

One may ask, "What's the big deal about kids doing some good for their community?" There is one very simple answer for this... "What's the big deal with your kids being OWNED by an omnipotent government?" What a wonderful example of its delights the Germans and their drilled and trained wunderkinder left us? Mandatory involuntary service shall set us all free!

The Politics of Human Nature

The number of replies I received to [my previous article, "Does the State Own Your Kids?"](#), took me by surprise. Perhaps I underestimated the reach of LRC, or more horrifyingly, perhaps I have something of some value to offer, which will now be an impetus for me to continue writing. Oh, the horrors! There was one reply from Jim H. that was particularly penetrating, and my answer to him is the present impetus for this article. The matter of not only that article and Jim H's reply, but of all things political, is supremely and conclusively concerned with the grand topic of Human Nature.

Before proceeding further, I must inform the squeamish, that this article must make use of Biblical scripture. Any libertarian vampire is forewarned to turn aside at this point. It is not my intent to wax theological, and, thank God, I have no ability to do so anyway. I am coming at it strictly for purposes of a logical argument. That is, if scripture verse A says this and that, and proponent A says, "I am the representative of scripture", and anti-proponent B says, "I am the anti-representative of scripture A", and both do and say that which is contrary to their proclamations, then logically both are full of crap.

Let's take as my simple supposition that Locke and Rousseau are at disparate ends of the political spectrum. Sure, there's more that could be added to this simplicity, but that will be my starting point. One can go back to the battle between the Gnostics and the Church Father, but there is not need to. It was what it still is now, and was in between in the times of Locke and Rousseau.

I do draw your attention to Igor Shafarevich masterful work, [The Socialist Phenomenon](#), and what Alexander Solzhenitsyn says concerning Gnosticism in his intro;

"Shafarevich points out with great precision both the cause and the genesis of the first socialist doctrines, which he characterizes as *reactions*: Plato as a reaction to Greek culture, and the Gnostics as a reaction to Christianity."

The central matter that would lead to this antagonism between the Locke and Rousseau camps would be their contrary views of human nature. It is my contention that all the opposing political structures that are built upon opposing ideologies, are at their genesis, their germination and sprouting, simple spiritual matters. In the case of Locke and Rousseau, as on all others that abide in either camp, the core spiritual matter concerns *the nature of man*. What is to do or not to do with the nature of man is the overriding question of all things governmental. As James Madison said as well:

"But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on *human nature*? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary."

In the Locke camp you would have the concept of a human nature as that of an essentially and incorrigibly depraved one, a "sinful human nature." It is clear to anyone who reads deeper into Locke, that though he did not believe in an inherent sinful nature with an Adamic source, he had no illusions about a serious "problem", and he did pin this problem on "human nature." As for

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.