

phies of Locke and Rousseau. There are many skirmishes to be had, but what would be the overarching impetus that brought the full force of these intellectual armies to the battlefield? It is the purpose of this writing to show that this impetus is their diametrically opposing views of "human nature". Further still, beyond Locke and Rousseau, I will seek to show that all the world is broken up into the two warring camps of Natural Law-based Republics (in various diluted forms), and Elitist-lead Gnostic States (in a variety of hideous forms).

On the one side, you have a man created in "God's image". This we are to assume means that man carries in his being some similitude of the Divine Nature. Yet through the introduction of "sin" into the world this human-Divine nature combination became "fallen", "depraved", and "sinful". And so this ill human nature inherently passes on down through the generations, in a somewhat Darwinistic manner. On the other side of the battle line, for the most part the biblical basis for defining human nature is dismissed. Instead we have human nature often of an unnamed celestial origin, and so inherently good, though somehow it had become ensnared into a imprisoned life in a weak body of evil material. This poor flesh-imprisoned spiritman (the "spirit" of the human being the same as the "nature" of the human in this philosophy) was now easily swayed by "environmental" (very loosely defined) and man made institutional forces, to behave against his will in unseemly and criminal manners.

The one side condemns man to an "inherently fallen, sinful, depraved nature", which needs to be restrained from harming others.. The other empathizes with man as an imprisoned celestial spirit, at the mercy of an environmental and institutional deck stacked against him. What to do with these either/or fallen and victimized men? So it is that both sides form governmental structures to accord with their perspective on the nature of human nature. Either a governmental system has to be formed that puts in place restraints to keep the depraved man from inevitably harming others. Or, on the other side, one has to be put in place that seeks "justice" for the grievously victimized spiritman. This is indeed what we have in the philosophies of Locke and Rousseau, and beyond these, what we have in the God-acknowledging Natural Law-based Republics, and the more atheistic self-empowering Elitist Gnostic States. The one seeks to implement reasonable restraints that have been culled and refined through the centuries. The other seeks to implement the plans of an elite that adjusts to the passing whims of the present, with little to no concern for what has passed beforehand. One believes in an inflexible universal moral code this is (re)discovered and compiled throughout history. The other believes only in a code that lasts an historical instant, and will be very different tomorrow.

It must be pointed out that Locke himself did not hold to the "depraved" orthodoxies of the Adamic origin of sin, and it being or becoming inherent in man's nature. But nonetheless he held to the understanding that man was helplessly sinful, regardless of the origins of this state. This perspective is not held by the Rousseau camp in any respect, never mind a debate concerning the "origin of sin". So it is that all who hold to belief of "sinful nature" (regardless of "origin") do find themselves in the camp of Locke, due as well to the vast majority of other common philosophical beliefs .

Sure, this is very basic and non-academic, but I've only written three paragraphs, and I am not an academic. This is fortunate, because it means that it will be written to be comprehended, and not something to be forever ruminated upon with very little conclusion. It will either be comprehended and accepted as of some validity and value, or immediately dismissed as useless trash. I hope for and expect both. I will begin this excursion with a visit to the Natural Law Locke camp first, then the Gnostic Rousseau camp. The former makes more use of the Greek and Hebrew scriptures, so an initial biblical foundation will be laid before visiting Locke. I believe that the biblical foundation that I will lay will be somewhat different from the orthodoxies laid by Natural Law Locke camp of the past. At the conclusion of all this, I think it will be seen that these past orthodoxies have not been wholly accurate, nor has the Gnostic Rousseau camp been wholly wrong. The ultimate argument will still favor the Natural Law Locke camp, though that assumed victory will be reasonably tempered.

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.