



CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE

eISSN: 2660-6828 | Volume: 04 Issue: 07 Jul 2023
<https://cajlp.centralasianstudies.org>

John Locke's Views on the Nature of State and Peace

Sharipov Dilshod Bakhshilloevich

Lecturer of Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute, Bukhara, Uzbekistan

Received 4th May 2023, Accepted 5th Jun 2023, Online 30th Jul 2023

ANNOTATION

In this article, the definition of the natural state, what other similar situations exist in this social space and their types, the impact of these circumstances on peace, John Locke's political philosophy, there are detailed comments on how he sees the "state of nature" as internal mechanisms that ensure peace in society.

KEYWORDS: liberalism, epistemology, philosophy, government, Declaration, enlightenment, parliament, civil society.

INTRODUCTION

John Locke (1632 - 1704) was an English Enlightenment philosopher who greatly influenced empiricism and liberalism, epistemology and political philosophy. He was born on August 29, 1632 in the town of Wrington, near Bristol, in the county of Somerset, in the north-west of England, in the family of a local lawyer. In 1646, during the civil war in England, his father served as a captain in O. Cromwell's army. After that, on the recommendation of the army commander, John Locke entered the famous and leading school of his time - Westminster School. In 1652, he entered Oxford University as one of the best students of the school[1]. He received a bachelor's degree in 1656, and a master's degree in 1658. Later, John Locke was invited by Lord Ashley, the Earl of Shaftesbury, to work as a house doctor and tutor for his son. From this time, John Locke also started his political career. John Locke writes "An Essay Concerning Religious Toleration": The first in 1689, the second in 1692, and the third in 1706 after his death were published anonymously. Under the instructions of Earl of Shaftesbury Ashley, the Constitution of the Province of Carolina in North America ("Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina") and the "General Plan of Development" were drawn up. In 1668, John Locke was elected a member of the Royal Society. In 1669, he was elected a member of its Council [2].

Science, medicine, politics, economics, pedagogy, the relationship of the state to the church, religious tolerance and freedom of religion were the main points of John Locke's interests. In 1671, the encyclopedist scientist began researching the cognitive abilities of the human mind and his research lasted for 19 years. As a result of these researches, John Locke wrote one of his main books entitled "Experience of understanding the human mind".

DISCUSSION

In 1672 and 1679, he held a high position in the government offices of England. But his career was tied to the rise or fall of the aforementioned Earl of Shaftesbury. From 1675 to the middle of 1679, John Locke lived in France to recover his health. In 1683, following the Earl of Shaftesbury, he moved to Netherlands. In 1688-1689, the “Glorious Revolution” took place in England. As a result, William III Oranski was proclaimed King of England. As a result, John Locke returned to England in 1688. In the 1690s, John Locke was involved in scientific and artistic creations along with state affairs. In 1690 “Experiment to understand the human mind”, “Two Treatises on Government”, In 1693 “Thoughts on Education”, In 1695, the works “The Wisdom of Christianity” were published. John Locke died on October 28, 1704 from asthma (in Lady Demeris Mesham’s field yard).

John Locke had a great influence on the renaissance in Europe - the “Age of enlightenment” and the emergence of liberal theorists. His ideas were reflected in the US Declaration of Independence[3]. D. Diderot, T. Hobbs had a great influence on his ideas. Later, the importance of Locke’s ideas was recognized by D. Hume and I. Kant. According to John Locke, people are born without innate ideas and knowledge comes through experience based on sense perception[4]. According to John Locke, free will is influenced by strong desire and liberty is a power of the soul, not of the will[5]. The theory of separation of powers is based on John Locke’s philosophy for the first time (the legislative body - parliament, executive body - court, army; federative power - the king, ministers). “The main purpose of people joining the society is to try to use their property peacefully and safely. The main weapon and tool of these people are the laws established in this society”, writes John Locke [6].

John Locke’s “Experiment to understand the human mind”, “On the experience of the laws of nature”, “About the experience of freedom of religion”, “Article about freedom of religion”, “Thoughts on education”, “Thoughts on what a gentleman should learn and study”, “Two Treatises on Government” this type of work were more famous. In Book 1 of “Two Treatises on Government” is entitled: “Investigation and refutation of the false principles and principles of Sir Robert Filmer and his followers”. This book is fully devoted to the perception, representation and right to control political power from a religious perspective.

In Book 2 of John Locke’s “Two Treatises on Government”, the following concepts are divided into chapters and explained in detail: 1) about the natural state; 2) about the war situation; 3) about the slavery; 4) about the property; 5) about paternal authority (It refers to Adam a.s.); 6) about political or civil society; 7) about the origins of political societies; 8) on the goals and management of political society; 9) about the forms of the state; 10) about the collapse of the management system a total of 19 chapters have been reviewed [7]. From the point of view of justice, we think that it will be fruitful if we interpret only one of these topics - the theory of the natural state. John Locke, writing about the state of nature, directly connects this term to the concept of political power.

Definition of political power: “defines the concepts of the creation of laws for the common good, the management and maintenance of (private) property, which envisages the death penalty. Correspondingly, I understand the right to exercise the powers of society in order to enforce less severe punishments and laws, and to prevent the invasion of a foreign state” [8], writes John Locke.

A state of complete freedom. “In order to properly understand political power and to describe its origin, we must know the condition of all mankind. This is a state of complete freedom regardless of their activities. We mean the use of one’s property and personality within the limits of the laws of nature, independent of the will of others and without asking permission from another person”, writes Locke. In John Locke’s definition of the term “state of complete freedom”, we see property and personality free from the will and permission of others.

Property is wealth, right, privilege. However, it should be recognized that the scientist equates the concept of personality with property. It is for the spirit of that time that man does not fall into slavery, like the Hindus, or, as I. Kant later wrote, it can be attributed to events such as Indians and blacks being taken away as slaves[9].

In addition, it is written that the Jews sold themselves to their master, [10] in which the product of labor belongs to the master. In this case, if according to the agreement, one of the submissive's teeth is broken or one of his eyes goes out, the agreement is void[11]. Personality and property are considered the essence of freedom, the state of complete freedom. The focus on property is also so great that it is viewed at the level of personality [12].

A state of equality

John Locke uses the phrase "state of equality" along with "state of complete freedom": "a state of equality - all power and all jurisdiction (the verdict of the trial) are interconnected, *so that no one has more than the other*". It is explained as follows: "It is clear that a creature belonging to the same breed and the same species, from the moment it is born, has the same natural advantage and uses the same ability without distinction. It is also understood to be equal in relationship, free from any submission or submission"[13]. Of course, the unity of the will of the God and the ruler is applied over the other, that is, as "the natural right of the supreme power and government"[14].

Natural equality

Here, John Locke quoted from the work "The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity" by the genius of his time, the "wise Hooker" (Richard Hooker (1554-1600)). According to him, "the equality of people is so obvious and unquestionable that it establishes the duty of mutual love between people. From this it is clear that our relationship to each other builds obligations and from them derives great laws - justice and mercy"[15]. Richard Hooker wrote: "It is this natural desire that has led people to realize that it is their duty at least to love others as they love themselves; *because everyone should have the same opportunity to achieve equal things*. So, if I create evil, then I must prepare for hardships and sufferings. If I do not show love to people, there is no reason for them to show me more love". In this place, Richard Hooker connects everything to emotion and shows that the natural obligations of men are as much as their feelings. "Equality in the relationship between us and those like us creates certain rules and noble tasks for living through natural intelligence. This is known to everyone" [16].

A state of freedom

John Locke believes the above definition is a state of freedom, but argues that it is not arbitrary. "Although man in this state governs his person and property in a state of unrestricted freedom, he does not have the freedom to destroy himself or any soul under his control. Except it's better to put it to good use than to just keep it".[17]

A natural state

John Locke wrote: "*The natural state has a law of nature by which it is governed and which is binding on everyone*; and the mind is a tool that is calculated by this law and teaches all people, with it, it is considered that all people are equal and free. which none of them should harm the life, health, liberty and property of another;[18] for all men were created by an all-powerful and infinitely God; they are all servants of one supreme ruler, sent for his decree and work; they are the property of the God, and their existence must be according to his will, not to them; and the possession of one nature, endowed with the same capacity and

given to all, we cannot say that there is anything that we cannot imagine: such subordination is considered to exist between us. Which gives us the right to destroy each other, one is considered to be created for the use of the other. for example, we should not accept that the lower species of creatures were created for us"[19]. According to John Locke, man is obliged to preserve himself and does not have the right to make his own mark in life, "in this sense, he is obliged - when his life is not in danger - how much he can manage to save the rest of humanity" - it depends on him. "A person should not deprive a criminal of his life, not encroach on his life, except for justice. Similarly, a person should do everything to preserve life, liberty, health, limbs and property of others" [20].

A matter of preserving peace and humanity

Based on the above considerations, John Locke concludes as follows: "All men must be restrained from encroaching upon the rights of others and from harming one another, and must obey the laws of nature. It is to preserve peace and all humanity; it is up to each person to follow the laws of nature in this situation, according to which everyone has the right to punish the violator of this law to such an extent that it depends (also) on the perception". John Locke believes that in such a "state of complete equality" naturally, one does not have any superiority and the right to rule over another, and these situations are the law of nature [21]. He wrote that the law of nature cannot be applied to society, because "everyone would have the right to do it". "Thus, in the state of nature, one person has some kind of authority over another". John Locke states that one person having partial or complete power over another creates despotic power [22]. There is only one case in which one person can legally do evil to another – "we call it execution"[23]. "A person who violates the law of nature, that is, a criminal, is thus emphasized. it is based on the rule of reason and equality - these are the rules established by God for the activities of people, for their safety. However, a criminal lives by different rules; thereby making this criminal a danger to humanity; and the bonds that protect people from harm and use of force (rule of reason and general equality are implied - D.B. Sharipov) are weakened and broken by him. It is a crime against the human race, human peace and security – in which the law of nature is implied".[24] According to John Locke, every person has the right to save humanity. This means that it must "retain or, where necessary, destroy things that are harmful to humans". At the same time, it also means that evil can be done to anyone who transgresses the law of nature. therefore, it is necessary to make the criminal feel sorry for what he has done and to keep him that way. Through this, he says, it is necessary to put an end to the crime of others. "For this reason every man has the right to punish criminals and to be the executor of the law of nature", wrote John Locke[25].

Law of foreign citizens

John Locke also spoke about the right of foreigners, which he did not see as a negative side to the peace of society. On the contrary, it is horrifying how foreign citizen can be punished or sentenced to death in a country without being a foreign citizen. Sanctions as the will of the legislative body in the form of state law should not be applied to a foreign citizen. Because he "does not have authority" over the foreign citizen. This is one side of the matter. On the other hand, the laws issued in England, France and Netherlands have defined how Hindus can be controlled like all other peoples of the world. After all, they are "not subject to authority," wrote John Locke [26] (these thoughts are the conclusion of the scientist's time spent in France and Netherlands).

Comparative thought

This is a similar idea to German Enlightenment I. Kant's pretext for the British East India Company, the Dutch in China and Japan at the same time. I. Kant sees the concept of peace as a paradigm of international relations. John Locke sees this concept of peace in the implementation of "civil laws" based on the laws of nature within society. That is, he sees it as the law of social morality. John Locke wrote that civil laws are just when they are based on the laws of nature. "Laws will be just if they are governed and interpreted only on this basis"[27].

About compensation for damage or loss

According to John Locke, crime is a violation of the law and the departure of reason from the rule of justice [28]. He goes so far from himself that the criminal denies the laws of human nature and becomes a harmful creature. In this case, the usual damage caused to this or that person occurs and some person is harmed. Whoever is harmed in this has the right to punish. All other people, at the same time, the victim has a special right, that is, the right to demand compensation for the damage caused. It is the responsibility of the one who caused the damage to compensate for the damage. And another person who wants can help the victim if he considers this situation fair. It is assumed that compensation will be paid in the same amount as the damage caused.

The law based on the right to self-preservation

In this matter, John Locke explains the existence of two rights in a person: the first is the issue of punishment for crimes such as intimidation and similar violations (the right to request an appointment); the second is the right to claim damages that only has the injured party. English Enlightenment John Locke wrote: it may be that, in the general interest, the judge, as a person with the right to general punishment, may not impose punishment for criminal activity. But he cannot satisfy the interests of the injured party and exempt him from non-reimbursement of damages. In this case, according to John Locke, whoever suffered damage, only that person can claim damages on his own behalf and only he can be released from non-reimbursement of damages[29]. This is where the law of self-preservation should come into play: "similarly, when a crime is committed against a person, the power to punish requires that the person exercise the right to preserve all humanity in him to prevent its recurrence. Thus, every person can naturally have the power to kill a murderer. This example shows the need to protect others from such crimes. It should be noted that unjust death cannot be justified by anything; at the same time it makes people safe from murderous intent; A murderer is a person who is completely disconnected from the general rules and norms given by God. In addition, by using unjust force and killing one person, he declared war on all mankind" [30]. According to John Locke, this scene is like a wild lion or tiger walking among people. Because of this, criminals do not have a way of life that interacts with other people, nor does it make people safe. Therefore, John Locke believes that he should be killed. It is based on the great law: "Whoever sheds human blood, his blood will be shed by human hands" [31].

RESULTS

The flaw in John Locke's doctrine is that, in the state of nature, it is shown that each person has the powers of executive power. Of course, this must come from the law of nature. "Bad character, emotion, malice or vindictiveness can lead to extremes in punishing others because it is human nature. It causes riots and disturbances; therefore, God has undoubtedly established a government that limits the use of emotion and force by other people"[32]. John Locke points out that the greatest disadvantage is that people are judges in their mutual affairs in the natural state. "After all, it is not difficult to imagine that one who has so unjustly

harmed his brother, would be so just in inflicting punishment on himself" [33]. John Locke admits all the shortcomings of the state of nature and proposes "civil government". This phrase, according to John Locke, removes all inconveniences in the state of nature and is "a proper remedy". During this period, John Locke writes about the limitation of absolute monarchy; in his sentences, he mentions the shortcomings of the government, that the judgment is just, correct, or that no one has the right to check. On the contrary, in such a case it shows the superiority of the state of nature over absolute monarchy: "After all, in the state of nature, people should not obey the unjust will of others. This is much better than absolute monarchy. If the judge judges wrongly in his own case or in some other case, he will answer for it before the rest of mankind"[34]. John Locke writes that following the above-mentioned circumstances, the following questions may arise: "Well, then "Where is the natural state?" or "When have people been like this?" "...All the kings and rulers of the independent countries of the whole world are in a state of nature. In this case, it becomes clear that if the majority of people in this world were not in this state, the state of nature would never have existed in history and in the future. I know that the kings of independent societies, whether in alliance with others or not, are in such a position. The point is that any agreement between people does not end the state of nature. But this can happen when people unite into a single community and form a single body politic; people can make commitments to each other and sign other agreements, but thus remain in their natural state. When promises and agreements involving the exchange of goods occur between two persons, it is mandatory for them, even if it is on an uninhabited island in Garcilaso de la Vega's "History of Peru", or even between a Swiss and an Hindu in the woods of America. At the same time, they are in a natural position relative to each other. Because truthfulness and keeping promises is a characteristic of human beings. [35] According to John Locke's conclusion, people were in a state of nature, such a situation occurred that they became members of some political society according to their own will.

Another important conclusion is that John Locke defines "atheism as a worldview that undermines the foundations of the state" [36]. In addition, in his conclusions, John Locke emphasizes the relationship between religion and philosophy, religion and the state, and the freedom of religious feelings.

In the philosophy of John Locke, the concept of peace was seen as the internal moral law of society. It can be said that this is the first behaviorist concept from the point of view of socio-political research and methodology. It should be noted that the school of behaviorism originated from here. The essence of the paradigm is that anything that is social can in time become a political phenomenon. Any political phenomenon is always a social phenomenon.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above, it can be concluded that almost all internal disturbances in human history, or political crises occurred when the legality of justice in the norms of social morality was abused. It is clear that establishing justice in society is the simplest and at the same time the most difficult way to ensure peace. We believe that the works of English enlightened scientist, philosopher and pedagogue John Locke can be theoretically helpful.

REFERENCES:

1. Литвинова Е. Ф. Джон Локк, его жизнь и философская деятельность — СПб., 1892. —р. 77.
2. Locke; John (1632 - 1704)// London qirolik jamiyati sayti/Сайт Лондонского королевского общества (англ.).

3. *Glausser W.* Three Approaches to Locke and the Slave Trade // *Journal of the History of Ideas.* — 1990. — Apr. - Jun. (т. 51, № 2). -pp. 199-216.
4. *Заиченко Г. А.* Объективность чувственного знания: Локк, Беркли и проблема «вторичных» качеств // *Философские науки.* — 1985. — № 4. -pp. 98-109.
5. Локк, Джон — Википедия (wikipedia.org).
6. *Политология: краткий энциклопедический словарь.* Ростов-на-Дону. «Феникс». Москва. «Зевс». 1997. -pp. 250-253.
7. *Ayers M.* Locke. — London, 1993. -p. 700.
8. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава I. -р. 263.
9. IMMANUEL KANTNING TINCHLIK MAKSIMALARI. Sharipov Dilshod Baxshilloyevich, Buxoro davlat pedagogika instituti “Ijtimoiy fanlar” kafedrası o’qituvchisi. *Scientific Bulletin of NamSU-Haychniy vестник НамГУ-NamDU ilmiy axborotnomasi-2023-yil. № 4. -p. 177.*
10. *Glausser W.* Three Approaches to Locke and the Slave Trade // *Journal of the History of Ideas.* — 1990. — Apr. - Jun. (т. 51, № 2). -pp. 199-216.
11. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 276.
12. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 277.
13. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -pp. 263-264.
14. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава I. -р. 263.
15. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 264.
16. Richard Hooker. *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity.* B.I.Chapter.VIII.
17. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 264.
18. *Boeker R.* Locke on Persons and Personal Identity. – Oxford, 2021. -p. 303.
19. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 265.
20. *Яковлев А. А.* Завещание Джона Локка, приверженца мира, философа и англичанина. — М.: Изд-во ин-та Гайдара, 2013. -р. 432. — ISBN 978-5-93255-357-2
21. *Boeker R.* Locke on Persons and Personal Identity. – Oxford, 2021. -p. 303.
22. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 266.

23. *Stuart M. Locke's Metaphysics*. – Oxford, 2013. -p. 522.
24. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 268.
25. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 267.
26. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 267.
27. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -рр. 267 – 268.
28. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 268.
29. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 269.
30. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 269.
31. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 269.
32. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 3. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. Книга вторая. Глава II. -р. 270.
33. ДЖОН ЛОКК. Сочинения в трех томах. Том 1. «Мысл». Москва. 1988. -р. 20.