



Q

What is difference between Rousseau's notion of 'the state of nature' and that of Hobbes and Locke?

Answer

Introduction

'The concept of the state of nature was unlike between Rousseau and Hobbes and Locke.'

(-Maxey)

Rousseau's notion of the state of nature was different from Hobbes and Locke's. However, it was quite social and special form of contract, while Locke and Hobbes gave natural view of the 'State of the nature'. Therefore, Rousseau's 'state of nature' was different from that of Hobbes and Locke.

2. Personal life and era of them

Rousseau was born in Geneva, while Hobbes and Locke were born in England. They saw different conditions of their time.

"Hobbes saw civil war in England; Locke saw Glorious revolution of 1688; and Rousseau saw a man in particular mills."

Therefore, they were philosophers of their time.

3. Human nature

Human nature was also different in philosophies of three. Rousseau took human back to caves, while Hobbes gave a dark and Locke gave a 'good' image of a man.

"Man is selfish, nasty, brutish, fearful, and cunning."

(- Hobbes)

However, Locke described,

"Man is simple, sympathetic,
optimist, and cooperative."
(- Locke)

According to Rousseau,

"Cave men were better
than today's because
they were absolute
free!"

(- Rousseau)

Therefore, human nature was different in philosophies of three.

4. State of nature

Along with 'human nature' state of nature was also different. Hobbes gave cruel face, while Locke gave peaceful face of the state. However, Rousseau described dual nature.

"State is an endless

struggle and in a
"continuous war."

(- Hobbes)

Besides Hobbes, Locke said;

"State is peaceful and
goodwill."

(- Locke)

However, Rousseau gave different idea,

"State is not absolute
free and is in
"a state of conflict"

(- Rousseau)

Hence, "State of nature" was different
from each other.

5. Social Contract

Moreover, Social Contract
was also different from each other's
contract. Hobbes and Locke gave
a natural view of contract, while
Rousseau presented a social view of
contract.

"I authorize and
surrender my rights to
sovereign
(Hobbes)

Hobbes further said;

"I surrender my all
rights, freedom, and
liberty to sovereign
and he will give it
and none will go
against the order of
he gives."
(Hobbes)

But, Locke gave democratic view,

"Your sovereign,
your guardian,
and is responsible
to you"

(Locke)

Besides, they both Rousseau gave
total different ideas.

"All powers are surrendered"

to community in its
 chief nature that citizens
 will make laws and
 while community will
 act upon them."

(- Rousseau)

Therefore, social contract of three
 philosophers was unlike.

6- Implications of state of nature
 Implications were as
 follows:

a) Unilateral, bilateral, and Absolute

Contract given by
 three was not identical. Hobbes
 contract was unilateral, Locke gave
 an idea of bilateral contract, and
 Rousseau gave an absolute free
 contract.

"Social contract was
 between only citizens."

(- Hobbes)

According to Locke,

"Social contract was between King and citizens."

(- Locke)

But, Rousseau's idea was different.

"I have made by me, and so will follow them and you are free."

(- Rousseau)

Therefore, nature of contract was also different.

b) Irrevocable, revocable

Locke's contract could be revoked, but Hobbes and Rousseau's contract could not.

"All powers are surrendered, and none is allowed to

go against sovereigns.

(- Hobbes)

While Locke and Rousseau explained as;

"Contract is bilateral,
and can be revoked
by any time and
by public..."

(Locke)

According to Rousseau,

"Community is agreed
on a single
'general will', and
is not any particular
will..."

(-Rousseau)

Therefore, contract period was also
different.

c) Absolute ruler versus absolute freedom

They also gave a
concept of an absolute ruler and
absolute freedom.

"Social contract is essential

and gives an absolute ruler."

(-Hobbes)

But, Locke described as,

"There would be no absolute ruler, and all are absolutely linked."

(Locke)

Bit similar to Locke, Rousseau explained,

"All people are free and free in their wills."

(-Rousseau)

Hence, impact of contract was also different in their philosophies.

7. Criticism

• Locke and Hobbes

are free from any

criticisms, while Rousseau
has certain criticisms.

(- Marx)

Rousseau is criticized,
while Hobbes and Locke were
free because both saw situations
very different in their eras.

• Man was a master
and

needed a big master.

(- Hobbes)

And according to Locke,

"Natural laws were
prevailing that needed
sanction."

(- Locke)

But, Rousseau's contract needed
special class of people.

"To understand Rousseau's
contract, people should
be well-educated."

Therefore, criticism is as possible

as described above.

8-

Conclusion

" Hobbes, Locke, and
Rousseau were

contemporary philosophers.

Thomas Hobbes, Locke,

and Rousseau were contemporary philosophers of their time. In fact, they picked up the glimpses of their era in their philosophies. Therefore, 'state of nature' was not identical in all of these three philosophers.