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Locke’s Theory

**Part One: Short Answers**

**1**

Nozick’s well-known Wilt Chamberlain argument endeavors to illustrate that patterned ideologies of just distribution are contrary to freedom. Nozick, in his assertions, asks individuals to suppose that individual choices of patterned principle inform the original distribution in society, similar to Rawls’s difference principle. Similarly, once individuals acquire property, they espouse the right to transfer it to others. The famous Wilt Chamberlain example offers concreteness to this assertion. He supposes people attending a basketball match and offering Wilt 1 U.S. dollar freely. In this example, Wilt espouses entitlement to these funds, making this argument an entitlement one.

**2**

The original position is the main attribute of John Rawls’s social contract account justice. The original position emanates as an impartial and fair viewpoint that individuals must adopt in their reasoning concerning fundamental justice principles (Gaus & Thrasher, 2015). When individuals adopt this perspective, they can imagine themselves as equal and free persons who mutually agree and commit themselves to political and social justice principles. The prominent distinctive attribute of the original position is the veil of ignorance to underwrite impartiality of judgment. Here, the parties lack knowledge of their characteristics, social and historical conditions. They never appreciate their fundamental interests and universal facts about economics, psychology, biology, and supplementary natural and social sciences.

**3**

  The Difference Principle is John Rawls’ substitute distributive principle. This principle permits deviation from strict equality provided the inequalities in question would render the least advantaged in society better off materially than they would be under austere equality. Thus, it permits inequalities in allocating goods to the deprived members of society if these inequalities profit them. **Rawls** asserts that inequality is tolerable only if it is to the advantage of deprived individuals. However, some individuals suppose that neither severe equality nor Rawls’s Difference Principle captures the significant moral roles of responsibility and luck.

**4**

When Michael Sandel discusses moral ties that are antecedent to choice, he underpins the liberal conception of the self-constituted self. He argues that individuals are freely choosing and independent persons unfettered by civic or moral antecedent to choice in his assertions. This argument further suggests that individuals are freed from the endorsements of custom, conventional and hereditary status, liberated by moral ties antecedent to choice. Thus, the liberal self emanates as supreme, radiated as the author of the only commitments that constrain. More than the simple summation of circumstance, individuals become competent of the dignity that encompasses being individuals of their creating, making, and choosing. Thus, individuals are agents and not tools for the purposes they pursue.

**Part Two: Long Essay**

**John Locke and the government**

Habitually, Locke emanates as the founder of liberalism. He is not simply a contributor to the emergence of English constitutional thinking, or a depiction of the seventeenth century socio-economic revolution (Inoguchi & Le, 2016).John Locke supposed that individuals are good and respect each other’s rights because their consent urges them.

However, some individuals are evil. Thus, more vigorous and skilled individuals abuse the weaker and less competent. Therefore, Locke supposed that individuals must safeguard their rights, property, liberty, and life through utilizing their skills and strength. To this end, the weak would endeavor to preserve their rights by banding together against the strong. Locke further supposed that no one’s life, property, or freedom was safe in a state of nature if there was no government or laws to safeguard them. Due to this, individuals agreed to form governments. According to John Locke, governments do not exist unless citizens create them. He supposed that in a state of nature, no individual espoused the right to rule over others.

Similarly, no one would have the right to govern others. According to Locke, the only way individuals espouse the right to control others is to offer their approval. If the people have not provided their consent to form a government, the government is unlawful or illegal. Meaning, the state or civil society comes to have authority over its citizens when the people give their approval. The power of a legitimate government emanates from the consent of the citizens. Fundamentally, a civil government's political legitimacy stems from an accord among the independent constituent institutions encompassing legislative, judicial, and executive agreeing for the national common good. One method that civil society grants legitimacy to governments is through public elections.

However, a section of individuals disproves the legitimacy presented by general elections, noting that the degree of legality public elections can offer depends considerably on the polls' electoral structure. To a certain extent, John Locke’s social contract theory seems erroneous. Arguably, the coherent basis for civil government is not consent. Unlike other animals, man is inherently social and political and will always live in and will always live in a group. Similarly, political society and authority emanate from an instantaneous stipulation of practical reason.

Any human society requires someoneto make binding decisions for every member of that society. Thus, humans have alwaysespoused some form of political clout. Such authority does not find its establishment in a social contract or supplementary transmission theory. Instead, the authority stems from the absolute fact that individuals must have a leader who can make decisions for a people, and the people consider these decisions are authoritative. Then, if a political society is a natural society, the rationale served by Locke’s social contract theory is ambiguous. Consequently, humanity does not require this transitional step of a social contract that takes them from an imaginary state of nature into political society.
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