

Hobbes VS. Rousseau Justice

Hobbes - Violence enforces justice

Rousseau - Human nature enforces justice

Who is right?

When considering Hobbes and Rousseau differing views on justice, I'm torn between idealism and realism.

Rousseau's belief that human nature itself can enforce justice is appealing. It reflects hope for people to be fair and cooperate. However, I recognize Hobbes argument that justice requires external forces, even violence, because not everyone will agree on what is fair or "just". History and daily life show that there will always be individuals that place their own interest above the common good. As much as I want Rousseau's vision to be true, I ultimately see Hobbes perspective as more realistic. Human nature alone cannot guarantee justice when disagreement and selfishness inevitably arise.

Read Hobbes as answer the following question. Question: Hobbes with his contract = a social contract, says that a future life will be a life that is reflective of our society's preference today. He's ending to a need for absolute authority to ensure commonwealth. In contrast, Rousseau emphasizes that true sovereignty rests in the general will of the people, favoring equality and direct participation to prevent corruption. Who is right? Or is there another way to explain it? Explain your answer and do not use any more examples.

Don't think Hobbes or Rousseau are ^{completely right} _{of themselves}. I think it's never right that people need rules and laws to enforce them, or else society will just turn into a horrible mess. In Rousseau is also right that if power is only in one place, and it's going to corruption, so people need a say in government. The best system is a mix of both, strong laws to keep order (Hobbes) and democracy with fairness to keep leaders accountable (Rousseau). History shows countries work best when they balance these two ideas.

~~Hobbes~~

~~John Smith~~

I think that Hobbes was right that laws without enforcement don't work, but Rousseau was also right that power without people holding a say can turn corrupt. The best way I think is a mix of both, authority that can ~~hold people accountable~~ keep people in order, but still ~~hold people accountable~~ but still be held accountable by the will of the people