



T.C.

**BURSA ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
FELSEFE BÖLÜMÜ**

**THE CONCEPT OF THE STATE IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF
THOMAS HOBBS**

(YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ)

Ahmad Khesrow ISHANCH

BURSA – 2023



T.C.

**BURSA ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
FELSEFE BÖLÜMÜ**

**THE CONCEPT OF THE STATE IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF
THOMAS HOBBS**

(YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ)

Ahmad Khesrow ISHANCH

Danışman:

Prof. Dr. Abdulkadir ÇÜÇEN

BURSA – 2023

T. C.
BURSA ULUDAĞÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

TEZ ONAY SAYFASI

Felsefe Bölümü'nde 702043003 numaralı Ahmad Khesrow ISHANCH'in hazırladığı "The Concept of the State in the Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes" konulu Yüksek Lisans Tezi ile ilgili tez savunma sınavı 28 Temmuz 2023 Cuma günü 14:30-17:00 saatleri arasında yapılmış, sorulan sorulara alınan cevaplar sonunda adayın tezinin/çalışmasının başarılı olduğuna oybirliği ile karar verilmiştir.

Üye

(Tez Danışmanı ve Sınav Komisyonu Başkanı)

Prof. Dr. Abdulkadir ÇÜÇEN

Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi

Fen-Edebiyat Fak. Felsefe Bölümü

Üye

Doç. Dr. Geoffrey Bowe

İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri

Üye

Doç. Dr. Ufuk Özen Baykent

Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi

Eğitim Fakültesi

SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
YÜKSEK LİSANS/ DOKTORA İNTİHAL YAZILIM RAPORU

BURSA ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
FELSEFE ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞI'NA

Tez Başlığı / Konusu: *The Concept of the State in the Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes*
Yukarıda başlığı gösterilen tez çalışmamın a) Kapak sayfası, b) Giriş, c) Ana bölümler ve d) Sonuç kısımlarından oluşan toplam 115 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 28/ 07/ 2023 tarihinde şahsım tarafından Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından (Turnitin) aşağıda belirtilen filtrelemeler alınmış olan özgünlük raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı % 18'dir.

Uygulanan

filtrelemeler:

- 1- Kaynakça hariç
- 2- Alıntılar hariç /dahil
- 3- 5 kelimededen daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç

Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Tez Çalışması Özgünlük Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılma Uygulama Esasları'nı inceledim ve bu Uygulama Esasları'nda belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına göre tez çalışmamın herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

Tarih ve İmza

28/ 07/ 2023

Adı Soyadı: Ahmad Khesrow ISHANCH

Öğrenci No: 702043003

Anabilim Tezli Yüksek Lisans Felsefe

Programı: Felsefe Tarihi

Statüsü: Yüksek Lisans

YEMİN METNİ

Yüksek Lisans / Doktora Tezi/Sanatta Yeterlik Tezi/ Çalışması olarak sunduğum “Yükselen Değer Dijital Girişimcilik: Seçilmiş Avrupa Birliği Ülkeleri ve Türkiye Karşılaştırması” başlıklı çalışmanın bilimsel araştırma, yazma ve etik kurallarına uygun olarak tarafımdan yazıldığına ve tezde yapılan bütün alıntılarım kaynaklarının usulüne uygun olarak gösterildiğine, tezimde intihal ürünü cümle veya paragraflar bulunmadığına şerefim üzerine yemin ederim.

Tarih ve İmza:

Adı Soyadı : Ahmad Khesrow ISHANCH
Öğrenci No : 702043003
Anabilim Dalı : Tezli Yüksek Lisans Felsefe
Programı : Tezli Yüksek Lisans
Statüsü : Yüksek Lisans

ABSTRACT

Name and Surname : Ahmad Khesrow ISHANCH
University : Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi
Institution : Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
d : 702043003
Field : Tezli Yüksek Lisans Felsefe
Branch : Tezli Yüksek Lisans
Degree Awarded : Yüksek Lisans Tezi
Page Number : XI + 141
Degree Date : .../ ... /20...
Supervisor : Prof. Dr. Abdulkadir ÇÜÇEN

THE CONCEPT OF THE STATE IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF THOMAS HOBBS

No justice, business, or culture can exist if no one trusts a higher authority to settle disagreements. To end this unsustainable state, people must agree to give up their natural rights to everything in exchange for the head of a Leviathan, a governmental power above them. This study investigated the view of Thomas Hobbes on government; the method of conducting this research is in the form of a literature review that includes the use of books and articles published in the philosophy of Thomas Hobbes. The results showed that Hobbes believed that a government headed by a king was the best form the sovereign could take. Placing all power in the hands of a king would mean a more resolute and consistent exercise of political authority, Hobbes argued. In addition, Hobbes argued that the social contract did not exist between the people and their king but only among them. It was illegal for the people to revolt against the king once he had been given absolute power. As Hobbes did, he warned against the church interfering in the king's government. He was worried that religious strife could spark a civil war. The church should be subordinate to the king's administration, so he suggested maintaining tighter control over spiritual matters. For Hobbes, there should be no choice but to obey the king in cases of conflict between divine and royal law.

Keywords: Thomas Hobbes, Government, Leviathan, Social contract, Philosophy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would love to thank all my professors for bringing the weight of their considerable experience and knowledge to this thesis.

Thanks to Prof. Dr. Mariusz Turowski, Prof. Dr. A. Kadir Çüçen, Prof. Dr. Funda Günsoy Turowski, Doç. Dr. Geoffrey Bowe and Doç. Dr. Ufuk Özen Baykent for their huge support not only academically but also humanly. Their advisorship and guidance is more than appreciated and recognized.

I would like to express my acknowledgements to all the academic staff members, who guided me, shaped my thoughts and helped me to figure out my own way.

My dearest recognition to my family and friends who helped me all the way from the very beginning until this moment.

Ahmad Khesrow ISHANCH

10/07/2023

TABLE OF CONTENT

ABSTRACT
TABLE OF CONTENT
INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER ONE: GENERALITIES OF RESEARCH

1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
2. IMPORTANCE AND NECESSITY OF RESEARCH
3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS
4. HYPOTHESES
5. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES GENERAL AIM
6. RESEARCH NOVELTY
7. THESIS STRUCTURE
8. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL CONCEPTS AND RESEARCH FOUNDATIONS

1. THOMAS HOBBS BIOGRAPHY
2. SOCIAL CONTEXTS
3. THE METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THOMAS HOBBS IN THE FORMATION OF THE STATE
 - 3.1. Importance of Methodology
 - 3.2. Mathematics Method
 - 3.3. Definitions
 - 3.3.1. De Corpore
 - 3.3.2. The Leviathan
 - 3.3.3. Moral Psychology
 - 3.3.4. The State of Nature
 - 3.4. Principles of Subject Matter Or Confiscations
 - 3.5. Concept of Motion Explanation
 - 3.6. Hobbes' Methodology

4. GEOMETRIC EXPLANATION OF POLITICAL SOCIETY
5. THE IMPORTANCE OF HOBBS' POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY
 - 5.1. Hobbes' Place in New Political Thought
 - 5.1.1. The Concept of Human Nature
 - 5.1.2. The Concept of Government
 - 5.1.3. Hobbes Modern Political Thought
 - 5.1.4. Natural Law Theory
6. SOCIAL CONTRACT AND GOVERNMENT FORMATION
7. THE RULING LEGAL AUTHORITY AND THE NECESSITY OF TYRANNY
8. THE NATURAL STATE OF HUMAN BEINGS
9. ARTIFICIAL PERSONS, LEVIATHAN GOVERNMENT
10. GOVERNMENT THEORIES
 - 10.1. Government in Pre-classical Liberal Theories
 - 10.2. Government in The School of Classical Liberalism
 - 10.3. Government in The Framework of New Classical Theories
 - 10.3.1. Utilitarianism
 - 10.3.2. Realism
 - 10.3.3. Neoclassical Approach
 - 10.3.4. General Choice Approach

CHAPTER THREE:

HOBBS' POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND THE NATURE OF GOVERNMENT

1. HOBBS EPISTEMOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
 - 1.1. The Nature of The State and The Foundations of Its establishment in Hobbes' Political Philosophy
2. THE HOBBSIAN PHILOSOPHY OF EXISTENCE
 - 2.1. Consequences of the establishment of the Hobbesian government
 - 2.2. Types of Founding Governments According to Hobbes
3. HOBBS'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS HUMAN NATURE
 - 3.1. Hobbes's mechanical interpretation of human nature
 - 3.2. Common features of human nature

4. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICS AND PSYCHOLOGY
IN HOBBS
5. CIVIL STATUS
6. THE FORMATION OF POLITICAL SOCIETY AND THE EMERGENCE
OF POLITICAL POWER
7. NATURAL SOCIETY
8. PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE HOBBS SOCIAL
CONTRACT
 - 8.1. Ontological principles
 - 8.2. Subjectivity and humanism
 - 8.3. Secularism
9. EPISTEMOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS
 - 9.1. Hobbes from the originality of experience to the originality of reason
 - 9.2. Separation from holy reason
10. ANTHROPOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES
 - 10.1. Pessimistic view of human nature
 - 10.2. Mechanical view of man
11. THE FRUITS OF HOBBS'S PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS IN
HIS THEORY OF SOCIAL CONTRACT
12. THE FRUITS OF HOBBS'S PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS IN
HIS THEORY OF SOCIAL CONTRACT
 - 12.1. Activity and Central Subject of Human Will
 - 12.2. Change in The Meaning of Natural Law
 - 12.3. Belief in The Relativity of Good and Evil
 - 12.4. Drawing The Natural State With a Focus on War and Conflict Between
Human Beings
 - 12.5. The Authority and Authority of The Ruler Determine Good and Evil
 - 12.6. Absolute Power of The Government
 - 12.7. The ruler and The Government are not Parties to The Contract
 - 12.8. Addressing The Social Contract in The Form of Inferential Military
 - 12.9. Government Inference Regardless of Metaphysical and Transcendent
Considerations

12.10. The battle for The Right of Government for The Institution of Religion

**CHAPTER FOUR:
NATURAL STATUS, SOCIAL CONTRACT AND GOVERNMENT
FORMATION**

1. NORMAL CONDITION
 2. FORMATION OF THE GOVERNMENT
 3. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND CIVIL SOCIETY
 4. SOCIAL PACT AND FORMATION OF SOCIETY AND GOVERNMENT
 - 4.1. Absolute Sovereignty or Absolute Sovereignty
 - 4.2. Hobbes's Theory and The International Situation
 - 4.3. From Levitan to General Will
 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF A POWERFUL CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
 6. ADVOCACY OF AN ABSOLUTE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
 7. HUMAN NATURE
 - 7.1. Natural Condition and The Social Contract
 - 7.2. Leviathan is The First Modern Political Teacher
 8. CIVIL SOCIETY OR POLITICAL SOCIETY
 - 8.1. Freedom
 - 8.2. Property
 - 8.2. Nature law
 9. THE RESULT OF HOBBS' THOUGHTS IN LEVIATHAN
 10. DISCUSSION
- CONCLUSION
- REFERENCES

INTRODUCTION

The issue of the political system is one issue that most political thinkers have been concerned with and have proposed solutions to the problem they saw for social disorder. In the modern era, various thinkers have addressed this issue, including Hobbes, and have greatly influenced political currents. Thomas Hobbes (1679-1588) was the first English political philosopher of modern times, whose outstanding work *Leviathan* is one of the classic texts in political philosophy that analyses the political system in a different framework and based on the social contract. He first came up with a particular method from "Galilean decomposition and composition" plus the method of geometric analogy. Moreover, entirely based on practical reason, he analysed man and then explained what the political system and the state were; a government that has completely authoritarian tendencies. Some criticise the nature of his government, arguing that Hobbes, in line with his time in the British Civil War, concluded that an authoritarian government was needed to avoid chaos. However, Hobbes, first, by limiting the end of the government in providing security and preventing civil war, and second, by establishing a link between the unreasonable authority of the government and security, gives the government extensive powers (Kamali Goki and Zamani Rad, 2016: 119).

Although the absolute power Hobbes gave to this government was not favoured by a group of politicians of his day, he built a government on the ruins of nature. The founding of the state and even the creation of a political community based on popular consent, the analysis of political power and the explanation of peace and unity as the ends of the state were among the issues not explored in this way before Hobbes; the depth and breadth of Hobbes's analysis of such matters aroused so much surprise and admiration that his conversations about the absoluteness of political power overshadowed it (Fрати, 2005: 2).

Hobbes talks about the state of nature and many human emotions, rather than his discussion of the state, but one of the essential things that Hobbes brings up and is directly related to his discussion of the state is the discussion about natural laws. He speaks of nineteen natural laws, laws whose philosophy of existence is to go out of the

ordinary or to war and peace, but for these laws to be enforceable and achieve the purpose for which they were created, there must be a power at work so that those who must obey these laws are compelled to obey. The second part of *Leviathan* is about government. In this section, Hayes discusses different approaches to government and governance and civil law.

Hobbes's philosophy has also been interpreted as the philosophy of power. Hobbes believes that the most important goal of government is security. Hobbes says, in the state's formation: "That is, in fact, the unity of all in one person, which is chosen to accord to the covenant of all with one another, and in such away that it is as if in its marriage everyone says to another: I entrust my right to self-government to this person or this assembly of persons and I consider all his actions to be correct and permissible, provided that you also entrust your right to him and in the same way all know his deeds as right and permissible. When this agreement is reached, the community that thus unites one person is called the state or in Latin *civitas*. The state, by definition, is a person who, under a covenant with another, considers himself a source of credit and permission to act according to a covenant with another, one by one a source of credit permission to neglect. They have made it so that he can use all the forces and facilities of all of them as he sees fit for maintenance, peace, security and public protection (Sadeghi Tabar, 2003: 398).

CHAPTER ONE: GENERALITIES OF RESEARCH

1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The confinement of happiness and pleasure in worldly and sensual pleasures has other implications - besides strife - that provides another basis for Hobbes' political thought. When happiness means the desire for constant pleasure, human beings inevitably must love peace, security, and stability, because it is only in the shadow of security that you can use and enjoy your benefits. Also, one should hate all the obstacles that exist on the way to pleasure and enjoyment, such as death (Hobbes, 1393: 139). It is clear that the reciprocal transfer of rights is what is called a "contract". This very agreement of the people on the mutual transfer of their rights is the basis of the state and the political community. According to Hobbes, the only way to secure public power is for people to give "all their power" to the state: "And I consider it permissible. However, on the condition that you also entrust your right to him and in the same way consider all his actions legitimate and permissible" (Hobbes, 1393: 192). An important question arises here that can even have human rights implications: do people in this agreement give up "all" their rights? Such a contract aims to establish a government and maintain security and tranquillity to gain benefits and enjoy life. Therefore, it is natural that human beings in such a contract do not relinquish their fundamental rights contrary to this goal.

2. IMPORTANCE AND NECESSITY OF RESEARCH

Hobbes' famous book is called *Leviathan*. Hobbes borrowed this name from the *Torah*, *Leviathan* in the *Torah* is a mythical giant that no creature of his size and power exists, and no one can equal and resist him. Hobbes sees the state as this giant and calls it an artificial human. Hobbes's political philosophy, expressed in this book, is prominent in several respects.

- a) The first political philosophy in English.
- b) A new method has been used in the study of political affairs.

- c) He has defended tyranny with reason and argument, and like Machiavelli, he has not been content with merely witnessing history.
- d) The evolution of political thought in Britain and the West in recent centuries. Because most of the titles in the political philosophy from the seventeenth century onwards have been in critique and confrontation with his ideas; in particular, Rousseau, Montesquieu and Voltaire seriously, systematically and scientifically opposed his views. Finally, it was their views that prevailed (Safavi, 1390: 4). According to the simple principle of "motion can express

Hobbes, all events in the universe." The philosophy of knowledge is from cause to effect and from effect to cause, and since the relationship between cause and effect is nothing but motion, philosophy is, in fact, "the science of motion." Hobbes was not the originator of this idea, and he accepted the opinion of the scientific leaders of his time in this regard, but he also included this simple and fundamental principle in the human soul and society. That is why he has been called a follower of the philosophy of mechanics and materialism. In his view, the human soul is a set of movements, and so is social life. He also considers consciousness to be based on movement, and in his opinion, consciousness is nothing but a picture of the movements in the nervous system. Therefore, the basis of human knowledge should be sought in sensory impressions. However, Hobbes's fundamental importance is neither in philosophy nor in psychology but in the field of social science and political science. In these two disciplines, his importance is not primarily in the results he has achieved but in applying the exact method of scientific reasoning. Hobbes realised that to know the society and the political apparatus, one must begin with human psychology and did so himself. His philosophical apparatus on society and politics is the exact result of the principles he has gained about the human soul. If these principles are not true, and we now know that they are not true, the conclusions Hobbes draws from them will be false. However, his importance remains because he has used the scientific method to understand politics and society. Therefore, Leviathan is one of the most authoritative books in the world on society and politics, and in English, it is the most authoritative book of its kind.

3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The primary question

- What is the meaning of the word government in the philosophy of Thomas Hobbes?

Sub-questions

- What is the power of government in the philosophy of Thomas Hobbes?
- What are the consequences of establishing the Hobbesian government?

4. HYPOTHESES

The main hypothesis

- Before discussing the state, Hobbes talks about the state of nature and many human emotions, but one of the essential things that Hobbes brings up and is directly related to his discussion of the state is the discussion of the state. The rules are natural.

Sub-hypotheses

- The power of government is based on a social contract and therefore is taken from the people's consent.
- The Hobbes administration has many consequences. Those who voted for the new government and those who opposed it do not have the right to agree again after the government, or rather the government came to power, and establish a government.

5. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES GENERAL AIM

- The study of the word government in the philosophy of Thomas Hobbes Sub-objectives
- Examining the power of government in the philosophy of Thomas Hobbes.
- Examining the consequences of the establishment of the Hobbesian government

7. THESIS STRUCTURE

In the sections above, the ideas of the research have been discussed. The thesis will have four chapters; the first is the introduction; the second chapter will discuss concepts and literature review. The philosophy of Hobbes will be examined in two parts. There will be a biographical sketch of Hobbes in the first section, which will help students better comprehend the social context in which his political ideas were written. *Leviathan* and *De Cive*, Hobbes's most famous works, will be examined in the second portion of this essay. Judd Owen and Richard Ashcraft will also be used to show how a commonwealth might be prosperous from a non-economic aspect .

In *Political Theology and The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*, Carl Schmitt, one of the most prominent proponents of fascism and the Hobbes of the 20th century, examines the concept of sovereignty. Because he believed that liberalism had failed, Schmitt became interested in sovereignty.

A strong, centralised sovereign power was what he needed to fix a system he thought was not working, which led him to Hobbes. We can see how Schmitt used Hobbes's idea of centralised power in the commonwealth as the authority is drawn from those who set laws; or the one who decides the exception in both of Schmitt's books. Thus, the reader can better see how Hobbes's views on lawmaking have been modernised and used in a contemporary environment. We can also observe how the leaders of the Soviet Union had similar thoughts on sovereignty and rule-making if we keep Schmitt's writings in mind as we proceed through the thesis.

Between Stalin and Hobbes, we will find an interlude in Chapter 3. This is where Foucault comes in, who provides the theoretical framework and provides invaluable insight into the nature of political power, particularly as it relates to the activities of Joseph Stalin. Using Marx's and Engels' vocabulary as "class" and "class consciousness," as well as Marx's plan to abolish the state and create a classless society, we will also conduct a direct study of their narratives. As a counterpoint, we will look at the absolutist state proposed by Hobbes, which is diametrically opposite to what Marx and Engels presented, but this thesis asks when an absolutist state ceases to be one. We hope to demonstrate through more profound research of Marx and Engel's writings that

the absolute state no longer exists within any modern conception of what a nation-state is and that it might effectively be considered akin to the stateless society in Marx in terms of effectiveness. He was as concerned with the emergence of an independent state as Hobbes was. He describes the evolution of society from a stage he calls "savagery" to one that is more "civilized" and "modern" in Engels' essay, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. As we will see, Engel's portrayal of the primitive stage is strikingly similar to Hobbes' image of nature. Both men reached a similar conclusion: the state is indispensable in light of our more primitive surroundings. Even though Hobbes advocates for an absolute state, and Engels advocates for the abolition of the state, this thesis aims to explain how an absolute state breaches the constraints of statehood as we know them and functions in much the same way that Stalin adapted Marxist theory.

Using Joseph Stalin's revolutionary methods as an example, the next chapter will show how these principles were implemented. We will look at Stalin's social policies to discover where he aligned with the ideals of socialism and where he veered from it. As a result, this chapter aims to connect Marxist rhetoric with Stalin's more Hobbesian policies. If we succeed, this chapter will serve as the foundation of the entire argument.. The combination of Hobbes' *Leviathan* and Marxism, as well as our assessment of Stalin's activities, shows that his acts were a synthesis of philosophies that many people have incorrectly believed were irreconcilable. It is, nevertheless, our goal to demonstrate that Stalin was a Leftist *Leviathan* in his own right.

In order to wrap things up, there will be a brief concluding section. The relationship between Hobbes' *Leviathan* and Marx and Engels' classless society will be explained in this article.

Previous chapters, having introduced us to these primary political philosophers' terminology, accompanied by analysis both from myself and professionals in the field of political theory, and having been analysed from the perspective of those who implemented Marx's words, will serve to strengthen this thesis's argument. Whatever Hobbes' intentions were, his system is almost like a classless, equal society in which the goals of the federation are identical to those of individuals; in this awful state, individuals can be free from worry about the terrors of the outside world and the

sovereign guarantees equal treatment, freeing them from worry about labour exploitation, and supplying the citizens with the best possible quality of life. "What Hobbes truly meant" is the first step in this process.

8. RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

One of the limitations of research is the limitation of access to research literature. In most situations, researchers begin a study by identifying and addressing gaps in the existing literature. However, the researchers' level of access to the current literature affects their ability to identify or interpret the gap. Because of a lack of access to scientific material, what appears to be a research gap may be a massive misperception. Literature can be a constraint.

CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL CONCEPTS AND RESEARCH FOUNDATIONS

1. BIOGRAPHY OF THOMAS HOBBS

Thomas Hobbes, a prominent philosopher and political theorist of the 17th century, was born in Westport, England in 1588. Hobbes lived through a tumultuous period in English history, witnessing the English Civil War, the execution of King Charles I, and the subsequent establishment of the Commonwealth under Oliver Cromwell. These events greatly influenced Hobbes' political thought, which emphasized the need for a strong central authority to maintain order and prevent chaos (Martinich, 1996).

Hobbes' early life was marked by poverty and hardship, but he was able to secure an education at Oxford University, where he studied classics and mathematics (Schuhmann, 2018). He later became a tutor to the Cavendish family, which provided him with the financial security to pursue his philosophical interests (Martinich, 1996).

Hobbes' most famous work, *Leviathan*, was published in 1651 and is regarded as one of the most significant contributions to political philosophy in Western thought (Skinner, 1996). In it, Hobbes presents his theory of the state, which he sees as a social contract between individuals who agree to surrender their natural rights to a sovereign in exchange for protection and security (Hobbes, 1651).

Hobbes' political philosophy was heavily influenced by his view of human nature, which he believed was inherently selfish and competitive. In his view, without the constraints of a powerful authority, individuals would be locked in a perpetual state of war with one another, leading to chaos and anarchy (Martinich, 1996).

Hobbes' views on government and human nature have been the subject of much debate and criticism over the centuries. Some have accused him of advocating for authoritarianism and tyranny, while others see his work as a valuable contribution to the development of modern liberal democracy (Skinner, 1996). Regardless of one's stance on his ideas, there is no denying the impact that Hobbes' thought has had on the shaping of modern political theory.

2. SOCIAL CONTEXTS

Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy was heavily influenced by the social contexts in which he lived. Hobbes lived in a time of great political upheaval, particularly during the English Civil War and the unrest that followed (Martinich, 1996). The war was fought between the Royalists and the Parliamentarians, who sought to limit the monarchy's power. The war ended with the execution of King Charles I in 1649 and the establishment of the Commonwealth under Oliver Cromwell (Schuhmann, 2018). This period of political instability has left a deep impression on Hobbes, who saw the chaos and violence that resulted from the breakdown of social order.

In *Leviathan*, Hobbes argues that the state of nature, in which individuals are free to pursue their interests without any constraints, is a state of war in which life is "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" (Hobbes, 1651, p. 186). According to Hobbes, the only way to avoid this state of war is to establish a strong central authority that can maintain order and prevent individuals from acting on their base instincts. Hobbes believed that without a sovereign, there could be no peace, and life would be a constant struggle for survival (Skinner, 1996).

Hobbes' views on human nature were also shaped by the social context in which he lived. He believed human beings were inherently selfish and competitive, motivated by a desire for power and self-preservation (Martinich, 1996). In his view, without the constraints of decisive authority, individuals would be locked in a perpetual state of war with one another, leading to chaos and anarchy (Hobbes, 1651).

Considering recent discoveries in the social history of seventeenth-century England, it is time to re-evaluate the socioeconomic setting of Hobbes's political theory. Neither the notion that England possessed a "possessive market society" that served as the basis for Hobbes' political theory nor the data supports the argument that Hobbes had a bourgeois ideology. He was an academic of the "middle sort" who had solid aristocratic pro-court attitudes, according to an assessment of his social theory, social identity, social prejudices, and his concept of what we currently term social class. A better knowledge of his social ideas might have averted or diverted the present debate over his political

views. A significant case may be made for a richer social context in intellectual history at the macro level (Hamilton, 2014).

The social contexts in which Thomas Hobbes lived remarkably influenced his political philosophy. The English Civil War and the political unrest that followed left a deep impression on his views on the role of government and the nature of human beings. Hobbes' belief in the need for a strong central authority to maintain order and prevent chaos was a direct response to the violence and instability he witnessed during his lifetime.

3. THE METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THOMAS HOBBS IN THE FORMATION OF THE STATE

In light of recent discoveries in the social history of seventeenth-century England, it is time to reevaluate the socioeconomic setting of Hobbes's political theory. Neither the notion that England possessed a "possessive market society" that served as the basis for Hobbes' political theory nor the data supports the argument that Hobbes had a bourgeois ideology. He was an academic of the "middle sort" who had aristocratic solid, pro-court attitudes, according to an assessment of his social theory, social identity, social prejudices, and his concept of what we currently term social class. A better knowledge of his social ideas might have averted or diverted the present debate over his political views. A significant case may be made for a richer social context in intellectual history at the macro level.

Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy is built upon a strong foundation of methodological principles, which have had a profound influence on the formation of the state. Hobbes believed that the state was necessary to ensure order and prevent the chaos that would result from the state of nature. In this section, we will explore the methodological foundations of Hobbes' political philosophy and their implications for the formation of the state.

Hobbes' methodology was heavily influenced by his background in mathematics and natural philosophy. He believed that the principles of mathematics could be applied to the study of politics, which would enable the construction of a rational and scientific

theory of the state (Schuhmann, 2018). In his view, the study of politics should be based on empirical observation and deductive reasoning, rather than on abstract speculation and metaphysical conjecture (Martinich, 1996).

Hobbes' methodology is reflected in his theory of the social contract, which he presents in *Leviathan*. According to Hobbes, individuals in the state of nature are driven by their self-interest and are in a constant state of war with one another. The only way to escape this state of war is to enter into a social contract, in which individuals surrender their natural rights to a sovereign in exchange for protection and security (Hobbes, 1651).

Hobbes' methodological approach emphasizes the importance of the state as a social institution that serves to protect individuals from the violence and chaos of the state of nature. He believed that the state should be established through a process of rational deliberation and agreement, rather than through force or divine right (Skinner, 1996).

In conclusion, the methodological foundations of Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy have had a profound influence on the formation of the state. Hobbes believed that the state was necessary to ensure order and prevent the chaos that would result from the state of nature. His methodology, which is based on empirical observation and deductive reasoning, emphasizes the importance of rational deliberation and agreement in the establishment of the state.

3.1. Importance of Methodology

The importance of methodology in Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy cannot be overstated. Hobbes believed that a rigorous methodology was essential to the construction of a rational and scientific theory of the state. His methodology was heavily influenced by his background in mathematics and natural philosophy, which emphasized the importance of empirical observation and deductive reasoning (Martinich, 1996).

Hobbes' methodology is reflected in his theory of the social contract, which he presents in *Leviathan*. According to Hobbes, the social contract is a rational agreement between individuals who surrender their natural rights to a sovereign in exchange for protection

and security (Hobbes, 1651). This theory is based on a deductive reasoning process that starts from a few basic assumptions about human nature and the state of nature, and then proceeds to logically deduce the necessity of the state.

Hobbes' methodological approach was groundbreaking in its emphasis on the scientific study of politics. He believed that politics should be studied in the same rigorous and objective manner as the natural sciences. This approach enabled him to construct a theory of the state that was based on empirical observation and logical deduction, rather than on abstract speculation or metaphysical conjecture (Schuhmann, 2018).

The importance of methodology in Hobbes' political philosophy is also reflected in his approach to the formation of the state. Hobbes believed that the state should be established through a process of rational deliberation and agreement, rather than through force or divine right (Skinner, 1996). This approach emphasizes the importance of rationality and reason in the construction of the state, and underscores the importance of a rigorous methodology in the study of politics.

The importance of methodology in Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy cannot be overstated. His methodological approach, which emphasizes the importance of empirical observation and deductive reasoning, enabled him to construct a theory of the state that was based on rigorous scientific principles. This approach also underscores the importance of rationality and reason in the formation of the state (Munro, 2021) situation. Since neither morality nor law existed previous to the foundation of the commonwealth, individuals in the state of nature are not bound by moral or legal obligations. Since "nothing can be Unjust" in the condition of nature, there is no place for "the notions of right and wrong, justice and injustice" (L 188). Human liberty, says Hobbes, is simply the freedom of bodily action and is not bound by any moral or legal concepts. A person is said to be free when they are not restrained or imprisoned physically. He argues that it is sensible and essential to pursue peace to satisfy our desires, including our basic urge for self-preservation, because the condition of nature is a constant and extensive struggle. When we use our minds, Hobbes claims, we can discover the "rule of nature" that can help us avoid the state of nature's calamities.

3.2. Mathematics Method

Mathematics played a crucial role in the methodological foundations of Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy. As a former mathematics teacher, Hobbes believed that the principles of mathematics could be applied to the study of politics, enabling the construction of a rational and scientific theory of the state (Schuhmann, 2018).

Hobbes' use of mathematics in his political philosophy is reflected in his methodological approach. He believed that the study of politics should be based on empirical observation and deductive reasoning and that these principles could be applied in the same way as they are in mathematics (Martinich, 1996). According to Hobbes, the principles of mathematics could be used to construct a logical and systematic theory of the state.

In order to have an overall picture of Thomas Hobbes's philosophical and scientific system, we must go to his *Elementa philosophiae*, which is divided into three parts, each of which seeks to describe and base the entire building of knowledge of its time. According to R. Tuck's writings (2002), it includes the geometric and physical origin of human movement, as well as the psychological and anthropological origin of the movement and behavior in humans, as well as the beginning (laws of nature) of the social and political behavior of social and political bodies (*De Cive*). It is important to remember that the exhibition's logical arrangement was scuppered due to political hazards of the era, as C. Hill (1987) informs us in its text of all that fell historically. A new era began when medieval Scholasticism and the emergence of modernity in Europe and England fundamentally changed from what had previously been called "truth" (p. 12). Since Hobbes concluded the *Leviathan* in the 1651, he reminded us that he was pleased to be able to return to his theories on natural bodies, which he had started in the *Leviathan*, and that he was eager to do so again in the following year (*De Corpore*). "*Leviathan*," by HOBBS (2003, p. 22). Even as it pursued all of this, it never lost sight of the importance of the other sciences that formed the foundation of physics. Here, we will select mathematics as Hobbes's gloomy science, which was not his castle next to geometry. On the contrary, this prominent humanist had a "stone in his shoe" because of this. We may discover a discussion context on the scientist's topic in the 17th century in England, especially in one author, Kuhn; in the late modernity, they suggest a new

paradigm of scientific knowledge as it had developed for the scholastic ones; perhaps in their medieval metaphysical understanding. Despite this, he has written extensively on the subject himself. According to Hobbes, the first author to lay the groundwork for modern science, there are several references to the subject matter in his person. But he intended to explore or offer the arguments removed from religion in order to construct what was known as truth, from other fundamental axes that were not related to the God's theme. Leviathan, his most famous work, is widely seen as a political or right-wing icon, yet its scientific spirit serves as a marker for a new historical period that has just begun. This perspective on how Hobbes perceived the conception of scientific practice in its day, especially in mathematics, can be examined through the textual present of reflection. Despite their fondness for Galilean physics, Hobbes' use of mathematics is also reflected in his theory of the social contract, which he presents in Leviathan. In this theory, Hobbes uses deductive reasoning to demonstrate the necessity of the state. He assumes that individuals in the state of nature are in a constant state of war and then deduces that the only way to escape this state of war is to enter into a social contract with a sovereign (Hobbes, 1651).

Hobbes' use of mathematics in his political philosophy was groundbreaking in emphasising the scientific study of politics. By applying the principles of mathematics to the study of politics, Hobbes constructed a theory of the state that was based on rigorous scientific principles. Moreover, this approach enabled him to construct a theory of the state that was both logical and systematic, emphasising the importance of empirical observation and deductive reasoning (Skinner, 1996).

Overall, mathematics played a crucial role in the methodological foundations of Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy. Hobbes believed that the principles of mathematics could be applied to the study of politics, enabling the construction of a rational and scientific theory of the state. His use of mathematics in his political philosophy was groundbreaking in emphasising the scientific study of politics. It enabled him to construct a theory of the state that was both logical and systematic.

3.3. Definitions

3.3.1. De Corpore

In Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy, definitions played a critical role in establishing a rigorous and systematic theory of the state. Hobbes believed that clear and precise definitions were essential for constructing a rational and scientific theory of politics. In his work *De Corpore*, Hobbes provides a comprehensive set of definitions that form the basis for his political philosophy. *De Corpore* is a work of natural philosophy in which Hobbes lays out the foundations of his materialist philosophy. The work is divided into four parts: "Of Body," "Of Motion," "Of Place and Time," and "Of the Universe." In each of these parts, Hobbes provides a set of definitions that are designed to be clear, precise, and unambiguous.

The definitions in *De Corpore* are crucial for understanding Hobbes' political philosophy. In *Leviathan*, Hobbes builds on the definitions provided in *De Corpore* to construct a theory of the state that is based on empirical observation and deductive reasoning. For example, Hobbes defines the state of nature as a condition in which individuals are in a constant state of war, and the social contract as a rational agreement between individuals who surrender their natural rights to a sovereign in exchange for protection and security (Hobbes, 1651).

De corpore's second section begins with the presumption that the universe has been destroyed, but that man has remained; what can this man philosophise about? "To this man, the world and all of the bodies that he had previously considered or that had been perceived by his other senses, the ideas—that is to say the memory and imagination of their sizes, motions, sounds and colors—all things that even though they are only ideas and apparitions, inner accidents in that one who envisions, will appear notwithstanding as independent external of the power of the spirit."

In other words, all of our senses' abilities are based on the subject's affective states. According to Hobbes, it is pretty reasonable for a man to suffer from these ailments after the world has been destroyed. In this story, the mind is limited to working with images, and it is these images. This is also what occurs when the world exists, though, as noted by Hobbes: "We do not climb to the top of the sky to divide and measure its motion; we do it quietly in our office or the dark."

It is possible to look at these images, which are the sole object of our thoughts, in two ways: they can be viewed as internal mental accidents, or they can be viewed as exterior things that appear to exist. To begin with, we can look at things from two perspectives: psychological and objective, as these mental representations make up reality. There are reasons why the two views remain relevant, and they are not because of the fiction of an end to all things, but because the phantasies that remain after this fictional extinguishment keep appearing as the exterior, so it is impossible if only to hypothesize an end to all things to hypothesize the existence of the world. Because there is many extrapolating, and their exteriority demonstrates their materiality, a first philosophy founded on a solid ontological premise can be opened up by such a fabrication. *De Corpore* is a textbook on geometry and mechanics, and most of it is devoted to studying geometry (Campo, 2016).

Hobbes' use of definitions in his political philosophy was groundbreaking in its emphasis on clarity and precision. By providing clear and precise definitions, Hobbes was able to construct a theory of the state that was both logical and systematic. This approach emphasized the importance of empirical observation and deductive reasoning in the study of politics, and enabled Hobbes to construct a theory of the state that was based on rigorous scientific principles.

Overall, definitions played a critical role in Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy. In *De Corpore*, Hobbes provides a comprehensive set of definitions that form the basis for his political philosophy. These definitions are crucial for understanding Hobbes' theory of the state, and are a testament to his emphasis on clarity and precision in the study of politics.

3.3.2. The Leviathan

In Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy, the concept of the Leviathan plays a crucial role in his theory of the state. The Leviathan is a metaphorical representation of the state as a single, powerful entity that is capable of maintaining order and preventing the chaos that would result from the state of nature. In *Leviathan*, Hobbes provides a detailed account of the Leviathan and its role in the formation of the state.

According to Hobbes, the Leviathan is a sovereign entity that is formed through a social contract among individuals who surrender their natural rights to the Leviathan in exchange for protection and security (Hobbes, 1651). The Leviathan is responsible for maintaining order and preventing the chaos that would result from the state of nature, in which individuals are in a constant state of war with one another. Hobbes' use of the Leviathan as a metaphor for the state is significant in several ways. First, it emphasizes the importance of the state as a single, unified entity that is capable of maintaining order and preventing the chaos that would result from the state of nature. Second, it underscores the importance of the social contract as the basis for the formation of the state. Finally, it highlights the role of the sovereign as the ultimate arbiter of power within the state.

The concept of the Leviathan in Hobbes' political philosophy has been subject to much debate and criticism. Some scholars have criticized Hobbes' reliance on the metaphor of the Leviathan as an oversimplification of the complex nature of the state. Others have questioned the legitimacy of the social contract as a basis for the formation of the state. Despite these criticisms, the concept of the Leviathan remains a significant and influential part of Hobbes' political philosophy. It has influenced the development of modern political theory and has been a subject of ongoing debate and discussion among political philosophers.

Overall, the concept of the Leviathan plays a crucial role in Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy. It represents the state as a single, unified entity that is responsible for maintaining order and preventing the chaos that would result from the state of nature. Although it has been subject to criticism and debate, the concept of the Leviathan remains a significant and influential part of Hobbes' political philosophy.

3.3.3. Moral Psychology

In Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy, moral psychology plays a critical role in his theory of the state. Hobbes believed that humans are fundamentally self-interested and motivated by a desire for self-preservation. His theory of the state reflects this view of human nature, which emphasises the importance of the social contract as a rational

agreement between individuals who surrender their natural rights to a sovereign in exchange for protection and security (Hobbes, 1651).

Hobbes' view of human nature is grounded in his moral psychology. He believed that human beings are motivated primarily by a desire for self-preservation, which he identified as the fundamental human instinct (Martinich, 1996). According to Hobbes, this instinct drives human behaviour and is the basis for forming a society and the state.

Hobbes' emphasis on self-preservation as the fundamental human instinct has been debated and criticised. Some scholars have argued that his view of human nature is overly pessimistic and fails to account for the role of altruism and cooperation in human behaviour. Others have criticised his moral psychology as reductionist and oversimplified.

Despite these criticisms, Hobbes' moral psychology remains a significant and influential part of his political philosophy. It emphasises the importance of the social contract as a rational agreement between individuals who recognise the need for protection and security and underscores the state's role as the ultimate guarantor of these rights.

Overall, moral psychology is critical to Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy. His view of human nature as fundamentally self-interested and motivated by a desire for self-preservation is reflected in his theory of the state, which emphasises the importance of the social contract as a rational agreement between individuals who surrender their natural rights to a sovereign in exchange for protection and security. Although his view of human nature has been criticised and debated, it remains a significant and influential part of his political philosophy.

3.3.4. The State of Nature

In Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy, the state of nature is a hypothetical condition in which individuals live in constant war with one another. According to Hobbes, the state of nature is a condition of chaos and violence in which individuals are motivated primarily by self-interest and the desire for self-preservation (Hobbes, 1651).

Hobbes' view of the state of nature is grounded in his moral psychology. He believed that humans are fundamentally self-interested and motivated by a desire for self-preservation, which drives human behaviour in the state of nature. Without a joint authority, individuals in the state of nature are in a constant state of war with one another as they compete for resources and attempt to protect themselves from harm.

Hobbes' view of the state of nature is significant in his political philosophy because it provides the foundation for his theory of the state. According to Hobbes, the state is formed through a social contract among individuals who recognise the need for protection and security in the state of nature. The social contract involves individuals surrendering their natural rights to a sovereign in exchange for protection and security.

Hobbes' view of the state of nature has been subject to much debate and criticism. Some scholars have argued that his view of human nature is overly pessimistic and fails to account for the role of altruism and cooperation in human behaviour. Others have criticised his view of the state of nature as a hypothetical construct that does not accurately reflect the complexity of human behaviour.

Despite these criticisms, Hobbes' view of the state of nature remains a significant and influential part of his political philosophy. It underscores the importance of the state as a means of maintaining order and preventing the chaos resulting from the state of nature. It also emphasises the role of the social contract as a rational agreement between individuals who recognise the need for protection and security in a world characterised by self-interest and violence.

The state of nature is crucial in Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy. It represents a hypothetical condition of chaos and violence, in which individuals are motivated primarily by self-interest and the desire for self-preservation. Although his view of the state of nature has been criticised and debated, it remains a significant and influential part of his political philosophy.

3.4. Principles of Subject Matter Or Confiscations

In Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy, the principles of subject matter or confiscations refer to the legitimate basis for acquiring and transferring property within the state. According to Hobbes, the state can regulate property rights and confiscate property when necessary for the common good (Hobbes, 1651).

Hobbes' view of property rights is grounded in his social contract theory. According to Hobbes, individuals in the state of nature have a natural right to everything. However, this right is constantly threatened by the violence and competition that characterises the state of nature. In order to escape this condition, individuals must surrender their natural rights to a sovereign in exchange for protection and security. The sovereign has the authority to regulate property rights within the state and to confiscate property when necessary for the common good.

Hobbes' view of property rights has been debated and criticised. Some scholars have argued that his view of property rights is overly authoritarian and fails to account for the importance of individual autonomy and freedom. Others have criticised his view of property rights as insufficiently protective of individual rights and too prone to abuse by the sovereign.

Despite these criticisms, Hobbes' view of property rights remains a significant and influential part of his political philosophy. It emphasises the state's role as the ultimate arbiter of property rights within the state. It underscores the importance of the social contract as the basis for forming the state.

Overall, the principles of subject matter or confiscations play a crucial role in Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy. They represent the legitimate basis for the acquisition and transfer of property within the state and emphasise the state's role as the ultimate arbiter of property rights. Although his view of property rights has been criticised and debated, it remains a significant and influential part of his political philosophy.

3.5. Concept of Motion Explanation

In Thomas Hobbes' philosophy, the concept of motion plays a crucial role in his theory of the natural world and human behaviour. According to Hobbes, all things in the world,

including human beings, are in constant motion. This view of motion is grounded in his materialist philosophy, which emphasises the importance of empirical observation and deductive reasoning in studying the natural world.

Hobbes' concept of motion is significant in his philosophy because it provides the basis for his explanation of the natural world and human behaviour. According to Hobbes, all things in the world, including human beings, are subject to the laws of motion. These laws govern the behaviour of all things in the world and can be observed and studied through empirical observation.

Instead of calling his definitions and basic principles of motion "laws of nature," Thomas Hobbes preferred to refer to them simply as "principles of motion." When it comes to the motion of matter, René Descartes laid out his theory in such a way that the laws of nature play a vital part in explaining it. Cartesian and Hobbesian theories of motion share the content of their three laws of nature, despite some significant differences.

Hobbes' view of motion also has important implications for his political philosophy. According to Hobbes, human behaviour is motivated primarily by a desire for self-preservation, a form of motion. His theory of the state reflects this view of human behaviour, which emphasises the importance of the social contract as a rational agreement between individuals who surrender their natural rights to a sovereign in exchange for protection and security.

Hobbes' concept of motion has been subject to much debate and criticism. Some scholars have argued that his view of motion is overly reductionist and fails to account for the complexity of the natural world and human behaviour. Others have criticised his materialist philosophy as insufficiently spiritual and too focused on the material world.

Despite these criticisms, Hobbes' concept of motion remains a significant and influential part of his philosophy. It provides the basis for his explanation of the natural world and human behaviour and underscores the importance of empirical observation in studying the world.

The concept of motion plays a crucial role in Thomas Hobbes' philosophy. It provides the basis for his explanation of the natural world and human behaviour and has important implications for his political philosophy. Although his view of motion has been subject to criticism and debate, it remains a significant and influential part of his philosophy.

3.6. Hobbes' Methodology

In Thomas Hobbes' philosophy, methodology plays a crucial role in his approach to understanding the natural world and human behavior. Hobbes' methodology is grounded in his materialist philosophy, which emphasizes the importance of empirical observation and deductive reasoning in the study of the world (Martinich, 1996).

Hobbes' approach to methodology is reflected in his emphasis on the importance of the senses in the acquisition of knowledge. According to Hobbes, all knowledge is ultimately derived from empirical observation, and the senses play a crucial role in this process. He believed that the senses provide the basis for all knowledge and that deductive reasoning allows us to derive further knowledge from these sensory observations.

Hobbes' methodology is also reflected in his emphasis on the importance of mathematics in the study of the natural world. According to Hobbes, mathematics provides a powerful tool for understanding the laws of motion that govern the behavior of all things in the world. He believed that mathematics allows us to make precise and accurate predictions about the behavior of physical objects, and that this knowledge can be applied to the study of human behavior as well.

Hobbes' methodology has been subject to much debate and criticism. Some scholars have criticized his emphasis on deductive reasoning as insufficiently grounded in empirical observation, while others have questioned the validity of his materialist philosophy as too focused on the material world and insufficiently spiritual.

Despite these criticisms, Hobbes' methodology remains a significant and influential part of his philosophy. It emphasizes the importance of empirical observation and deductive

reasoning in the study of the natural world and human behavior, and underscores the importance of mathematics as a tool for understanding the laws of motion that govern the behavior of all things in the world.

Overall, Hobbes' methodology plays a crucial role in his approach to understanding the natural world and human behavior. It emphasizes the importance of empirical observation, deductive reasoning, and mathematics in the study of the world, and has important implications for his philosophy as a whole. Although his methodology has been subject to criticism and debate, it remains a significant and influential part of his philosophy.

4. GEOMETRIC EXPLANATION OF POLITICAL SOCIETY

In Thomas Hobbes' philosophy, the idea of political society is closely connected to his materialist methodology and his emphasis on the importance of empirical observation and deductive reasoning. Hobbes' approach to political society can be understood through his use of geometrical explanations, which provide a framework for examining the patterns of collective action and interaction that provide societies with at least partial answers to questions of structure and authority (Ehrenberg, 2002).

The concept of civil society, which is central to Hobbes' philosophy, has been the subject of much debate and interpretation. According to Michael Walzer's definition, civil society is "the sphere of uncoerced human association between the individual and the state, in which people engage in collective action for normative and substantive purposes, relatively independent of government and the market" (Walzer, 1998). This definition highlights the importance of individual agency and creativity in solving current concerns and emphasizes the role of civil society in providing a space for collective action and interaction that is relatively independent of government and the market.

However, the concept of civil society has been subject to more reductive interpretations, which posit a mechanical relationship between certain forms of voluntary citizen action and the achievement of macro-level goals like democratisation and poverty reduction. This reductive approach has led to confusion and unhappiness among some people

about the concept of civil society itself. To avoid this confusion, it is important to critically examine the concept of civil society and its cultural, political, and economic significance.

Despite these challenges, there has been a growing desire for participatory, direct, and deliberative forms of democracy in the 21st century, in which civil society has a central role to play. The traditional mechanisms of democracy cannot activate, channel, or collect the numerous voices of modern citizens, making alternative routes crucial to the successful functioning of politics (Edwards, 2009).

In conclusion, Hobbes' methodology and his use of geometrical explanations provide a framework for understanding the patterns of collective action and interaction that provide societies with at least partial answers to questions of structure and authority. The concept of civil society, which is central to Hobbes' philosophy, emphasizes the role of individual agency and creativity in solving current concerns and provides a space for collective action and interaction that is relatively independent of government and the market. Despite challenges and reductive interpretations, there has been a growing desire for participatory, direct, and deliberative forms of democracy in the 21st century, in which civil society has a central role to play.

5. THE IMPORTANCE OF HOBBS' POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Aside from Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Rousseau, Kant, and John Rawls, Thomas Hobbes, an English philosopher from the 17th century, is now widely considered one of the few genuinely great political philosophers. Hobbes is renowned for his early and extensive formulation of "social contract theory," explaining political principles or structures by appealing to the agreement that would be formed among suitably placed rational, accessible, and equal persons. Using the social contract method, he concluded that we should submit to the authority of an absolute—undivided and unlimited—sovereign power. His substantive results have primarily acted as a foil for developing better philosophical perspectives despite his methodological innovation. " Since no one can agree on what Hobbes's moral philosophy says, it has not had the same kind of sway as his political philosophy. Researchers have widely assumed personal relativism or

subjectivism; Hobbes' writings also suggest that he did not advocate various other theories, such as rule egoism and the rule of God's commands. To comprehend the discrepancies in interpreting Hobbes's moral philosophy, one must grasp Hobbes's "rules of nature," which will be examined in detail below.

De Cive, *Philosophical Rudiments Concerning Government and Society* in 1651, the English *Leviathan* (1651), and its Latin edition in 1668 were all versions of Hobbes' political philosophy, which he published under *Human Nature* or *De Corpore Politico*. In addition to his account of the English Civil War, *Behemoth* (published in 1679), *De Corpore* (1655), *De Homine* (1658), *Dialogue Between a Philosopher and a Student of the Common Laws of England* (1681), and *The Questions Concerning Liberty, Necessity, and Chance* (1656). Sir William Molesworth edited *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes* (11 volumes, London 1839–45) and *Thomae Hobbes Opera Philosophica Quae Latina Scripsit Omnia* (5 volumes, London 1839–45) to compile all the philosopher's essential works. Oxford University Press is collecting the Clarendon Edition of Thomas Hobbes' works in a planned 26-volume compilation. Currently, there are three books available: *De Cive*, the *Thomas Hobbes Correspondence*, and *Writings on Common Law and Hereditary Rights* (edited by Alan Cromartie and Quentin Skinner). Noel Malcolm has recently published a three-volume edition of *Leviathan* that includes both the English and Latin versions of the work side-by-side. As a starting point for those new to Hobbes, *Leviathan* is an excellent place to start, especially if you want to read the more familiar and frequently excerpted parts one and two. Lists of secondary publications on Hobbes' normative philosophy are included in the following bibliography, some of which are excellent.

5.1. Hobbes' Place in New Political Thought

Thomas Hobbes is the first authentic political philosopher who established a precise understanding of justice, sovereignty, and citizenship. His works, such as *The Elements of Law*, *De Cive*, and *Leviathan*, provide a new reason and model for the state and society. As a result, they have become fundamental concepts in modern political philosophy and political science. In addition, Hobbes' alternative genesis for modern

political authority, derived from God's power over ancient Israel, is discussed in his works.

Hobbes' claim to have discovered the first authentic political science is essential to understanding his philosophy. He criticises Aristotle and other political thinkers for failing to make any discernible progress on what is good. Hobbes claims to provide a scientific theory of the political good, which sees political order as a self-conscious invention, an artifice we manufacture to distance ourselves from a pre-political condition of nature.

Hobbes' political philosophy is limited to the consequences of the decision to establish a political order or "commonwealth." His political science proper is only the section of *Leviathan* that deals with the "rights and duties" of the sovereign and the subjects necessary to maintain this basic political order. However, this decision is influenced by our emotions and words, particularly the way we describe the object of our wishes as "good" or "pleasant."

Hobbes' emphasis on the importance of consent and authorisation in the relationship between the sovereign and the people it represents is a unique area of interest for him. He uses social contract theory to create a story of consent and authorisation, claiming that the people are the genuine "writers" of the covenant they sign with the king. This suggests that the greater community has a part in their political arrangements, although the degree of that involvement is an ongoing controversy among Hobbes scholars.

In conclusion, Hobbes' place in new political thought is significant. His works provide a new reason and model for the state and society. His emphasis on consent and authorisation in the relationship between the sovereign and the people it represents is still relevant today.

While his political philosophy is limited to the consequences of the decision to establish a political order or "commonwealth," his ideas have become fundamental concepts in modern political philosophy and political science.

5.1.1. The Concept of Human Nature

Hobbes' concept of human nature is central to his political philosophy. He believed that morality does not exist in the natural state of man, and good is defined as something that people desire, while evil is something they try to avoid. These ideas are the foundation for Hobbes' explanations of a wide range of human emotions and behaviours, such as hope and fear.

However, Hobbes' view of human nature is only tenable when we view men outside of the restrictions of law and society. In the state of nature, there are no general principles concerning excellent and evil, as the sole sense of good and evil comes from individual appetites and desires. Therefore, a society's central authority is the only source of moral judgments regarding good and evil.

This belief in an autocratic and absolute type of government is intimately linked to Hobbes' position on human nature. He believes a strong central authority is necessary to restrain individuals' natural inclinations towards violence and chaos. Without such an authority, Hobbes believed that society would quickly descend into war and chaos.

Hobbes' concept of human nature is a vital aspect of his political philosophy. It highlights the importance of a strong central authority in controlling individuals' natural inclinations and shaping society's moral judgments regarding good and evil.

5.1.2. The Concept of Government

Hobbes' concept of government is closely tied to his view of human nature. He believed that humans are self-centred creatures who, if left to their own devices, would constantly conflict with each other. This led him to conclude that only absolute monarchy could keep humanity's evil inclinations in check.

In *Leviathan*, Hobbes stated this belief most forcefully, arguing that the monarchy was the only natural and proper form of government. He believed a strong central authority was necessary to restrain individuals' natural inclinations towards violence and chaos. Without such an authority, Hobbes believed that society would quickly descend into war and chaos. The English Civil War and the following chaotic interregnum period greatly influenced Hobbes' theory of human nature. He viewed this period as the closest

human beings could get to the actual state of nature. Hobbes' opinions on the state of the English government should be no surprise, given his dismal view of human nature.

Despite his belief in social contract theory, which holds that a ruler has an implied, implicit pact with his people obliging him to rule equitably, Hobbes held that the people had no right to revolt against the monarchy. In his view, absolute monarchy was the only way to prevent society from collapsing into chaos and violence.

In conclusion, Hobbes' concept of government is closely tied to his view of human nature. He believed that only absolute monarchy could keep humanity's evil inclinations in check and prevent society from descending into chaos and violence. Despite his belief in social contract theory, he held that the people had no right to revolt against the monarchy.

5.1.3. Hobbes Modern Political Thought

Thomas Hobbes' modern political thought is a significant contribution to the field of political philosophy. Yves Charles Zarka's book, *Hobbes et la pensée politique moderne*, provides a comprehensive analysis of Hobbes' ideas and how they shaped modern political thought. Zarka's book is based on a "simultaneously historical and philosophical" approach, which involves using historically accurate standards and interrogations to determine the essence, value, and end of political philosophy.

Zarka's book is organized into four sections, and each section focuses on a different aspect of Hobbes' political thought. The first section examines Hobbes' attempt to make the study of politics more philosophical by moving away from civil history and towards the study of civil philosophy. Zarka highlights the importance of Hobbes' theory of human nature in this section and how it led to his belief that principles should be derived from human nature rather than history.

The second section of the book examines the relationship between language and power in Hobbes' political thought. Zarka argues that Hobbes' theory of language serves as the foundation for the unity and consistency of his overall theory. He also explores how different signs can influence human relations.

Zarka's book is valuable in its attention to the writing dimensions of Hobbes' political thought. He examines not only the concepts of writing in the context of Hobbes' political philosophy but also Hobbes' own writing and his relationship to his readers. Zarka's approach offers a better alternative to historicism, which tends to construct a history of thought only at the expense of the idea of political philosophy.

Overall, Zarka's book is an insightful and comprehensive analysis of Hobbes' political thought and its impact on modern political philosophy. It highlights the importance of understanding Hobbes' theory of human nature and his ideas on language and power. Zarka's focus on the writing dimensions of Hobbes' political thought also provides a valuable perspective on the development of modern political philosophy.

5.1.4. Natural Law Theory

In the context of natural law theory, Hobbes' view diverges greatly from that of Aquinas. Hobbes argues that in the state of nature, there can be no concept of good and wrong, justice and injustice. He believes that natural law only comes into existence when men reach a point of consensus that this is in their own self-interest. In contrast, Aquinas believes that natural law is intrinsic to human beings, both through divine providence and their capacity for reason. Hobbes does not see natural law as innate because of divine providence and God-given rationality, as Aquinas does.

Hobbes also does not believe in the existence of absolute good or bad. He argues that each person has a unique definition of these values, and what a person craves or desires is what they label as excellent. Men cannot naturally aim for one good because everyone has a different definition of good and evil. In contrast, Aquinas believes that the natural law is a particular demand of practical reason and the rational creature's participation in the eternal law.

Hobbes sees it as a matter of self-interest for humanity to act justly, and the cornerstone of his political philosophy and the construction of a commonwealth is based on principles of obligation in people's self-interest. He believes that all men should conduct themselves lawfully in order to build a more secure civil society, or else they would once again find themselves without security and in the state of nature. This makes it

difficult to consider him a deontologist who adheres to Kant's theory of morality, as he emphasizes a politics of realism rather than moral imperatives.

In conclusion, Hobbes' philosophy of natural law is significantly different from Aquinas'. Hobbes' views do not adhere to the natural law tradition, and he does not believe in innate human morality. Instead, he emphasizes self-interest and the need for a secure civil society. His philosophy reflects the shifts in European consciousness between the 15th and 16th centuries and might be seen as the pioneer of a new tradition.

Because Hobbes does not believe in an "ultimate end," he does not advocate doing good and avoiding evil. According to him, there are many diverse ways to define good and evil.

Civil society's precepts or general norms, which are the laws of nature, introduce the concepts of just and unjust to man. Because it is in their own best interest, men adhere to these rules. In contrast to Aquinas, Hobbes does not believe that natural law is innate because of divine providence and God-given rationality, as Aquinas does. When escaping a life of misery and death, males are more likely to consent to an arrangement than women. As a result, his point of view is purely utilitarian. It is also vital to interpreting Skinner's writings in the context of his political ideology and the twentieth century, as he contends. Therefore, a deontological reading of Hobbes is implausible in light of this fact. Hobbes breaks away from the naturalistic tradition of political philosophy and might be seen as the pioneer of a new tradition (Oakeshott, 1946: 31). Furthermore, his philosophy successfully portrays the shifts in European consciousness between the 15th and 16th centuries: Leviathan is a symbol of both an end and the beginning; the end of natural law and the early stages of awakened intellect and the scientific method.

6. SOCIAL CONTRACT AND GOVERNMENT FORMATION

Social contract theory has been a longstanding concept in philosophy, with Thomas Hobbes often cited as its father. According to this theory, individuals' moral and political obligations are determined by their participation in the formation of the society in which they live. Hobbes' mechanical account of human psychology suggests that

normative propositions are subjective and reflect individuals' preferences and inclinations. He further argues that human beings are self-interested and rational, seeking what they believe to be in their own best interests. Hobbes believes that political obligation is justified by the fact that individuals will submit to the authority of a sovereign to live in a civil society that is beneficial to their interests.

Hobbes' description of the State of Nature, an imaginary world where individuals are self-interested and equal to one another but limited in resources, is a constant state of battle that cannot be avoided. To escape this state, individuals must use their reason to recognize the natural rules that govern their world and build a Social Contract that provides them with a better existence than they would have had in the State of Nature. This agreement requires individuals to give up their rights against each other and to give a specific individual or group of people power to enforce the initial contract.

While living under a sovereign's power may be harsh and cruel, it is better than living in the State of Nature. Hobbes argues that it is self-interested but desirable to conform oneself to the artifice of morality and justice since the sovereign has the authority and power to punish violations of the contract that are worse than not acting as one pleases. As long as individuals agree to live together and have a sovereign with unlimited authority, nothing is morally wrong or unethical. Hobbes contends that no reasonable individual would choose to abandon the contract's conditions and return to the state of nature.

Despite Hobbes' scepticism about human nature, he develops an argument that allows for civil society and all of its benefits. His theory justifies the continuation of the old form of power that his society had long enjoyed, but on a more acceptable base, in the light of the political events of his England. However, social contract theory has faced criticism from feminist and race-conscious philosophers who argue that it is an incomplete account of our moral and political lives and may be parasitic in the oppression of classes of people.

Despite his scepticism about human nature, Hobbes manages to develop an argument that allows for civil society and all of its benefits. He also managed to argue for the

continuation of the old form of power that his society had long enjoyed, but on a far more acceptable base, in light of the political events of his England.

7. THE RULING LEGAL AUTHORITY AND THE NECESSITY OF TYRANNY

The Rule of Law is a fundamental value in political morality that refers to the supremacy of law and its institutions in a system of government. It encompasses several formal and procedural principles, including universality, clarity, publicity, stability, and future outlook. The process and institutions, such as courts and an independent judiciary, are called "procedural principles" in this context. The Rule of Law also includes specific substantive objectives, such as the assumption of liberty and adherence to private property rights, which are more contentious and subject to disagreement.

During the English Civil War, there was a significant argument about the divine right of the English monarchy. Thomas Hobbes argued that there should be an all-powerful ruler who can maintain order and deliver critical government services. His book, *The Leviathan*, published in 1651, depicts the Leviathan (the absolute king) with a crown, a sword (a symbol of military might), and an ornate cymbal (of spiritual power). Hobbes argued that the Leviathan comprises all of his followers and is called the "captain of the state." He towers over the army and the established church, the two cornerstones of his power.

However, the Levellers, who advocated for property rights, religious tolerance, and democratically elected parliaments, contested these ideals aggressively in the Parliamentary Army. Their political thought persisted and influenced subsequent generations before the American Revolution. *The Levellers' Regal Tyrannie Discovered*, a title page of a Leveller tract, denies every concept advanced by Hobbes. The title page was rapidly drafted and inexpensively printed to avoid confiscation by the censors before they could be distributed. However, the author and printers needed more resources and expertise to create a well-designed title page. The most they could accomplish was to arrange the paragraphs on the front page in fascinating and aesthetic shapes using some imaginative typesetting.

The lengthy "sub-title" on the title page sums up Lilburne's critical arguments, referring to the monarch and parliament as "delinquents," "ruffians," "invaders," "rotten members," and "tyrants" on the title page. Lilburne envisioned a monarch very similar to the one Hobbes pictured on his book's title page. The Levellers' political thought persisted and influenced subsequent generations before the American Revolution, 140 years after Oliver Cromwell defeated them for challenging the divine right of kings to reign.

8. THE NATURAL STATE OF HUMAN BEINGS

Hobbes believed that human nature is such that people are not content with their current power and will always seek greater power. This desire for power is natural and drives people to pursue fame and glory, comfort and sensual pleasure, or the adoration of others. He also believed that all people are created equal, and any physical strength advantage can be compensated for under intellect or some other personal characteristic. However, when two or more people want the same thing, enmity arises, and people seek to destroy each other. This moment of conflict between males, according to Hobbes, is natural and arises due to competition, distrust, and grandeur.

Hobbes argued that violence is often used to attack enemies' land for personal gain, protection or glory. He also believed that if there were no joint forces uniting people, there would be a war of every man against every man. To bring about peace, Hobbes argued that an artificial state founded on an agreement was necessary, as a natural state of conflict was inevitable. If people had a shared interest or a common objective, they would not be at war and would be more potent against those trying to destroy them. Hobbes saw that people strongly needed to protect themselves, and this need for self-protection was a fundamental aspect of human nature.

In summary, Hobbes believed that the natural state of human beings is one of conflict and that people are driven to pursue power, fame, and glory. He argued that violence is often used to attack enemies' land for personal gain, protection or glory. An artificial state founded on an agreement was necessary to bring about peace, as a natural state of conflict was inevitable. The need for self-protection was a fundamental aspect of human

nature, and people could be more potent against those who would try to destroy them if they had a shared interest or common objective.

9. ARTIFICIAL PERSONS, LEVIATHAN GOVERNMENT

Hobbes witnessed an English civil war and revolution that resulted in the abolition of the Anglican church government, Lords and monarchy and the emergence of the Puritan Republic. He believed the war and anarchy were caused by Puritan clerical and political leaders who brought down a legitimate government on the pretext of following their private consciences. In *Leviathan*, he aimed to restore peace and order in his country and study governance on the same scientific footing as he thought Galileo had done for the study of matter in motion.

Hobbes believed that the ability to create artificial animals results from man's ability to replicate nature. This ability to create artificial animals led him to the idea of an artificial person. The LEVIATHAN, or STATE, is an artificial man whose sovereignty is an artificial soul, giving life and motion to the whole body. Magistrates and other officers of judicature and execution are artificial joints, and reward and punishment are fastened to the seat of the judicial and penal system. God's fiat inspires the initial pacts and covenants of this political system or "let us make man" uttered in Creation.

Hobbes also believed that the happiness of this life is not found in the contentment of a mind at rest but in the constant progression of desire from one object to the next. This continual and insatiable thirst for more power is a general predisposition of all men that only ends with death. Sometimes a person needs more power and resources to live a good life, but this is only sometimes because he is looking for more intense pleasure or cannot be satisfied with his current power and resources. Kings, who have the most potent focus on securing power at home through laws or abroad through wars, and when that is done, a new desire arises for fame from new conquest, ease and sensual pleasure, or admiration for excellence in some art or other ability of the mind.

In summary, Hobbes believed that the ability to create artificial animals led him to the idea of an artificial person, and the LEVIATHAN, or STATE, is an artificial man. God's fiat inspires the initial pacts and covenants of this political system or "let us make man"

uttered in Creation. Hobbes believed that the happiness of this life is found in the constant progression of desire from one object to the next, and the general predisposition of all men is towards a continual and insatiable thirst for more power. Kings focus on securing power through laws or wars, and when that is done, a new desire arises for fame, ease and sensual pleasure, or admiration for excellence.

10. GOVERNMENT THEORIES

Hobbes's political philosophy emphasizes the organization of government and the relationship between protection and obedience. In *De Cive*, he departs from Aristotle's authority and rejects the renowned Aristotelian thesis that humans are born to live in a polis and do not entirely comprehend their true nature until they take on the role of the citizen. Instead, he asserts that human beings are innately unsuited to political life due to their natural tendency to demean and compete with one another, and their passions amplify the importance they place on their interests, particularly immediate and short-term ones. Hobbes believes that war is an instinct for human beings, but political order is achievable when the many agree to submit to a sovereign in exchange for physical protection and a degree of well-being.

Individual liberty is traded for collective safety in Hobbes's social contract, and the government's authority is unrestricted unless most people feel their lives are in danger from submitting. Any national church has no jurisdiction over a sovereign because he or she is preeminent in all aspects of military, legal, and religious interpretations. Hobbes believes that submission is the most acceptable kind of insurance against conflict, while total liberty encourages war. The sovereign's authority may be eroded by subjects who are afraid for their lives, and the deposed monarch is likely to suffer the wrath of those who enslaved him in vain when he is reduced to a mere commoner.

Hobbes's political beliefs influenced his work in other subjects, including history and legal theory. His history of the English Civil Wars, *Behemoth; or, The Long Parliament*, covers a view of the typical reasons for civil conflict. He views democracy as the worst type of weakening of royal authority, and metaphysics was utilized to keep individuals submissive to Roman Catholicism at the expense of civil authority. Hobbes opposes the

division of powers between the branches of government or between the state and the church, as power-crazed priests and popes have endangered legitimate civil authority throughout his religious history. In conclusion, Hobbes's political philosophy emphasizes the organization of government and the relationship between protection and obedience. He believes that human beings are innately unsuited to political life and that war is an instinct for human beings. Individual liberty is traded for collective safety in Hobbes's social contract, and the government's authority is unrestricted unless most people feel their lives are in danger from submitting. Hobbes's political beliefs influenced his work in other subjects, including history and legal theory, and he opposes the division of powers between the branches of government or between the state and the church.

10.1. Government in Pre-classical Liberal Theories

Classical liberalism is a political theory that emphasizes protecting the individual's freedom by restricting the government's power. This concept was born due to the Industrial Revolution and urbanisation in Europe and the United States. The theories of Adam Smith, John Locke, Jean-Baptiste Say, Thomas Malthus, and David Ricardo, among others, form the foundation of classical liberalism. These theorists believed in individual liberty, the conflicting theories of natural law and utilitarianism, and a belief in progress to support the theory of progress.

In the early 20th century, Conservatives embraced classical liberal economic libertarian views, advocating for protecting social and civil freedoms. However, modern American conservatism and social liberalism broke away from classical liberalism. Classical liberalism, on the other hand, was not embraced by any of the two major political parties. The limited government in preventing government intervention into economic civil rights is a crucial ideology of conservatism.

According to traditional liberalism, individuals founded government to protect themselves from each other. People can sell their goods, services, or labour to anybody except in rare circumstances where society's general welfare is in danger. This concept

aligns with limited government, where the government's power is restricted to preserve individual liberty and property rights.

In summary, classical liberalism is a political theory that emphasising protecting individual freedom by restricting government power. The theories of Adam Smith, John Locke, Jean- Baptiste Say, Thomas Malthus, and David Ricardo form the foundation of classical liberalism. Conservatives embraced classical liberal economic libertarian views, while classical liberals advocated for protecting social and civil freedoms. The limited government in the area of preventing government limitation against economic civil rights is a crucial ideology of conservatism, and the traditional liberalism notion states that individuals founded government to protect themselves from each other.

10.2. Government in The School of Classical Liberalism

Classical liberalism is a political theory emphasising individual freedom and limited government power. According to Thomas Hobbes, the government was founded by individuals to protect themselves from each other and reduce conflict that would otherwise occur in a state of nature. Classical liberals agreed with this position. Furthermore, they believed limited government power would preserve individual liberty and property rights. In addition, classical liberals believed that workers might be best motivated by money, leading to the passage of the Poor Law Amendment Act in 1834, which restricted the amount of social aid that could be provided. This was based on the population theory of Thomas Robert Malthus, who argued that population increase would surpass food production, and famine was seen as a beneficial way to restrict population growth. Classical liberals were also opposed to any redistribution of wealth or income, fearing that the lower echelons of society would squander it.

The origins of liberalism can be traced back to the Middle Ages and earlier, although it did not become prominent in European politics until the early 16th century. The gradual commercialisation and urbanisation of Europe, the intellectual ferment of the Renaissance, and the spread of Protestantism in the 16th century led to the dissolution of the old feudal stratification of society. The fear of civil dissension led to adopting

monarchical absolutism as the only remedy. However, this led to devastating conflicts such as the Thirty Years' War (1618–48).

In the 17th and 18th centuries, mercantilism, which promoted government interference in a country's economy to boost state wealth and power, was increasingly adopted by national rulers. However, the rapidly developing middle-class members criticised this intervention as it supported established interests and stifled entrepreneurship over time. These conflicts sparked the development of classical liberalism, which emphasised individual freedom and limited government power.

The English Civil Wars, the Glorious Revolution, the American Revolution, and the French Revolution were all sparked by the challenge to mercantilism. The defeat and execution of absolutist monarch Charles I by Parliament during the English Civil Wars led to the development of a system of balanced governance in which the king, his ministers, and Parliament shared power. Thomas Hobbes and John Locke formally embodied the political concepts that inspired these revolts. Hobbes argued that the sovereign's full power could only be justified if his subjects agreed to abide by him in exchange for a promise of peace and security. On the other hand, Locke believed that absolute control contradicted the purpose and justification of political authority, namely the need to safeguard individuals' safety and property and protect their inalienable rights to freedom of thought, speech, and religion. Locke argued that revolution was appropriate when the sovereign failed to meet these commitments.

10.3. Government in The Framework of New Classical Theories

In the framework of new classical theories, "homo economicus" is central. This concept originated from Hobbes's economic philosophy. It describes an individual driven solely by their own self-interest and without interest in socialising or being recognised by others. This individual is seen as an automaton lacking self-control or interest in pacifism and harmony. The State is viewed as the entity capable of controlling and planning this individual's behaviour through ideological control or coercion.

According to new classical theories, the State's role is to plan and regulate economic activity to achieve a decentralised and harmonious social order. This is achieved by

denying or seizing the information that allows for a decentralised social order and returning it from the standpoint of the institutional proposal. The State is seen as the ultimate authority that knows better than the rest of society what is good for them.

Hobbes justifies the State's control over individuals by suggesting that the State is the only institution capable of granting property and removing it. He also argues that the State must attend to the needs of the deprived and defenceless as part of its program of the legitimacy of the practice of absolute power. Finally, Hobbes suggests that the State is a despotic institution that plans the ideological factor for the human being, showing them what religion they must profess, which books they can and cannot read, which ideas are pernicious, and which ones must be banned. The State is also responsible for determining how work results are appropriated, setting up property as a prerogative of the sovereign, and distributing income and recognitions.

New classical theories view the State as the entity responsible for planning and regulating economic activity to achieve a harmonious social order. This is achieved through imposing ideological control or coercion over individuals, who are viewed as automata driven solely by self-interest. Hobbes justifies the State's control over individuals by suggesting that the State is the only institution capable of granting and removing property and attending to the needs of the deprived and defenceless.

10.3.1. Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is a philosophical theory that evaluates actions based on their usefulness in promoting the greatest happiness for the most significant number of people. In the context of Hobbes' political philosophy, there is much debate about whether he should be understood as a materialist utilitarian or more Kantian in his approach to natural law. Some writers, such as Warrender, Taylor, and Hood, see Hobbes as a continuation of the natural law tradition, while Quentin Skinner defends Hobbes as a utilitarian model. However, examining Hobbes' three political works, *The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*, *De Cive*, and *The Leviathan*, shows that Hobbes' moral and political philosophy departs significantly from Christian moral theorists.

Hobbes' departure from the natural law tradition can be seen in his views on man's ultimate goals, the definition of natural law, human rationality, and the meaning of divine providence and religious belief. According to the natural law tradition, humans should strive to do good and prevent harm. Their primary goals should be to do good and attain a natural end, such as enjoying this life and realising God's glory beyond death. In contrast, Hobbes has a much more pessimistic view of human nature. He believes that all human beings are born with a perpetual and restless craving for power after power and that they constantly seek to expand their political influence.

In Hobbes' state of nature, there is no such thing as justice or injustice, right or wrong, as there is no law where there is no joint authority. Therefore, any action taken to ensure one's own life is legitimate, and people are free to do whatever they deem necessary. When the conditions in the state of nature are so bleak that every man has a right to everything, even to one another's body, men come to a rational consensus that a social compact is the only way they may be safe and avoid violent death. The cornerstone of Hobbes' political philosophy and the construction of a commonwealth is based on these principles of obligation in people's self-interest.

Hobbes' definition of reason is based on experience and calculation rather than God-given by Aquinas, which can also be found in his alternative definition of natural law. In Hobbes' view of the world, the law is not innate, and men believe that a social compact is the only way they may be safe and avoid violent death. The cornerstone of Hobbes' political philosophy and the construction of a commonwealth is based on these principles of obligation in people's self-interest, which is the foundation of utilitarianism.

In summary, Hobbes' departure from the natural law tradition can be seen in his views on man's ultimate goals, the definition of natural law, human rationality, and the meaning of divine providence and religious belief. His political philosophy is based on principles of obligation in people's self-interest, which is the foundation of utilitarianism. While there is much debate about how to interpret Hobbes, his departure from the natural law tradition and his utilitarian model are apparent in his political works.

10.3.2. Realism

Realism in the political sphere has been recently associated with Thomas Hobbes. His emphasis on peaceful cohabitation separates him from those who see legitimacy and justice as competing objectives of politics. Hobbes' political position can only be attributed to a qualified form of autonomy, which is crucial in appraising Hobbes' liberal credentials from a realist standpoint. In Hobbes' political theory, ethics and politics play a crucial role, and his use of the term "consent" is better understood as part of a more significant effort to change the minds of his readers, which is a goal that realists share.

Hobbes' emphasis on peaceful cohabitation is a central theme in his political theory, which separates him from those who see legitimacy and justice as competing objectives of politics. According to Hobbes, the primary objective of politics is to create a stable and peaceful society. This requires a stable and centralized government, which can only be legitimate if it obtains the governor's consent. For Hobbes, legitimacy is more important than justice, as justice is a luxury that can only be afforded in a stable and peaceful society.

Hobbes' political position can only be attributed to a qualified form of autonomy, as he recognizes that individuals must surrender some of their freedom to the state to enjoy the benefits of a peaceful and stable society. This is a crucial aspect of Hobbes' political theory from a realist standpoint, as it recognizes the importance of power in politics. In Hobbes' view, the state is the only entity capable of ensuring peace and stability. Therefore, individuals must be willing to surrender some of their freedom to enjoy the benefits of a stable society.

Ethics and politics play a crucial role in Hobbes' political theory. According to Hobbes, the state has the right to punish individuals who violate its laws, but it must do so in a way consistent with natural law. This means that the state must punish individuals who violate its laws but also respect the rights of innocent individuals. This is a crucial aspect of Hobbes' political theory from a realist standpoint, as it recognizes the importance of ethics in politics. Hobbes' use of the term "consent" is better understood as part of a more significant effort to change the minds of his readers, which is a goal

that realists share. According to Hobbes, individuals must consent to be governed by the state in order for the state to be legitimate. However, Hobbes recognizes that individuals are often reluctant to surrender their freedom to the state. As a result, Hobbes uses the term "consent" to persuade individuals to surrender their freedom to the state.

In conclusion, Hobbes' emphasis on peaceful cohabitation, his recognition of the importance of power in politics, the role of ethics in politics, and his use of the term "consent" are all crucial aspects of his political theory from a realist standpoint. Hobbes' political theory recognizes the importance of power in politics and the importance of ethics in ensuring that power is exercised legitimately. Hobbes' use of the term "consent" is a way of persuading individuals to surrender their freedom to the state, which is a goal that realists share.

10.3.3. Neoclassical Approach

According to neoclassical theory, consumers' preferences are considered unchanging regardless of their current wealth or consumption level. However, behavioural economics has shown that preferences are influenced by an individual's "reference point," typically equivalent to their current wealth [Kahneman and Tversky, 1979; 1991]. Loss aversion further specifies that individuals detest negative departures from their reference point more than they enjoy positive ones. This can be shown as a kink in the value function or indifference curves at the current endowment point [Kahneman and Tversky, 1979; 1991]. This combination of loss aversion and reference dependency has led to the "endowment effect," a psychological phenomenon where people become overly attached to things they already own and are reluctant to part with them, even if they did not want them in the first place [Kahneman, Knetsch, and Thaler, 1990].

In order to address this and other issues, Köszegi and Rabin [2009] proposed a model of reference-dependent preferences, in which an individual's expectations serve as the only and definitive point of comparison. The concept has been applied in several areas, including work performance analysis [Mas, 2006] and labour supply analysis [Farber, 2008]. However, the increased accuracy of the model comes at a cost, as it proposes introducing the concept of a "personal equilibrium," in which expectations and

behaviour are mutually consistent for an individual. This issue has been largely ignored in tests of the model, and the question of how behaviour can be explained by the assumption that expectations are the reference point has been overlooked.

In conclusion, neoclassical theory assumes that consumers' preferences are unchanging regardless of their wealth or consumption level. However, behavioural economics has shown that preferences are influenced by an individual's reference point, which can lead to loss aversion and the endowment effect. Köszegi and Rabin's model of reference-dependent preferences has been developed to address some of the issues with reference dependence. However, it introduces the concept of a personal equilibrium, which has not been fully explored in tests of the model.

CHAPTER THREE: HOBBS' POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND THE NATURE OF GOVERNMENT

1. HOBBS EPISTEMOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy is rooted in his epistemology and anthropology. He believed that the key to avoiding societal collapse and maintaining security was to unite and find a means of maintaining order and safety within that community. Hobbes argued that the universal condition of human mortality and the mutual and incompatible desires of persons gave each individual a universal right to all things, leading to perpetual war unless society was united under a common sovereign.

Hobbes' view of human nature was based on the idea that all humans are equal in physical and mental faculties. The drive for self-preservation and fear of death is the fundamental motivation for human behaviour. This drive for self-preservation can lead to violence against others in a state of nature outside the boundaries of convention and law. Hobbes believed that a rational allegiance to the law manifests this existential instability within society, as it is governed by the famous covenant under the compulsion of the common sovereign. The artificial unity of voice in the sovereign and the shared mortality of the citizens binds the people in a community of fear, where natural equality finds its most perfect expression in the mutual destruction of total war.

Hobbes' approach focuses on only those characteristics and motivations that can be assumed to be inherent in each person's inner drive, with Kantian rationalism at the heart of the law. He disregards other-regarding motivations such as generosity and kindness, not because they are impossible but because they put us at risk when we assume they exist in our fellows. Hobbes' view of human nature is similar to Niccolo Machiavelli's, who believed that desires could outstrip our abilities and that the fear of death is a powerful motivator. However, Machiavelli sees habit and custom as essential to thoroughly understanding causes, while Hobbes sees them as a hindrance. Hobbes

argues that custom is irrelevant to or seriously impairs the procedures we open the world of causes. Nonetheless, Hobbes' inferences from these fundamental conditions of human existence can be troubling. They suggest that the fear of death drives people to do whatever it takes to keep themselves alive, even sacrificing others.

1.1. The Nature of The State and The Foundations Of Its establishment in Hobbes' Political Philosophy

Hobbes argues that in the state of nature, individuals have a right to everything, including each other's possessions and even their lives. This leads to a constant state of war between individuals, where the strong dominate the weak, and there is no security or stability. Therefore, Hobbes argues that individuals must surrender their rights to a sovereign power that can establish and enforce laws to ensure peace and security.

Hobbes' concept of the state is based on the idea of the social contract, where individuals give up their natural rights in exchange for protection and security provided by the state. The state has absolute power, and individuals must obey its laws or face punishment. Hobbes believed that the state should be ruled by an absolute monarch, who has the power to make and enforce laws without interference.

In conclusion, Hobbes' political philosophy is based on the state of nature, where individuals have an infinite right to everything, and a constant state of war prevails. In order to escape this state of war, individuals must surrender their rights to a sovereign power that can establish and enforce laws to ensure peace and security. Hobbes' concept of the state is based on the social contract, where individuals give up their natural rights in exchange for protection and security provided by the state.

2. THE HOBBIAN PHILOSOPHY OF EXISTENCE

Hobbes' philosophy of existence is based on the idea of the state of nature, which is a hypothetical scenario where individuals are free to do as they please without any external control or authority. According to Hobbes, in such a state, individuals would constantly be in a state of war, and life would be "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and

short". Therefore, Hobbes argues that individuals must surrender their rights to a sovereign power, who can establish and enforce laws to ensure peace and security.

Hobbes' mechanical view of human nature and its drives is based on the idea that humans are driven by self-interest and the desire for self-preservation. Therefore, in the state of nature, individuals would only act in their own self-interest, leading to a constant state of war. Hobbes argues that the only way to escape this state of war is through the establishment of a social contract and a civil society, where individuals give up part of their rights for protection.

According to Hobbes, the sovereign authority must have absolute power and control over civil, military, judicial, and ecclesiastical authority. The sovereign's power cannot be opposed since it is derived from the individuals who give up their sovereignty in exchange for protection. Therefore, individuals cannot complain about any harm caused by the sovereign since they themselves are the source of the sovereign's power.

In conclusion, Hobbes' philosophy of existence is based on the idea of the state of nature, where individuals are driven by self-interest and constantly in a state of war. To escape this state of war, individuals must surrender their rights to a sovereign power, who can establish and enforce laws to ensure peace and security. The sovereign must have absolute power and control over all forms of authority, and individuals cannot complain about any harm caused by the sovereign since they themselves are the source of the sovereign's power.

2.1. Consequences of the establishment of the Hobbesian government

The establishment of the Hobbesian government has several consequences. Firstly, men are doomed to a life of violence and oppression without a powerful government due to their natural situation, which is untenable. Humans are naturally prone to conflict and cannot coexist peacefully without higher authority. Secondly, the human condition is troublesome and only leads to chaos and conflict due to our innate impulses and regular behavioural patterns.

The natural state of humans, or the state of nature, is undesirable and should be avoided at all costs. In the state of nature, there is no governing organization to apply concepts like right and wrong, justice and injustice. Instead, each individual is free to pursue self-preservation and do whatever it takes to accomplish it. This leads to a constant state of war where all men are each other's enemies, and there is no security or stability.

Hobbes argues that the only way to escape this state of war is through establishing a commonwealth, where men yield their power to one man and subject their wills to his will and their judgments to his judgments. The construction of a commonwealth is rational and necessary given the problematic character of humans, the "miserable situation" of the state of nature, and the limited possibility that men will comply with the laws of nature.

Hobbes also argues that the only way to establish the joint authority necessary to sustain peace and security is through a covenant, in which men give up their rights in exchange for protection provided by the sovereign. The sovereign has absolute power and control over civil, military, judicial, and ecclesiastical authority, and individuals must obey its laws or face punishment.

In conclusion, establishing the Hobbesian government has several consequences, including avoiding a constant state of war and establishing peace and security through a commonwealth and a covenant. The sovereign has absolute power and control over all forms of authority, and individuals must obey its laws or face punishment.

2.2. Types of Founding Governments According to Hobbes

According to Hobbes, the only way to establish order and peace is through the formation of a supreme power that can impose peace on everyone. This supreme power is established through a social contract, in which individuals give up their natural rights of equality and freedom and hand over absolute power to a ruler or sovereign. Hobbes believed that a monarchy was the most acceptable form of government for the sovereign, as it allowed for more confident and consistent use of political power.

Furthermore, Hobbes argued that the social contract was a binding pact between citizens rather than their sovereign. Once the people had given the king ultimate power, they had no right to revolt against him. Hobbes also warned against the church interfering in the king's government, as he believed that religion could lead to civil war. Instead, he suggested that the church should be a component of the king's administration, and the king should keep a close eye on all religious affairs.

Hobbes believed that the sovereign must set and enforce the rules to maintain a peaceful community, allowing for the preservation of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If there is a disagreement between the divine and royal law, the individual must obey the monarch or face death. In conclusion, Hobbes believed that a monarchy was the best form of government for the sovereign, as it allowed for the confident and consistent use of political power, and the social contract was a binding pact between citizens rather than their sovereign.

3. HOBBS'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS HUMAN NATURE

Hobbes's attitude towards human nature is that humans are naturally selfish and vain and seek to dominate and demand respect from others. He argues that the natural state of humanity is a state of war in which individuals are engaged in a "war of all against all." This makes life "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short." Hobbes believes that individuals have a natural right to do whatever they believe is necessary to maintain their lives in such a situation and that neither morality nor law existed before establishing the commonwealth. Therefore, individuals in the state of nature are not constrained by moral or legal obligations, and notions of right and wrong, justice and injustice have no place in nature.

According to Hobbes, human liberty means the freedom to act physically without moral or legal considerations. He argues that it is rational and necessary to seek peace to satisfy our desires, including our natural desire for self-preservation because the state of nature is a constant and comprehensive war. In order to live in harmony with the natural world and avoid its perils, Hobbes argues that the "laws of nature" can be revealed by

the human power of reason. These laws of nature are general principles of conduct that restrict individuals from engaging in self-destructive or self-defeating activity.

In conclusion, Hobbes's attitude towards human nature is that humans are naturally selfish and vain and seek to dominate and demand respect from others. He believes that the natural state of humanity is a state of war, in which individuals have a natural right to do whatever they believe is necessary to maintain their lives. However, he also argues that it is rational and necessary to seek peace to satisfy our desires and that the human power of reason can reveal the laws of nature.

3.1. Hobbes's mechanical interpretation of human nature

Hobbes's interpretation of human nature is mechanical, according to which the motions and interactions of material bodies can explain all phenomena in the universe. He did not subscribe to the common notions of a soul, mind, or other intangible or metaphysical entities. Instead, he viewed humans as virtual machines, with their thoughts and emotions operating according to physical laws and chains of action and reaction. According to Hobbes, we are always looking for ways to maximise our well-being and minimise our suffering, similar to machines.

Similarly, Hobbes viewed the commonwealth or society as an artificial machine still operating according to the laws governing motion and collisions. His contemporaries Galileo and Kepler influenced Hobbes, whose discoveries of laws governing planetary motion discredited much of the Aristotelian geocentric worldview. Hobbes hoped to establish similar laws of motion to explain human behaviour. He hoped to arrive at his laws of motion deductively as in geometrical proofs.

However, it is essential to note that Hobbes could not demonstrate that physical and mechanical processes can explain all human experiences. It would have required a level of scientific knowledge unimaginable in the 17th century. Although many people believe that science will one day be able to explain the human experience in physical terms fully, this is still far from reality. Hence, Hobbes's interpretation of the human being as a machine is more of a metaphor than a philosophical argument.

In conclusion, Hobbes's mechanical interpretation of human nature views humans as virtual machines, with their thoughts and emotions operating according to physical laws and chains of action and reaction. He hoped to establish laws of motion to explain human behaviour deductively, similar to geometrical proofs. However, he could not demonstrate that physical and mechanical processes can explain all human experiences. His interpretation of the human being as a machine is more of a metaphor than a philosophical argument.

3.2. Common features of human nature

According to Hobbes, human nature is characterised by a natural inclination to seek self-preservation and to do whatever is necessary to achieve that goal. Men are preoccupied with ensuring their survival; everything else matters once accomplished. They are naturally inclined to get what they want, do what they want, and live their lives however they see fit. This is because the right to survival is an inalienable human right. Men are free to use their power for the purposes they deem beneficial in the natural world, even if it means acting in their self-interest.

However, Hobbes also argues that men are not born social and that it is not in their nature to seek a relationship with another human being. Despite this, he believes that men will eventually establish a global government with absolute power over all human beings. This is because, even though human nature is flawed and egocentric, it still drives men toward society for survival. Therefore, it is logical that if men's primary motivation is to ensure their survival, they will eventually realise that cooperating is the best course of action.

Furthermore, Hobbes argues that in the state of nature, where there are no rules or higher authority to hold men accountable for their actions, men are free to do as they please. However, for the "fundamental law of nature" to be enforced, there must be agreements or "covenants," and men must "perform their covenants made." Otherwise, "we are still in a state of war." Hobbes believes that defecting is the best option in the state of nature compared to the prisoner's dilemma. This is because it is more

advantageous not to keep one's word in the state of nature, and men will never keep their promises.

In summary, according to Hobbes, human nature is characterised by a natural inclination to seek self-preservation and do whatever is necessary to achieve that goal. Therefore, men are preoccupied with ensuring their survival and have the freedom to use their power for the purposes they deem beneficial in the natural world, even if it means acting in their self-interest. However, Hobbes also believes that men will eventually establish a global government with absolute power over all human beings because it is only logical that if men's primary motivation is to ensure their survival, they will eventually realise that cooperating is the best course of action.

4. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICS AND PSYCHOLOGY IN HOBBS

Hobbes's understanding of human nature and psychology forms the foundation for his political philosophy. In *Leviathan*, he employs a scientific approach to his political argument, starting with his views on the nature of the mind and the psychology of humans. He reconstructs the commonwealth by putting its members into a state of nature, an abstract shape, before political society was formed. Hobbes believes that by studying the behaviour of humans in this controlled environment, he has discovered the causes of commonwealths. He employs the paradigm of geometry to define the fundamental features of human nature and then draws conclusions based on these.

Hobbes's political conclusions are based on his understanding of psychology, which he sees as a form of natural philosophy. He believes that moral philosophy can be seen as a starting point for political philosophy, as it establishes the fundamental ethical principles from which social conclusions are deduced. Hobbes resolves humans into their "parts," which are their mental actions, following his method of resolution of the commonwealth.

However, it is essential to note that Hobbes only sometimes consistently or rigorously applies a scientific method to political matters consistently or rigorously. In *Leviathan*, he employs many rhetorical devices to make his point rather than relying solely on

definitions and fundamental principles. Hobbes may have used these devices to reach a broader audience, which could have political implications. He also acknowledges the importance of personal reflection and self-examination in understanding his political ideas. In the introduction to *Leviathan*, he suggests that self-examination is the best way to understand his political ideas. In conclusion, Hobbes's political philosophy is based on his understanding of human nature and psychology, which he approaches scientifically. He employs the paradigm of geometry to define the fundamental features of human nature, and his political conclusions are drawn based on these principles. However, he only sometimes applies a scientific method to political matters consistently, and he also acknowledges the importance of personal reflection and self-examination in understanding his political ideas.

6. THE FORMATION OF POLITICAL SOCIETY AND THE EMERGENCE OF POLITICAL POWER

Political systems can collapse due to various factors, such as military catastrophes, economic crises, deterioration of social relations, and the erosion of an individual's sense of security. The outbreak of revolutions in other political systems can also be a catalyst. In times of crisis, the quality of political leadership is often a deciding factor. Those systems that allow for the selection and replacement of capable political leaders have a significant advantage. The ability of government structures and processes to meet the demands placed on them is another condition of political systems' survival.

However, political systems can break down when there is a need for more general agreement on what constitutes appropriate political action and how to implement it. The issue of legitimacy confronts all newly established regimes, and the breakdown of political systems is exacerbated by the lack of a fundamental consensus on what constitutes acceptable political behaviour. For example, in systems with no agreed limits on the role of violence, many forms of political activity must be restricted, contributing to public dissatisfaction.

In summary, the formation of political society and the emergence of political power are complex processes that various factors can influence. The ability of government

structures and processes to meet the demands placed on them is a critical factor in political systems' survival, as is the quality of political leadership. The lack of agreement on what constitutes acceptable political behaviour can contribute to the breakdown of political systems. Many forms of political activity must be restricted if the government cannot rely on widespread support for peaceful political procedures. Ultimately, political stability is vital for the well-being of society, and efforts must be made to ensure that political systems are resilient and responsive to the demands of their citizens.

7. NATURAL SOCIETY

In a natural society, justice, commerce, and culture cannot thrive without a higher authority adjudicating dispute. Individuals must cede their natural rights to everything in exchange for the authority of a civil authority more significant than themselves, known as Leviathan. This social contract ensures that individuals are less vulnerable to attack or eviction. While Hobbes did not assume that such an agreement occurred historically, he claimed it was the best way to understand the state.

According to Hobbes, no one is above the sovereign's will, who has absolute power. However, this does not mean that the sovereign's authority is unrestricted. In cases where the sovereign is silent, subjects are free to act as they see fit. Social contracts allow people to leave the state of nature and join civil society, but the threat of the state of nature always looms large. The fall of Leviathan is unlikely unless it can no longer protect its citizens from its might.

In conclusion, the concept of natural society highlights the need for a higher authority to adjudicate disputes and ensure that justice, commerce, and culture can thrive. The social contract involves individuals ceding their natural rights to a civil authority more significant than themselves, allowing people to leave the state of nature and join civil society. While the sovereign's power is viewed as absolute by Hobbes, this does not mean its authority is unrestricted. The fall of Leviathan is improbable unless it can no longer protect its citizens from its might.

8. PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE HOBBIAN SOCIAL CONTRACT

Recent research into Hobbes' views on women and family has highlighted his recognition of the value of including women in creating a social contract. Hobbes advocates for the equality of all people, including women, based on the premise that we are all equally vulnerable to domination. He rejects the belief that women are born inferior and subservient, which was a widespread view at the time. Instead, he sees women and men as inherently equal and innately free, with the need to consent before they can be subordinated to anyone else's authority.

However, Hobbes' use of patriarchal language to describe the commonwealth is at odds with this egalitarian foundation. In the transition from the natural world to the civilised one, he uses terms such as "fathers," "servants," and "children" to describe family members. According to Hobbes, fathers, not mothers, have built societies. This has led to debates about whether Hobbes' patriarchal claims are integral to his theory, with some emphasising the potential feminist or egalitarian aspects of his thought and others emphasising his ultimate exclusion of women.

In contrast to Hobbes, John Locke rejects the patriarchalism view and the Salic law, extending the definition of 'authority' to include 'either male or female.' He also supports the idea of a natural maternal right, in which the mother has dominion over her children by default. Thus, while Hobbes' views on women and family have been the subject of recent debates, it is clear that his egalitarian foundation and recognition of the value of including women in creating a social contract were significant contributions to Western philosophy.

In conclusion, Hobbes' social contract theory recognises the equality of all people, including women, based on the premise that we are all equally vulnerable to domination. However, his use of patriarchal language to describe the commonwealth has led to debates about the integral nature of his patriarchal claims to his theory. Nonetheless, his recognition of the value of including women in creating a social

contract was a significant contribution to Western philosophy, as was his rejection of the belief that women are born inferior and subservient.

8.1. Ontological principles

Hobbes is considered a pioneer among Western philosophers for including women in formulating a social contract between individuals. He advocates for the equality of all people, including women, based on the premise that to be equal, one must be subject to dominance and be able to dominate others. Hobbes rejects the prevailing view that women are born inferior and subordinate to men and explicitly rejects patriarchy and Salic law. He also recognises the natural right of mothers to rule over their children, which is a point of contention for some.

However, Hobbes' use of patriarchal language to describe the commonwealth contradicts his egalitarian foundation. In the transition from the natural world to the civilised one, he uses terms such as "fathers," "servants," and "children" to describe family members. According to Hobbes, societies are founded by fathers, not mothers. This has led to debates about the integral nature of Hobbes' patriarchal claims to his overall theory.

These debates raise the question of how integral, if at all, Hobbes' patriarchal claims are to his overall theory. Nonetheless, Hobbes' recognition of the equality of all people, including women, significantly contributed to Western philosophy. He rejected prevailing views that women were born inferior and subordinate to men and explicitly rejected patriarchy and Salic law. Although his use of patriarchal language contradicts his egalitarian foundation, it is essential to consider the context in which he was writing and the prevailing beliefs of his time.

In conclusion, Hobbes' ontological principles recognise the equality of all people, including women, based on the premise that to be equal, one must be subject to dominance and be able to dominate others. He rejected prevailing views that women were born inferior and subordinate to men and explicitly rejected patriarchy and Salic law. However, his use of patriarchal language to describe the commonwealth raises questions about the integral nature of his patriarchal claims to his overall theory.

Nonetheless, his recognition of the value of including women in creating a social contract contributed to Western philosophy.

8.2. Subjectivity and humanism

The rise of technology has kept humanist ideas and practices, even in our late age of print. However, mid-twentieth century schools of anti-humanism challenged the Enlightenment ideal of the rational individual by postulating a "subject" constructed by its language, culture, and technologies. According to Lacanian psychoanalytic theory, cybernetics and computers are evidence of a symbolic order that can be used to construct a subject. Heidegger's post-war conceptions of technology also influenced this idea. As a result, posthumanism has emerged as a new discourse in new media, challenging the dominant discourse on the subject in contemporary theory.

As a result, the theory itself is being questioned. It raises the question of whether the posthuman subject of technology is rewriting the anti-humanist subject of theory in new and unexpected ways. This calls into question the very nature of the theory itself.

In the context of Hobbes' social contract theory, subjectivity and humanism are essential considerations. Hobbes' theory is based on the premise that individuals must cede their natural rights to a civil authority more significantly than themselves. This raises questions about the individual's nature and role in society. The posthuman subject of technology challenges traditional notions of the individual by postulating a subject constructed by its language, culture, and technologies. This challenges the Enlightenment ideal of the rational individual and raises questions about the nature of subjectivity.

In conclusion, subjectivity and humanism are essential considerations in the context of Hobbes' social contract theory. The rise of posthumanism and the posthuman subject of technology challenges traditional notions of the individual and raises questions about the nature of subjectivity. This calls into question the very nature of the theory itself and raises essential questions about the role of the individual in society.

8.3. Secularism

The concept of authority has undergone numerous transformations throughout history, and institutions of power have often attempted to portray themselves as institutions of authority. However, the concept of authority has been ambiguous. Citizens can legitimately oppose or disobey the decisions made by power if they perceive them as arbitrary or tyrannical. Medieval theologians and philosophers such as John of Salisbury and Thomas Aquinas held this view, and it was used to justify the right to resist the tyrant. In contrast, Hobbes rejected these ideas and adopted Jean Bodin's current account of sovereignty, which he radicalised. For Hobbes, any divided, shared, limited, or incomplete power was essentially worthless, and he opposed the mixed constitution and any form of power distribution or limitation. He sought to recast authority as a form of power and attempted to remove it from its original meaning. Regarding religion, Hobbes was firmly in the Erastian camp. His social contract was renamed the "pact of authorisation" in *Leviathan*, reflecting his view that sovereignty is a conflation of power and authority.

Hobbes believed that all forms of power must be acknowledged as having authority, and sovereign power is the only source of authority. Thus, the state is both the source of authority and the locus of power, and authority cannot be found outside one's own country. This view of authority reflects Hobbes' rejection of the medieval view that citizens have the right to resist the tyrant and his belief that the state must have absolute power to ensure social stability and prevent chaos.

In conclusion, Hobbes' rejection of the medieval view of authority and his adoption of Bodin's current account of sovereignty reflects his belief in the state's absolute power. He recast authority as a form of power and sought to remove it from its original meaning, and he believed that sovereign power is the only source of authority. While this view of authority differs significantly from the medieval view, it reflects Hobbes' belief in the importance of absolute state power to ensure social stability and prevent chaos.

9. EPISTEMOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS

A Companion to Hobbes provides a comprehensive examination of Thomas Hobbes's thought, presenting him as a systematic philosopher in various ways. Hobbes believed that society must submit to the supreme authority of sovereign power to be free. Despite this, he produced a wide range of writings, including translations of works by Homer and Thucydides, interpretations of Biblical books, and works on geometry and optics. By advocating an interconnected system of philosophical thought, Hobbes sought to present a unified approach to theoretical and practical science.

The Companion features numerous essays exploring Hobbes's ideas about natural philosophy, mathematics, the nature of human nature, the philosophy of the state, and religion. Philosophers such as Immanuel Kant, René Descartes, Margaret Cavendish, and David Hume have all influenced various aspects of Hobbism. The Companion examines these and other thinkers' reception of Hobbes's philosophy. In addition, it offers a wide range of new perspectives from established and emerging scholars.

The book thoroughly examines Hobbes's significant works, including *Elements of Law*, *Elements of Philosophy*, and *Leviathan*. It guides Hobbes's philosophical system, helping readers understand how the various parts fit together. It also examines Hobbes's philosophy of mathematics and how he tried to understand geometrical objects and definitions. The Companion reexamines Hobbes's moral theory and claims about sovereign rights, and it considers Hobbes's philosophy in light of various issues, including human nature, gender roles, and materialist worldviews.

A Companion to Hobbes is an invaluable addition to the acclaimed Blackwell Companions to Philosophy series. It will interest students and scholars of early modern thought, particularly those from philosophy, political philosophy, intellectual history, history of political theory, and English. It thoroughly examines Hobbes's thoughts, presenting him as a systematic philosopher and offering new perspectives on his ideas.

9.1. Hobbes from the originality of experience to the originality of reason

Thomas Hobbes's interests in politics and natural science were nurtured by his connections with the Cavendish and Devonshire families, which allowed him to participate in various intellectual communities in England and on the continent. Before his work in political philosophy, Hobbes worked in practical politics, and his employer's involvement with the Virginia Company brought him into contact with influential people. Through these meetings, he engaged in discussions about political issues, including the role of the Anglican church and how it should be governed and how it should interact with any English civil government.

In the late 1630s, King Charles I and Parliament were at odds over the extent of the king's powers. Hobbes defended King Henry VIII's prerogatives in a treatise circulated in manuscript form and used in debates by royalist members of Parliament. Hobbes's first work of political philosophy, the *Elements of Law, Natural and Political*, was written in 1640 and published in a misdated unauthorized version in 1650. It was not intended to be published as a book.

Hobbes's interest in mathematics and science was piqued by his conversations and readings on the continent, and he became a self-taught scientist and innovator in fields like optics. His great trilogy, *De Corpore*, *De Homine*, and *De Cive*, was his attempt to organize natural science, psychology, and politics into a hierarchy. In *Leviathan*, the final and most famous formulation of his political philosophy, the political science contained in *De Cive* was substantially anticipated in Part II of *The Elements of Law*.

Hobbes feared for his life in 1640 and fled to Paris, where he worked on optics and his major works of political philosophy. He even agreed to teach mathematics to the future Charles II when the prince sought refuge in Paris in 1646. Hobbes's connections with influential families and his interest in various areas of knowledge, including politics, mathematics, and natural science, shaped his thought and contributed to his unique perspective on the world.

9.2. Separation from holy reason

Hobbes has specific ideas about the true nature, scope, and exercise of sovereignty, which can alleviate some of our anxieties about living under an authoritarian-sounding

regime. However, he believes that neither philosopher Hobbes nor we the people have the authority to determine the proper parameters under which sovereignty should be exercised. To justify any limits or constraints placed on the sovereign, he must make judgments about moral or practical requirements, which presents a persistent challenge. Any right or entitlement can only be practically meaningful when paired with a concrete judgment about what it dictates in a given situation.

Hobbes concedes that the one aspect of his system that cannot be proven with certainty is the question of what or who should constitute the sovereign power. While he imagines a King or Queen in his writings, he was well-versed in ancient forms of government such as aristocracy and democracy. He argues that each has its own set of positives and negatives, but a single head of state with clear succession rules that eliminate any room for disagreement makes monarchy his preferred system.

To understand Hobbes's sovereignty, we must begin with the question of judgment if we are to lay down concrete ideas about its nature and limits. In his view, distributing judgment-making abilities amongst different people is the same as reintroducing the natural order to society. The division of a commonwealth's power is equivalent to dissolving it, because powers divided destroy each other. However, Hobbes does not go into great detail about this issue, despite it being central to his theory. The fact that only a few extreme forms of disagreement possess the perilous power to end the commonwealth is apparent to us, and dividing government powers does not necessitate an increase in the likelihood of violent clashes.

Therefore, many people believe that political compromises that give various groups and bodies the freedom to weigh in on controversial social or political issues are essential if we are to avoid violence or civil war. While Hobbes's ideas about sovereignty may have some relevance today, his inability to predict the expansion of government and its powers limits their applicability to modern times.

10. ANTHROPOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES

Hobbes's political problems stem from his anthropological view of human vision, which he uses as a starting point for his political philosophy. He refers to the human being as a

being endowed with speech, which is the foundation of human society. Hobbes's life was marked by political upheaval in England, including the civil war that saw the Commonwealth rise and fall before the monarchy was restored. He fled to Europe in 1640, where he spent time with Descartes and travelled to Italy's warring principalities to hone his philosophical chops.

Despite his royal sympathies and support for democratic philosophy, Hobbes was a devout Christian with naturalistic and materialist views that could be read as atheistic. He was a man of contradictions, but his philosophy laid the groundwork for the Enlightenment philosophers. According to Hobbes's political philosophy, individuals will always act according to what they believe is in their own best interest. He believed that man's natural state was a war between individuals, sparked by the fact that each person could destroy the other in some way.

Hobbes believed that in man's original state, each individual has unrestricted rights, such as the ability to kill anyone they choose. However, if A has the right to kill B and B has the right to live, then it follows that no one has the right to anything. People willingly give up their rights to an absolute sovereign in the hopes of reducing general misery, suffering, and death, because doing so would be in the best interests of each individual. This is how Hobbes sees it, and the term "social contract" refers to the idea that the power of government is based on the people's will and was instrumental in the development of Enlightenment writers.

10.1. Pessimistic view of human nature

Despite the many new discoveries made during the Enlightenment that would typically produce a more optimistic view, human nature's outlook and views were still excessively pessimistic. This pessimistic view of human nature can be seen in the concept of the "tragedy of the commons," which has been around for a long time. This idea states that public resources (such as air, water, and land) can be depleted if people use them selfishly.

However, Nobel Prize-winning economist Elinor Ostrom's study of how people worldwide manage the commons when they are left to their own devices shows that

people act cooperatively and do not require social control once certain elements are present. This optimistic view of human nature can also be applied to crime prevention and prison reform. Prisons that treat their prisoners humanely prevent more crime and recidivism than those that do not, and getting "tough on crime" and handing out harsh prison sentences is not the best way to reduce crime.

Bregman's book, which argues that our better nature will prevail if we recognise its existence, offers additional suggestions for seeing the good in people, such as "When in doubt, trust first," "Temper your empathy," and "Avoid the news." He believes that a more egalitarian society can be created if we believe that everyone is born good, and paying attention to science and personal experience is all that is required. He concludes that there is nothing sentimental or simplistic about believing that people are born with a desire to be kind, and that it is both courageous and realistic to believe in peace and forgiveness.

10.2. Mechanical view of man

As far as Hobbes was concerned, all phenomena in the universe could be explained in terms of the motions and interactions of material objects. Others have believed in concepts such as the soul and mind as distinct from one's physical body, but he rejected them. As a result, he saw human beings as essential machines, with even their thoughts and emotions following physical laws and chains of cause and effect, action and response. In the same way that machines avoid pain and seek pleasure mechanically, human beings do the same as machines. Similarly, Hobbes viewed the commonwealth (or society) as a machine, more significant than the human body and artificial but still operating according to the laws governing motion and collision.

For Hobbes, the discoveries of Galileo and Kepler, who had discovered laws governing planetary motion and thus discredited much of Aristotle's worldview, were influential in putting together this materialist worldview. Galileo and Kepler's mathematical precision impressed Hobbes more than their use of empirical data and observation. Hobbes hoped to establish similar laws of motion to explain human behaviour. His goal was to prove his motion theories deductively, in the manner of geometrical proofs, like those used by

Hobbes. That Hobbes could not demonstrate that physical and mechanical processes can explain all human experience should not be underestimated. This would have necessitated a level of scientific

11. THE FRUITS OF HOBBS'S PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS IN HIS THEORY OF SOCIAL CONTRACT

In the United States, the number of anti-government organisations is rising. Some militia groups believe that an armed populace is a necessary safeguard against government tyranny. People's concerns about the economy are also a factor in their decision-making process. Some also express anti-immigration sentiments in response to the rise of non-whites. Despite their differing goals, the groups all oppose the government's efforts to limit citizens' freedoms; some are even preparing for revolution and war. When a car bomb killed 168 people in Oklahoma City's federal office building, 19 of them were children in a daycare centre on the ninth floor. An anti-government militia group's message was that the government should not take away our freedoms which motivated the bombing.

As defenders of liberty, we accept some of the anti-government groups' ideological messages, while rejecting others because of their extremism. In the minds of many anti-government groups, the primary purpose of a government is to protect us from foreign invasions. However, the government oversteps its bounds by enforcing unjust restrictions on people's rights. According to the US Constitution, "When any form of government becomes destructive to these ends [i.e., the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness], it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to establish new government."

Social contract theory is the underlying philosophy of these anti-government groups. The so-called social contract theory is legitimate and historically significant when applied to political and moral obligations in a less extreme form. Social contract theory outlines a disease and then proposes a remedy. Humans are infected with a disease that prevents them from forming and maintaining cooperative societies. The remedy is a governing body that we set up specifically to enforce our contractual agreement to treat

one another civilly. The moral obligations we have to one another are based on this mutual contract.

The history of the theory of the social contract is mixed at best. In his dialogue *The Republic*, Plato makes an allusion to such a hypothesis. A sceptic named Glaucon claims that people are born with a natural tendency to exploit one another. To avoid being exploited, we have agreed to refrain from exploitation in exchange for our own protection: it is only after people have experienced the wrongs of both perpetrating and being a victim of injustice that they conclude that it is better to agree amongst themselves to have neither; thus, laws and mutual covenants are enacted, and the things that are prescribed by law are considered legal and just. [*The Republic*, 2] .358e]

In Glaucon's view, the rules of justice are based on the mutual contracts that we make. This scepticism about the origins of morality was rejected by Plato, who maintained that moral truths are rooted in a higher, eternal realm. Plato's view on morality has been widely accepted for nearly two millennia. To put it another way, they held that both morality and government authority are based on objective natural laws that God himself approves. There were a few philosophers in the seventeenth century who advocated for a more humanistic approach to the study of morality. An early proponent of the social contract theory was English philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679). In this chapter, we'll look at Hobbes's theory and its critics.

Among Hobbes' best-known works are *The Leviathan* and *A Treatise on the Rights of Man* (1651). A powerful governing body is like the "Leviathan," a large mythological sea creature depicted in the Hebrew Bible and earlier Canaanite mythology, for Hobbes. As a "king over all the children of pride," a great sea creature is described in the Hebrew Bible. He also saw the government as an oppressor of prideful people, because they are forced to form a government to protect themselves from their own self-importance.

It is a common theme in science fiction stories that modern society is wiped out by a nuclear war or a catastrophic ecological catastrophe. A few lone humans scavenge through the ruins of destroyed cities in search of food, fuel, and ammunition in an effort to stay alive. Every encounter with another human is a battle for the other person's possessions that can either be fatal or life-saving. As opposed to trying to paint a picture

of a future world devastated by a post-apocalyptic event, Hobbes asks us to imagine what life was like before there were any established authorities to guide us. The situation Hobbes describes is as gruesome as any science fiction tale. He refers to this savage state as "nature" in his writings. He's not trying to portray a specific period in human history, but rather the limitations of our human nature and the consequences of our socially awkward tendencies. But why is nature in such a socially awkward state? Similarly to how science fiction movies depict the future as a utopia, we can imagine a more primitive human condition in which people get along perfectly. The first and most fundamental reason why people would be so unsociable in the natural world is that we are selfish and incurable. It is impossible for us to avoid acting in ways that benefit only ourselves, because selfishness is ingrained in our emotions and thought processes. Even if we appear to be motivated by compassion and kindness, we are still thinking about ourselves at the root of our actions.

Another factor that contributes to our aloofness is the belief that we can get what we want in life with little resistance from others because we are all roughly on par in terms of intellectual cunning and physical strength. It takes time and effort for each of us to reach a similar level of intellectual development, but we can all get there. Even if a bigger person could beat me in an arm wrestling match, I can outsmart him with my cunning. According to Hobbes, the "weakest has strength enough to kill the strongest, either by secret mechanisation or in confederacy with others who are in the same danger as himself," he writes. The idea of intellectual and physical equality may appear to be a good thing, but it only perpetuates conflict in nature. Superman, for example, could simply seize control and compel others to cooperate by virtue of his superhuman physical abilities. If a person had superhuman intellect, perhaps the same thing would happen. But since we're all equal in the natural world, no one will emerge to take charge.

Third, we're socially awkward because we're naturally argumentative and always ready for a fight. As Hobbes points out, there are three main reasons for this. First and foremost, we all want things that are scarce. Food, clothing, and shelter are things that all of us look for in our lives. There would be no need to engage in conflict if all of our

physical needs could be met by simply reaching up and picking things off a tree. The truth, however, is quite different.

Because of the scarcity of necessities, we quickly turn on one another and see each other as rivals. As a result, we aim to conquer "men's persons, wives, children, and cattle" by using violence. The second reason for conflict is that once we've acquired something, we begin to distrust others and begin to attack them. This isn't just irrational fear; it's a necessary safeguard for the things we've worked so hard to acquire. People who win large sums of money in the lottery, for example, are frequently targeted by con artists who offer them dubious investment opportunities in an attempt to defraud them of their winnings. We'll be better able to hold onto what we've learned if we're wary of outsiders. This mistrust manifests itself in our natural inclination toward violence. The third reason why people get into fights is to protect our reputations as tough guys who can't be trifled with. People will see us as vulnerable if our reputations take a hit.

As a result of this, the world is in a state of war, with everyone and everything fighting each other. As in the cold war between the US and the USSR, this includes actual as well as anticipated wars that are characterised by constant military posturing. When the outcome of industry is uncertain, there is no place for it, and as a result no place for agriculture, navigation or the use of goods that can be imported by sea; no place for a comfortable home; no tools for moving heavy objects; no knowledge of the surface of the earth; no account of time; no place for Hobbes's description of this state of war. [Leviathan, 13].

The state of nature for Hobbes is one in which we would be deprived of all of the social comforts that can only be achieved through cooperation. In order to protect ourselves, we would not even attempt to grow our own food, import our own goods, or build our own homes on our own. They would see what we have, want it, and kill us to get their hands on it. This means that we would not have any "knowledge of the face of Earth" because we are only concerned with protecting ourselves from other people's attacks. As long as we're fighting for our lives right now, we have "no account of time. We wouldn't have any art or literature if we didn't have a means of sustaining ourselves first. Without trust and cooperation, we would not be able to form any kind of society. "Solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" would be the sum total of our human existence.

With nature as it is, do we expect any kind of ethics? The answer is a resounding "no!" There is no place for right and wrong, justice and injustice, according to Hobbes. Everyone has the right to do whatever they want in this moral free-for-all, where "every person has a right to everything, even to [their] own body." To back up his pessimistic assessment of human nature, Hobbes cites a number of examples from everyday life. We always bring guns on vacation in case we run into any trouble. Our housekeepers and even our own children cannot steal from us at night because we lock our cabinets. In addition to the protection we receive from law enforcement and the court system, we take these additional measures to ensure our own safety. When it comes to defending themselves against intruders, countries are just like individuals. Consider how much worse it would be if there were no police, courts, or international laws to keep things in check.

12. THE FRUITS OF HOBBS'S PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS IN HIS THEORY OF SOCIAL CONTRACT

Political philosophers use the term "social contract" to refer to any contract between the rulers and their subjects that sets out the rights and duties of both parties. According to the theory, individuals were born into an anarchic state of nature, either happy or unhappy, depending on the theory's particular version. They formed a society (and a government) using a social contract and natural reasoning.

Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau are the three most prominent philosophers. They have been credited with popularising social-contract theories, which can be traced back to the Greek Sophists. Individual self-interest and rational consent were used to justify and limit political authority in these theories of political obligation, setting them apart from other ideas of the time. This comparison demonstrated why and under what circumstances government is beneficial and should therefore be accepted by all reasonable individuals as a voluntary obligation. A social contract was developed from these findings, and it was assumed that all of a citizen's fundamental rights and responsibilities could be derived from it.

Theories of the social contract have a variety of purposes: some are meant to justify the sovereign's power, while others are meant to protect the individual from an all-too-powerful sovereign.

According to Hobbes, there were no enforceable standards of right and wrong in the state of nature (*Leviathan*, 1651). Human life was "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" because everyone took what they could get their hands on. As a result, nature was in a constant state of conflict. The only way to end it was for individuals to agree (through a social contract) to surrender their freedom to a sovereign in exchange for the sovereign guaranteeing their safety.

According to Hobbes, the sovereign's authority is absolute, meaning that no other authority has any power to override the sovereign's. When the sovereign is silent, however, it does not mean that he or she has complete control over the actions of his or her subjects (in other words, when the law does not address the action concerned). Civil society is made possible by the social contract, but it is a fragile structure that is vulnerable to collapse once governmental authority is lost. When it can no longer protect its citizens, *Leviathan* (the political state) will collapse, but this is extremely rare.

12.1. Activity and Central Subject of Human Will

Political philosophers us As far as Hobbes' materialism is concerned, the basics are well-known. Hobbes believed that everything in the universe is a body and that bodies are in motion and at rest at any given time. According to him, the only essential property of a body is its extension or magnitude. Colour, taste, and firmness are all properties of bodies that result from motions from bodies being transmitted through media to the sense organs of humans. Conceptions, or ideas, are formed when these motions continue into the bodies of the perceivers. In order to distinguish one idea from another, things outside of perceivers must move to generate hypotheses about the objects of perception. Because all pictures in the human mind are derived from sense perceptions, they are all sense-based (*Leviathan I; LEV 22*). Hobbes' empiricist leanings are evident in this account of the origin and nature of ideas. Still, he does not hold that knowers should accept what the concepts of sense objects appear to represent without

question. A common view among seventeenth-century philosophers was that our knowledge of the outside world was not direct but was instead filtered through our thoughts. Concerns about human ability arose from the realisation that "we compute nothing but our phantasm or ideas" (Hobbes 1642–43 [1973: 452]; see OL 1.82)[3].

The first step for those who seek to understand is to look at the similarities between mental images and real-world objects. These concerns resemble those expressed by Descartes' meditator in *Meditations on First Philosophy* (1641), but Hobbes sought a solution that excluded any mention of God or anything ethereal like a soul. To demonstrate that ideas are distinct from the things they represent, Hobbes argued in his early work *Elements of Law*, written in 1640 and published in 1650 (EL), that we could know that so-called secondary qualities like colour, taste, and sound were not in bodies. For this, he drew on his own life experiences to support his assertions:

Seeing the sun and other visible objects through water and glasses reflections is enough for anyone to conclude that colour and image may exist even if the thing seen itself does not.

In *Leviathan I*, he used the same reasoning to conclude that colour and sound are not in bodies because if they were, "they could not be severed from them, as by glasses, and in *Ecchoes* by reflection" (LEV 24).

When we only have mediated access to bodies in the world, Hobbes worries about our ability to discover the causes of natural events. The vast majority of body-related concepts are those that people have been absorbed passively. An investigation into a phenomenon's cause is limited to the ideas that are generated as a result of a person's body's movement. If you're trying to figure out what caused billiard ball B to start moving after it appeared to have come into direct contact with moving A, you'll find no evidence that A was responsible for B's movement. There is no evidence that A's motion causes B's motion, even if one were to examine the most minor 'level', as it were, more diminutive than billiard balls using a microscope. Human agents are not the creators of natural phenomena, as noted by Hobbes in his diagnosis of this lack of causal knowledge. Through the process of making, he seemed to believe that makers gain this knowledge of causality. A central claim of Hobbes' was that we are unable to

determine the true causes of individual phenomena because we do not have ideas about their reasons gleaned from our personal life experiences. Possible causes are all we have to go on. In *Six Lessons to the Professors of Mathematiciques* (1656), Hobbes argues that we can only know "what [the causes] maybe" because "of natural bodies we know not the construction but seek it from the effects" (EW VII.184).

Hobbes' condition for scientific knowledge, namely, the possession of (actual) causal knowledge, is brought to the fore in this second concern. According to him, in order to be said to know [scire] an effect, we must be able to identify its causes, where they originate, how they introduce, and how they accomplish it. As a result, this is the study of causes or *Scientia*.

Scientific knowledge necessitated understanding the phenomenon's actual causes, not just potential ones. Only by acting as a creator, as God did in the natural world, can one gain access to such causal knowledge.

Hobbes was able to limit himself to geometry and civil philosophy as scientific disciplines because they are the only ones in which human beings create the objects they study. Hobbes distinguished these two fields from all others in his *Six Lessons to the Professors of Mathematics* by relating them to the following:

Therefore, geometry can be proven because the lines and figures from which we reason are drawn and described by ourselves. Civil philosophy can be proven because we create our commonwealth.

Since the creation of the commonwealth and its laws from the state of nature was the origin of civil philosophy, Hobbes used geometrical principles to explain many natural phenomena. He used the term "social contract" to refer to any contract between the rulers and their subjects that sets out the rights and duties of both parties. According to the theory, individuals were born into an anarchic state of nature, either happy or unhappy, depending on the theory's particular version. They formed a society (and a government) using a social contract and natural reasoning.

12.2. Change in The Meaning of Natural Law

Whether Hobbes should be understood as a materialist utilitarian, deriving his theory from egoistic psychoanalytic theory and explaining responsibility through rational calculation of self-interest, or as more of a Kantian deontologist adhering to the tradition of natural law has been hotly debated. Writers such as Warrender, Taylor, and Hood have seen the Leviathan as a continuation of natural Law tradition, while Quentin Skinner has defended Hobbes as a utilitarian model (Skinner, 1964: 321). Examining Hobbes' three political works, *The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*, *De Cive*, and *the Leviathan*, provides clear evidence that Hobbes's moral and political philosophy departs radically from Christian moral philosophers. St. Thomas Aquinas is used as a comparison to show how Hobbes departs from traditional natural law writers like Aquinas. Concerning human nature's inherent desire to do good, the definition of natural law and our capacity to reason, as well as the meanings of divine providence and religion, we'll briefly touch on the tradition of natural law before turning our attention to how Hobbes' views differ from the traditional ones.

According to Aristotle's natural law theory, every substance or nature has a telos, or Law of progression (Baumgarth, Regan, 1988: xvii). Saint Thomas Aquinas exemplifies traditional natural law theory. He is widely regarded as the most influential natural law moral philosopher. Thomas Aquinas' teleological theory, built on the foundation of Aristotle's metaphysics of final causes, gave rise to an area of theology dedicated to the Catholic Church's moral primacy. An attempt to rationally explain the Christian faith was made by Thomas Aquinas (ibid: 7). Philosophically, faith and reason are intertwined throughout his philosophical system, and his underlying assumptions of natural law are that humans are capable of using rationality through divine providence (Murphy, 2008). Good is to be done, and evil is to be avoided as the fundamental principle of the natural law tradition (ibid.). Doing good and attaining a natural end, such as happiness in this life and the realisation of God's glory after death, are the primary goals of human nature (Baumgarth, Regan, 1988: xix). As stated earlier, "...man is ordained to an end of eternal happiness... directed to his end by a law given by God" (Aquinas, 1988: 23).

For Hobbes, the pursuit of happiness is not a natural end in itself, and he disagrees with Aquinas' view that it is. According to him, things are not looking good.

In the books of the old moral philosophers, there is no such a thing as a finis Ultimus, utmost goal, or summum bonum, most excellent good." There is a constant movement from one object to the next that makes us feel happy. Only with death is the eternal and restless desire for power after power ends for most human beings. Ch. 10, 86 in Hobbes (1958).

He disagrees with the traditional natural law theorists on this point, as evidenced by this quote. Rather than being satisfied with cultivating virtue for its own sake, humans are always looking for ways to gain more of it. When there is no social contract or a sovereign leader in Hobbes' "state of nature," "continual fear and danger of violent death" is all that men have in common (Hobbes, 1958: Ch. 13, 107-108). During times of peace, men are more likely to agree to form a peaceful society because it is in everyone's best interest to avoid premature death (Hampsher- Monk, 1992: 30). People are drawn to peace because of fear of death, a desire for the necessities of a comfortable lifestyle, and a belief that hard work can help them achieve them. Ch.13, p.109 in Hobbes, 1958. There is a conflict between Hobbesian philosophy and the natural law tradition's underlying principle that men should do good and avoid evil and that human nature is ordained to do good.

He believes that "Nothing can be unjust in the state of nature. Neither the concepts of right or wrong, justice or injustice, have any place in this worldview. There is no law in the absence of common authority, and in the absence of injustice, there is no law." Chapter 13 (Page 108) of Hobbes (1958). To put it another way, any action taken to protect one's own life is acceptable, and people are free to do whatever they deem necessary (Curran, 2002: 64). When the conditions in the state of nature are so bleak that "every man has a right to everything, even to one another's body," men agree that this is in their own self-interest (ibid: Ch. 14, 110). Even if all men had equal rights, it would still be no better than if no one had any rights at all." There is little use and benefit to a man's right to do something if someone with equal or greater strength outmatches him. (Hobbes, 2005: ch. 14: 8, 61). Hobbes' first natural law is "to seek and follow peace" (Hobbes, 1958: Ch. 14, 110). A law of nature is defined as "a preceptor general rule, found out by reason, which a man is forbidden to do that which is destructive of his life or takes away the means of preserving the same that by which he

thinks it may best be preserved." (see *ibid*: 109), For Aquinas, "...the natural law is nothing but the rational creature's participation in the eternal law" and "a law is a certain dictate of practical reason" (Aquinas, 1988: 20-21). So Aquinas' Natural Law, as well as the capacity for reason, is innate to human beings. Because God has given us a reason to act, humans are able to do so (Baumgarth, Regan, 1988: xvii). Natural Law, as defined by the two philosophers, differs greatly. Law is not innate in Hobbes' state of nature, where men believe that a social contract is the only way to be safe and avoid violence (Martinich, 2005: 85). The definition of reason here differs from Aquinas' in that it is based on knowledge and reasoning rather than being predetermined by God (Oakeshott, 2009: 14). "The right to anything" and "liberty" are traded for security under a sovereign leader in order to form a civil society (Hobbes, 1958: Ch. 14, 111). The establishment of a commonwealth, which Hobbes describes in Part Two of the *Leviathan*, is based on these principles of obligation in people's self-interest.

When viewed as an atheist, Hobbes' writings can be seen as continuing the traditional Christian view of natural law. In fact, God is frequently mentioned in his work, but this was probably done to appease the authorities of his day and to allay any suspicions of heresy on his part. It is worth noting that Hobbes was a big fan of ancient Greek authors like Thucydides (Ahrens Dorf, 2000: 579). In contrast to Aquinas, Hobbes uses mathematical axioms and logical equations to move from one argument to the next, while Aquinas uses dialogues and biblical quotations to do the same. In *Leviathan*, Hobbes argues that people are inherently curious about the origins of things, with some being more so than others (Hobbes, 1958; Ch. 11, 91-92). Men call God when they come across a cause that cannot be explained and is thus referred to as eternal (*ibid.*). There are so many natural causes that it is impossible not to believe in a single, eternal God, even if they do not have an image of him in their minds that corresponds to his nature. (*ibid.*) Instead of following the natural law tradition, Hobbes attempts to rationally explain the concept of God in a way that is almost ironic in its questioning of God's existence. The definition of religion given by Hobbes, on the other hand, is rather bleak: That which every one in himself calls religion and those who worship or fear that power other than they do, superstition, is the natural seed of this fear of the invisible. Since there is no other explanation and fear of the consequences of not worshipping

God, people are only "inclined" to worship him (ibid: 92). All religions are on the same level in this definition, which does not necessarily make Christianity superior.

For one thing, he argues that there is no such thing as absolute good or evil. For each person, these values have a unique meaning.

Whatever a man craves or desires, that is what he calls good; and what he despises and despises, vile and insignificant; and what he despises and despises, evil." Good, evil, and contemptible are always used concerning who uses them, and that is why. (Chapter 6, 53; Hobbes, 1958: Ch. 6)

Men can't naturally strive for one good because everyone has a different definition of good and bad. "The desires and other passions of man are in themselves no sin," Hobbes writes in "The State of Nature." Until they know a law that prohibits them, they will no longer engage in the actions that stem from their passions" (Hobbes, 1958: Ch. 13, 107). This view definitely conflicts with the Catholic Church's concept of original sin. According to these quotations, no supernatural being defines good and bad or justice and injustice in the natural world. As a result, this throws Hobbes' belief in divine providence into question. Aquinas uses the biblical quote, "Although they have no written law, yet they have a natural law, whereby each one knows and is conscious of what is good and what is evil," to support his argument for human awareness of good and evil (a gloss on Rom. 2:14, cited in Aquinas, 1988: 19). It is clear from the foregoing that Hobbes does not hold to Aquinas' conception of divine providence and is therefore out of step with the natural law tradition.

More research is needed to determine if Hobbes was a Kantian deontologist or a materialist utilitarian. "A very strict deontology, curiously suggestive, though with interesting differences, of some of the characteristic theses of Kant," says Taylor of Hobbes' doctrine, which he claims is "disengaged from an egoistic psychology with which it has no logically necessary connection." The following year, (1938:408) De Cive's "Just means the same as rightly done"(Hobbes, 1998: III, 5, 46) is cited by him as a comparison to Kant's notion of goodwill in this passage. In the same vein as Kant's categorical imperative, which holds that all actions should be worthy of universal law, Hobbes states that men should treat others as they themselves would like to be treated.

However, to interpret Hobbes in this way is to assume that he is disengaged from egoistic psychology. These passages must be viewed in the context of Hobbes' entire philosophy, which emphasises realist politics rather than moral imperatives. Hobbes sees it as a matter of self-interest to act justly. In order to create a civil society in which everyone can feel safe, people must abstain from some of their freedom or "the absence of external impediments" (Hobbes, 1958: Ch. 14, 109). They will only find themselves back in nature if they do not, with no sense of security. Hobbes' political writings make it difficult to see him as a deontologist who adheres to Kant's theory of morality. It is in the self-interest of Hobbes to determine the moral value of an action by its utility in maximising or minimising negative utility, or in other words, by whether it is in one's own self-interest. A deontological view is "to remove any meaningful points of contact between Hobbes and his own intellectual milieu," according to Skinner (1966: 317). Seeing Hobbes outside of the context in which he wrote is, he claims, a paradox. It is also possible that he could have corrected his contemporaries if they had misunderstood his notions of self-interest (ibid: 288).

It can be seen that Hobbes' philosophical doctrine conflicts with the natural law tradition on three fundamental points: (a) that good is to be done, and evil is to be avoided; (b) his account of practical rationality; and (c) his handling of divine providence. Hobbes does not advocate that one should do good and avoid evil because there is no "ultimate end" for him. According to him, there are many different ways to define good and evil. Humans learn about right and wrong only through the precepts and general rules established by nature's laws. Men adhere to these rules because it is in their own best interest.

In contrast to Aquinas, Hobbes does not believe that natural law is innate because of divine providence and God-given rationality, as Aquinas does. Men prefer to form agreements because it gives them the best chance of avoiding a miserable existence and a horrifying death. Thus, he holds a utilitarian view. Hobbes argues that understanding his writings concerning his political ideology and the twentieth century is critical. Deontological interpretations of Hobbes lose their plausibility when this is taken into consideration. It is fair to say that Hobbes is the founder of a new tradition of political philosophy that breaks away from the naturalistic approach to politics (Oakeshott, 1946:

31). The Leviathan also symbolises an end and a beginning, the end of traditional natural law, and the beginning of enlightened thought and the scientific method (ibid.).

12.3. Belief in The Relativity of Good and Evil

Hobbes equates "good" and "evil" with "desired" and "hated. We call something "evil" if we don't like it, but this is based on our beliefs about what it will do to us. Nothing in the object itself can be blamed for the evil it causes. Things that we consider promising are either pleasant or serve as a gateway to something else that is thought to be pleasant: or they give us hope for a pleasant experience. According to Hobbes, the universe is made up of physical matter in motion, so even the things we consider good can cause internal motions. This is what we mean when we talk about a feeling of delight. In order to describe our reactions, we use terms that reflect our desires and aversions. People feel pity when they see someone else go through a terrible experience and fear that it could happen to them at some point in the future. People are cruel when they do not believe that such a disaster could happen to them. For the most part, sovereign states (through their laws) or individuals can label things as good or bad.

A lack of a sovereign state forces individuals to judge and label themselves. On the other hand, drug users may find beating up older adults a good thing, and this activity may either bring them joy or lead them to something else they enjoy, such as drugs. If there is no sovereign state, there is no law, and this conduct cannot be considered unfair or unethical. Force and fraud are the two most important virtues in a state of war, which cannot exist without authority.

Our hopes guide us when we contemplate the world around us. It is our final desire or aversion, after careful consideration. The drug user has a strong desire for drugs, weighs the possible sources and risks, and decides whether or not to take action. We all want to be able to fulfil our fantasies indefinitely. This is what happiness is all about. In the same way that the universe is ever-changing, so are we. To be happy, we must be able to achieve our goals and avoid our fears. Hobbes predicted that if everyone is free to make their own moral judgments and pursue their own desires, the result would be

catastrophic for society. He believed that all people were nearly equal when it came to their minds and bodies.

Because we are arrogant and selective in our social circle, we tend to think of ourselves as superior to others when it comes to knowledge. There aren't enough differences between people to stop them from competing for what they believe will satisfy their needs. In the case of senior citizens, for example, they may find it beneficial to declare open season on drug users, even though they lack the vigour of their youth. People will kill and enslave one another as long as resources are scarce and happiness is defined as fulfilling one's desires. These people not only want to get what they want, but they also enjoy obtaining it. Even those who are content with what they have been forced to act like tyrants in order to protect themselves from these people. Respect and esteem are also sought after by many people, and the ultimate goal is to be regarded as a leader. Conflict and violence are also a result of this desire. We cannot have any of the benefits of civilisation if we do not have the assurance that our labour will be compensated. As a result, we would be paralysed by fear. Human life would be "... solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" if it lacked security.

Men, according to Hobbes, are not inherently evil. Without a sovereign authority to make law, a desire is not a bad thing, nor is an action that does not comply with the law. We can get out of this awful situation because of our passions and our rationality. We fervently desire to avoid death, and we believe that hard work is the best way to achieve our dreams. Only those who possess a fundamental right to judge the world and then use their judgement to take action on it are capable of creating an order. We owe ourselves to use our reason, and our reason tells us this. As a result, we must all relinquish our ability to judge right from wrong in favour of a central authority that will enact laws to limit our freedom to pursue our desires.

Many people don't get Hobbes' point of view correctly. He doubts that the majority of people would consent to the establishment of a central government. This is "like" everyone saying to everyone else that they would accept sovereign authority if everyone else did, too. Even though authority can be established through various methods, including violence, it should be accepted. Furthermore, Hobbes does not believe that a monarch is necessary for sovereign authority. One can have a sovereign assembly where

all members are members, such as a parliament or a congress. The caveat that Hobbes places on our submission to sovereign authority is also commonly ignored by readers. For our own safety and the sake of obtaining "the means of so preserving life, that we may not be weary of it," we submit to the authority of a sovereign government.

We refuse to allow ourselves to be deprived or even destroyed. Despite his emphasis on the vast authority of sovereign governments, Hobbes was writing to a populace prone to upending the status quo and waging civil wars. Hobbes' argument is hampered by the questionable status of both reason and some of the passions.

One part reason and one part emotion are responsible for our release from real agonies and terrors, for which we have no sway. We want to live. Death is the summum malum, the greatest evil because there is no summum bonum, the greatest good. "And Reason recommends convenient Articles of Peace," which we fervently desire to avoid. To put it another way, we see the necessity of a central government. Because sovereign authority cannot be divided, there is a risk of civil war if the parties disagree. Limiting the sovereign's authority will only lead to civil unrest when the sovereign exceeds the limit. Both the argument and the issues that Hobbes addresses are complicated. Hobbes believed that those who fought in the English Civil War lacked an understanding of how a king could represent his people because they did not understand why sovereign authority could not be limited, divided, or even divided in the first place. For John Locke, who rejected Hobbes' argument, the men who fought the war were not idiots. Despite their knowledge of political philosophy, the men who wrote the United States Constitution did not realize that attempting to limit and divide the sovereign power would lead to war, in this case, the American Civil War.

If you believe in and accept Hobbes' theory of war, you know that the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution is a clear example of how the Founding Fathers sought to divide sovereignty. The rest of the Founding Fathers — Madison, Jefferson, and Hamilton — were, on the other hand, brilliant individuals. They made a terrible mistake in the Constitution's drafting, but the people ratified it anyway. We have now reached the crux of Hobbes' problem with good and evil. He realizes that many factors aid in the establishment of sovereign authority and many factors that hinder it. Understanding the root causes of conflicts (such as civil wars), being grateful for gifts, being easygoing,

accepting others as our natural equals and not showing contempt, and accepting arbitration if we are in dispute promote peace.

We can see this because of our rationality. Bad books (primarily philosophical ones), organized religion, superstition, and overpowering passions can all be dangerous if we do not use sound reasoning (such as pride). Reason enables us to understand why these threats to peace are so severe. The problem is that this has not been fully grasped or accepted by the general public. They have been irrational or irrational at times.

Hobbes also admits that many people will dispute his claims about the degree of sovereign power required to keep the peace. However, he claims that this is because men have not taken the time to think things through. For him, this isn't an argument in favor of building all human structures out of the sand. Reason can be used in both politics and architecture. According to Hobbes, people haven't understood political philosophy because the poor don't have the time to think about it and the rich don't care enough, but whatever the reason, people have not been able to think rationally. However, this would imply that prior to the establishment of sovereign authority, morality could no longer be left to individual judgment.

Regardless of what anyone else thinks, some things appear to be universally good for peace. Even prior to establishing sovereign authority, a healthy fear of death, the desire to obtain the things that allow for "commodious living," and the reasoning ability that allows you to follow Hobbes' argument are absolute goods. In the same way, anything that erodes a person's sanity or character is a sin. I believe that the use of any substance that causes inattentiveness or impatience, such as alcohol, drugs, or even boxing, is a universal evil. The philosopher Thomas Hobbes acknowledges that "... drunkenness, and all other parts of Intemperance" are contrary to reason but are not relevant to his political philosophy because they only serve to destroy particular men. Hobbes is said to have gotten drunk once a year in order to vomit. As a result, it may be no coincidence that he could not see the long-term ramifications of regularly indulging in alcoholism. According to Aristotle, private actions can have public repercussions. There is no way to know what is right or wrong solely based on one's own moral compass. A peaceful world cannot be achieved if men engage in activities that harm their ability to reason or incite unhelpful passions. It does not matter whom you ask or whether a sovereign

authority has prohibited something; some things are inherently evil regardless of who says they are good or bad. Leviathan may be the only way to bring peace to the world if people give up their booze.

12.4. Drawing The Natural State With a Focus on War and Conflict Between Human Beings

Because of our inherent selfishness, competition, and aggression, Hobbesian war is not primarily caused by scarcity of resources or by our instinctive desire to survive at all costs. When it comes to our irrational outbursts of fury, it is because we are fragile, fearful, impressionable, and psychologically prickly creatures that are susceptible to ideological manipulation. According to Hobbes, disagreement is the primary cause of the war because we interpret the most inflammatory signs of disdain. Consequently, the cause and the remedy are primarily ideological: The primary purpose of Leviathan is to settle the meaning of the most controversial words in social life, minimize public disagreement, neutralize glories and increase fear of death and root out radical doctrines. Coercive power alone is not enough to manage interstate conflict; it also necessitates the ability to shape personalities and defuse the effects of status competition.

12.5. The Authority and Authority of The Ruler Determine Good and Evil

Hobbes believed that in man's natural state, moral ideas do not exist. Thus, in speaking of human nature, he defines good simply as that which people desire and evil as that which they avoid, at least in the state of nature. Hobbes uses these definitions as bases for explaining various emotions and behaviors. For example, hope is the prospect of attaining some apparent good, whereas fear is the recognition that some apparent good may not be attainable. Hobbes admits, however, that this definition is only tenable as long as we consider men outside of the constraints of law and society. In the state of nature, when the only sense of good and evil derives from individuals' appetites and desires, general rules about whether actions are good or evil do not exist. Hobbes believes that moral judgments about good and evil cannot exist until decreed by a

society's central authority. This position leads directly to Hobbes's belief in an autocratic and absolutist form of government.

12.6. Absolute Power of The Government

In Hobbes' view, the absolute monarchy was the only form of government that was true and correct. In *Leviathan*, he argued this most forcefully. An essential part of Hobbes' natural philosophy is that humans are fundamentally self-centered beings. English contract law provided Hobbes with the idea of an "implied agreement." People agreed to "lay down" their natural rights of equality and freedom, according to Hobbes, in order to hand over absolute power to a sovereign, according to Hobbes. Hobbes referred to it as a social contract. According to Hobbes, the best form of government was headed by a king. According to Hobbes, it would be more effective to place all power in the hands of a monarch.

12.7. The ruler and The Government are not Parties to The Contract

Coerced promises and contracts, according to Hobbes, are entirely voluntary. Coerced promises and contracts are made out of fear, and Hobbes argues that such actions are wholly voluntary and therefore morally binding as long as this does not prevent deliberation. He also held that the social contract is how civilized society, including authorities, arises from a historical and contemporary or rationally pre-existing condition.

12.8. Addressing The Social Contract in The Form of Inferential Military

As one of the first Philosophes to consider women when formulating a social contract between individuals, Thomas Hobbes was a pioneer in this regard. He believes that all people, including women, should be treated equally. Domination and the potential for dominance are inherent in all human beings, and thus all people are equal. According to the second law of nature, do not do to others what you would not do to yourself. My rights? Why should I sacrifice them? Because my life is at stake. On the other hand, Hobbes suggests that we should only give up those rights that are essential to

maintaining the peace between us. When it came to protecting people from their worst instincts, Hobbes argued that a social contract was necessary. On the other hand, Locke was a firm believer in the necessity of a social contract to safeguard individuals' inherent rights. According to Locke, the people have the right to reject government if their rights are not protected. The social contract refers to the idea that states exist solely for the benefit of the people and that all political power enjoyed by states originates from this source. As they see fit, this power can be given or withheld by the people. American politics is built on the concept of a social contract, one of its most fundamental principles.

12.9. Government Inference Regardless of Metaphysical and Transcendent Considerations

As one of the first Philosophes to consider women when formulating a social contract between individuals, Thomas Hobbes was a pioneer in this regard. He believes that all people, including women, should be treated equally. Domination and the potential for dominance are inherent in all human beings, and thus all people are equal. According to the second law of nature, do not do to others what you would not do to yourself. My rights? Why should I sacrifice them? Because my life is at stake. On the other hand, Hobbes suggests that we should only give up those fundamental rights to maintain the peace between us. When it came to protecting people from their worst instincts, Hobbes argued that a social contract was necessary.

On the other hand, Locke was a firm believer in the necessity of a social contract to safeguard individuals' inherent rights. According to Locke, the people have the right to reject government if their rights are not protected. The social contract refers to the idea that states exist solely for the benefit of the people and that all political power enjoyed by states originates from this source. As they see fit, this power can be given or withheld by the people. American politics is built on the concept of a social contract, one of its most fundamental principles.

12.10. The battle for The Right of Government for The Institution of Religion

As much as he favored monarchy over other forms of government, Hobbes was more concerned with arguing that effective government must have the power to make final decisions in whatever form it takes. It must not be divided or restricted in any way. As long as they do not infringe on anyone else's rights, he said, owners can do whatever they want with their property. He argued that the "public good," which he defined as protecting property and encouraging commerce, was the primary reason for government. Locke advised, "Govern lightly." Theologian Thomas Hobbes cautioned against the church interfering in the affairs of the state. He was worried that religious strife could spark a civil war.

Consequently, he recommended creating a government department to oversee all religious affairs, which would be under the king's direct control.

CHAPTER FOUR: NATURAL STATUS, SOCIAL CONTRACT AND GOVERNMENT FORMATION

1. NORMAL CONDITION

Hobbes also believes that humans are naturally vainglorious and thus seek to dominate and demand respect from other people. According to Hobbes, humanity is doomed to a life of "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" because everyone is engaged in an "all against all" conflict (L 186). A constant and violent state of competition, in which each individual has a natural right to everything, characterises the state of nature for Hobbes as a "war of every man against every man." In Hobbes' view, what is the human race's innately primitive state? All must compete for the same goals in nature, where resources are scarce, and must constantly seek possession and any power that may be needed in the future competition. The place of the same thing-an all-out conflict. His primary focus is on the issue of social and political order, specifically how to keep people from getting into civil conflict in the first place. He offers two stark alternatives: either we should submit to an unaccountable sovereign or reject democracy altogether (a person or group empowered to decide every social and political issue).

2. FORMATION OF THE GOVERNMENT

Hobbes argued that the only way out of this predicament was for individuals to form a supreme power that could impose peace on all of them. In order to ensure a peaceful society, a sovereign would draught and enforce legislation. This would allow for the preservation of life, liberty, and property. The "social contract" was the term used by Hobbes to describe this arrangement. In Hobbes' view, the absolute monarchy was the only form of government that was true and correct. In Leviathan, he argued this most forcefully. An essential part of Hobbes' natural philosophy is that humans are fundamentally self-centred beings. Hobbes argued that people agreed to form a government to maintain law and order and prevent the chaos of the natural world. The preamble of the Constitution: "We the People" establish a government to "ensure

domestic tranquilly" and "promote the general welfare," and this idea is written into the preamble.

3. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND CIVIL SOCIETY

He laid out his theory of the foundations of states and legitimate governments and created an objective science of morality in this book. By signing a social contract and creating a civil society, Hobbes claimed that people could avoid the chaos he thought was associated with the state of nature. Civil society was not just the opposite of nature but rather an escape from nature achieved when free and rational people came together to agree. Civil society, according to Hobbes, is a single entity that possesses both legislative and executive powers. There are no other forms of government, according to Hobbes, that can ensure peace like a monarchy. Without specifying which form of supreme sovereign power is best in society, he only says that there must be one in early works.

4. SOCIAL PACT AND FORMATION OF SOCIETY AND GOVERNMENT

The "social contract theory" that Hobbes popularised is a method of justifying political principles and arrangements by appealing to the agreement that would be made among suitably situated, rational, accessible, and equal individuals, which he developed early and extensively. According to Hobbes and Locke, a social contract, or voluntary agreement, was made by individuals who recognised that only sovereign power could protect them from the insecurity of the state of nature. According to the theory, people were born into an anarchic state of nature, which could either be happy or unhappy, depending on the version of the theory they were exposed to as infants. In order to form a society (and a government), they used their common sense to draw up a social contract.

4.1. Absolute Sovereignty or Absolute Sovereignty

He proposed a contract in which humans relinquish their power to govern themselves to an absolute sovereign on the condition that everyone else does so. Contracts between

sovereigns and their subjects are not binding on the monarch. Sovereignty is established. Hobbes refers to this as "sovereignty by institution" when two or more people agree to follow a common rule. As soon as they promise to obey a conqueror in order to secure their safety, they have established "sovereignty by acquisition." Hobbes held that the absolute monarchy was the only legitimate form of government throughout his life. For this, he wrote *Leviathan*, his most famous work. According to Hobbes' natural philosophy, human beings are fundamentally self-centred creatures.

4.2. Hobbes's Theory and The International Situation

As a general rule, Hobbes's theory of international relations focuses not on the definitions of anarchy in any conventional sense but rather on issues of knowledge, ideology, and legitimacy in constructing political orders both domestically and internationally. For his political philosophy, which relied on citizens' self-interested consent to justify broad government powers, he made an indelible mark on political thought for generations to come. Liberty is exchanged for security in Thomas Hobbes' social contract. Hobbes was roundly derided for his religious views during his lifetime, and few people today still stand by them. Hobbes is a thinker who continues to fascinate us today because of the influence he exerted on the minds of those who prefer not to acknowledge it.

4.3. From Levitan to General Will

As long as one has a desire, Hobbesian human nature is admirable in that he will do all he can to fulfil it, regardless of the consequences. Put another way: If you are a man who wants to live, you will give up your rights and obey any higher authority that can protect you. Even if we all agree that we have free will, it's hard to pin down exactly what it entails. According to David Hume, free will is "the most contentious metaphysical question." To be sure, figuring out what is free will be a difficult task. An agent's ability to choose his or her course of action can be summed up in the phrase "free will." Animals, on the other hand, appear to meet this criterion, and we tend to believe that only humans have free will. Let us then define free will as the ability to control one's actions that are unique to each individual. If this minimal understanding of free will

requires an agent to have a specific faculty of free will, whether the term "free will" is simply shorthand for other features of persons, and whether there exists such a thing as free will it is open to debate.

5. ESTABLISHMENT OF A POWERFUL CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

Hobbes believed that a monarchy was the best form of government for the sovereign. Hobbes argued that placing all power in the hands of a king would lead to more consistent and resolute use of political authority. Hobbes held that the absolute monarchy was the only legitimate form of government throughout his life. For this, he wrote *Leviathan*, his most famous work. According to Hobbes' natural philosophy, human beings are fundamentally self-centred creatures. Hobbes defined power as the ability to secure well-being or personal advantage "to obtain some future apparent Good." 'Natural Power' was a term he coined to describe people's internal qualities, such as intellectual eloquence, physical strength, and prudence.

6. ADVOCACY OF AN ABSOLUTE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

Hobbes held that the absolute monarchy was the only legitimate form of government throughout his life. At its core, Hobbes was a staunch supporter of monarchic absolutism or the belief that monarchs have absolute and unrestrained authority over their subjects. For this, he wrote *Leviathan*, his most famous work. Hobbes' pessimistic view of human nature led him to believe that only absolute monarchy, where a king wielded supreme and unchecked power over his subjects, could keep humanity's cruel impulses in check. As much as he favoured monarchy over other forms of government, Hobbes was more concerned with arguing that effective government must have absolute power in whatever form it takes. This power should not be divided or restricted.

7. HUMAN NATURE

According to Hannah Arendt, Thomas Hobbes made modern people into apolitical subjects incapable of making moral judgments on their own. In twentieth-century totalitarianism, the refusal to believe what Hobbes allegedly engendered was significant

in the most heinous crimes. Hobbes' Leviathan established the architecture of the totalitarian state, and the cultivation of people incapable of exercising moral judgement was started by them, she claims. Dominance in the proto-totalitarian sense, which Arendt attributes to Hobbes, was rejected by Hobbes, who expressed faith in the human capacity for moral and practical judgement. He proposes that the Leviathan cultivate the public's capacity for reason and judgment to eliminate the need for violence instead of creating mindless subjects that authorise any crime the state may commit. When viewed through Hobbes' materialism, it becomes clear that the Leviathan cannot function properly without the participation of each individual's moral reasoning and judgement. As a Hobbesian sovereign, I argue that my primary obligation is to cultivate individual judgement and reason rather than suppress it.

7.1. Natural Condition and The Social Contract

In order to end this unsustainable state, people must agree to give up their natural rights to everything in exchange for the authority of a Leviathan, a civil authority above them. As one of the earliest Western philosophers to consider women when formulating a social contract between individuals, Thomas Hobbes was a pioneer in this regard. He believes that all people, including women, should be treated equally. Domination and the potential for dominance are inherent in all human beings, and thus all people are equal. Hobbes also believes that humans are naturally vainglorious and thus seek to dominate and demand respect from other people. According to Hobbes, humanity is doomed to a life of "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short" because everyone is engaged in an "all against all" conflict (L 186).

7.2. Leviathan is The First Modern Political Teacher

Based on a hypothetical social contract in Leviathan (1651), Hobbes claimed that the sovereign's absolute power could only be justified by the consent of the governed, who agreed to obey the sovereign for the sake of peace and security. English philosopher, scientist and historian Thomas Hobbes are best known for his political philosophy in Leviathan. Founding Fathers and First Principles were influenced by his thoughts. Many

aspects of American founding principles can be traced back to Thomas Hobbes, an English philosopher who influenced many of the country's founders.

8. CIVIL SOCIETY OR POLITICAL SOCIETY

Civil society was not just the opposite of nature but rather an escape from nature achieved when free and rational people came together to agree. Civil society, according to Hobbes, is a single entity that possesses both legislative and executive powers. His primary focus is on the issue of social and political order, specifically how to keep people from getting into civil conflict in the first place. He offers two stark alternatives: either we should submit to an unaccountable sovereign or reject democracy altogether (a person or group empowered to decide every social and political issue). According to Hobbes, the best form of government was headed by a king. According to Hobbes, it would be more effective to place all power in the hands of a monarch.

8.1. Freedom

Hobbes' concept of liberty appears to be logically consistent. He argues that agents can only be free if outside forces do not hinder them. Most commentators see Hobbes as the primary theorist of what I call "pure" negative freedom is not a surprise at all then. However, I argue that his theory of freedom is more complicated than commonly thought. In fact, besides the absence of external obstacles, Hobbes discusses a slew of other conditions for freedom. When we dig deep into his argument, we uncover a complex view of freedom, at times muddled. I contend that Hobbes uses the term "freedom" in various ways that both complement and conflict with each other. [Here](#), I examine Hobbes' use of the term "freedom" and how it relates to concepts such as causality, fear, obligation, endeavour, punishment, and the laws and rights of nature.

In *Leviathan*, Hobbes defined liberty as the absence of external impediments in *De Cive*. As the most significant shift in his moral and civil philosophy that he has ever made, this shift in his conception of liberty gets a special nod from me. Since 'notions of right and wrong, justice and injustice have no place in nature, "nothing can be unjust" (L

188). There are no moral or legal restrictions on human liberty for Hobbes, who sees it as simply the freedom of bodily action.

8.2. Property

As it relates to property rights, Hobbes believes that humanity has no right to ownership: "(T)here be no propriety, no Dominion, no Mine and Thine distinct; but only (only) that to beevery man's that he can get, and for so long as he can keep it;" No property rights exist in Hobbes' language in the state of nature. We do not have "natural rights," which are rights that people have regardless of the laws or political institutions of any particular state when it comes to property. According to Hobbes's description of the natural world, among the most important things that human beings desire and fear is the preservation of their lives and property. For Hobbes, this desire to protect ourselves from the threat of death by violence is at the heart of his philosophy.

8.2. Nature law

Hobbes believes that "Nothing can be unjust in the state of nature." Neither justice nor injustice, right or wrong, can be found in this environment. There is no law where there is no standard power; where there is no law, there is no injustice." (Hobbes, c. 1958). Common-law theory, according to Hobbes, has a fundamental flaw because it fails to offer authoritative and final views on what its supposed subjects should do because the "immemorial customs" of the community are not always easily discernible; they may be deeply controversial. Hobbes argued that if lawyers and judges were necessary intermediaries between the sovereign and the subject, then the law would again fail to guide the conduct of those it applied if they were unable to understand the law. He remarked that non-lawyers could learn the ins and outs of a legal system on their own in about two months of study.

9. THE RESULT OF HOBBS' THOUGHTS IN LEVIATHAN

Hobbes argued that the natural state of humankind is anarchy, with the strong enforcing their dominance over the weaker ones, and that our only inherent right is the right to

maintain our survival. He proposed that people form a 'contract' with a protector who would act as their sovereign to alleviate this common fear. Under this social contract, individuals forfeit their rights, while those of the protector are unrestricted. However, Hobbes was not a follower of the doctrine of divine right, and his main point was that any protector was only there by agreement with the people they were supposed to protect.

Leviathan's iconic cover image, depicting a crowned giant wielding a sword and a crosier, represents the earthly and Church powers of the sovereign. The giant is made up of over 300 human beings, demonstrating how the people are represented by their contracted leader, who derives his strength from the collective agreement of his people. The book's title is taken from an excerpt from the Book of Job, which Hobbes named his book after. There is not a direct correlation between Hobbes' ideas in Leviathan and the issues raised during Parliament's conflict with Charles I, which originally focused on voting rights but expanded to include free speech, religious expression, and equal treatment under the law. However, Hobbes' concept of a social contract and the fundamental ideas of Western political philosophy are widely accepted, and other thinkers such as Algernon Sidney and John Locke developed these ideas in different directions.

Despite the persecution faced by those who advocated for protecting individual rights and liberties, their thoughts contributed to a better understanding of human rights and their place in the world. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights would not have been possible without the contributions of these thinkers.

10. DISCUSSION

Thomas Hobbes' political philosophy in Leviathan is centered around the idea that the natural state of humankind is anarchy, and our only inherent right is the right to maintain our survival. Hobbes argued that individuals should enter into a social contract with a protector who would act as their sovereign to alleviate this common fear. Under this social contract, individuals forfeit their rights, while those of the protector are unrestricted (Hobbes, 1651).

Hobbes' concept of a social contract was further developed by other thinkers such as Algernon Sidney and John Locke, who wrote *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690). They expanded on Hobbes' ideas and developed them in different directions. However, Hobbes' fundamental ideas of a social contract between the ruler and the ruled are widely accepted in Western political philosophy today.

The concept of a social contract has evolved over time, and it has been used to justify the role of government in society. Hobbes believed that any protector was only there by agreement with the people they were supposed to protect (Hobbes, 1651). This idea is still relevant today, as it suggests that the legitimacy of government comes from the consent of the governed.

Hobbes' political philosophy also touches on the role of individuals in society. He argued that individuals should forfeit their rights under the social contract to ensure their safety and security. This view is contrary to the idea of individual rights and freedoms that were raised during Parliament's conflict with Charles I. The conflict originally focused on voting rights but expanded to include free speech, religious expression, and equal treatment under the law. These issues contributed to a better understanding of individual rights and freedoms, which are fundamental to Western political philosophy (Locke, 1690). Hobbes' view of government and the role of individuals in society has been the subject of much debate and discussion. Some critics argue that Hobbes' pessimistic view of human nature and his belief in the need for absolute authority are incompatible with democracy and individual rights. However, others argue that Hobbes' concept of a social contract provides a valuable framework for understanding the relationship between government and the governed.

In conclusion, Hobbes' political philosophy in *Leviathan* presents a pessimistic view of human nature and argues that individuals should enter into a social contract with a protector who would act as their sovereign to ensure their safety and security. Hobbes' ideas were further developed by other thinkers such as Algernon Sidney and John Locke, and the concept of a social contract is now widely accepted in Western political philosophy. The conflict during Parliament's conflict with Charles I raised issues related to individual rights and freedoms, which are fundamental to the development of a just society.

CONCLUSION

According to the author of this research, the central hypothesis that the concept of government in Thomas Hobbes's philosophy is founded upon his theory of the state of nature and human emotions has been successfully defended. Through analysing Hobbes's writings, particularly *Leviathan*, this thesis has shown that Hobbes's conceptualisation of government arises from his understanding of human nature in the state of nature as one marked by constant competition, diffidence and glory-seeking. To curb these passions and establish order, Hobbes proposes that individuals consent to establish a sovereign power - an absolute government headed by a sovereign.

This thesis has also substantiated the sub-hypotheses that Hobbes's government derives its power from the social contract of individuals and that establishing such a government has irreversible consequences. By consenting to be ruled by a sovereign, individuals forfeit their natural right to govern themselves and to dissent from the sovereign's dictates. However, some aspects of Hobbes's theory of government remain ambiguous and open to interpretation. For instance, it is unclear if Hobbes allows for any mechanism to curb potential abuses of power by the sovereign or for the people to retract their consent should the sovereign fail to protect their safety.

In conclusion, this study has achieved its aim of analysing the word 'government' and its conceptualisation in Hobbes's political philosophy. Through close readings of Hobbes's texts it has reconstructed his grounding of government in human nature and passions, the social contract as the basis of political obligation, and his arguments for absolute sovereign power. However, certain lacunae and inconsistencies remain in Hobbes's reasoning, providing avenues for further research. Future studies could, for instance, examine contemporary rebuttals of Hobbes's views by Locke (1689) or probe deeper into the ambiguities in his theory regarding the relationship between subject and sovereign. Hobbes's arguments have also sparked much debate in contemporary political philosophy, with thinkers like Rawls (1971) and Nozick (1974) engaging critically with his theory of the state.

Overall, this thesis has elucidated Hobbes's seminal government theory, which shaped Western political thought's development. Furthermore, Hobbes's conceptualisation of

sovereignty and absolute government laid the foundations for modern theories of the sovereign nation-state, notwithstanding the controversies surrounding his views. This study has thus aimed to contribute to a better understanding of Hobbes's political philosophy and his notion of 'government'.

REFERENCES

- [CSL] 1655 [1981], *Computatio, Sive, Logica: Logic*, first part of *De Corpore*, A. P. Martinich (trans. and commentary) and I.C. Hungerland and G. R. Vick (eds), New York: Abaris Books.
- [DP] 1661 [1985], *Dialogus Physicus*, translated by Simon Schaffer in Shapin and Schaffer 1985, 345–391.
- [EL] 1640/1650 [1928], *The Elements of Law*, Ferdinand Tönnies (ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [EW] 1839–1845, *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, 11 volumes, William Molesworth (ed.), London: John Bohn. [[EW available online](#)]
- [LEV] 1651 [2012], *Leviathan: The English and Latin Texts*, (The Clarendon Edition of the Works of Thomas Hobbes 4), Noel Malcolm (ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/actrade/9780199602643.book.1
- [MC] 1994, *Man and Citizen: (De Homine and De Cive)*, Bernard Gert (ed.), Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing. *De Homine* is 1658 and *De Cive* is 1642.
- [OL] 1839–1845, *Thomæ Hobbes malmesburiensis opera philosophica*, 5 volumes, William Molesworth (ed.), London: John Bohn.
- 1642–43 [1973], *Critique du de Mundo de Thomas White*, Jean Jacquot and Harold W. Jones (eds.), Paris: Vrin.
- 1646 [1983], *Thomas Hobbes' A Minute or First Draught of the Optiques: A Critical Edition*, Elaine C. Stroud (ed.), PhD Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Achbari, Azadeh, 2017, “The Reviews of *Leviathan and the Air-Pump*: A Survey”, *Isis*, 108(1): 108–116. doi:10.1086/691398

- Adams, Marcus P., 2016, "Hobbes on Natural Philosophy as 'True Physics' and Mixed Mathematics", *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, 56(April): 43–51. doi:10.1016/j.shpsa.2015.10.010
- Ahrens Dorf, P. J. (2000) "The Fear of Death and the Longing for Immortality: Hobbes and Thucydides on Human", *The American Political Science Review*, 94 (3): 579- 593.
- Amiri Parian, Circus Priests, Garine, (1399), A Study of the Function of "Trust" and "Political Tolerance" in the Theory of "Social Contract" by Thomas Hobbes, Institute of Humanities and Cultural Studies, Volume 11, Number 2.
- Anglin, W. S. (1990). *Free Will and the Christian Faith* (Clarendon Press).
- Anstey, Peter R., 2005, "Experimental Versus Speculative Natural Philosophy", in *The Science of Nature in the Seventeenth Century*, (Studies in History and Philosophy of Science 19), Peter R. Anstey and John A. Schuster (eds.), Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 215–242. doi:10.1007/1-4020-3703-1_9
- Aquinas, T. (1988) *Saint Thomas Aquinas: On Law, Morality and Politics* (Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company).
- Barry, B. (1989) 'Warrender and his Critics', in Lively, J. and Reeve, A. (eds.) *Modern Political Theory from Hobbes to Marx*, London: Routledge.
- Baumgarth, W. P. and Richard J. Regan (eds.) (1988) "Introduction" in *Saint Thomas Aquinas: On Law, Morality and Politics* (Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company).
- Baumgold, D. (2003) 'Hobbes', in Boucher, D. and Kelly, P. (eds.) *Political Thinkers: from Socrates to the Present*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biener, Zvi, 2016, "Hobbes on the Order of Sciences: A Partial Defense of the Mathematization Thesis", *The Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 54(3): 312–332. doi:10.1111/sjp.12175

- Broad, C. D. (1952). "Determinism, Indeterminism, and Libertarianism," in *Ethics and the History of Philosophy* (Routledge and Kegan Paul).
- Chisholm, Roderick (1967). "He Could Have Done Otherwise," *Journal of Philosophy* 64: 409-417.
- Curran, E. (2002) "Hobbes's Theory of Rights: A Modern Interest Theory", *The Journal of Ethics*, 6 (1): 63-86.
- Deigh, John, 1996, "Reason and Ethics in Hobbes's Leviathan", *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 34(1): 33-60. doi:10.1353/hph.1996.0001
- Deigh, John, 2003, "Reply to Mark Murphy", *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 41(1): 97-109. doi:10.1353/hph.2002.0094
- Descartes, René (1998). *Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy*, 4th edition (Hackett Publishing Company).
- Dockès 1, P. (2006). Hobbes et le pouvoir. *Cahiers d'économie politique*, (1), 7-25.
- 103.Locke, J. (1795). *Traité du gouvernement civil*. Royez.
- Ekstrom, Laura Waddell (1999). *Free Will: A Philosophical Study* (Harper Collins Publishers).
- Finch, Alicia and Ted Warfield (1994). "Fatalism: Logical and Theological," *Faith and Philosophy* 16.2: 233-238.
- Finch, Alicia and Ted Warfield (1998). "The *Mind* Argument and Libertarianism," *Mind* 107: 515-528.
- Fischer, John Martin (1984). "Power Over the Past," *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 65: 335-350.
- Fischer, John Martin (1994). *The Metaphysics of Free Will* (Blackwell).
- Fischer, John Martin and Mark Ravizza (1998). *Responsibility and Control: A Theory of Moral Responsibility* (Cambridge University Press).

Frankfurt, Harry (1969). "Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility," reprinted in Pereboom, (1997), pages 156-166.

Frankfurt, Harry (1971). "Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person," reprinted in Pereboom (1997), pages 167-183.

Frati, Abdolvahab, (2005), Religion and Government in Hobbes' Thought; Locke and Kant, Political Science, No. 32.

Garber, Daniel, 2009, *Leibniz: Body, Substance, Monad*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199566648.001.0001

Ginet, Carl (1966). "Might We Have No Choice," in Keith Lehrer, ed., *Freedom and Determinism*(Random House), pages 205-224.

Gough, J.W. (1957) *The Social Contract: a Critical Study of its Development* (2nd ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hampsher-Monk, I. (1992) *A History of Modern Political Thought: Major Political Thinkers from Hobbes to Marx* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd).

Hampton, Jean, 1986, *Hobbes and the Social Contract Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hampton, J. (1986) *Hobbes and the Social Contract Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hattab, Helen, 2011, "The Mechanical Philosophy", in *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy in Early Modern England*, Desmond Clarke and Catherine Wilson (eds.), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 71–96. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199556137.003.0005

Helm, Paul (1994). *The Providence of God* (InterVarsity Press).

Hobbes, T. (1946) *Leviathan*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hobbes, T. (1958) *Leviathan: Parts One and Two* (New York: The Liberal Arts Press).

- Hobbes, T. (1998) *On the Citizen* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Hobbes, T. (2005) *The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic* (London: Elibron Classics).
- Hobbes, Thomas (2014), *Leviathan*, translated by Hossein Bashiriye, Tehran: Ney Publishing.
- Hobbes, Thomas, (1997), *Leviathan*, ed. B., McPherson, translated by Hossein Bashiriye, Ney Publishing, second edition.
- Hobbes, T. *Leviathan*. London: Andrew Crooke, 1651. *Project Gutenberg*.
- Hoekstra, Kinch, 2003, "Hobbes on Law, Nature, and Reason", *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 41(1): 111–120. doi:10.1353/hph.2002.0098
- Honderich, Ted (2002). *How Free are You?*, 2nd edition (Oxford University Press).
<http://www.shlobin-foss.net/papers/hobbes.html>
- Jesseph, Douglas M., 1999, *Squaring the Circle: The War Between Hobbes and Wallis*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kamali, Goli, Hojjat Zamani Rad, (2016), The Nature of the State and the Foundations of Its Establishment in the Political Philosophy of Hobbes and Locke in a Paradigm Narrative, *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, Volume 12, Number 34.
- Kane, Robert (1998). *The Significance of Free Will* (Oxford University Press).
- Kane, Robert (2005). *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will* (Oxford University Press).
- Kane, Robert, ed. (2001). *Free Will* (Blackwell).
- Kane, Robert, ed. (2002). *The Oxford Handbook of Free Will* (Oxford University Press).
- Lewis, David (1981). "Are We Free to Break the Laws?" *Theoria* 47: 113-121.

Lloyd, Sharon, 2009, *Morality in the Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes: Cases in the Law of Nature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511596759

Locke, J. (1967). *Locke: Two treatises of government*. Cambridge university press.

Malcolm, Noel, 2002, *Aspects of Hobbes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/0199247145.001.0001

Martinich, A. P. (2005) *Hobbes* (New York: Routledge).

Martinich, Aloysius P., 2005, *Hobbes*, (Routledge Philosophers), New York/London: Routledge.

McKay, Thomas and David Johnson (1996). "A Reconsideration of an Argument against Compatibilism," *Philosophical Topics* 24: 113-122.

Murphy, M. (2008), Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy [online], "The Natural Law Tradition in Ethics", Available: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/natural-law-ethics/>, [Accessed: 27 October 2010].

Murphy, Mark C., 2000, "Desire and Ethics in Hobbes's Leviathan: A Response to Professor Deigh", *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 38(2): 259–268. doi:10.1353/hph.2005.0078

Nozick, R. (1988). *Anarchie, État et utopie*, Paris, PUF; traduction de *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, (1974).

Nozick, R. (1974). Constraints and Animals. *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, 35-42.

O'Connor, D. J. (1967) *Aquinas and Natural Law* (London: Macmillan & Co Ltd).

O'Connor, Timothy (2000). *Persons and Causes: The Metaphysics of Free Will* (Oxford University Press).

Oakeshott, M. (2009) “An Introduction to Thomas Hobbes’s Leviathan: The Matter, Form and Power of a Commonwealth: Ecclesiastical and Civil” (typescript prepared by Nauenburg, J. (MARS), University of Detroit – Mercy).

Other Authors:

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*.

Rawls, J. (1987). *Théorie de la justice*, trad. *Audard, C, Editions du Seuil, Paris*.

Pereboom, Derk (2001). *Living Without Free Will* (Cambridge University Press).

Pereboom, Derk, ed. (1997). *Free Will*(Hackett).

Peters, Richard, 1967, *Hobbes*, Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books.

Pettit, P. (2008) *Made with Words: Hobbes on Language, Mind, and Politics*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Robertson, George Croom, 1886, *Hobbes*, London: William Blackwood and sons.

Ryan, Alan, 1970, *The Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, London: Macmillan.

Sadeghi Tabar, Razieh, (2003), *Government, Power and Law in Hobbes' Thought, Leviathan Rereading*, *Strategy Quarterly*, Volume 11, Number 4.

Safavi, Salman, (2016), *Thomas Hobbes Political Philosophy*, Academy of Iranian Studies, London.

Secondary Literature

Shapin, Steven and Simon Schaffer, 1985, *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Skinner, Q. (1964) “Review Article: Hobbes’ ‘Leviathan’” *The Historical Journal*, 7(2): 321-333.

Skinner, Q. (1966) “The Ideological Context of Hobbes’s Political Thought”, *The Historical Journal*, 9 (3): 286-317.

Smilansky, Saul (2000). *Free Will and Illusion* (Clarendon Press).

Sprat, Thomas, 1667, *The History of the Royal-Society of London, For the Improving of Natural Knowledge*, London: Printed by T. R. for J. Martyn. [[Spratt 1667 availableonline](#)]

Strawson, Galen (1994). "The Impossibility of Moral Responsibility," *Philosophical Studies* 75: 5-24.

Strawson, Peter (1963). "Freedom and Resentment," reprinted in Pereboom (1997), pages 119-142.

Stump, Eleonore (2003). *Aquinas* (Routledge).

Taylor, A. E. (1938) "The Ethical Doctrine of Hobbes", *Philosophy*, 13 (52): 406-424.

Taylor, A. E., 1938, "The Ethical Doctrine of Hobbes", *Philosophy*, 13(52): 406–424.[doi:10.1017/S0031819100014194](#)

Thomas Hobbes. *Leviathan*. Ed. Edwin Curley. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1994.

Tuck, R. (1993) *Philosophy and Government 1572-1651*, Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

Universalis, E. (2017). *Léviathan de Thomas Hobbes: Les Fiches de lecture d'Universalis*. Encyclopaedia Universalis.

Van Inwagen, Peter (1983). *An Essay on Free Will* (Clarendon Press).

Warrender, Howard, 1957, *The Political Philosophy of Hobbes: His Theory of Obligation*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Watkins, John W. N., 1965, *Hobbes's System of Ideas: A Study in the Political Significance of Philosophical Theories*, London: Hutchinson.

Widerker, David and Michael McKenna (2003). *Moral Responsibility and Alternative Possibilities: Essays on the Importance of Alternative Possibilities* (Ashgate).

Weber, D. (2004). Hobbes, les pirates et les corsaires. Le «Léviathan échoué» selon Carl Schmitt. *Astérian. Philosophie, histoire des idées, pensée politique*, (2).