

1. Unlike Hobbes, Locke anticipates that leaders will occasionally fail in their responsibility to protect the rights of the individual. The following excerpt comes from the website, "Great Thinkers", an online resource for introductory material on Western philosophers, <https://thegreatthinkers.org/locke/introduction/>, analyzes Locke's belief on the right to revolt.

"Anticipating objections to this doctrine, (the right to revolt against the laws of the Commonwealth), and particularly the accusation that it would encourage the people to revolt frequently and without due cause, Locke insists that this right of resisting arbitrary power will be used only as a last resort: "Great mistakes in the ruling part, many wrong and inconvenient laws, and all the slips of humane frailty will be born by the people, without mutiny or murmur. But if a long train of abuses, prevarications, and artifices, all tending the same way, make the design visible to the people, and they cannot but feel, what they lie under, and see, whither they are going; 'tis not to be wonder'd, that they should then rouse themselves, and endeavor to put the rule into such hands, which may secure to them the ends for which government was at first erected."

Question: From your reading of Locke, what would force the people to revolt against the government of the Commonwealth?

2. In *The Social Contract*, Rousseau states that without the benefit of society, men rely on their own self-sufficiency to obtain happiness. Alternatively, in a society like the one he envisions in *The Social Contract*, Rousseau states that men are forced to be free. He writes, "Men do not govern themselves by abstract visions," he says (118). No indeed, "they are made happy only by compulsion" (119). Do you agree that by forfeiting self-sufficiency and relying on the body politic for one's freedom, the individual is more likely to be free?