

THE SOCIAL CONTRACTS OF THOMAS HOBBS AND JOHN LOCKE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Umeh, George-Franklin

Department of Philosophy

Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka

georgefranklin04@yahoo.com; 07030275410

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.16461.56809

Abstract

There have been different views and opinions regarding the state of nature. It was said to be unorganized, chaotic, pre-social, political and full of anarchy, and this makes men to abandon the state of nature for a civil society through the means of social contract. It was this social contract theory that Hobbes and Locke sets out to explicate in their social and political philosophy. The problematic divisions among Hobbes and Locke as to the nature of the social contract led to the comparative analysis between them and as such this work seeks to answer the following questions: does the social contract theory of Hobbes share any similarity with that of Locke? Did they differ or contrast at any point at all? Can it be said that the social contract theory according to the two philosophers under consideration is completely the same? The method of this research work shall be analytical. It was found that the social contract theory of Locke is more close to human values than that of Hobbes. In conclusion, this study recommends that the social contract theory of John Locke should be adopted and applied to the contemporary society because it is more democratic than that of Hobbes.

Keywords: Social Contract, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Democracy

Introduction

It is in the nature of man as a social being to live together in a community. But to achieve his utmost fulfillment, man desires to live in peace and harmony with his environment, persons and things alike. Hence, every nation continues to search for a workable system that would permit her citizens to live together as much as possible. It is this quest by men for harmonious existence that Thomas Hobbes and John Locke addressed in their social contract, which J.J. Rousseau also refers to as: “the principles of political right:” a living reality which must be found present wherever there is a legitimate government. This living reality according to Samuel Enoch Stumpf, is the fundamental principle underlying a political association; this principle helps to overcome the carelessness of absolute license and assures

liberty, because people willingly adjust their conduct to harmonize with legitimate freedom of others (1994: 296).

By this, Rousseau seems to present a prototype for all legitimate governments, which when conformed to, the sky would be the limit of the political freedom, liberty, equality, and rule of law to be witnessed therein. Rousseau further opined that no demarcation should exist between morality and politics. On this Rousseau inspired the French revolution of 1789.

However, the theory of social contract is so important in social and political philosophy that it did not start from Rousseau. Political philosophers like Plato, Hobbes and Locke had used it to situate the origin of the civil society. Plato holds that the origin of the state is a reflection of people's economic needs; 'a state comes into existence because no individual is self-sufficing; we all have many needs', there must, therefore be a division of labour.(Plato, Republic,1997:89) Thomas Hobbes in his *Leviathan*' says of people giving up their rights of governing themselves, to this man or to this assembly of men who undertakes the function of protecting man from the strife and war of nature, which he says leaves "the life of man solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short"(1651:63). On the other hand, John Locke talks of man uniting into a commonwealth and placing themselves under government, for preservation of their property. 'Property', here in Locke's thought refers to lives, liberty and estates (John D,1969:77)

Rousseau (1950) prefers to take a middle position on the thoughts of his predecessor. He presents the problem of social contract as not simply to find a form of association which will protect the persons and goods of each member. But also to find an association, which each member will still obey himself and remain as free as before(14). This point brings out the reason why the people's consent become important in major decision affecting them. Thus, Rousseau summarizes the essence of the social contract in these: "Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will, and, in our corporate capacity, we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole."(15)

The general will he referred to is the will of the 'sovereign' where the sovereign stands for the total number of citizen of a given society. Such being the case, the general will of the sovereign is the single will, which reflects the sum of the wills of all the individual citizens.

Now, the thoughts espoused by Rousseau in his 'social contract' have some affinity with the principles of democracy, especially the use he made of the general will. The principles of democracy are distinctly shown in the definition of democracy, given by the chambers twenty-first century Dictionary as 'a form of government in which the people govern themselves or elect a representative to govern them (Married,1999:355). Obviously democracy means rule by the people, the common people. A state of society where freedom for the people, justice and equality of rights and privileges; both political, social or legal equality are recognized.

Social Contract Of Thomas Hobbes

The concept of social contract theory is that in the beginning man lived in the state of nature. Man's life in the state of nature is one of fear and selfishness, they had no government and there was no law to regulate them, which means that man lived in chaotic condition of constant fear. Life in the state of nature was solitary, nasty, poor brutish and short (Hobbes, 1651). Human condition in the state of nature is very bad, and in order to escape from the existing horrible conditions, men resorted to the means of a contract to establish a civil society. Through this contract, everyone surrendered all their natural rights to a sovereign and thereby established the society, state and government or common wealth. This contract was made by each individual with every other individual. They surrendered all their natural rights, except the right to self – preservation. Hobbes pointed out that there are two stages which led to the creation of civil society or common wealth. The first stage is man's realization of the need and necessity of peace. A peaceful life is possible only when men follow certain rules called the laws of nature. The most important law of nature is to seek peace and avoid ill conditions. The reason says that when there are passions leading to conflict, there must be a means to peace. The second stage is to find and employ a method to establish peace and eradicate fear. Men understood that the natural rights come in the way of peace and these natural rights are to be surrendered to a sovereign. In other words, to ensure their escape from the state of nature, they must both agree to live together under common laws, and create an enforcement mechanism for the social contract and the law that constitute it. This mutual laying down of natural rights is accomplished by what has come to be known as the social contract. Civil society is constituted by the social contract, where each men of the multitudes obliges

himself, by contract with each of the rest, not to resist the commands of that man or council that they recognized as their sovereign.

The contract created the civil society and political authority. It is a contract of everyone with everyone else. The commonwealth can be established both by acquisition and institution. The first method is when one or some men threaten the inhabitants and bring them under his or their control. The second method is when men of their own impulse unite and agree to transfer all their natural powers through a contract to another man or a body of men. The contract is perpetual and irrevocable. The individuals limit their sovereignty voluntarily and create a society. The sovereign was not a party to this contract because before the contract was made, there was no sovereign, it was only at the time of contract that sovereign came into being. So by the contract; people agree to obey sovereign. The superiority of the sovereign is the result of the contract, the law is the command of the sovereign and liberty is its gift. In the connotation of Hobbes' notion, contract is only one, it is made among the people themselves and through this contract there will be an existence of civil society and sovereign power.

According to Hobbes, there are some rights which are attributed to the sovereign. The first right of the sovereign is the right to punish or the right to wield the police power. This follows from the fundamental renunciation of the right of resistance agreed to by all the citizens. No subject can be free from his subjection by claiming that the sovereign has committed a breach of covenant, for the sovereign has made no covenant with any subject, the subjects have covenanted only among themselves. Since the sovereign has not covenanted with anyone, he alone retains the right to all things that all men had in the state of nature. Furthermore, since the sovereign represents the will of each of the subjects, anyone accusing the sovereign of injury is accusing himself, and to do injustice to oneself is impossible. Hence the sovereign cannot justly be punished in anyway by his subjects. The right to make war and peace and to compel citizens to take up arms for these rights must be in the hands of the same power that can punish those who will not obey. The legislative power must also be in the sovereign's hands for the same reason men will not obey the commands of those they have no reason to fear. The power of the sword and the legislative power must be in the same hands. They prescribe what goods a man may enjoy; they define what is and what not private property is. They determine what actions a man may do without being molested by his fellows. They contribute to peace by attempting to determine all controversial questions before controversy arises. The judicial power, for the same reason as the legislative power, is all committed to the sovereign. Because the sovereign must be able to

determine the means of discharging his functions, the executive power, and the power of appointing all counselors, ministers, and officers, is invested in him⁸. It is clear from this list of powers that the power of the sovereign is absolute, meaning that no greater power can be conveyed by men to any man. The sovereign is not bound to obey the civil laws, for they are only his commands and he can release himself from them at his pleasure. No one can claim any property rights against him because all property is derived from the law which are his will, opposing the sovereign will in any particular case would be opposing the ground of all property and hence self-defeating. The sovereign power may reside in one man or in an assembly of men (monarchy, aristocracy, democracy). But according to Hobbes, the monarchy is the best form in which the king, the public and private interests are most closely united. And the king can act more consistently than a body of men. The sovereign power according to Hobbes ought to be absolute. The sovereignty of the government is indivisible and inseparable which means no other power in the state has the right to challenge or punish the sovereign. The sovereign does all the functions of the state namely the legislative, executive and judicial functions. The sovereign alone has the right to decide what is good for the people. Neither an individual nor a power has the right to question the sovereign. Though Hobbes preferred monarchy, he stated that the sovereignty may be located in an assembly of men. But, Hobbes emphasized that the sovereign whether represented by one man or a body of men, should necessarily be absolute. The law of sovereign is not a counsel but a command to be immediately obeyed ⁴. The sovereign is authorized to declare war or to conduct peace. The words of the sovereign cannot be questioned or challenged or disobeyed. Hobbesian absolutism does not mean that people have no rights to be enjoyed. The individuals have the rights which the law of nature grants for self-preservation. No sovereign can force an individual to kill himself. Even after the contract the individual enjoy the following rights:

1. What the sovereign has permitted
2. What the sovereign has not prohibited and
3. What is necessary for self-preservation-strictly speaking, what is granted by the sovereign by is mercy cannot be considered as rights, they are only privileges. The sovereign grants these privileges in his own interest.

There have been a lot of questions on why should citizens obey the authority of such state, because some believe that the state does not exercise authority but power because they have the ability to compel obedience with sanction placement.

Thomas Hobbes claims that citizens ought to obey the state by giving three main arguments for this:

Firstly, argument for the condition of state of nature, Hobbes said that we don't want to take the current society back to the state of nature because the state of nature has some properties which will not make life comfortable for citizens because being a state of absolute liberty where every member is free to do anything they want and being a state of war of all men against all men, nothing is wrong, nothing is just and nothing is unjust, the state does not own anything making it a property less state in which one do not own anything not even oneself. A state where not every members of the state has the same things but they have almost the same degree of misfortune and it's also a state of insecurity of lives, even though there is liberty but is insecure because the strong can overcome the weak via combat and the weak can overcome the strong via any other means.

Secondly, argument about human rationality, Hobbes says we ought to obey the state because we are rational human being, rational in the sense that given the opinion of the state of nature and the current civil state, we will go for the civil state because we all know that returning to the state of nature is not in the interest of its inhabitants.

Finally, of the argument from the original contract, Hobbes said that we have to obey the state because everyone surrendered all their rights to enter into agreement and we must fulfill our part, except the right to self-defense, which we did not surrender tacitly. With these three arguments Hobbes believe that we ought to obey the sovereign.

Critique Of Thomas Hobbes Political Philosophy

According to Hobbes, it was fear of death and extinction which compelled man to make a contract and create the state. But this is not correct because people being selfish in the state of nature could not and would not trust each other. Contract is an act based on trust. How would such people trust one another? Thomas Hobbes's theoretical explanation of government formation is not practical, this is mainly because he claimed that all government are created through covenant, but in real life, it is certain that government are often imposed on unwilling subjects against argument for contract. Many have been known to obey a particular government because of the fear of punishment and not because they wanted to obey the government.

He relies heavily upon a sovereign who also bears human nature “self-interest”. History has shown that absolute power corrupts absolutely. Leaders who tend to satisfy desire at the expense of the citizens. Hobbes reliance on a monarch who would somehow ignore his personal desire for the good of the country is less practical. There is no ruler or bearer of the sovereignty that would be expected not to pursue his own private advantage, the advantages of family and friends as much and even more than the public advantage.

Another criticism of Hobbes’ position asks whether he has really given an account of moral obligation at all. If he is right that we can only trust ourselves to act morally because of the fear of being caught and punished, then it may be argued that our motives are not genuinely moral. This criticism rests on the plausible contention that moral actions must be motivated by the desire to do good, and cannot be self-serving. After all, we normally suppose that for an action to be genuinely moral I cannot do it simply for fear of the consequences. If I return a wallet that I find with the money inside, only because I fear I might have been seen taking the money, then my actions are morally praiseworthy. Hobbes is saying that there is nothing inherently wrong with harming others it is only imprudent and that each stands to gain from a conventional agreement according to which it is wrong. He is saying that people are forced to behave morally, not because morality is a good thing in itself, but because they are constrained and cannot exercise power. If they did have the power, it appears, they would perfectly justify in behaving immorally. But surely this is not what we ordinarily understand by morality. Moral demands are distinct from the demands of prudence. To say that it is wrong to steal does not mean that it is imprudent or unwise, but rather that it is wrong.

In Hobbes argument about the formation of the covenant, we would say that his argument contains contradictory statements he says all men made covenant with all men yet the sovereign one of the man was said not to make covenant with his subjects because they were too many. Also human who were by nature pellicos fighters all of a sudden used reason which had been with them from the onset to deduce the law of nature which makes them seek peace and the preservation of their life. Hobbes did not tell us that reason came to human at that point in time. This contraction discredits his arguments and leads to questionable conclusions.

The kinds of obligation produced by a Hobbesian contract may not be precisely the same as those we would normally regard as our moral obligations. After all the stronger you are in the state of nature, the better your bargaining power in

negotiating the contract. Not everyone has the same to gain from cooperation and from restrictions on their power. A strong individual might only enter a contract which seemed advantageous and would be able to dictate the terms of the contract. So the theory seems to allow that the weaker e.g. the disabled, children, elderly, might become enslaved by the stronger. It appears entirely possible to have negotiated a contract which involves using children as a slave labor, or executing those who are no longer able to work. But it seems intuitively clear that such contracts would not be truly moral.

Hobbes has shown us why it may be advisable to act according to the dictates of morality in a situation where we are likely to be caught and punished for breaking the contract. However, in most societies we have lots of opportunities to break moral rules. So why don't all but the most totalitarian states fall into anarchy? While many may be tempted by relatively minor transgression of moral rules e.g. of obeying some lay down rules and regulations, serious crimes are still a minority occupation. Also, if Hobbes is right and we are by nature selfish then we should have no problems with doing the wrong thing to make gains for ourselves. But we do have, suggesting that perhaps Hobbes is wrong to say we are by nature selfish creatures. Are we capable of caring about anything other than our own welfare? Surely people do all kinds of actions that are motivated by concern for others and not just for their own satisfaction. Here we could consider the actions of a parent raising their child, soldiers who are prepared to die for their country or the many charity workers who devote their lives caring for the poor. To deny that people are ever motivated to act altruistically seems to fly in the face of the facts. So perhaps Hobbes had an overly pessimistic view of human nature and that we can behave morally without the need for an authoritarian state surveying our every move

Social Contract Of John Locke

In the *Second Treatise*, Locke wrote that because of the three ills suffered by men in the state of nature, and then they could not remain in there. Since the State of Nature lacks civil authority, once war begins it is likely to continue, and this is one of the strongest reasons why men has to abandon the State of Nature by contracting together to form civil government. The people surrendered their right to the community as a whole and not to an individual or an assembly of men. Man gives up his freedom and power, because the enjoyment of it is very uncertain and he is constantly exposed to the invasion of others. Since, all men are equal in the

state of nature; there is no strict observer of equity and justice. Consequently, the enjoyment of property that they possess in the state of nature is unsafe and insecure. This makes the individuals to look for a way out of this condition that is full of fears and continual dangers. The most important end of men's uniting into a commonwealth is for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties, and estates. Hence the power of society can never be supposed to extend farther than the common good. It is by means of contract the individuals agree to submit their powers (natural rights) to a majority rule in order to organize themselves as a community. Once the contract becomes functional, the civil society is established. Also, it must be mentioned here that the legislative power is different from the executive power. The third is the federative powers, whose function is to make treaties and conduct external relation of the state. People enter into a contract among themselves in order to protect their life, property and liberty. Consequently, they enter into a civil society. Locke, unlike Hobbes, spoke of two contracts. The first is a social contract by which the state or civil society is created. It is otherwise known as Express Contract. By this contract, civil society is created to meet the deficiencies of the state of nature. Unlike Hobbes, Locke stated that people surrendered only one aspect of their rights and only a limited surrender. The second is known as a governmental contract or tacit contract. Here the contract is between the community and the rulers by which the society authorizes the government to make positive laws consistent with the laws of nature. He further observed that the legislative power becomes the supreme power in the commonwealth. This power is based on the consent of the people. This legislative power should be exercised only to promote the peace, safety and public good of the people. According to Locke, the government is only a trust and the governmental contract is aato exercise powers for the peace and prosperity of the people. When the government does not function for the good of the people, they have the right to overthrow the government. Thus Locke made the monarch a party to the contract and established a constitutional monarchy. Its authority should be based on the consent of the people and it has to work for the welfare of the people. Locke advocated for a limited sovereign state because to him, absolute monarchy is inconsistent with civil society.⁹ Locke basically believed that body politic and commonwealth came into being for the welfare of the individuals and the community as a whole and he argued against the attainment of power through conquest.

Critique Of John Locke Political Philosophy

Looking at Locke's emphasis on the consent of government, according to the theory of consent is the fundamental basis for the government to work which means they must have the consent of the people who they are governing. This I think is where the problem begins. If consent is the fundamental basis for the government, how does one ensure that everyone has consented to government? For instance, in Nigeria we last held a general election around 3 years ago. However, in those 3 years since recently born children, those that were not around and those who were disfranchised at the time of the last elections haven't actually consented to the government's rule because they did not vote, which in some respects makes the government illegitimate. This raises the question that is it possible for government to have the consent that Locke proposes? Which means you would have to hold countless elections to ensure that people still consent to government. This issue of consent also raises questions about how much consent is needed for the government to be legitimate. This is an issue which Locke doesn't tackle, suggesting a flaw in his theory.

Another problem encountered with Locke's theory of government is the theological emphasis. Locke believes that we have a duty to protect our life and the lives of others because we are God's workmen and are but the possession of God. Does this mean that because of the theistic influence on Locke's theory, an atheist could reject it? If we have a duty to protect our own and other lives because of God, and then it turns out that there is no God, what then happens? And I think that religion and politics should be separated. On the basis of this Locke's theory is a flaw.

Finally, I think Locke's theory shows great promise and was a step in the right direction to a more democratic way of governance after the tyranny of the monarchy, but the theory has some problems at the grassroots level which weakens the theory at the top, mainly in the area of consent. The type of consent that Locke promotes is practically impossible because it is impossible for everyone to consent to government at all times.

A Comparative Analysis

Thomas Hobbes and John Locke believed that before there was a society where political government existed, man lived in a state of nature and that if the government ceases to exist, man would revert back to the state of nature. To escape

the state of nature both of them relied on the contract theory. The contract must be between rational people, because neither Hobbes nor Locke permits children or non-rational adults, such as the insane, to participate in the contract. John Locke and Thomas Hobbes believed in the state of nature and a social contract and the importance of the presence of some form of government. Although they had different views on all of these things, they also had some similarities. Regardless of their differences, they both believed that in the state of nature, man's main priority is self-preservation and that in order to achieve stability, order and protection, people must surrender some of their freedoms to a government. Also they both believed that divine right does not exist, the rights to rule is given to the government by the people.

Another point of agreement is that the majority will make decisions concerning any issue which arises once the contract is formed. Hobbes says that the minority voters must stand with the majority once the covenant is made, since the minority, originally voluntarily agreed to covenant with the rest. Similarly, Locke argues for the majority to determine the type of government once the contract is accepted. One of the provisions of the contract is to transfer some power to the government to rule and provide for the safety of its subjects. Both Hobbes and Locke consider the power that is given the Sovereign as man's power to enforce the Law of Nature. In the *Leviathan*, Hobbes argues that men are the judges in the State of Nature, and this judicial power extends to having the power over life and death. It is this same power of defending others which is transferred to the Sovereign so that he can punish criminal. Hobbes also states that the end of punishment is "that the will of men may thereby better be disposed to obedience" (1651:xxviii). In addition, men are bound to help the Sovereign when he needs it. In the *Second Treatise*, Locke also argues that men in the State of Nature have the power to judge and enforce the Laws of Nature. Locke says that this power is contracted away to the government when men enter civil society. Like Hobbes, Locke states that men are also obliged to help the government when necessary.

Related to punishment is the fact that Hobbes and Locke both consider a person's body as the workmanship of God and so men are only stewards, as it were, of their bodies. For this reason, Hobbes does not consider it possible to alienate one's right to self-preservation; allowing a person to transfer the right to defend others, but not to alienate their right to protect themselves. Just the same, Locke also considers a man's body as belonging to God. Additionally, men cannot transfer their right to protect themselves to the government either.

When we take a look at Hobbes' and Locke's theories, we see many differences between them though they are both defenders of the social contract theory. The source of these differences in my opinion is the distinction between their understandings of human nature. Hobbes thinks that human beings are rational egoists, who are self-interested and that they always look for self-profit in what they do but in Locke's understanding, humans are social creatures that tend to live more peacefully and cooperatively in their state of nature. Although they both believe in the natural equality of people, this equality of ability creates problems in Hobbes' theory whereas it strengthens the ties between people in Locke's ideology. Hobbes asserts that when equality of ability and limited resources happen at the same time in a world without central authority, two people would automatically become enemies and both sides as rational egoistic agents would have the right to attack the other side to protect themselves from possible attacks and to obtain what they need. For example, according to Hobbes, if two rational egoist agents happen to stay on an island alone and if there is not enough food for both of them, they will try to attack each other and realize that the other side may think in an egoistic way and may try to attack first. However, Locke presumes that in the same situation when individuals see each other, they will behave affectionately towards each other because they will know that they are same kind of creatures and they have equal abilities. They will see a person as precious and as talented as themselves and this will motivate them to cooperate with each other and try to find another kind of food.

Hobbes believed that the state of nature was the state of war; because no morality existed, everyone lived in constant fear of one another. Hobbes believed that the number one priority in the state of nature is self-preservation and because mankind had the right to protect themselves at all costs even if it meant killing another man, life would become an endless war of all against all. Thus the life of all mankind would be solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. Hobbes maintained that the only way to avoid this life was by a social contract in which man agreed to transfer sovereignty to a monarchy. Locke on the other hand, perceived the original state of nature to be a state of perfect freedom to do whatever they wish. Locke believed that law was reason and that reason taught people that one should not deprive another of his life, health, liberty or possessions and anyone who disobeys this should be punished. Locke based his views of the state of nature on the Christian belief that all men are God's possessions, which was why the inhabitants of his state of nature are guided by God's laws. While Hobbes believed that people were born vicious and corrupt, Locke believed that the mind was a

blank slate (tabula rasa) and that people were born with no innate conceptions and that society shaped mankind and that mankind favored peace, respect and virtue in the state of nature.

Hobbes concludes his theory in a consistent way and says that the only way for rational egoistic, individually oriented human beings, is to make a social contract between them and thus give their rights to a person or a group of people to regulate the social life and get rid of the chaotic state of war. Hobbes does not believe in the goodness of people, so his ideal type of political system is a very authoritarian dictatorship or oligarchy that prevents different ideas and thinks of the unity and the order in the society, not the happiness of people. He only gave people the right to protect their life against the Leviathan and few other rights. In contrast, Locke believes that if people were making a social contract, the aim would not be to provide the continuity of a harsh system but instead, the aim would be to bring happiness to all people who have different ideas, opinions and enjoyments. Thus, the role of the state should be to regulate social life and make necessary interventions when there are mistakes and problems.

Hobbes holds that the people through a social contract, would willingly surrender their sovereignty, also known as their natural rights, and agree to subject to civil law or political authority in exchange for peace, protection, social order and civil rights. Hobbes social contract denied the right of rebellion against the monarchy and did not support the separation of powers. He believed that separation of powers was an invitation to unnecessary conflict and war. Also he said unlike Locke that the contract was not between the government and the people, instead it was between the citizens themselves and it stated that they would all agree to accept the rule of the monarchy. Locke's social contract on the other hand stated that the people would give up some of their freedoms in exchange, so that their natural rights, the rights to life, health, and liberty would be secured. Locke did not believe in the absolute rule of the government. He believed that a limited government was best for society and if the government overstepped their limits then they forfeited their side of the contract thus making it null and void.

The rule of government as well as the type of government directly depended on the social contracts created. Hobbes and Locke had different ideas on what role the government should play in society. Hobbes believed that the type of government needed was an absolute monarchy that monarchy's role in society was to impose law and order to prevent the state of war. He also says that the government was designed to control, not necessarily represent the people. He said

that mankind was not able to avoid war unless there were strict laws and guidelines they had to follow and the government was simply there to enforce those rules and guidelines. He holds that mankind in the state of nature, only do what is in their best self-interest and eventually the people would give their freedoms to the government to escape war and if there is no power to keep the people in check, they would inevitably return to war. Locke believed that the sole purpose of the government was to protect man's natural rights, and that government should represent the people and that representation was a safeguard against oppression. Locke's book *The Second Treatise of Civil Government* was written to justify man's right to revolution, to overthrow an unjust government. Locke maintains that if the legislature is not protecting the people's natural rights and not representing the will of the majority, then it should be replaced and you are naturally obligated to replace it. Locke believed that a representative democracy would be a good government as long as it can represent the will of the majority and protect people's rights.(Tuck,1979:54)

Hobbes and Locke both believed that in nature, people would come together to form a state for some form of protection. Hobbes and Locke offered different reasons about why people formed a state. Hobbes argued that people formed a state out of self-interest to protect themselves from each other. Locke's theory of human nature, however, was far more optimistic. He proposed that people were fundamentally moral beings that would form a state in order to protect their inalienable natural rights of 'life, liberty and estate' and adjudicate disputes between them.

Hobbes and Locke were also divided on the nature of government. Hobbes advocated the sovereign's absolute and undivided power. In *Leviathan* Hobbes wrote: The only way to erect a Common power is to confer all their power and strength upon one man, or one assembly of men that may reduce all their wills, by plurality of voices, unto one will. In contrast, Locke wrote in *Two Treatises of Government*: The legislative though it be the supreme power in every commonwealth, yet first, it is not, nor can possibly be, absolutely arbitrary over the lives and fortunes of the people. The divergence between both Hobbes' and Locke's theories on the sovereign's power can also be traced back to their theories of human nature. Hobbes' pessimistic beliefs of human nature required a strong central authority in order to protect the sovereign's citizens from each other and foreign powers. In contrast, Locke's optimistic beliefs advocated that people in a state of nature would have stronger moral limits and would be able to live in relative harmony without a strong central authority (Lemos, 1978:201).

When I compare these two philosophers, I can say that Locke's ideas are much closer to contemporary human values and Hobbes' theory has many inherent dilemmas. In my opinion, if we look at Hobbes' theory as a historical evaluation of human beings, this would not be a consistent theory for many reasons. Even if we look at this theory as an imaginary model that is done to explain the necessity of the state, there are still many problems with this account. First, we know that the population in the world during the earlier lifetime was small and it is not very rational to claim that there was an incredibly competitive struggle between individuals for limited resources. Secondly, even in the time of the first humans there were families, tribes that were living together with the visible or invisible leadership of a person or many persons. That is why, Hobbes' idea of the "all individuals are against all individuals" seems very contradictory because even if there was a competition for limited resources, the competition should have happened between families or tribes. Thirdly, Hobbes in my opinion completely ignores the social needs of human beings. Human beings have social needs such as communicating, loving, hating etc. Even the rational egoist individuals of Hobbes need to communicate with each other, share some feelings and this makes his theory incomplete. For example, if we think of the island example, a rational egoist agent would think of his social needs and would likely seek a better way than to kill his fellow man. Moreover, Hobbes definitely believes that human beings are selfish and not good at all, but he gives the executive power of society not to a machine or a God but only to an ordinary, rational egoist man. This raises many questions such as why this sovereign who would play the role of the God should behave in a good way and think of the profit of the society? Like all other individuals he would think of his profit and absolute monarchy would soon become a tyranny. Also, Hobbes' thesis about the reason of human acts may not be true in all cases. I believe that we can sometimes think of the benefit of another person more than our own benefit; and it is not our own profit should determine what we should do. Human beings are complex creatures and their behaviors cannot be calculated easily like a mathematical equation. Hobbes is not aware of this complexity and thinks of all human beings as hard-hearted egoist agents which is not entirely true. As far as I am concerned, Locke goes forward in the right direction but he has problems with producing strong arguments and concrete examples that will prove the goodness and the self-sacrificing nature of humans. I also think like Locke and believe that the state of nature was a period of peace. First, if we consider this theory as a historical evaluation of humans, there are enough resources for everybody in earlier times because the population was

very low. So, in this case there would never have been a struggle of survival between humans. Secondly, humans needed to cooperate in earlier times more than today due to the lack of technology and knowledge to be protected from the dangers of nature. How can a man even if he is a rational egoist live individually in nature, how can he struggle against the millions of dangers of nature alone? If he is a rational egoist, he will be more likely to live in society and cooperate with other people to avert danger. Locke's idea about the meeting of the two creatures of the same kind may seem funny to us today because we think ourselves as the owners of this world. However, if we think that the first humans were very few and ignorant, this is not a bad idea at all. The meeting of two human beings in a jungle full of living things (birds, trees, flowers, insects, lions, etc.) will certainly make these two people close to each other. Also, the first human beings were not as competitive as today's humans. I believe in the equality of people but we should accept that the distribution of this equality is different. Some people are taller, some are stronger and some are wiser and it is not always the effect of environment that affects human qualities. Also, in the earlier life the resources were enough for everybody and that is why people did not have any reason to possess more than they needed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we have been able to discuss some similarities and differences between Thomas Hobbes and John Locke concerning the issue of social contract. We can also see that the political theories of both Thomas Hobbes and Locke were founded on social contract theory but unlike Hobbes, Locke believed that human nature is characterized by reason and tolerance. Like Hobbes, Locke also believed that human nature allowed men to be selfish, and we see that they both agreed that the sole right to defend in the state of nature was not enough, so people established a civil society to resolve conflicts in civil way with a help from government in the civil society which they both agreed on. Even though Hobbes is an advocate of an absolute power of the monarchy, Locke on the other hand did not accept that absolute monarchy was the best structure for a state or the best way to govern a society rather Locke believed in the supremacy of the legislature over the monarch. I will conclude by saying that Locke's idea of social contract has proven to be more practicable in establishing liberty for the society in general unlike that of Hobbes that was in favour of absolute monarchy.

References

- Bell, C.J., *Human Nature: Issues in Political Theory*. London: Macmillan, 1986
- Godwin, A., *Thomas Hobbes in History of Political Philosophy*, Chicago; university of Chicago, 1963
- Hobbes, T., *Leviathan*, Renaissance Editions. Oregon: The University of Oregon, 1651.
- Hampton, J., *Hobbes and the Social Contract Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- John, D., *The Political Thought of John Locke: A Historical Account of the Argument of the Two Treatises of Government*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge press, 1969.
- Lemos, M., *Hobbes and Locke; Power and Consent*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1978
- Married, R., *Chambers Twenty-first Century Dictionary* Great Britain: Chambers Harrap publishers Ltd., 1999
- Macpherson, C.B., *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008.
- Plato, *Republic*, trans Davies, J.I and Vaughan, D.J, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth classics, 1997.
- Peter, L., *John Locke Two Treatises of Government*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Rhys, E., *John Locke Two Treatises of Civil Government*, Cambridge. University of Cambridge press, 1940.
- Rousseau, J.J., *The Social Contract and Discourses*, translated by G.D. Cole New York: E.P. Dutton and company Inc., 1950.
- Stumpf, S.E., *Philosophy, History and Problems*, 5th edition New York: MC Graw-hill Inc., 1994..
- Tuck, R., *Natural Rights Theories; their Origin and Development*, Cambridge: Cambridge University. Press, 1979
- Trames & Partel, P., *The explanation of conflict in Hobbes's leviathan*. 2nd ed., St. John's College, Cambridge, 2006.