

.How did both classical republicans and natural rights philosophers influence the Founders' The views about government?

What are the essential differences between classical republicanism and natural rights philosophy?

Explain what John Locke meant by the social contract. Do social contracts exist today? Give examples.

Do you think government should have purposes that classical republicans and natural rights philosophers did not include in their writings? Explain your answer.

The Founders' views about government were heavily influenced by both classical republicans and natural rights philosophers. Each of their ideas left a major imprint on the Founders' ideas about which type of government would work best for the people. The concepts of classical republicanism and natural rights philosophies were influential in many ways, and each contained different aspects on which the Founders based their ideas on. Natural rights philosophy is the idea that "universally obligatory standards of justice would prevail in the absence of man made laws," which means that no man made law can violate a person's' individual rights. As argued by John Locke, in a state of nature, each individual possesses inalienable rights to "life, liberty, and estate [property]." He also argued that if a government were to start to violate or take away these rights then the people have a right to rebel and be fairly governed. In natural rights philosophy, the aspects that influenced the Founders' were individual rights, popular sovereignty government by consent, right of revolution, limited government, and human equality. The Founders also studied and got ideas from the Romans. These ideas put the community's welfare over individual interests. There were many advantages and disadvantages that came with using their ideas. However, the Founders studied very thoroughly through both ideas, and made sure that the disadvantages would not interfere with the advantages. This helped insure a better government for the people.

As there are differences in many beliefs and ideas, there are differences between classical republicanism and natural rights philosophies. Classical republicanism focuses on the importance of civic virtue, or helping out the society or the benefit through the common good and for what is best for

the people. On the other hand, natural rights philosophy focuses on the idea of individual importance. Cicerone stated, "For our country did not beget and educate us gratuitously, or without the expectation of receiving our support. She does not afford us so many blessings for nothing, and supply us with a secure refuge for useless idleness and self-indulgence," and this basically means that our government provides us with care and freedoms, and in return we have to help the Government and help it better develop for the people.

John Locke's idea of social contract was an agreement with the government for individuals to agree with others to create and live under a government and give that government the power to make and enforce laws. So basically in a state of nature, everyone was free to do whatever they wanted to do. This meant that their rights would not be protected, and that would make everyone feel insecure. In a social contract the individual must give up something to get something in return. Therefore, in a social contract everyone gives up the absolute right to do whatever they want, and in return the government provides protection to whoever obeys in the social contract. John Locke believed that government is a better alternative to a state of nature. He stated that its main purpose was to protect the rights which an individual could not protect in a state of nature. L.L. Nunn said that, "Such natural rights as society takes from the individual in order to protect him in the enjoyment of his more important rights." What L.L. Nunn means by this is, individuals have to give up some natural rights for protection from the government.

The government should have purposes that natural rights philosophers and classical republicans didn't include in their writings, because the government needs to adapt to the changes of society. James Madison knew what would be best for the country, so he adopted a representative type of government. This is where the people elect representatives, and they represent the people in government. This makes sure that the people's choices are always

respected. For example, during the time of the formation of the United States, there were no provisions in place for education. Another example might be the view of slavery or women's rights, before the 1800's, people viewed these things not as problem. In the 1900's, slavery and women's rights were fought for and people changed their perspectives and their ideas to believing that slavery is horrible and that women should have the right to vote. John Marshall said, "The Constitution would always have to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs." This quote shows the perspective of a Supreme Court Justice about the need for adaptation of the Constitution.