and advantage.”

B. 2nd Treatise

1. Locke’s Goal: To Explain the Origins of Political Authority

Chapter 1

“I think it may not be amiss to set down what I take to be political power. That the power of a magistrate over a subject may be distinguished from that of a father over his children, a master over his servant, a husband over his wife, and a lord over his slave. ...Political power, then, I take to be a right of

making laws, with penalties of death, and consequently all less penalties for the regulating and preserving of property, and of employing the force of the community in the execution of such laws, and in the defence of the commonwealth from foreign injury, and all this only for the public good.”

Questions: Isn't this an overly normative definition of “political power”? If a ruler or set of rulers exercise their power in enacting and enforcing laws that do not serve the common good, does that entail that they lack political power? The Founding Fathers seem to have agreed that rulers cannot be trusted to serve the common good. They seem to have designed the US gov't so that political power was distributed among several people, composing several different institutions (legislative, executive and judicial) so that the political power of some might be checked by the political power of others. Is it wrong, then, of Locke, to equate political power with a **right** rather than an **ability**?

A Less Normative Definition of Political Power: Social power is the ability to shape the behavior of others. If it is to be distinguished from other forms of social power (as Locke intends above), **political power is the ability to shape the behavior of others by making, interpreting and enforcing rules.**

With the “ought” thus segregated from the “is” we can then describe Locke's normative project in the 2nd Treatise.

Locke's Normative Question: When is political power rightly or justly possessed and administered? Though it strains common usage somewhat, we can say (with many political theorists) that someone who possess and exercises her political powers in a just or morally acceptable way has political *authority* rather than “brute” political *power*.

Locke's First Answer: (1) Political power is justly possessed by X only if (a) X's aim in exercising that power is the good or welfare of those over whom she exercises it, and (b) she limits herself to the defense, regulation and distribution of the property of these same people.

2. The State of Nature

Locke begins by positing a “state of nature” in which people are equal in “rank” (or normative status) because equal in ability to coerce.

§2.2.2 “A state also of equality, wherein all the power and jurisdiction is reciprocal, no one having more than another, there being nothing more evident than that creatures of the same species and rank, promiscuously born to all the same advantages of Nature, and the use of the same faculties, should also be equal one amongst another, without subordination or subjection, unless the lord and master of them all should, by any manifest declaration of his will, set one above another, and confer on him, by an evident and clear appointment, an undoubted right to dominion and sovereignty.”

The Most Historically Common Criticism of Locke on this Score: Surely children don't have the same abilities as their parents. We can agree with Locke against Filmer as a general matter: there is no direct derivation of the justice of monarchy (much less the monarchy of James II) from the nature of fatherhood or even parenthood. But human families (understood as interacting composites of adults and children) are biologically natural units. A human child cannot survive to reproductive age without the assistance of her parents, as Locke himself argues in his 1st Treatise. Insofar as the first tribes were extended family units, they contained these natural inequalities and whatever inegalitarian consequences flow from them. E.g., bad or unjust parents will allow or instill further inequalities by favoring some children over others. So how can Locke feel justified in positing a state of nature with social powers equally distributed among those persons living within it? There has never been such a state.

Locke's Response to this Criticism:

§55 “Children, I confess, are not born in this full state of equality, though they are born to it. Their parents have a sort of rule and jurisdiction over them when they come into the world, and for some time after, but it is but a temporary one. The bonds of this subjection are like the swaddling clothes they are wrapt up in and supported by in the weakness of their infancy. Age and reason as they grow up loosen them, till at length they drop quite off, and leave a man at his own free disposal.”

Rebuttal: This is not right as either a descriptive or normative matter.

Descriptive: Inequalities in social power mark family structures from beginning to end as childhood gives way to marriage (typically arranged by

parents or even grandparents) and parenthood (which is typically unplanned). Social power is unevenly distributed amongst siblings, husband and wife (or wives) and offspring.

Normative: Duties and rights are worked out within the family structure (and then tribal culture) without explicit concern for full equality (except in liberal, post-Enlightenment households where attempts are made in this regard). Nor does full equality result as the inevitable (if unintended) consequence of tribal life. It is consistent with this that the members of hunter-gatherer tribes are **more** equal in both roles and resources than members of larger societies and that non-human primates are averse to unequal distributions of resources that do not reflect their social hierarchies. Economists have long held that the division of labor that marks agricultural, commercial and industrial societies is itself a source of inequality as are inheritance and marriage practices, which further concentrate resources.

Indeed, Locke gives a (more or less) plausible (if euro-centric) account of this process in his own explanation of how fathers become “political monarchs” of their extended families at §75-§76.

The Most Common Response to the Traditional Objections to the State of Nature Posited by Orthodox Social Contract Theories: The state of nature is a hypothetical construct useful for *normative* purposes: i.e. the idea can help us figure out which social/political arrangements are **just** or **right** or **moral** for us to institute today. Unless one thinks that norms or ideals must be read off of God’s creation (i.e. nature) one can argue that a state of equality is **ideal** without thinking it is or was **real**. (A hard question pops up here, though: how do you argue for embracing an egalitarian ideal without appealing, as Locke does, to a creator whose intentions are made manifest in his creation? How can you get powerful people to adopt an ideal when doing so would make them less powerful?)

Locke hints at this fully non-natural, non-descriptive wholly ideal or normative understanding at §76 “if...it be a sufficient proof of the natural right of fathers to political authority, because they commonly were those in whose hands we find, de facto, the exercise of government...it will as strongly prove that all princes...ought to be priests, since it is as certain that in the beginning the father of the family was priest, as that he was ruler in his own household.” But Locke makes a mistake in asserting a difference in

kind between political and familial societies, as the smallest polities are tribes, which are at the same time large families.

And at §101-106 Locke reiterates his belief in the historical reality of the social compact that took free and equal men out of the state of nature, when he argues that the father may have been chosen as the best candidate for magistrate but when this was not practicable common consent of free and equal men took place instead.

“It is not at all to be wondered that history gives us but a very little account of men that lived together in the state of Nature. The inconveniencies of that condition, and the love and want of society, no sooner brought any number of them together, but they presently united and incorporated if they designed to continue together. And if we may not suppose men ever to have been in the state of Nature, because we hear not much of them in such a state, we may as well suppose the armies of Salmanasser or Xerxes were never children, because we hear little of them till they were men and embodied in armies. Government is everywhere antecedent to records, and letters seldom come in amongst a people till a long continuation of civil society has, by other more necessary arts, provided for their safety, ease, and plenty . . . reason being plain on our side that men are naturally free; and the examples of history showing that the governments of the world, that were begun in peace, had their beginning laid on that foundation, and were made by the consent of the people; there can be little room for doubt, **either where the right is, or what has been the opinion or practice of mankind about the first erecting of governments.**”

Normative Social Contract Theory: The just distribution of political powers in a community C can be inferred by figuring out what distribution of powers in C *would* be established by a contract agreed to by equally powerful people (or the heads of families) seeking to coordinate their activities for mutual advantage.

Tough Question: How might a social contract theorist argue for this normative claim? Must she **presuppose** the equal value of humans or humanity? (See Kant.) Connect this to the framer’s claim that the equality of men in their original state is “self-evident” and therefore needs no external or extra evidence to compel an audience’s belief or assent. Indeed, when Locke confronts this challenge, he seems to assert that people *deserve*

equal social power in a state of nature without trying to derive, prove, establish or even argue for this equality from some more descriptive, value-neutral kind of equality they might then be thought to have. For example, equal normative authority is not derived from equal power but conflated with it in the following passage.

§54 “Age or virtue may give men a just precedence. Excellency of parts and merit may place others above the common level. Birth may subject some, and alliance or benefits others, to pay an observance to those to whom Nature, gratitude, or other respects, may have made it due; and yet all this consists with the equality which all men are in respect of *jurisdiction* or *dominion* one over another, which was the equality I there spoke of as proper to the business in hand, being that *equal right* that every man hath to his natural freedom, without being subjected to the will or authority of any other man” (emphasis added).

Big Questions: Isn't Locke just **asserting** what is in fact a point of *contention* between Filmer and himself: i.e. that men are, “by nature,” obliged to respect the lives, basic liberties and properties of each other? Does Locke have a good argument for this normative claim? *Does anyone?*

More general epistemological questions: Can one give a “good” or convincing argument for a moral claim of this sort without assuming some moral claim as a premise? If a speaker's audience differs significantly from her in embracing monarchical or fascistic values, does that mean that any argument for equality in political standing will “beg the question” against that audience?

Another Common Response to Critiques of the Unrealistic Nature of the State of Nature: A state of nature still exists: (a) in war-torn countries without effective government, (b) between countries, tribes or factions that are not ruled by a common power.

§14 “It is often asked as a mighty objection, where are, or ever were, there any men in such a state of Nature? To which it may suffice as an answer at present, that since all princes and rulers of “independent” governments all through the world are in a state of Nature, it is plain the world never was, nor never will be, without numbers of men in that state. I have named all governors of “independent” communities, whether they are, or are not, in

league with others; for it is not every compact that puts an end to the state of Nature between men, but only this one of agreeing together mutually to enter into one community, and make one body politic; other promises and compacts men may make one with another, and yet still be in the state of Nature. The promises and bargains for truck, etc., between the two men in Soldania, in or between a Swiss and an Indian, in the woods of America, are binding to them, though they are perfectly in a state of Nature in reference to one another for truth, and keeping of faith belongs to men as men, and not as members of society.”

Problem: There may be a sense in which these conditions approximate Locke’s state of nature, but the people or groups that find themselves in this state are usually (always?) unequal in social and physical power.

3. Natural Law

Locke’s conception of nature is pre-Darwinian. Instead of random mutations leading to phenotypic variations “selected” when they aid reproduction or survival to reproductive age, Locke thought the members of animal species were each united by a common essence. When an animal is functioning properly it is acting in accord with its essence. So **the natural law is a kind of descriptive/normative hybrid. By observing how animals act, we can figure out how they act when functioning properly, which will tell us how they should act (in some sense of “should”). If we describe how animals act when they are functioning properly, we therein describe the “natural laws” that govern them. Humans are the only animals who are sufficiently intelligent and self-aware to frame these natural laws for themselves. When we know how we should act, or how we would act were we functioning properly, we can then decide whether to act as we should, or act immorally instead.**

(Do Calvinists and other determinists deny this variety of free will? Some do, but others argue that these decisions are made but they are themselves determined by antecedent states of the universe over which decision makers have no control.)

Humans can then consciously act immorally or irrationally: i.e. contrary to the laws of nature: the laws that describe proper human functioning. Because we use reason to become aware of God’s natural

laws (i.e. in figuring out how we ought to act), Locke follows the tradition in calling natural laws “Laws of Reason.”

§57-8 “The law that was to govern Adam was the same that was to govern all his posterity, the law of reason.... For nobody can be under a law that is not promulgated to him; and this law being promulgated or made known by reason only, he that is not come to the use of his reason cannot be said to be under this law; and Adam’s children being not presently as soon as born under this law of reason, were not presently free. For law, in its true notion, is not so much the limitation as the direction of a free and intelligent agent to his proper interest, and prescribes no farther than is for the general good of those under that law... For God having given man an understanding to direct his actions, has allowed him a freedom of will and liberty of acting, as properly belonging thereunto within the bounds of that law he is under.”

*Locke conjoins his belief in natural law (so understood) with his belief in the substantive equality (in power) of humans prior to the institution of governments to derive some normative claims about our **pre-political obligations**.*

§2.2.6 “The state of Nature has a law of Nature to govern it, which obliges every one, and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty or possessions; for men being all the workmanship of one omnipotent and infinitely wise Maker; all the servants of one sovereign Master, sent into the world by His order and about His business; they are His property, whose workmanship they are made to last during His, not one another’s pleasure. And, being furnished with like faculties, sharing all in one community of Nature, there cannot be supposed any such subordination among us that may authorise us to destroy one another, as if we were made for one another’s uses, as the inferior ranks of creatures are for ours. Every one as he is bound to preserve himself, and not to quit his station wilfully, so by the like reason, when his own preservation comes not in competition, ought he as much as he can to preserve the rest of mankind, and not unless it be to do justice on an offender, take away or impair the life, or what tends to the preservation of the life, the liberty, health, limb, or goods of another.”

Epistemology: As an epistemological matter, Locke acknowledges both

reasoning from our observations of biological nature and revelation as putative sources of moral knowledge (understood as knowledge of natural law).

§2.5.24 “Whether we consider natural reason, which tells us that men, being once born, have a right to their preservation, and consequently to meat and drink and such other things as Nature affords for their subsistence, or “revelation,” which gives us an account of those grants God made of the world to Adam, and to Noah and his sons, it is very clear that God, as King David says (Psalm 115. 16), “has given the earth to the children of men,” given it to mankind in common.”

But in other works Locke makes it clear that reasoning from nature is a superior source of knowledge of morality (understood as natural law) whereas belief in God (whether based in revelation, prophetic testimony of an argument from design) is necessary to give us belief in the binding force of morality. We know from nature that people desire food, family, freedom etc. This allows us to infer that these things are good for us and their deprivation bad. But we need to know that there is a God in order to know that we **ought** to respect the food, family, freedom of another, as the “ought” implies the existence of a power who can punish those who knowingly or intentionally do to another what we know (by observation of our natures) to be bad. *According to Locke, the **authority** of a rule depends on the existence of someone or some body of people with **the power to enforce** that rule.*

4. Execution of Natural Law

In the 1st Treatise we saw a number of cases in which Locke infers natural law from instincts and desires, the idea being that our good can be inferred from our nature as with all of God’s creations. But there is an important difference between: (a) natural law understood as a description of a (properly functioning) animal or plant, and (b) natural law understood as God’s command. God enforces his or her commands with Earthly punishments (smiting Sodom and Gomorrah, refusing to allow Moses into the Holy Land for his hubris, etc.) or punishments in the afterlife. The Jewish religion posits a week between Yom Kippur and Rosh Hasannah (the New Year) when amends can be made for wrongdoing, the idea being that God writes the “book of life” for that year and decides who will live and who will die, who will prosper and who will languish, etc. The Christian

tradition goes further: perhaps the most famous idea of God's enforcement of natural law is the description of judgment in [Revelation](#).

Revelation 20:11-15: "Then I saw a great white throne and him who was seated on it. From his presence earth and sky fled away, and no place was found for them. And I saw the dead, great and small, standing before the throne, and books were opened. Then another book was opened, which is the book of life. And the dead were judged by what was written in the books, according to what they had done. And the sea gave up the dead who were in it, Death and Hades gave up the dead who were in them, and they were judged, each one of them, according to what they had done. Then Death and Hades were thrown into the lake of fire. This is the second death, the lake of fire. And if anyone's name was not found written in the book of life, he was thrown into the lake of fire."

Question: Who enforces the Natural Law in Locke's State of Nature?

§2.2.7 "That all men may be restrained from invading others' rights, and from doing hurt to one another, and the law of Nature be observed, which willeth the peace and preservation of all mankind, the execution of the law of Nature is in that state put into every man's hands, whereby every one has a right to punish the transgressors of that law to such a degree as may hinder its violation."

Epistemological Question: Suppose one man harms, or enslaves or imprisons another in a state of nature, how can we **tell** whether he is (justly) punishing another for a violation of the law of nature or (unjustly) violating the laws of nature himself or doing neither?

Locke's answer: We must consult our prior knowledge of the law of nature, which are God's commands, which can be inferred from human nature (essence) and the norms of proper functioning discernible from it. From the fact that all people (except the suicidal) want to survive and it is species-typical to desire to reproduce, move and secure the means to one's survival (food, water, shelter, etc.) we can infer that these things are naturally good, that we all have a natural right to them, and that, in consequence, others have a natural obligation to respect our right to them. Moreover, we can **justly** punish anyone who violates these rights. And if someone damages us (or the possessions we naturally acquire in the pursuit of our natural ends), he or

she owes us reparation as our natural right. It is **naturally right** or just to punish violations of person and property and insist on reparation for the same. These are natural laws insofar as they are “writ in the hearts of all mankind.”

§2.2.8 “In transgressing the law of Nature, the offender declares himself to live by another rule than that of reason and common equity, which is that measure God has set to the actions of men for their mutual security, and so he becomes dangerous to mankind; the tie which is to secure them from injury and violence being slighted and broken by him, which being a trespass against the whole species, and the peace and safety of it, provided for by the law of Nature, every man upon this score, by the right he hath to preserve mankind in general, may restrain, or where it is necessary, destroy things noxious to them, and so may bring such evil on any one who hath transgressed that law, as may make him repent the doing of it, and thereby deter him, and, by his example, others from doing the like mischief. And in this case, and upon this ground, every man hath a right to punish the offender, and be executioner of the law of Nature.”

§2.2.11 “From these two distinct rights (the one of punishing the crime, for restraint and preventing the like offence, which right of punishing is in everybody, the other of taking reparation, which belongs only to the injured party) comes it to pass that the magistrate, who by being magistrate hath the common right of punishing put into his hands, can often, where the public good demands not the execution of the law, remit the punishment of criminal offences by his own authority, but yet cannot remit the satisfaction due to any private man for the damage he has received. That he who hath suffered the damage has a right to demand in his own name, and he alone can remit.”

§2.2.12 “Each transgression may be punished to that degree, and with so much severity, as will suffice to make it an ill bargain to the offender, give him cause to repent, and terrify others from doing the like.”

5. Vesting Executive Power in the Gov’t or Magistrate

Locke acknowledges that people are largely self-interested and often take a partial view of any disagreement to which they are a party. These provide ample reason for vesting the power to punish natural wrongs and compensate for natural injuries in a “neutral party.”

“Civil government is the proper remedy for the inconveniences of the state of Nature, which must certainly be great where men may be judges in their own case, since it is easy to be imagined that he who was so unjust as to do his brother an injury will scarce be so just as to condemn himself for it.”

Locke uses this reasonable conjecture to argue that the magistrate must himself answer to an external authority adding another plank to his case against Filmer’s justification of absolute monarchy.

§2.2.13 “What kind of government that is, and how much better it is than the state of Nature, where one man commanding a multitude has the liberty to be judge in his own case, and may do to all his subjects whatever he pleases without the least question or control of those who execute his pleasure? ... If he that judges, judges amiss in his own or any other case, he is answerable for it to the rest of mankind.”

6. State of War

§2.3.16 “One may destroy a man who makes war upon him, or has discovered an enmity to his being, for the same reason that he may kill a wolf or a lion, because they are not under the ties of the common law of reason, have no other rule but that of force and violence, and so may be treated as a beast of prey, those dangerous and noxious creatures that will be sure to destroy him whenever he falls into their power.”

For this reason Hobbes argues we have no natural obligation to agree to capital punishment even if we are guilty of the crime and the gov’t that seeks to execute us is a good and just gov’t.

According to Locke, *the attempt to enslave institutes a state of war just as surely as the attempt to kill*. §2.3.17 “He who makes an attempt to enslave me thereby puts himself into a state of war with me. He that in the state of Nature would take away the freedom that belongs to any one in that state must necessarily be supposed to have a design to take away everything else, that freedom being the foundation of all the rest.”

§2.4.21 “The natural liberty of man is to be free from any superior power on earth, and not to be under the will or legislative authority of man, but to have only the law of Nature for his rule. The liberty of man in society is to be under no other legislative power but that established by consent in the

commonwealth, nor under the dominion of any will, or restraint of any law, but what that legislative shall enact according to the trust put in it.”

7. Inalienable Natural Rights to Life, Liberty and Property

§2.4.22 “This freedom from absolute, arbitrary power is so necessary to, and closely joined with, a man’s preservation, that he cannot part with it but by what forfeits his preservation and life together. For a man, not having the power of his own life, cannot by compact or his own consent enslave himself to any one, nor put himself under the absolute, arbitrary power of another to take away his life when he pleases. Nobody can give more power than he has himself, and he that cannot take away his own life cannot give another power over it. Indeed, **having by his fault forfeited his own life by some act that deserves death, he to whom he has forfeited it may, when he has him in his power, delay to take it, and make use of him to his own service; and he does him no injury by it. For, whenever he finds the hardship of his slavery outweigh the value of his life, it is in his power, by resisting the will of his master, to draw on himself the death he desires.**”

Locke here argues that X is justified in enslaving Y if Y tried to kill or enslave X and X is forgoing X’s power to justly kill Y for the offense in question to impose the lesser evil of slavery.

Question: If I need to use deadly force in self-defense when you are assailing me without provocation, then I am justified in killing you to protect my life. (At any rate, that is the “intuition” of everyone except the “purest” pacifists.) But if I am able to enslave you at a given time, I cannot be under mortal peril from you at that same time, so I cannot satisfy the “necessity” component of the conditions on just killing in self-defense. But then it will never happen that I can be poised to justly kill an assailant and at that same time offer him slavery as a lesser evil. Once he’s under my control, there is no longer the option of justly killing him and so no just evil to which he might prefer slavery.

Another Question: Despite the critique contained in this line of questioning, does Locke here provide a good justification for the enslavement of an assailant? Might Locke’s reasoning have provided a rationale for those then embroiled in the slave trade?

On Slavery: Consider §2.16.178-9: “But supposing, which seldom happens, that the conquerors and conquered never incorporate into one people under the same laws and freedom; let us see next what power a lawful conqueror has over the subdued, and that I say is purely despotal. He has an absolute power over the lives of those who, by an unjust war, have forfeited them, but not over the lives or fortunes of those who engaged not in the war, nor over the possessions even of those who were actually engaged in it...the conqueror gets no power but only over those who have actually assisted, concurred, or consented to that unjust force that is used against him. For the people having given to their governors no power to do an unjust thing, such as is to make an unjust war (for they never had such a power in themselves), they ought not to be charged as guilty of the violence and injustice that is committed in an unjust war any farther than they actually abet it, no more than they are to be thought guilty of any violence or oppression their governors should use upon the people themselves or any part of their fellow-subjects, they having empowered them no more to the one than to the other.”

Question: How could anyone think these rather limited conditions of just enslavement satisfied by the vast majority of those Africans bought and sold at the time?

§2.5.26 “Though the earth and all inferior creatures be common to all men, yet every man has a “property” in his own “person.” This nobody has any right to but himself. The “labour” of his body and the “work” of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever, then, he removes out of the state that Nature hath provided and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with it, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property. It being by him removed from the common state Nature placed it in, it hath by this labour something annexed to it that excludes the common right of other men. For this “labour” being the unquestionable property of the labourer, no man but he can have a right to what that is once joined to, at least where there is enough, and as good left in common for others.”

Question: It is one thing to say that consent of mankind is not necessary to have a right to the acorns or apples one has gathered, and another to say that one has a right simply in virtue of having gathered them. Locke says gathering is a kind of labor that one “mixes” with the tree’s produce and seems to argue that someone’s mixing her labor with something gives her a right to that thing “at least where there is enough, and as good left in

common for others.” This last proviso renders controversial the application of this principle to any actual case of claimed ownership (or *almost* any actual case); see below.

§2.5.27 “The grass my horse has bit, the turfs my servant has cut, and the ore I have digged in any place, where I have a right to them in common with others, become my property without the assignation or consent of anybody. The labour that was mine, removing them out of that common state they were in, hath fixed my property in them.”

Question: “the turfs *my servant* has cut”?

§2.5.31 “As much land as a man tills, plants, improves, cultivates, and can use the product of, so much is his property. He by his labour does, as it were, enclose it from the common.”

But Locke qualifies these claims with two conditions:

(1) Condition of Abundance: X’s mixing her labor with Y gives X a right to Y only when “there is enough and as good left in common for others.”

(2) Condition of Thrift: X’s mixing her labor with Y gives X a right to Y only if *X can make use of Y* before it spoils.

§2.5.37 “In the beginning, before the desire of having more than men needed had altered the intrinsic value of things, which depends only on their usefulness to the life of man, or had agreed that a little piece of yellow metal, which would keep without wasting or decay, should be worth a great piece of flesh or a whole heap of corn, though men had a right to appropriate by their labour, each one to himself, as much of the things of Nature as he could use, yet this could not be much, nor to the prejudice of others, where the same plenty was still left, to those who would use the same industry.”

Questions: How are these two conditions best interpreted? Does a wealthy person not have a right to estates she never visits or cars she never drives? The “sunset view” for which people pay thousands or millions “spoils” every time a beachside condo or lakeside estate goes empty for a weekend because its owner is sleeping in her penthouse apartment. Do these conditions render Locke’s theory inapplicable to the conceptualization of property rights today?

On alienation and consent: According to Locke, we each begin life with the same natural rights we possessed in the state of nature. We are not obligated to the civil society—and its transference of coercive power to the sovereign—until we reach maturity and then either consent to the social contract or signal dissent by leaving the society in which we were raised.

§2.9.118-9 “It is plain, then, by the practice of governments themselves, as well as by the law of right reason, that a child is born a subject of no country nor government. He is under his father’s tuition and authority till he come to age of discretion, and then he is a free man, at liberty to what government he will put himself under, what body politic he will unite himself to....naturally free, and nothing being able to put him into subjection to any earthly power, but only his own consent.”

The only limitation on this is the “tacit consent” to the social contract implied by one’s accepting its protections and other advantages (§2.9.119).

8. The Value Added By Labor – The Introduction of Currency

§2.5.40 “Let any one consider what the difference is between an acre of land planted with tobacco or sugar, sown with wheat or barley, and an acre of the same land lying in common without any husbandry upon it, and he will find that the improvement of labour makes the far greater part of the value. I think it will be but a very modest computation to say, that of the products of the earth useful to the life of man, nine-tenths are the effects of labour. Nay, if we will rightly estimate things as they come to our use, and cast up the several expenses about them—what in them is purely owing to Nature and what to labour—we shall find that in most of them ninety-nine hundredths are wholly to be put on the account of labour.”

§2.5.46 ”It was a foolish thing, as well as dishonest, to hoard up more than he could make use of. If he gave away a part to anybody else, so that it perished not uselessly in his possession, these he also made use of. And if he also bartered away plums that would have rotted in a week, for nuts that would last good for his eating a whole year, he did no injury; he wasted not the common stock; destroyed no part of the portion of goods that belonged to others, so long as nothing perished uselessly in his hands. Again, if he would give his nuts for a piece of metal, pleased with its colour, or exchange his sheep for shells, or wool for a sparkling pebble or a diamond, and keep

those by him all his life, he invaded not the right of others; he might heap up as much of these durable things as he pleased; **the exceeding of the bounds of his just property not lying in the largeness of his possession, but the perishing of anything uselessly in it.**”

§2.5.47 “And thus came in the use of money; some lasting thing that men might keep without spoiling, and that, by mutual consent, men would take in exchange for the truly useful but perishable supports of life.”

§2.5.48 “And as different degrees of industry were apt to give men possessions in different proportions, so this invention of money gave them the opportunity to continue and enlarge them.”

§2.5.50 “Since gold and silver, being little useful to the life of man, in proportion to food, raiment, and carriage, has its value only from the consent of men—whereof labour yet makes in great part the measure—it is plain that the consent of men have agreed to a disproportionate and unequal possession of the earth—I mean out of the bounds of society.”

9. Paternalistic Power and “Reason” as a Precondition for Right

§2.6.60 “But if through defects that may happen out of the ordinary course of Nature, any one comes not to such a degree of reason wherein he might be supposed capable of knowing the law, and so living within the rules of it, he is never capable of being a free man, he is never let loose to the disposal of his own will; because he knows no bounds to it, has not understanding, its proper guide, but is continued under the tuition and government of others all the time his own understanding is incapable of that charge. And so lunatics and idiots are never set free from the government of their parents.”

§2.6.63 “The freedom then of man, and liberty of acting according to his own will, is grounded on his having reason, which is able to instruct him in that law he is to govern himself by, and make him know how far he is left to the freedom of his own will. To turn him loose to an unrestrained liberty, before he has reason to guide him, is not the allowing him the privilege of his nature to be free, but to thrust him out amongst brutes, and abandon him to a state as wretched and as much beneath that of a man as theirs. This is that which puts the authority into the parents’ hands to govern the minority of their children. God hath made it their business to employ this care on their

offspring, and hath placed in them suitable inclinations of tenderness and concern to temper this power, to apply it as His wisdom designed it, to the children's good as long as they should need to be under it. ”

Question: Does Locke invoke a racist or euro-centric belief in the childlike pre-rationality of Africans and Native Americans to argue for the propriety of colonialism and the slave trade as so many theorists did? See Frederick Douglas for a moving and effective demolition of this line of reasoning.

§2.7.85 “**Master and servant are names as old as history, but given to those of far different condition; for a free man makes himself a servant to another by selling him for a certain time the service he undertakes to do in exchange for wages he is to receive; and though this commonly puts him into the family of his master, and under the ordinary discipline thereof, yet it gives the master but a temporary power over him, and no greater than what is contained in the contract between them. But there is another sort of servant which by a peculiar name we call slaves, who being captives taken in a just war are, by the right of Nature, subjected to the absolute dominion and arbitrary power of their masters. These men having, as I say, forfeited their lives and, with it, their liberties, and lost their estates, and being in the state of slavery, not capable of any property, cannot in that state be considered as any part of civil society, the chief end whereof is the preservation of property.**”

Questions: What makes a just war just? And how might the just ad bellum that leads to a rational decision to wage war justify the subsequent enslavement of captives as jus in bellum? See Locke's reasoning at §2.4.22. Isn't this enslavement a violation of the laws of nature or reason? Does Locke's failing to draw this conclusion show that his political purposes—to argue for the necessity of the consent of Englishmen to the just political authority of their monarch without impugning the justice of the slave trade—are controlling (or at least shaping) his moral reasoning?

10. Political Society

§2.8.96-9 “When any number of men have, by the consent of every individual, made a community, they have thereby made that community one body, with a power to act as one body, which is only by the will and determination of the majority. For that which acts any community, being only the consent of the individuals of it, and it being one body, must move one way, it is necessary the body should move that way whither the greater force carries it, which is the consent of the majority, or else it is impossible it should act or continue one body, one community, which the consent of every individual that united into it agreed that it should; and so every one is bound by that consent to be concluded by the majority. And therefore we see that in assemblies empowered to act by positive laws where no number is set by that positive law which empowers them, the act of the majority passes for the act of the whole, and of course determines as having, by the law of Nature and reason, the power of the whole. ...And thus every man, by consenting with others to make one body politic under one government, puts himself under an obligation to every one of that society to submit to the determination of the majority, and to be concluded by it; or else this original compact, whereby he with others incorporates into one society, would signify nothing, and be no compact if he be left free and under no other ties than he was in before in the state of Nature....**that which begins and actually constitutes any political society is nothing but the consent of any number of freemen capable of majority, to unite and incorporate into such a society. And this is that, and that only, which did or could give beginning to any lawful government in the world.**”

11. The Purposes or Legitimate Functions of Political Authority

According to Locke, the original polities were military in origin and purpose. A man was chosen as chief or king or ruler in order to organize the men and lead them in war. And his authority dissolved at the end of hostilities.

§2.8.108-110.

How according to Locke did kings secure longer periods of rule and privileges beyond those enjoyed by a general commanding his troops?

§2.8.111 “The golden age (though before vain ambition, and amor sceleratus

habendi, evil concupiscence had corrupted men's minds into a mistake of true power and honour) had more virtue, and consequently better governors, as well as less vicious subjects; and there was then no stretching prerogative on the one side to oppress the people, nor, consequently, on the other, any dispute about privilege, to lessen or restrain the power of the magistrate; and so no contest betwixt rulers and people about governors or government. Yet, when ambition and luxury, in future ages, would retain and increase the power, without doing the business for which it was given, and aided by flattery, taught princes to have distinct and separate interests from their people, men found it necessary to examine more carefully the original and rights of government, and to find out ways to restrain the exorbitances and prevent the abuses of that power, which they having entrusted in another's hands, only for their own good, they found was made use of to hurt them."

Conclusion: §2.8.112 "Thus we may see how probable it is that people that were naturally free, and, by their own consent, either submitted to the government of their father, or united together, out of different families, to make a government, should generally put the rule into one man's hands, and choose to be under the conduct of a single person, without so much, as by express conditions, limiting or regulating his power, which they thought safe enough in his honesty and prudence; though they never dreamed of monarchy being *jure Divino*, which we never heard of among mankind till it was revealed to us by the divinity of this last age, nor ever allowed paternal power to have a right to dominion or to be the foundation of all government. And this much may suffice to show that, as far as we have any light from history, we have reason to conclude that all peaceful beginnings of government have been laid in the consent of the people. I say "peaceful," because I shall have occasion, in another place, to speak of conquest, which some esteem a way of beginning of governments."

Question: How does this explanation square with Locke's acknowledgment of domestic violence, theft, etc. and the need for "neutral" or 3rd party adjudication of disputes to quash the kind of civil unrest and feuding that leads to internal war and violence in any group larger than the immediate family?

§2.9.127 "Notwithstanding all the privileges of the state of Nature, being but in an ill condition while they remain in it are quickly driven into society. Hence it comes to pass, that we seldom find any number of men live any

time together in this state. The inconveniencies that they are therein exposed to by the irregular and uncertain exercise of the power every man has of punishing the transgressions of other, make them take sanctuary under the established laws of government, and therein seek the preservation of their property. It is this that makes them so willingly give up every one his single power of punishing to be exercised by such alone as shall be appointed to it amongst them, and by such rules as the community, or those authorised by them to that purpose, shall agree on. And in this we have the original right and rise of both the legislative and executive power as well as of the governments and societies themselves. “

12. Necessarily Democratic Origins Permit Other Forms of Subsequent Rule

§132. “The majority having, as has been showed, upon men’s first uniting into society, the whole power of the community naturally in them, may employ all that power in making laws for the community from time to time, and executing those laws by officers of their own appointing, and then the form of the government is a perfect democracy; or else may put the power of making laws into the hands of a few select men, and their heirs or successors, and then it is an oligarchy; or else into the hands of one man, and then it is a monarchy; if to him and his heirs, it is a hereditary monarchy; if to him only for life, but upon his death the power only of nominating a successor, to return to them, an elective monarchy. And so accordingly of these make compounded and mixed forms of government, as they think good. And if the legislative power be at first given by the majority to one or more persons only for their lives, or any limited time, and then the supreme power to revert to them again, when it is so reverted the community may dispose of it again anew into what hands they please, and so constitute a new form of government; for the form of government depending upon the placing the supreme power, which is the legislative, it being impossible to conceive that an inferior power should prescribe to a superior, or any but the supreme make laws, according as the power of making laws is placed, such is the form of the commonwealth.”

Question: According to Locke, we cannot alienate or get rid of our natural rights to life, liberty and property unless we try to rob others of their enjoyment of these rights. Why then is the same not true of our right to determine the political structure wherein rules are established to protect the

lives, liberties and properties of those who live within it? Locke maintains that we give up our right to enforce our rights with violence because our knowledge of men's partiality allows us to see the wisdom of establishing a "neutral" 3rd party for this purpose. Does he have a similar story to explain why natural democrats would consent to be governed by a monarch? See here *the necessity of establishing peaceful transitions of executive power*.

13. No Taxation Without Representation

§2.11.140 "It is true governments cannot be supported without great charge, and it is fit every one who enjoys his share of the protection should pay out of his estate his proportion for the maintenance of it. But still it must be with his own consent—i.e., the consent of the majority, giving it either by themselves or their representatives chosen by them; for if any one shall claim a power to lay and levy taxes on the people by his own authority, and without such consent of the people, he thereby invades the fundamental law of property, and subverts the end of government. For what property have I in that which another may by right take when he pleases to himself?"

14. CONCLUSION: Five requirements of a just legislature:

(1) Uniform rules for governed and government; (2) Rules must be set for [utilitarian](#) ends; (3) No Taxation without representation; (4) No legislative transference of legislative power to an unrepresentative person or body; (5) Separation of Legislative from Executive into distinct persons or bodies of people.

§2.11.142-3. "These are the bounds which the trust that is put in them by the society and the law of God and Nature have set to the legislative power of every commonwealth, in all forms of government. First: They are to govern by promulgated established laws, not to be varied in particular cases, but to have one rule for rich and poor, for the favourite at Court, and the countryman at plough. Secondly: These laws also ought to be designed for no other end ultimately but the good of the people. Thirdly: They must not raise taxes on the property of the people without the consent of the people given by themselves or their deputies. And this properly concerns only such governments where the legislative is always in being, or at least where the people have not reserved any part of the legislative to deputies, to be from time to time chosen by themselves. Fourthly: Legislative neither must nor

can transfer the power of making laws to anybody else, or place it anywhere but where the people have...Because those laws which are constantly to be executed, and whose force is always to continue, may be made in a little time, therefore there is no need that the legislative should be always in being, not having always business to do. And because it may be too great temptation to human frailty, apt to grasp at power, for the same persons who have the power of making laws to have also in their hands the power to execute them, whereby they may exempt themselves from obedience to the laws they make, and suit the law, both in its making and execution, to their own private advantage, and thereby come to have a distinct interest from the rest of the community, contrary to the end of society and government. Therefore in well-ordered commonwealths, where the good of the whole is so considered as it ought, the legislative power is put into the hands of divers persons who, duly assembled, have by themselves, or jointly with others, a power to make laws, which when they have done, being separated again, they are themselves subject to the laws they have made; which is a new and near tie upon them to take care that they make them for the public good.”

A Question to Keep in Mind Moving Forward: How well are these principles exemplified in the writings of Jefferson and the Federalists?

15. Just Revolution

§149 “Though in a constituted commonwealth standing upon its own basis and acting according to its own nature—that is, acting for the preservation of the community, there can be but one supreme power, which is the legislative, to which all the rest are and must be subordinate, yet the legislative being only a fiduciary power to act for certain ends, there remains still in the people a supreme power to remove or alter the legislative, when they find the legislative act contrary to the trust reposed in them. For all power given with trust for the attaining an end being limited by that end, whenever that end is manifestly neglected or opposed, the trust must necessarily be forfeited, and the power devolve into the hands of those that gave it, who may place it anew where they shall think best for their safety and security. And thus the community perpetually retains a supreme power of saving themselves from the attempts and designs of anybody, even of their legislators, whenever they shall be so foolish or so wicked as to lay and carry on designs against the liberties and properties of the subject.”

Important Passages

§81 “A man can never be obliged in conscience to submit to any power, unless he can be satisfied who is the person who has a right to exercise that power over him. If this were not so, there would be no distinction between pirates and lawful princes; he that has force is without any more ado to be obeyed, and crowns and sceptres would become the inheritance only of violence and rapine. Men too might as often and as innocently change their governors, as they do their physicians, if the person cannot be known who has a right to direct me, and whose prescriptions I am bound to follow. To settle therefore men’s consciences, under an obligation to obedience, it is necessary that they know not only that there is a power somewhere in the world, but the person who by right is vested with this power over them.”

§92 “Property, whose original is from the right a man has to use any of the inferior creatures, for the subsistence and comfort of his life, is for the benefit and sole advantage of the proprietor, so that he may even destroy the thing, that he has property in by his use of it, where need requires: but government being for the preservation of every man’s right and property, by preserving him from the violence or injury of others, is for the good of the governed: for the magistrate’s sword being for a “terror to evil doers,” and by that terror to enforce men to observe the positive laws of the society, made conformable to the laws of nature, for the public good, i.e., the good of every particular member of that society, as far as by common rules it can be provided for; the sword is not given the magistrate for his own good alone.”

§90 “It is evident that absolute monarchy, which by some men is counted for the only government in the world, is indeed inconsistent with civil society, and so can be no form of civil government at all. For the end of civil society being to avoid and remedy those inconveniences of the state of Nature which necessarily follow from every man’s being judge in his own case, by setting up a known authority to which every one of that society may appeal upon any injury received, or controversy that may arise, and which every one of the society ought to obey. Wherever any persons are who have not such an authority to appeal to, and decide any difference between them there, those persons are still in the state of Nature. And so is every absolute prince in

respect of those who are under his dominion.”

§2.121 “Whoever has the legislative or supreme power of any commonwealth, is bound to govern by established standing laws, promulgated and known to the people, and not by extemporary decrees, by indifferent and upright judges, who are to decide controversies by those laws; and to employ the force of the community at home only in the execution of such laws, or abroad to prevent or redress foreign injuries and secure the community from inroads and invasion. And all this to be directed to no other end but the peace, safety, and public good of the people.”

§2.135 “A man, as has been proved, cannot subject himself to the arbitrary power of another; and having, in the state of Nature, no arbitrary power over the life, liberty, or possession of another, but only so much as the law of Nature gave him for the preservation of himself and the rest of mankind, this is all he doth, or can give up to the commonwealth, and by it to the legislative power, so that the legislative can have no more than this. Their power in the utmost bounds of it is limited to the public good of the society. It is a power that hath no other end but preservation, and therefore can never have a right to destroy, enslave, or designedly to impoverish the subjects; the obligations of the law of Nature cease not in society, but only in many cases are drawn closer, and have, by human laws, known penalties annexed to them to enforce their observation. Thus the law of Nature stands as an eternal rule to all men, legislators as well as others. The rules that they make for, other men’s actions must, as well as their own and other men’s actions, be conformable to the law of Nature— i.e., to the will of God, of which that is a declaration, and the fundamental law of Nature being the preservation of mankind, no human sanction can be good or valid against it.”

§2.172 “Despotical power is an absolute, arbitrary power one man has over another, to take away his life whenever he pleases; and this is a power which neither Nature gives, for it has made no such distinction between one man and another, nor compact can convey. For man, not having such an arbitrary power over his own life, cannot give another man such a power over it, but it is the effect only of forfeiture which the aggressor makes of his own life when he puts himself into the state of war with another. For having quitted reason, which God hath given to be the rule betwixt man and man, and the peaceable ways which that teaches, and made use of force to compass his unjust ends upon another where he has no right, he renders himself liable to

be destroyed by his adversary whenever he can, as any other noxious and brutish creature that is destructive to his being. And thus captives, taken in a just and lawful war, and such only, are subject to a despotical power, which, as it arises not from compact, so neither is it capable of any, but is the state of war continued. For what compact can be made with a man that is not master of his own life? What condition can he perform? And if he be once allowed to be master of his own life, the despotical, arbitrary power of his master ceases. He that is master of himself and his own life has a right, too, to the means of preserving it; so that as soon as compact enters, slavery ceases, and he so far quits his absolute power and puts an end to the state of war who enters into conditions with his captive.”

§2.195: “I will not dispute now whether princes are exempt from the laws of their country, but this I am sure, they owe subjection to the laws of God and Nature. Nobody, no power can exempt them from the obligations of that eternal law. Those are so great and so strong in the case of promises, that Omnipotency itself can be tied by them. Grants, promises, and oaths are bonds that hold the Almighty, whatever some flatterers say to princes of the world, who, all together, with all their people joined to them, are, in comparison of the great God, but as a drop of the bucket, or a dust on the balance- inconsiderable, nothing!”

§2.201 “Wherever the power that is put in any hands for the government of the people and the preservation of their properties is applied to other ends, and made use of to impoverish, harass, or subdue them to the arbitrary and irregular commands of those that have it, there it presently becomes tyranny, whether those that thus use it are one or many.”

§2.19.222: “Since it can never be supposed to be the will of the society that the legislative should have a power to destroy that which every one designs to secure by entering into society, and for which the people submitted themselves to legislators of their own making: whenever the legislators endeavour to take away and destroy the property of the people, or to reduce them to slavery under arbitrary power, they put themselves into a state of war with the people, who are thereupon absolved from any farther obedience, and are left to the common refuge which God hath provided for all men against force and violence. Whensoever, therefore, the legislative shall transgress this fundamental rule of society, and either by ambition, fear, folly, or corruption, endeavour to grasp themselves, or put into the hands of

any other, an absolute power over the lives, liberties, and estates of the people, by this breach of trust they forfeit the power the people had put into their hands for quite contrary ends, and it devolves to the people, who have a right to resume their original liberty, and by the establishment of a new legislative (such as they shall think fit), provide for their own safety and security, which is the end for which they are in society.”