

# Essay on think tank

[Life, Adolescence](#)



## Think Tank Essay 1

The questions in intergenerational justice tend to focus on the roles that should be played by members within each generation in order to ensure equitable and fair distribution of resources and justice. In many cases, the common arguments founded on individualism and self-reliance tends to support the younger generation from being subjected to responsibilities by members of the older generation. The argument specifically disengages the older generation from the younger generation in terms of allocating roles and responsibilities. The argument supports the idea that the older generation should not burden the young generations, and should instead leave the younger generation to do whatever they so wishes (Christman, 2002). The other argument founded on communitarian theories advocates for reciprocity from the younger generation to the older generation. The argument advocates for the need to have young people taking care of the older generation as a payback for the developments initiated by the older generation. In this work, I will argue that the communitarian's ideologies should be applied when evaluating intergenerational justice.

Intergenerational justice focuses on the need to have equitable and fair engagements across all the generations in terms of sharing roles and responsibilities. According to this justice system, each member of a given generation has certain roles to play so as to maintain the desired social engagement (Schumaker, 2010). Communitarian ideologies are founded on the superiority of the older generation in terms of age and experience. The older generation is considered to be resourceful based on the information, knowledge and ideas held throughout one's life.

Although individualists would deny that the efforts hitherto put in place by the old generation should not be rewarded through care, they cannot get away from the truth that the old generation has some significant records over their lives (Simmons, 1999). From these arguments, it can be easy to establish reasonable and arguable differentiation between political ideologies and political theories. Political theories are the documented literary contents explain about the political frameworks. Ideologies are usually used in practice and in defining the best ways to start engaging in different politically related operations.

In addition, the issue of political theory illustrates the availability of many theoretical frameworks and approaches towards dealing with a specified problem. Political ideology therefore illustrates the various applicable and practical approaches that can be used in promoting the analysis of an idea or in making use of the existing sociological and political concepts (Christman, 2002). Political theories are broad, since they embrace sociological, ontological, epistemological, and anthropological pillars that support human existence. Political ideologies are however different from the theories since they provide different explanations associated with the theoretical frameworks.

## **References**

Christman, J. (2002). *Social and Political Philosophy: A Contemporary Introduction*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Schumaker, P. (2010). *The Political Theory Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Simmons, J. A. (1999). *Moral Principles and Political Obligations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

## Think Tank Essay 2

Machiavelli's claim that no lawgiver proceeded with developing substantial laws without resorting to divine authority means that most laws are based on religious interpretations and beliefs (Soll, 2005). The argument is that, all the existing laws have some relevance and reference to the religious expectations and rules, and it is therefore extremely hard to make independent laws that do not reflect some aspect of religion. Machiavelli's claim can be taken as true based on the fact that most of the ethical and moral practices are based on the religious views. When making laws and rights for the public, the institutions derive their judgment on the ethical and moral principles that define good and bad. These principles are mostly founded on religions, making Machiavelli's claim be correct and appropriate.

Augustine and Aquinas asserted that, in most of the existing legal structures, there are borrowed statutes from religion and that these statutes cannot be easily revoked since they represent rational and logical conclusions; hence support Machiavelli's claim. The two agree on the existence of divinity beliefs in political and national legal structures; although these claims tend to differ in their conclusions. Augustine was born by a Christian mother and a pagan father. This experience led him to assert that, although most of the laws are derived from religion, ethics and human capacity to separate wrong from right can also be applied so as to make proper judgments on what should be done and what should not be done.

The claims from the two are founded on the existence of similarities between ethical principles and religious expectations, with both being subjective of proper conduct and acting according to the welfare of humanity. However, both disagree on the over-reliance of religion in making credible laws, citing that religion might be somehow biased towards some communities while being against others (Fischer, 1997). Aquinas claims that religious views form the basis on which laws can be developed. However, Augustine feels that any of the positions held has its own limits and religion cannot therefore be used as the foundation for establishing laws human rights.

The argument in favor or against the contribution of religion towards forming laws and human rights can be attributed to the existence of similar clauses, especially when it comes to defining right and wrong. All the similarities are also based on existing moral and ethical principles, and especially on being respectful of human life and integration among humanity. Based on the legal structures that exist and govern human behaviors, Machiavelli can be said to be correct up to a certain degree. Although most of the laws are founded on religion, other issues have to be addressed based on individual communities.

The concept of religion fit with the issue of realpolitik and d'tat in that all these systems are influenced by common interpretations of human behavior, and are aimed at influencing changes through a set of rules. While religion emphasizes on the availability of punishment after death, the legal frameworks emphasize on punishment once an offence is committed (Schaefer, 1990). The political and social integration of humanity can only be enhanced through following specific rules and regulations that are

considerate of morals, justice and fairness. These concepts therefore relate in their perspectives and their governing philosophies, of ensuring that humanity establishes god engagements with all other branches of existence.

## References

Fischer, M. (1997). Machiavelli's Political Psychology. *The Review of Politics*, 59(4), 789–829

Schaefer, D. (1990). *The Political Philosophy of Montaigne*. New York, NY: Cornell University Press.

Soll, J. (2005). *Publishing The Prince: History, Reading and the Birth of Political Criticism*. University of Michigan Press

### Think Tank Essay 3

Social contracts can be defined as the existing agreements between members of a society so as to reduce their freedoms and engage in common activities and integration. This helps in sustaining harmony and order and ensures that there are fewer conflicts in the society. Sznajder claims that, in terrorism, social contract does not function since members of different communities resort to engage in individualized activities as defined in their beliefs.

Sznajder claims that, as terrorism increases, the social contract breaks, making people more vulnerable to conflicts and attacks. Therefore, terrorism is an individualistic activity that portrays one group more popular than the other, and hence creates the notion that some members in a society must die in order to sustain harmony. Rather than reaching agreements, terrorism

disengages humanity from integration and creates disparities that increase the possibilities of war.

Therefore, Sznajder makes claims that even during the holocaust; the Nazi's resorted to suicide terrorism as a way of eliminating one group deemed as irrelevant and unfit in the society. Rather than engage in collaborative activities, terrorism encourages people to disunite and to fight certain groups considered inferior (Mark & Wokler, 2006). It can therefore be termed as a way of ensuring that the superior groups attain their liberty and satisfaction, at the expense of other smaller groups.

Hobbes and Sznajder can be said to be making similar arguments, especially with reference to contemporary terrorism (Ross, 2003). In his claim, Hobbes compares human nature with a state of war, at which people strive to get the limited resources available. In his argument, he claims that, people resorts to war so as to ensure that they secure the available resources, even if it means killing masses of people. Both authors have similar claims that when humanity starts to compete for the available resources, they become disoriented, with each person striving to attain satisfaction.

Terrorism can therefore be defined as a disorienting practice that relies only on individual needs and which strives to eliminate a given group from the larger group. The authors' claims can be attributed to the existing ideologies that compare terrorism with the human nature, at which society is perceived as state of war. The competition that exists in terrorism makes it a complete opposite of the social contract theory that allows people to engage in agreements that sustain harmony and peace.

In the social contract, humanity come together to form social groups incorporated within the existing human needs in order to avoid conflicts and to ensure that there is mutual agreements and understanding among the people. Terrorism resolves to violence as the only solution to get access to scarce and limited resources (Harrison, 2003). The idea behind terrorism is to establish individualistic views that only fit within the expectations of the person perpetrating the terrorism act. Although Hobbes does not make direct response to Sznajder, their statements are similar because; they both claim that terrorism disengages individuals and makes society look like being at war.

Therefore, the issue on terrorism can be said to be in support of human nature proposed by Hobbes because; it illustrates a society where individuals strive to gain personal satisfaction and to get access to the limited resources. It means therefore that terrorism leads to disintegration and conflicts by bringing in disagreements within the social structures and developing negative perceptions that compromise peace and harmony.

## **References**

Harrison, R. (2003). *Hobbes, Locke, and Confusion's Empire: an Examination of Seventeenth-Century Political Philosophy*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Mark G., & Wokler, R. (2006). *The Cambridge History of Political Thought*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press

Ross H. (2003). *Locke, Hobbs, and Confusion's Masterpiece*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.