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Abstract

Although humanity is at the height of technology and the scope of knowledge crosses infinite boundaries, some people are deprived of even the most basic freedoms. Regarding the fact that without freedom, no meaning can imagine for human life, and none of the human talents will find a place to flourish, removing the obstacles to human freedom is vital. The current research aims to introduce the three doctrines of the social contract, resistance, and natural law, which have a libertarian capacity to discredit ideological and intellectual barriers to freedom.

The libertarian capacities of the social contract, resistance, and natural law doctrines

December 2022

The libertarian capacities of the social contract, resistance, and natural law doctrines

Abstract:

Although humanity is at the height of technology and the scope of knowledge crosses infinite boundaries, some people are deprived of even the most basic freedoms. Regarding the fact that without freedom, no meaning can imagine for human life, and none of the human talents will find a place to flourish, removing the obstacles to human freedom is vital. The current research aims to introduce the three doctrines of the social contract, resistance, and natural law, which have a libertarian capacity to discredit ideological and intellectual barriers to freedom.

The main question of this research is what political ideas have the potential to provide theoretical grounds for the liberation of humanity from religious and royal captivity? The research hypothesizes that the doctrines of the social contract, resistance, and natural law are among the doctrines that have the necessary potential to lay the foundation for realizing people’s fundamental freedom. We have used Qualitative analysis of content and history method to achieve the research objectives.

Finally, the doctrines evaluated in this study provide the theoretical groundwork to challenge the legitimacy of authoritarian regimes by discrediting the theoretical justifications used, which causes them to gain the ideological capacity to Overthrow dictatorial regimes.
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Introduction:

Freedom is the most sacred human value because our humanity finds meaning under the shadow of freedom, and our intellectual ability will emerge in the light of freedom, so if we do not have the freedom to live our way, we will not be human anymore. Although 21st-century humanity is at the height of technology and the scope of knowledge crosses infinite boundaries, in many regions of the world, some people are deprived
of even the most basic freedoms. Regarding the fact that without freedom, no meaning can imagine for human life, none of the human talents will find a place to flourish, and man will be reduced to the level of an animal, removing the obstacles to human liberty, especially from a theoretical point of view, is vital. The current research aims to introduce the three doctrines of the social contract, resistance, and natural law, which, from the writer’s point of view, have a libertarian capacity to weaken and discredit ideological and intellectual barriers to freedom and take a small step in paving the way for the liberation of humanity.

This article divides into three different sections, each dedicated to one of the doctrines of the social contract, resistance, and natural law. In the section that is related to the social contract, while providing a general definition of the doctrine of the social contract, the expression of people such as Lautenbach, the German Princes who concluded the Treaty of Schmalkaldic, Hobbes, John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Jhon Rawls will be examined, and their influence in providing theoretical foundations for freedom will express. In the second part, which is related to the doctrine of resistance, the geographical scope and the different interpretations of this idea from the perspective of François Hotman, Philippe du Plessis-Mornay, George Buchanan, Du Francis, Bellarmine, Dam Mariana, Suarez, and John Locke will investigate, and its impact on the discourse of freedom will show. In the last part, the doctrine of natural law and its evolution from ancient Greece to the Middle Ages and according to people like Alcidamas, Antiphon, Cicero, Aquinas, Hugo Grotius, and Hobbes and its theoretical importance discuss will evaluate in the framework for freedom.

The main question of this research is what political thoughts have the potential to provide theoretical grounds for the liberation of humanity from religious and royal captivity. The sub-questions of the research are as follows: How does the doctrine of social contract create a theoretical basis for the justification of people’s sovereignty? How does the doctrine of natural law delegitimize laws that restrict human freedoms and are against the people’s interests? The research hypothesizes that the doctrines of the social contract, resistance, and natural law are among the doctrines that have the necessary potential to lay the foundation for realizing people’s fundamental freedoms. We have used Qualitative analysis of content and history method to achieve the research objective.

Finally, this paper evaluates three libertarian doctrines that have underpinned subsequent libertarian movements. These thoughts provide the theoretical groundwork for societies engaged in authoritarianism to challenge the legitimacy of authoritarian regimes by discrediting the theoretical justifications used, which causes them to gain the ideological capacity to Overthrow dictatorial regimes.

Theoretical Framework:
The theoretical framework of the research is liberalism. Liberalism has a particular emphasis on freedom and considers all people to have the right to live freely. The goal of liberalism is to remove social and legal obstacles from the path of freedom. In particular, liberalism focuses on removing old social customs, religious barriers, racial prejudices, and gender discrimination. Relying on individual liberties is based on the basic assumption that humans are rational beings and believes they can determine their benefits and harms. Therefore, everyone has the right to choose his favorite goal in life, and each person is the best judge who can decide about his interests and benefits. Of course, this freedom is based on not endangering the freedom of others. (Ball and Dagger, 1384: 78, 76) In general, liberalism emphasizes commitments such as the unique value of freedom, tolerance for change, the possibility of rationality ruling collective life, distrust of tradition as a guide, and belief in the process of moral and political progress. (Sibley, 2014: 841)

Research method:
The research method used in the research is a combination of the Haas method of content analysis and the historical method. In analyzing the content to understand the author’s or the speaker’s theories and opinions, classification, bitterness, analysis, and interpretation of the writings of individuals or their speeches are discussed. In the qualitative type of this research method, after the units of analysis have been determined, the researcher identifies and evaluates the theoretically important and meaningful cases and relates them to the central question. (Sanjabi, 2010: 372, 362). In historical research, the researcher tries to present the facts of the past by collecting information, evaluating and verifying the accuracy of this information, combining
documentary reasons and analyzing them systematically and objectively, and concluding defensible research results related to the special assumptions of the research. (Taheri, 2015:134)

**Social contract:**

The social contract or government contract has been one of the most prominent doctrines of western political philosophy. Political philosophy between the religious reform movement and the second half of the 18th century was controlled by this thought. It means that at that time, any political theorizing was not of the type of social contract; at least, it had to take a stand against it. Although many think that this doctrine declined after Hume and Bentham’s attacks, its use in political theories continued until the 20th century. In the years before the American Civil War, supporters of secession in the southern states explored a version of this doctrine. During the 20th century, discussions about the social contract continued in discussions about states’ rights. Today, in line with the proper understanding of public policy, another narrative of the social contract has reappeared, the most important of which can be seen in the works of John Rawls and his theory of justice. Also, the doctrine of the social contract has been used to support various political positions. The leaders of the English Commonwealth in the 17th century used it to justify the king’s execution and the overthrow of his government. John Locke used it to justify limited government. Rousseau revised it as a basis for justifying a kind of revolution. Southerners in America adopted this doctrine for secessionism, and John Rawls took advantage of it to present a decent treatment of blacks. (McClelland, 2014: 382-381)

**The central theme of the social contract doctrine**

In this doctrine, the relationship between the ruler and the subjects is assumed to be like normal contract parties. The main content of the doctrine is that the ruler’s power is subject to specific requirements, and as long as the ruler remains loyal to them, his power is legitimate. In general, the doctrine of the social contract is designed to limit the ruler’s power and, in extreme cases, to justify removing him from office. Social contract theorists, especially Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau, resort to a distinctive method according to conventional wisdom to justify the existence of political government and rule. They first depict a situation in which there is no government to justify the human need for it. Then, the problems that arise in the absence of a government reveal the need for it, and in the end, a specific form of government is justified with the type of problems that arise in their natural situation and severity because it can handle issues better than other types. Therefore, the doctrine of the social contract is an apparent arrangement to establish a connection between three different components of political philosophy: 1- a specific opinion about human nature 2- a description of the problems that arise in the absence of government 3- justification of a specific form from the government that is the most appropriate type to overcome the problems introduced.

**The social contract in the medieval**

One of the first defenders of the social contract was the Saxon monk, Manegold of Lautenbach, who wrote against German Emperor Heinrich IV in the 11th century, believed that the ruler’s power derives from the people who raised him to that position to fight against wrongdoers and evil people and to establish justice. It is clear that when the ruler cannot fulfill his duties and becomes an evil person, he loses the dignity and position given to him. In the Middle Ages, the standard view about the relationship between the ruler and the subjects was that God appointed the ruler, and the subjects did not have the right to resist him. This issue was strengthened by the thirteenth chapter of Paul’s Epistle to the Romans: “Each person should be subject to superior contracts because there is no contract except from God, and God arranges those that exist. Manegold of Lautenbach was the first theorist who clearly questioned the divine origin of the government and acknowledged that the people are the main source of the government. This critical thing happened when Europe was in its darkest period, and the church had complete control over the life and death of the people. Also, in another important step, he made the continuation of the government conditional on fighting evil and wrongdoing people and establishing justice. He boldly stated that if the ruler could not handle these matters, he would be removed from the position given to him. This ruling was extraordinary in an era when rulers were considered divinely chosen, and disobeying them was considered a great sin. Although Lautenbach considered the origin of the government to be popular, he could not describe this
popular process and explain how the people formed the government.

**Social contract during religious reforms**

During the religious reforms, the issue of resistance had become a key issue in Europe, especially in Germany, because many of the princes of that land were Protestants, while its emperor, Charles V, was a Catholic. The German princes feared the emperor would invade their lands for religious reasons. For this reason, they made a military pact called Schmalkaldic League and used arguments outside the Bible based on specific readings of the social contract to justify their positions. Their most famous justifications are given in the Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos. In part of this treatise, it is said that in all legitimate governments, there is a kind of contractual relationship between the king and the people. The king is obliged to rule justly, and the people are obliged to obey him as long as the king rules justly. However, the duty of the people is conditional. The people will be freed from their responsibilities if the king does not rule justly. (Klosko, 2011: 99-132) Like Lautenbach, the German princes abandoned arguments based on the divine origin of the government and emphasized its secular and popular source of it. Also, like Lautenbach, they made government establishment conditional on requirements such as observing justice. The critical difference that the reading of the German princes from the social contract with Lautenbach had was that Lautenbach’s statements were very general and had a negative aspect. He only mentioned that the ruler would be stripped of his dignity and position if he did not fulfill his duties, and he did not explicitly prescribe to the people that if failure to observe justice on the part of the ruler, they would refuse to obey him. However, the German princes clearly described the contractual relationship between the rulers and the subjects, highlighted people’s roles, and spoke about the mutual duties of the people and the king. Additionally, they clearly stated that if the king does not rule justly, the people will also be fallen from the duties they have in front of him. In conclusion, the German princes had given a more positive and radical aspect to the contract doctrine.

**Social contract from Hobbes’ point of view**

The most apparent description of the social contract was provided by Hobbes, although Hobbes sought to strip the doctrine of the social contract of its essence. He intended to develop a new line of argument to defend absolute power at a time when the traditional arguments justifying the absolute power of rulers based on the Bible had lost their validity, and the arguments based on the social contract had removed them. However, despite Hobbes’ intention, he gave an obvious and orderly account of the doctrine of the social contract, removed it from a simple assumption and expressed it in the context of a historical event, and gave it a narrative sequence. In line with this narrative, he explained the main characteristics of human nature, the general conditions of people before the formation of the government, the process of government formation by the people, and the creation of a social contract by them, to the extent that later thinkers such as Locke and Rousseau they followed the same line of reasoning. Hobbes began his narrative with his general view of human nature.

**Human nature**

The main premises of Hobbes’s political philosophy lie in his characteristic view of human nature. Hobbes believed that humans are competitive creatures whose desires lead them to compete and eventually fight. Therefore, life is a constant movement in satisfying desires and wishes, but this is not a one-time process. Our desires and wishes are not interrupted; they start and demand satisfaction again as soon as they are satisfied. In Leviathan, Hobbes explained this process: “Continuous success in obtaining the things that man seeks over time, that is, continuous happiness is what men call happiness.” Hobbes believed that because the means necessary for satisfying desires are rare, there is inevitably competition among people to get them. In such a competition, all people have the same privileges because the primary reason is that all people can kill others, and also, they cannot be completely protected from being killed by others. Under these conditions, the full-scale conflict between people is inevitable. The conflict can be referred to as "the war of all against all.”

**State of nature**
Hobbes then describes humans’ situation before the government establishment. Hobbes presents a very horrible description of the state of nature. According to him, In the State of nature, every human being is the enemy of another human being. This situation is beautifully described by the famous phrase "man is a wolf man." In that situation, the rule of life is that everyone can get whatever they can and keep it for as long as they can, and moral rules and observing justice have no meaning. Strength and cunning are two main virtues in the state of nature, and all moral and religious rules lose color. Fear casts a shadow over all human moments and even makes breathing difficult. Hobbes was clear that man would be in such a miserable situation without government. The basis of Hobbes’s thought was that in a society without political governance, people are always in conflict with each other, and life becomes miserable. (Alem, 2011: 240-241) Hobbes himself, in a high-profile statement, explains this situation: "In such condition, there is no place for industry, because the fruit, therefore, is uncertain, and consequently, no culture of the earth, no navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by sea: no commodious building: no instruments of moving and removing such things as require such knowledge of the face of the earth: no account of time, no arts: no letters, no society: and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger, of violent death and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short. (Hobbes, 1651: 78)

Social contract and establishment of government

What should a person do to escape from this horrible situation? Fortunately, two human powers, reason and fear, are the source of hope. Fear causes a constant fear of violent death, and reason considers it necessary to find a way out of this situation. Taking these points into consideration and using his intellect, the natural man infers some laws of nature that will guide him in reducing the risk of his destruction. The most important of these laws declares that we must preserve and protect ourselves. Hobbes believes that all other laws can be deduced from this principle. From this, it is immediately inferred two other principles, the first being that everyone should strive for peace, and the other stipulates that everyone consents to the reciprocal observance of others to give up their right to everything and to be satisfied with the amount of freedom that others wish to have before themselves. When men realize that they can only protect themselves by forming a society that does not exist naturally, they make a pact to give up their right to everything, as well as the right to be judged by someone they choose. It is determined by themselves to accept. Their wills are surrendered to one person’s will, and they agree with each other not to resist the will of that one person. So, according to Hobbes, after humans agree with each other to leave the state of nature, they enter a society that submits to the ruler, but the people make no agreement with the ruler because he is not a party to the contract, but the people’s deal with each other has brought him to power. For this reason, he does not make any promises to them and is free to act as he sees fit; he only has to observe the fundamental law of nature, which is the protection of people’s lives. Although Hobbes’ goal was to deplete the doctrine of the social contract from its theme and neutralize its revolutionary potential, it had an aspect that Hobbes himself might not have paid attention to, which was to assert the right of the people to determine their original destiny to get out of the state of nature and form a government. Hobbes’ doctrine of a social contract does not consider the origin of the state based on its previous common examples, namely tradition, custom, and religion, and considers people as the source and cause of the state. However, his important performance was to describe the process of forming this popular organization and portray it as a historical event. Also, in this regard, Hobbes uses solid theoretical arguments to justify the formation of the government by the people, which was unprecedented until that time. Although Hobbes does not set any conditions for the ruler’s sovereignty and does not oblige the ruler to comply with specific requirements for ruling, he does not assign any right to the people to protest or remove the ruler due to his undesirable behavior. However, the ruler’s rule is subject to one critical condition: to ensure the people’s security. Indeed, the ruler is almost not obliged to any conditions for his rule, but there is an important issue called security; if the ruler cannot provide it, the people can leave the agreement and refuse to obey the ruler. This issue shows that the people are not unquestionably subject to the orders of the government and its servants, but it is the government that the people created to serve them, and the government is not a Presale-eternal holy institution that has holiness in its essence, and people are obliged to obey it under any circumstances. The government belongs to the people and for the people, even if, like Hobbes’s view, its only duty is to provide security.
to the people. Therefore, the doctrine of the social contract, even in its Hobbesian narrative, rejects other non-popular sources of government and affirms the popular nature of government formation. Also, it gives the people the right to resist if the ruler does not provide security, even despite Hobbes’s attempt to limit its revolutionary potential, again, to a large extent, undermines the basis of non-popular governance and by preparing the theoretical foundations, it provides the ground for people’s protest against the government and their freedom from tyranny. (Soltani, 2019: 75-76)

**Locke's understanding of social contract**

**State of nature in terms of Locke**

Locke had an opposite position to Hobbes about the state of nature. He believed that in the state of nature, there was complete freedom as much as full equality. Locke did not think that people in a state of nature used their freedom to destroy each other. He stated that the state of nature was a state of peace because human beings are rational beings who can discover moral truths and obey them. Following an ancient intellectual tradition, Locke referred to this rational human capacity as laws of nature. From Locke’s point of view, in a short sentence, laws of nature mean that human beings are social creatures who can develop themselves based on pursuing their interests. (Nelson, 198-199) Therefore, Locke believed that laws of nature prevail in the state of nature. These laws, which are derived from reason, state that all human beings are equal and no one should harm the life, health, freedom, and property of others. In applying these laws, Locke claimed that all people are law enforcers in the state of nature. Each person can punish not only cases of violation of laws of nature about himself but also those concerning others. The right to punishment is limited, and the penalty must be proportionate to the crime and violation. Now the question arises, what was the need for a government despite establishing peace with the laws of nature rule? Locke believed that people are selfish, so they are not impartial judges in cases involving their own feet. When a person is oppressed, he has the right to punish the other party in the same proportion as the victim, but the problem appears when the victim overdoes the punishment, he gives the other party the right to punish him for excessive punishment. Locke believed that without the existence of government, due to people’s differences in the interpretation and implementation of laws of nature, the state of nature would become the arena of the culminating cycle of revenge, which would resemble the war of all against all, and Hobbes’s interpretation of the state of nature. (Klosko, 1391: 225-224)

**Establishment of government**

Therefore, people decided to sign a social contract and establish a political society that had a government. The purpose of establishing the government was to protect the life, freedom, and property of the members of this newly established political society. From Locke’s point of view, freedom was a protection for personal life because if a person is not free, then due to the lack of freedom, he cannot fully protect his life, and his life will always be in danger. In the same way, the personal property protects a person’s freedom because if a person is destitute and has no money, he is forced to depend on others and cannot make his decisions independently. This connection also establishes in another way. A person’s life is protection for his freedom, and his freedom is protection for his property. (Jha, 2010: 133-134) As a result, everyone voluntarily hands over the right to enforce and implement the rulings to the government, which is the most important symbol of the parliament, to prevent chaos and put an end to conflicts and assume the duty of interpreting and implementing the laws of nature. The people in charge of the government may have made a mistake and sought extra-legal expansion of their power, which in the case of implementation of the authoritarian government will be far more dangerous than the natural situation from Locke’s point of view for human life. Therefore, people, At the time of conclusion, should put the precondition that if the government goes beyond the legal limit of exercising its power, it will lose its power. This interpretation should contrast with Hobbes’s perception of the contract, which claims the people do not enter into an agreement with the ruler but make a contract among themselves, so there are no mutual obligations between the ruler and the people. In Lake’s narrative, the parties to the contract are the people and the government, so there are mutual obligations between them. People leave the right to enforce and implement the laws of nature to the government and oblige themselves to obey them, but only until the government performs its duties properly. John Locke
offered a more revolutionary interpretation of the doctrine of contract. First, in opposition to Hobbes’s point of view of human nature, he described humans as beings with compassion and Sympathy. Also, Locke told the state of nature as not a war situation but as freedom and equality in which the laws of nature ruled. Further, he declared that the existence of differences due to the interpretation and implementation of the laws of nature caused conflicts as the reason for the government establishment. Locke believed that the main particular task of the government is to protect the freedom, property, and life of individuals, and he believed that without the existence of freedom, it is impossible to guarantee the other two things. In the Presentation that Locke gave on the natural contract, he tried to show the government as limited and bound by duties and to block the way for the rulers’ autocracy, which is considered the most critical threat to human freedom. Locke declared that the ruler had signed a contract with the people with two sides, and the ruler and the people must adhere to it. Also, through resorting to his interpretation of the social contract to find a solution for autocratic governments, he said that if the ruler violates his obligations, the people have the right to dismiss him from his position. In conclusion, Locke’s interpretation of the social contract allows the people to attack and overthrow a tyrannical government to ensure their freedom.

Social contract from Rousseau’s point of view

Human nature and the state of nature

Rousseau called compassion and selfishness the most characteristic feature of primitive human nature. Selfishness leads to the pursuit of personal interests, and kindness makes one directly share in the sufferings of others and be selfless. Rousseau believed that in the state of nature, there was controlled inequality, which consisted of inequality in physical ability, talents, attributes, and traits that are the product of nature. These inequalities were created naturally, and political institutions had no role in their creation. Based on this, in this situation, only those who were fit with the hardships and cruelties of the natural condition and were resistant to them would survive. From Rousseau’s point of view, these inequalities were utterly opposed to political inequalities, which are artificial and the product of human rebellion against the state of nature and had no external existence in the state of nature. Because Rousseau considered the inequalities of the state of nature to be intrinsic and without human intervention, he considered them natural and thus argued that there was no inequality in the state of nature. Therefore, by emphasizing human nature based on compassion, humans had united in a natural state in a society where friendship, camaraderie, and collective experience prevailed. (Alem, 1391: 685-686)

Formation of society and government

Nevertheless, how was a society formed? Rousseau was pessimistic about society and the government and believed that unnatural inequality and exploitation of humans had been allowed to appear in society, so he claimed that the first ones who claimed ownership of a piece of land and others because of stupidity accepted their claim, they were the first founders of civil society. Rousseau continued that the emergence of property laid the foundation of the inequality among people and divided society into two groups, the rich and the poor. Due to the fear of others taking their property, the rich spent money to protect them, but after a while, they realized the exorbitant costs and put a new measure on the agenda, namely the establishment of the government and the adoption of laws. Indeed, Rousseau believed the law and government establishment was pursued to secure minority interests to the detriment of the majority. Rousseau said that the rich paid for the protection of their property by convincing the weak that the law applied equally to all and by persuading them to pay taxes to strengthen the state. Rousseau saw the law as a deceitful device used against humankind. Rousseau did not consider the formation of civil society to be related to the conclusion of a social contract between people, and in this case, he had an opposite view to Hobbes and Locke.

New social contract

Therefore, Rousseau sought to provide a solution to save man from civil society’s chaos and restore his freedom to his state of nature. Rousseau saw the solution in establishing a link between profit-seeking and group interests so that these two are not opposed to each other and do not provide the basis for separating people. To solve the problem of the existing separation between justice and self-interest, he presented the
highly misleading idea of the public will. Rousseau described this solution: "Each of us places our person and all our powers jointly under the supreme direction of the general will, and as far as our capacity for collective action allows, each We consider the members as an inseparable part of a whole. Therefore, each one gives up his absolute power in favor of the general will, provided that others do the same. The decisions of the entire rightful people of the ruling power on important matters also reveal how the public will act. Indeed, Rousseau believed that how the public will work is not known until the first gathering of the people and the exercise of sovereignty, and there is no way to determine in advance the type of decision-making of the public will. (McClelland, 2013: 564-574) Therefore, it can be said that Rousseau saw 18th-century man as a captive of tyranny and sought to break tyranny’s chains through political theorizing. He tried to remove obstacles to human freedom by providing a new interpretation of the doctrine of a social contract. In this regard, Rousseau obtained a completely different description of human nature, society’s origin, and the state’s formation. Because he sought to make his theory function revolutionary, he tried to provide a more radical interpretation of the nature of society and government, calling them wholly artificial and the tool of the rich. This extreme and pessimistic blaming of the existing governments and emphasizing that they have destroyed man’s fundamental freedom and equality and chained him justified the necessity of full-scale political transformation and revolution. The critical point in Rousseau’s thought was that by using the doctrine of the social contract, he tried to theorize some kind of political transformation to assert the sovereignty of the people and their freedom. Rousseau’s social contract was not the same as Hobbes, and Locke’s social contract was closed between primitive men at an uncertain time, but a modern human revolution against tyranny. In this regard, by destroying the previous political order, the modern man put in place a new system based on public will, the public will in which each individual of society played a role in its formation and function. 7. Rawls interpretation of Social contract John Rawls is the last person we will read from the social contract theory. As evidence shows, Rawls’s account of the doctrine of the social contract was vastly different from the leaders of this doctrine. Unlike his predecessors, Rawls did not consider the social contract as an objective historical event that happened in humankind’s past but only benefited from the framework of this doctrine to justify his interpretation of the social contract. Therefore, in reading Rawls, we do not come across any common arguments and descriptions about human nature and the natural state and the reasons for the formation of the state. From Rawls’ point of view, the natural state is a hypothetical and ideal state in which the principles of justice are chosen. In this situation, people have no understanding of their interests, no economic relationship has been established, and there is no competition between people. This veil of ignorance prevents people from accessing information that violates neutrality. Indeed, in the natural state, people do not know about their characteristics and interests, but they have enough information about humans and human societies. The people present in the natural situation ignore their privileges and problems; they think about people with common physical and intellectual abilities located in the same place and time, who have conflicts that can be extended to a dispute, to choose the principles of justice for these people in the actual situation. (Bashiriyeh, 1999: 118-120) By taking the two fundamental principles of justice from the natural state, Rawls obtains a picture of a society that he thinks is a just society. The first principle says that anyone who has been present in a symbol or is influenced by it has the right to freedom in the broadest sense that is compatible with the same freedom for others. Thus, the first principle defends freedom and equal opportunities. The second principle says that inequalities determined and maintained by the structure are unjustified unless they can be rationally proven beneficial to all. Therefore, the second principle refers to how inequalities can be justified and fair. Rawls bases the conception of his desirable liberal democratic society based on his two principles of justice and considers them the main criteria for judging the legitimacy of the distribution system in society. In general, Rawls believes that according to the first principle, wealth should flow from the upper classes to the lower classes, and for this purpose, the government should create obstacles against the general tendency of the market to concentrate. However, according to the second principle, the government’s intervention should not be to the extent that it reduces efficiency and economic production and harms people’s motivation. (Bashiriye, 1999: 121-123) Therefore, Rawls’ purpose in using the doctrine of the social contract is actually to obtain a measure to measure the current level of justice in societies. Rawls considers the society and the laws that come out of the heart of the contract to be fair by considering people to be ignorant of their opponents in the natural
state. With this line of reasoning, Rawls presents two principles of justice and sets the criterion of the fairness of social affairs and the distribution system on these two principles, one of which considers the intervention of the government as necessary to prevent the concentration of wealth and provide minimum livelihood and equal opportunities. The other one limits the extent of government intervention to avoid reducing economic production and individual motivation. Although Rawls seeks to justify the existing inequalities in liberal democratic societies to a large extent with a theoretical approach, acquiring two principles can create good criteria to measure the performance of political systems. If unjustified inequalities exist, the grounds for people’s protest and resistance against these inequalities should be provided.

The doctrine of resistance:

At the medieval end and modern centuries beginning, ideas were gradually formed seeking to increase the role of the people in power and curb the tyranny of the rulers. These thoughts provided the necessary theoretical arguments for the people’s resistance against authoritarian governments, the overthrow of these governments, and the liberation of the people from the chain of them. They were presented by different thinkers and at different times, but they have almost common themes. This group of thoughts considered the people as the creators of the government and rejected any divine, mythological and traditional roots of the government. Following this line of thought, they emphasized that the purpose of the government is to meet the people’s needs and secure their interests. They believed that there are mutual duties between the people and the rulers, and just as the people are required to obey the rulers, rulers must also fulfill the duties, such as providing security, observing justice, and fulfilling public interests, for which they came to power. Nevertheless, the most obvious point of these thoughts, which is related to the present discussion, was that they recognized the right of the people that if the rulers follow the path of tyranny, violation of justice, and limitation of the people’s freedoms, people can resist such rulers and remove them from the government. This prescription allowed the subsequent freedom movements to step toward popular sovereignty. In the following, we will discuss the opinions of some of the most prominent resistance thinkers.

According to the 16th-century writer Francois Hotman, the author of the book Franco Gallia, Philippe du Plessis-Mornay, the author of the book Defense of Liberty Against Oppressors, and George Buchanan, the author of a treatise entitled Vindiciae, the people are the criterion for determining the tyranny of the government. According to them, the origin of the authority of the kings is not tradition or religion, but it is the people who create the royal government by their decision or legitimize it by continuously re-electing the rulers.

The resistance doctrine from Hotman’s point of view

Hotman said that although "the people may be without a king, a king without the people is as inconceivable as a shepherd without his flock.” He added that the ancient government of Franco Gallia "was not subject to the law of inheritance, as if the government were private hereditary wealth.” It was customary there that the people’s voting and decisions elected the government. He added that the people protect the right to remove rulers and have established institutions such as the king’s Council and the Class General Assembly to achieve this. Hotman said that the General Assembly naturally limits the king’s power and has the right to elect or remove the king. Mornay also believed that "since no one was born with a royal crown on his head and a royal scepter in his hand, and since no one can make himself king and rule without the presence of the people, it necessarily follows that the people made them kings. (Arblaster, 2014: 51)

Mornay’s understanding of the resistance doctrine

Mornay emphasized that the king’s rule is conditional and not absolute. "People should not obey a ruler who commands against God’s law. Through their representatives, the people must disobey the law’s incomplete command or the religion. He emphasized, "People should not obey oppressive or criminal rulers through their representatives. Everywhere there is a mutual and bilateral commitment between the ruler and the people, and the ruler’s commitment to the people is absolute and unconditional. If the ruler does not fulfill his commitment, the people will also be exempted from their commitment.” Mornay gives the people the right to resist the unjust ruler and depose him. (Alem, 1391: 1120-119)
Buchanan's perspective on the resistance doctrine

Like the two previous writers, Buchanan claimed that the people are the ultimate source of laws, the law is more powerful than the king, and the people are more potent than the law because the people are both the ancestors of the laws and certainly their author. Buchanan believed that the monarchy should serve the people. (Arblaster, 2014: 51-52) A king who does not consider public interests in governance and creates extra-legal powers for himself should be punished as a clear enemy of humankind. Buchanan considered fighting the oppressor as the justest war. (Alem, 1391: 123) As seen, all three authors believed that governments do not have a supernatural origin, but the people are the source of creating governments. Thus, they considered the kings appointed by the people and believed that there were mutual duties between them and the people. They thought their overthrow would be legitimate if the rulers refused to do their duties. Issuing such decisive decrees granting the people the right to resist was unprecedented until that time.

The doctrine of resistance in non-Protestant countries

The scope of the doctrine of resistance was not only limited to the Protestant countries but also appeared among the followers of other religions. It is as if tasting the deadly taste of absolute power and tyranny made thinkers of different religions seek to spread the seeds of resistance to overthrow autocratic power. In the meantime, the pioneering of the Roses, who were fanatical Catholics, was also interesting. Many prominent among them played an essential role in spreading the idea of resistance, and their guidelines caused many followers to resist the authoritarian rulers of France at the time. These resistances led to a series of freedom movements in France. Cardinal Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) was one of the prominent members of the Jesuits sect and was another theorist of resistance. The Jesuits were a sect that demanded reforms in the structure of the Catholic Church due to the Catholic Church’s discrediting and the Catholic’s rapid joining to Protestantism. Bellarine used to say that in contrast to the power of the Pope, which comes directly from God, the king’s power relies on the community and, therefore, should only be used for non-religious purposes. He believed that political duties are not absolute and that there is a two-way relationship between the people and the ruler. He emphasized that people can transform political authority the same way they create it. Bellarmine reserved the right to revolt against the oppressive and treacherous ruler for the people. (Alem, 1391: 127)

Expanding the resistance doctrine in southern Europe

The resistance doctrine fire not only appeared in the north and west of Europe but also melted its tongues in the south of that continent, Spain. Like other European thinkers, Spanish thinkers also used concepts such as the divine right of kings, absolute rule, and unconditional obedience to give credit to the popular origin of the government, the mutual duties of the ruler and the subjects, and the right of the subjects to overthrow the rulers. Thinkers such as Juan de Mariana and Francisco Suarez were the leaders in developing resistance thought in this country. Juan de Mariana (who lived from 1536-1623), one of Spain’s wise men, said that each specific form of government was created according to the society in question, and the community’s will created governments. If the leaders of the people confirm a despotic king’s transgression, one can resist the king and oust him; of course, Mariana did not prescribe individual resistance, and the power of resistance against the tyrannical king is reserved for the National Assembly Knew. (Alem, 1391: 129) Francisco Suarez (1548-1617) was another thinker of Spanish origin of the doctrine of resistance. He and his fellow thinkers had tried to gather the medieval philosophy of law with an emphasis on natural law. They thus gave the theory of natural law a form that became more comprehensible in the 17th century, which other thinkers, including the famous Grotius, used who established international law based on the theory of natural rights. Suarez considered the government’s purpose to provide for human needs and said that the government is organized based on the agreement of the heads of the families and is obliged to integrate the activities of the people with common interests. He believed that God did not create the government, but humans created it due to their inherent right to rule over their destiny; therefore, the powers of the governments are not unlimited
and are entirely dependent on public consent, and if the governments are from the scope of legal powers. If they go further, they can be dropped or changed. He emphasized that it is possible to resist oppressive power with any method.

**Locke, the most influential theorist of the resistance doctrine**

The last thinker we will talk about in this section is John Locke. John Locke was one of the most prominent breeders and arguably the most influential thinkers of this thought. Importance of Locke because his ideas had a significant impact on the political philosophy of the west, and he is considered one of the founders of the ideology of liberalism. Also, his ideas about resistance had a tremendous impact on the constitution of one of the most powerful countries in the world, the United States. Locke, like other thinkers of resistance, but in a much more precise and more explicit statement, emphasized the popular origin of the government and the mutual duties between the people and the rulers. However, he was much more radical and passionate in prescribing resistance against autocratic rulers and even gave this resistance an individual aspect. John Locke emphasized the right of the people to protest and resist unjust authority. He believed that every person has the right to evaluate the performance of public authorities, and if he is convinced of their abuse of power, protest and resist. In a clear statement, Locke said: "This I am sure, whoever, either Ruler or Subject, by force goes about to invade the Rights of either Prince or People, and lays the foundation for overturning the Constitution and Frame of any Just Government, is guilty of the greatest crime, I think, a Man is capable of, being to answer for all those mischiefs of Blood, Rapine, and Desolation, which the breaking to pieces of Governments bring on a country. And he who does it is justly to be esteemed the common Enemy and Pest of Mankind; and is to be treated accordingly". (Locke, 1965:418) And in another Phrase of two Treatises of Government, he stated: "Every man is judge for himself, as in all other cases, so in this, whether another hath put himself into a State of War with him, and whether he should appeal to the Supreme Judge, as Jephtha did.” (Locke, 1965: 427)

**The doctrine of natural law:**

The doctrine of natural law, and especially the interpretation of it that was updated over the modern centuries, provides the ground for freedom from another aspect, which is to reject authoritarian laws. In its secular interpretation, this doctrine states that there is a series of universal principles independent of religion, geography, and time, and they can be discovered by human reason. Thought stated that the laws of the human subject should be deduced from these natural laws, and if the subject law contradicts the natural laws, it should be acted upon. He protested. This order provides the ground for the people to resist and refuse to act against the unjust laws that endanger their interests and lives.

Natural law is one of the central doctrines in the political philosophy of the west, and since its introduction in the ancient world, it has been presented in various forms. Even though there are various interpretations of natural law and its characteristics, three central characteristics have been emphasized in all interpretations: First, natural law is an objective law: which means that natural law relies on sources beyond human legislation, and for this reason, in opposition to human law, it must depend on divine commands or permanent features of the world. This feature makes natural law independent of different times and places, unlike the law of the state, which changes according to its geographical location. Second, the natural law must be tangible and recognizable; people must be able to recognize it by relying on their intellect. According to this interpretation, it should be added that since all human beings have the power of reasoning, natural law is available to everyone. Thirdly, the natural law must have a legal form and be seen as a set of laws. Natural law cannot be limited to one or two recipes like a moral doctrine, but a set of principles should be derived based on it.

**The natural law in ancient Greece**

In Greek society in the fifth and fourth centuries BC, doctrines such as natural law were used to criticize controversial institutions such as slavery. For example, a sophist named Alcidamas said: "Even if a man be a slave, he has the same flesh; no one was ever a slave by nature, though chance enslaves the body.” In addition, some thinkers used the doctrine of natural law to question the common tradition among the
Greeks that considered themselves different from other neighbors who were introduced under titles such as Greek and barbarian. Antiphon stated: "We are all born the same, according to nature in every way, and observing the laws of nature is open to all people. In conclusion, everything can be acquired by all, and none, whether barbarian or Greek, has an advantage over another." Therefore, the doctrine of natural law had a protesting and challenging spirit from its initial readings. From the beginning of the ancient Greek era, its early interpreters benefited from it to challenge unjust and anti-human laws. Although in this era, the early interpreters did not take advantage of the natural law in the sense that it was interpreted later. They only pointed out the lack of harmony with the world's natural order in criticizing unjust and racist laws and traditions such as slavery and distinguishing between Greeks and non-Greeks. However, this matter itself was breaking the tradition and was unprecedented.

The natural law from the perspective of the Stoics

The previously expressed views did not take the form of a codified doctrine, and the tradition of natural law doctrine in its original form is rooted in the Stoic period. For the first time, the Stoics provided the necessary philosophical support for the doctrine of natural law by establishing their ethics, whose center is the existence of a divine order that governs all world affairs. They believed that because nature intelligently moves toward specific goals due to divine sovereignty, everything in harmony with nature is good and right, and everything inconsistent with nature is evil or wrong. Although no authentic connection was found between this aspect of their thoughts and the legal understanding of natural law in the era of the early Stoic thinkers, the Middle Stoic thinkers diluted some parts of the Stoic thought system. They projected a doctrine that the foundation of It was that people could understand the plan of the divine foundation of the world through their intellect, and the most explicit expression of it is found in the two treatises of Cicero, Republic, and Laws. Cicero completely expresses natural law in his Republic: "There is, in fact, a true law—namely right reason—which is in accordance with nature, applies to all men, and is unchangeable and eternal. By its command, this law summons men to the performance of their duties; by its prohibitions, it restrains them from doing wrong. To invalidate this law by human legislation is never morally right, nor is it permissible ever to restrict its operation, and to annul it wholly is impossible. It requires no Sextus Aelius to expound and interpret it. It will not lay down one rule at Rome and another at Athens, nor will it be one rule today and another tomorrow." (klosco, 2011: 302-306) As a result, the doctrine of natural law in its codified form is the product of Stoic thinkers. Stoic thinkers, especially Cicero, believed that there is a divine order in the universe, the outline of which can be understood by reason. Understanding this general order by reason forms a set of principles called natural law. This law does not apply to different times and different places. They stated that this law is superior to human laws, so no person or institution can declare it invalid or stop people from acting on it. The Stoics took a vital step in giving this doctrine a revolutionary potential. The idea that laws derived from nature exist which are superior to human laws and no person or institution can prevent people from acting on them; laid the foundation stone so that people can evaluate the existing laws with natural laws criteria arising from human reason.

Thomas Aquinas’s interpretation of the natural law

Saint Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) was one of the Christian thinkers of the Middle Ages. Aquinas believed that the universe is governed by law. He introduced the law as a reason command for the common good from who takes care of the community and considered the source of the law to be God. Aquinas theorized four laws levels: eternal, natural, divine, and human. According to Aquinas, the eternal law is the order in the divine mind for the world, and everything in the universe is subject to the eternal law. No being other than God can understand its complete nature, but humans can participate in it in various ways. Thomas Aquinas seems to have equated the eternal law with the divine nature or essence. Regarding natural law, Aquinas believed that if people look at the eternal law with reason, they can extract evidence or moral principles that create the norms of human behavior. The general moral rules of natural law determine the framework in which legal thought is the standard against which to control the behavior and actions of human legislators. Regarding divine law, Thomas said that natural law is discovered by human reason, but divine law is obtained through revelation, especially in the Old and New Testaments. Nevertheless, the
most influential interpretation of Aquinas about the nature of laws relates to his understanding of human law. He considered human law to be a low-level expression of natural law. Aquinas said that human law, just like theoretical sciences, deduced from certain principles of provability, is obtained with specific and provable principles of natural law and based on it. Therefore, subject rights come from natural law that can be discovered by reason. (Sibley, 2014: 426-437) Saint Aquinas presented a more religious interpretation of natural law, unlike the Stoics, who believed that natural law is derived from reason and the general order of the world and nature, and whatever is compatible with nature is right is inconsistent with it is wrong. He considered the natural law not the intellect’s understanding of nature but receiving it from the eternal law, which is the order in the divine mind for the world. Nevertheless, Aquinas took a vital step in giving revolutionary potential to this thought. Aquinas stated that human laws are a lower form of expression than natural law, which should be deduced from the principles of natural law and regulated based on its rules. This interpretation of Aquinas opened the way for human laws to be evaluated with the standard of natural law, so if the laws were unfair and illogical, they would be delegitimized.

The doctrine of natural law in the modern centuries

In the modern centuries, natural law was used in a new interpretation. In this new interpretation, the reliance of thought on theology and its religious content was abandoned, and it was adjusted in the secular aspect. Indeed, natural law’s divine and religious origin was no longer considered. Now natural law was a series of rules that Relying on reason, could be discovered by human beings. In its new interpretation, the natural law was considered principles utterly independent of the religions and customs of nations, and it was supposed to reflect the common moral principles among humans. This law was superior to all human laws, and respecting it was considered obligatory for all the world. Also, this law took on an individualistic aspect, especially in its Hobbesian interpretation, in such a way that protecting the individual’s essence and ensuring his security became the focus of the law. Hugo Grotius, a Dutch thinker (1583-1645) and one of the founders of international law, was one of the most prominent users of natural law in a secular interpretation. He sought to explain a series of fixed rules governing international relations by resorting to natural law, so he redefined natural law in this regard. Gross said that natural law is the rule of common sense and right. He considered the natural law beyond religious sanctity and believed that even God does not change it because of his justice and does not make things good that are inherently bad. He stated that natural law is beyond civil laws, has broad authority, and is binding on all people, citizens, and rulers. Grotius said people could discover natural law by relying on common sense. Thus Groth, depending on his new interpretation of the natural law, which was beyond the religious beliefs and customs of the nations, wanted to achieve common principles between the worlds to provide the basis for world peace. Using the concept of natural law in a secular and individual position reached its peak in Hobbes’s thought. By altogether abandoning the religious foundations of natural law, Hobbes considered it as a rule or a general rule that was discovered by reason and which deprives a person of the current action that is destructive to his life or the means of protecting his life or from He knew to forbid the current leaving, which in his opinion is the best way to save them. According to Hobbes, natural laws are the rules of self-preservation. (Klosko, 2012:115) The difference between Hobbes’s and traditional interpretations was that the commands of the traditional natural law were unconditional, and God, their creator, was assumed to have the power to enforce them, but Hobbes’s natural laws were conditional. They are rational theorems that provide the necessary means to achieve the desired goal, i.e., self-preservation or the protection of the essence. Therefore, in Hobbes’s interpretation, the usefulness of natural law for protecting the individual’s essence is considered. Although Hobbes’s goal of interpreting the natural law was to limit its revolutionary potential, his emphasis on the centrality of the individual, the need for this law to be used to protect him, and also to give a secular face to the interpretation of the natural law, provided the grounds for appealing to the natural law. To resist the governments that justify the laws that ignore the simple and vital rights of the individual by appealing to religion, custom, and tradition. Therefore, the doctrine of natural law provides a good basis for delegitimizing arbitrary and unjust laws. The emphasis of this doctrine is on the point that a set of principles can be discovered by referring to nature and relying on reason, which is independent of theology and nation’s customs and have a higher status than human laws, making this basis over laws to be evaluated and delegitimized if they are considered anti-human.
Natural law provides the basis for governments not to be able to impose any law on the people and ask them to obey. In addition, this idea has a libertarian capacity, and people can, by its invoke, refuse to abide by the laws they consider authoritarian and even seek to change these laws or even the governments that founded them.

Conclusion:

This article divides into three different sections, each dedicated to one of the doctrines of the social contract, resistance, and natural law. In the section that is related to the social contract, while providing a general definition of the doctrine of the social contract, the expression of people such as Manegold of Lautenbach, the German Princes who concluded the Schmalkaldic league, Hobbes, John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and John Rawls have examined, and their influence in providing theoretical foundations for freedom have expressed. In the second part, which is related to the doctrine of resistance, the geographical scope and the different interpretations of this doctrine from the perspective of Francois Hotman, Mornay, George Buchanan, Du Franci, Bellarmine, Dam Mariana, Suarez, and John Locke have been investigated, and its impact on the discourse of freedom has shown. In the last part, the doctrine of natural law and its evolution from ancient Greece to the Middle Ages and according to people like Alcidamas, Antijphon, Cicero, Aquinas, Hugo Grotius, and Hobbes and its theoretical importance have evaluated in the framework for freedom. Finally, by evaluating three liberal doctrines that have the potential to be liberal, this article has provided theoretical preparations for the societies involved in tyranny by appealing to them to challenge the legitimacy of authoritarian systems and their theoretical justifications for tyranny and to be able to rely on these options to have the ideological capacity necessary to establish freedom movements and ultimately bring down tyranny.
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