

6) By enabling the alienation of the individual labor.

7) By denying the need for communal consent to transfer of ownership of property admitted to be held in common (an internal contradiction in Locke's theory). He denies this for practical reasons. Locke states hereto:

"By making an explicit consent of every commoner, necessary to any one's appropriating to himself any part of what is given in common, children or servants could not cut the meat, which their father or master had provided for them in common, without assigning to every one his peculiar part. Though the water running in the fountain be every one's, yet who can doubt, but that in the pitcher is his only who drew it out? His *labour* hath taken it out of the hands of nature, where it was common, and belonged equally to all her children, and *hath* thereby *appropriated* it to himself."¹⁶

I critique this position:

1) argument by analogy is not as strong as deductive reasoning and moreover this analogy doesn't hold well. The global economy has nothing to do with a family's meal.

2) proverbs, while being by their simplicity, obscure the real issues and appeal to emotions, which are not rational.

3) Locke made this argument to manipulate our emotions: he seeks our pity for the hungry workers and children, and asks us to see the volunteering spirit of paternalistic aristocrats. Thus we are distracted from the central issue, the division of labor, working conditions, and the correlation between work and remuneration.

Reviewing Locke's position in its structure – proverb and analogy – it seems ill formed. A Marxist would ask for exactly that which Locke sees as a disadvantageous or impossible. Without a social right to essential goods the weak could perish according to the law over the strongest. Sharing guarantees the provision of basic necessities maintains social peace and enables social productivity. The maintenance of certain "safeguards" in a liberal economy does not necessarily mean the collectivization of the means of production. These precautions even

¹⁶ John Locke, Two Treatises, II 5 §29 http://oll.libertyfund.org/?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=show.php%3Ftitle=222&chapter=16269&layout=html&Itemid=27

appear necessary to ensure the proper functioning of the capitalist system and to prevent its excesses.

Another criticism: Locke says that reason and the Bible justifies private property. But this is not necessarily the case. One could also say that reason requires a system of communal property to ensure the needs of people with low needs or to fulfil the will of God.

Although the ideas of Locke were able to be adopted in English-speaking countries, it nevertheless appears that his vision is not entirely persuasive when critical examined. On the points discussed herein – the origin of the state, the origin of property, revolution – Locke and Marx are similar because Marx and Locke use very similar analytical tools. It is likely Marx read and was aware of Locke. The divergences then must be conscious and when Marx diverges from Locke he usually has the better view because he is a materialist. Marx theory developed out of and seriously considered the various liberal theories of the state.