

**THE MORAL DIMENSION OF THOMASS HOBBS POLITICAL
PHILOSOPHY**

BY

MUKTAR AHMED

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
(GRADUATE PROGRAMME) IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN PHILOSOPHY**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY**

JULY 2014

ADDIS ABABA

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY**

**THE MORAL DIMENSION OF THOMAS HOBBS POLITICAL
PHILOSOPHY**

BY

MUKTAR AHMED

Approved by Board of Examiners

_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	Signature	Date

Table of Contents

Contents	Pages
CHAPTER ONE	
Introduction	6
1.1 What is Philosophy?	7
1.2 The General Over View	7
1.3 Branches of Philosophy	8
1.4 How Ethics Became Independent From Other Branches of Philosophy?.....	9
1.5 What is Ethics?	9
1.6 Objectivism and Subjectivism in Ethics	10
1.7 Religious and Cultural World Views toward Ethical Rules	12
1.8 The Influence of Pagan Philosophy for Religious Ethical Principles	13
1.9 Moral Philosophy from Historical Point of View	14
CHAPTER TWO	
The influences of Thomas Hobbes	28
2.1 The Lessons Hobbes Learned from Thucydides.....	29
2.2 Machiavellian Influence On Hobbes Philosophy.....	31
2.3 Hobbes and Antiquity	33
2.4 Hobbes' Contemporaries	36
2.4.1 John Locke	36
2.4.2 Baruch Spinoza	37
CHAPTER THREE	
3.1 Scientific Ideas and Hobbes Moral Philosophy	41
3.2 What is the Moral Dimension of Scientific Thoughts?.....	42
3.3 Hobbes Psychological Egoism.....	45
CHAPTER FOUR	
4.1 Hobbes' Moral Rules and Contemporary World	47
4.2 Hobbes' Moral Philosophy and Reason of State	54

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion 59

Bibliography 64

Abstract

Thomas Hobbes is one of the prominent thinkers who insist that there is no morality in the absence of social contract. He is one whose work is sometimes considered as controversial by some thinkers. There are thinkers who argue that Hobbes moral and political conclusions are too extremes. In this thesis I will attempt to show that there is no extreme point in Hobbes moral philosophy. Even though the focus of my thesis is Hobbes moral philosophy, I will also raise some relevant issues from political philosophy. In general political arena is characterized by conflicts, contentions, claims and disagreements. It is from this arena that I want filter moral philosophy of Hobbes. Moral philosophy is the question of 'how we ought to live' as Socrates insisted. In order to live better we also need politics. That is why I argue that in some circumstances, moral philosophy and political philosophy may overlap in my thesis. Moreover, I will show that Hobbes moral and political arguments are not extreme and controversial. Rather from my point of view the world itself is controversial, and in order to live better we need controversial moral and political measures to address it. Even though I support most of Hobbes moral and political philosophy, there are also some concepts that I want to correct from Hobbes.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Hobbes is one of the prominent defenders of social contract. He argued that morality is unthinkable without it. He contends that morality should be understood as a result of an agreement that rational as well as self-interested people create. In his analysis of moral philosophy Hobbes breaks away from medieval and classical thinkers.

Accordingly he indicated that man by nature is not social and political animal by nature. This understanding of human nature influenced his moral philosophy. For him men are selfish by nature and they should be cooperated in order to practice what we call morality. For him morality is not mysterious dictates from a super natural force that is believed to have been revealed to human being. It should be understood as human creation. Hobbes understanding of morality is similar with, that of Nietzsche's transvaluation of values. Unlike classical and medieval thinkers Hobbes argued that there is no inherent good. Whatever we desire is good, and whatever we avert is evil for him.

Thus, I can say that Hobbes brought down morality from heaven to earth as Socrates did philosophy. This made him the first prominent modern thinker that provided a secular and naturalistic basis for moral philosophy.

In this paper I am going to explore Hobbes understanding of moral philosophy deeply. Although Hobbes breaks away from classical and medieval philosophy, it does not mean that he totally rejected them. In this regard Thucydides' "work of the Peloponnesian war" and sophists' philosophy fascinated him and echoed in his moral philosophy.

For example, one of sophist philosopher Protagoras insisted that "man is the measure of all things". This idea influenced the work of Hobbes when he argued that morality is entirely human terms.

When I explore his works on moral philosophy I will try to consider his influences and also include my personal suggestions on his work as much as possible. Before I directly go to his moral philosophy let me say some things about the roots of moral philosophy.

Section One: The Roots of Moral Rules

I have tried to explore different literary works of different world views, and scholars. It is difficult to find the primary substance /arche/ of moral philosophy in secular understanding. The reason is that as human beings and general universe evolved, the meaning and origins of moral philosophy was also evolved in this world. Thus, what I say regarding moral philosophy basically follows this evolution. For convenience it is possible to analyze these world views from three perspectives namely; secular, cultural and religious perspectives.

Secular perspectives toward moral philosophy can be understood from two angles in my view. The first is a pagan philosophy which developed by the Pre Socratics of Ionia and continued by sophists, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. The second perspective is that of the modern philosophers that originated from renaissance and has developed through the contemporary time.

1.1 What is Philosophy?

1.2 The General Over View

Philosophy comes from two Greek words “Philo” and “Sophia” which means "love of wisdom". It was first used by the ancient Greek thinker Pythagoras (about 600 B.C). But for me this is the nominal (literal) definition of philosophy because wisdom is not loved only by philosophers since scientists, biologists, historian, psychologists and others also love Knowledge or wisdom. This definition cannot satisfy the modern way of thinking unless it is modified. In this case Ayn Rand’s definition of philosophy which insists that “Philosophy is an integrated view of existence”(Rand,1991,206) is logically convincing since it indicates that human beings cannot escape from doing philosophy in their life. This idea of J. Ducaise strengthens Rand’s and my idea:

Philosophical reflection is not an activity indulged in only by specialists called philosophers who allegedly live in architectural monstrosities known as ivory towers. Just as each of us at times engaged casually in horticulture or medicine or carpentry without special training, so practically all of us on certain occasions spontaneously occupy ourselves with philosophical questions (J .Ducase quoted in Miller ,1997:1).

Although Pythagoras started to use the word philosophy, philosophizing was started long before Pythagoras. Accordingly philosophy was started in the Miletus on the western coast of Ionia (now Turkey). Pre Socratic philosophers such as Ionians, Italians and pluralists raised metaphysical questions such as "what is ultimate reality?," "how other realities related to this ultimate reality", and so forth. My aim is not to discuss Pre Socratic philosophy in detail, but to show that "philosophy started and will always start with wonder" as Aristotle insisted. Pre Socratic Philosophers wondered about natural phenomena that they found around themselves and began Philosophy by asking Philosophical questions specially that of metaphysics. Metaphysics and other issues of philosophy such as ethics, epistemology, aesthetics and others started to be studied deeply.

1.3 Branches of Philosophy

There are different classifications in philosophy. Let me consider the branches of philosophy that were described by Vincent Barry and Ayn Rand. According to Barry's view:

Traditional concerns to philosophy suggest that the three categories under which all other philosophical fall: knowledge, reality and value. The fields of philosophy that explore these themes are generally termed epistemology, metaphysics and axiology respectively. Epistemology literally means the study of knowledge. A variety of problems are usually discussed as part of epistemology: the structure, reliability, extent, and kinds of knowledge; truth (including definition of truth, and validity); logic and variety of strictly linguistic concerns and the foundations of all knowledge. Metaphysics is the study of the most general or ultimate characteristics of reality or existence. Axiology refers to the study of values. Specifically

axiological problems of then involve values in human conduct; the nature and justification of social structures and political systems; the nature of art, and the meaning of art in human experience (Barry, 1980: 12-13).

1.4 How Ethics Became Independent From Other Branches of Philosophy?

From the quotation of Vincent Barry we can understand that Ethics embedded in the axiology. Accordingly Axiology includes various values while Ethics is concerned with moral values. Thus, ethics is a branch of axiology, which in turn is a branch of philosophy with other branches such as politics, and aesthetics. Axiology is defined by Vincent Barry as:

The word axiology, which comes from the Greek 'axios' meaning "worthy", refers to the study of values in general. It deals with values that are thought to be good in themselves, and with values leading to what is good one branch of axiology is ethics, or moral philosophy. Traditionally ethics has investigated the problems of values in human conducts. Ethics investigates questions involving right conduct, good character and life fulfillment. (Barry, 1980:89).

Now we reach concretely on ethics by isolating it from three broad branches of philosophy. While axiology is the general study of values, moral philosophy studies moral values. Ethics and political philosophy are very interrelated concepts. Hobbes moral rules also bend to political philosophy which concerns questions about social structures and political systems.

1.5 What is Ethics?

Any Rand defined ethics by comparing it with other branches of philosophy:

Metaphysics and epistemology, like the natural sciences, are factual subjects. Their concern is to describe the universe and man's means of knowledge. Ethics is an evaluative subject. Its concern is not only to describe, but also to prescribe for man. Ethics is the branch of philosophy that provides a code of values to guide man's choices and actions- the choices and

*actions that determine the purpose and the course of his life
(Rand, 1991: 206)*

1.6 Objectivism and Subjectivism in Ethics

Ethicists divided ethics into objectivism and subjectivism. Ethical subjectivism argues that moral rules are not objective or absolute but rather relative according to individual person, society, culture nation or community. In contrast to the subjectivists the objectivist ethics insists that moral rules are objective. Ayn Rand defines ethics from objectivist point of view. She defines it this way:

According to objectivism, ethical code must deal with three basic, interrelated questions. For what end should a man live? By what fundamental principle should he act in order to achieve this end? Who should profit from his actions. The answers to these questions define the ultimate value, the primary virtue, and the particular beneficiary upheld by an ethical code and reveal them by its essence. The objectivist position can be indicated in three words. The ultimate value is life. The primary virtue is rationality. The proper beneficiary is oneself. (Rand, 1991:206)

In addition to the attempt of showing the controversy between objectivist and subjectivist ethics, Rand gives her personal judgment as follows:

Because of its evaluative nature, ethics has always posed a unique problem to philosophers even to those who had no doubts about man's power to reason or of them, lead logically to estimates, such as "good" or "evil" "right" or "wrong" "desirable" or "undesirable".

How can a knowledge of what is validate a conclusion stating what ought to be?

to know the facts of reality. How thinkers have wondered from the Greeks to the present? Can value judgments ever be proved? How can facts, any or all

What "ought to be" can be validated objectively. Ethics is a human necessity and a science, not a playground for mystics or skeptics. The principles of morality are a product not of feeling, but of cognition. (Rand,1991: 206-207).

Thus, according to Rand ethics is something universal/objective. But there is objection to this view like this:

The question of "where morals come from?" has exercised by philosophers, theologians and many others for millennia. It has lately, like many other questions previously addressed on by through arm chair rumination, become addressable empirically, through the combined approaches of modern neuroscience, genetics, physiology, anthropology, and many other disciplines. From these approaches a naturalistic frame work is emerging to explain the biological origins of moral behavior. From this perspective, morality is neither objective nor transcendent it is the pragmatic and culture dependent expression of a set of neural systems that have evolved to allow our navigation of complex human social systems. (www.wiringthebrain. Com/2011/06/where-do-morals-come-from-htm)

Unlike Rand William Graham Sumner also describes ethics from subjective point of view. Here is his view:

The morality of a group at a time is the sum of the taboos and prescriptions in the folk ways by which right conduct is defined. Therefore, morals can never be intuitive. They are historical, institutional, and empirical world philosophy, life policy, right, and morality are all products of the folk ways. They are reflections on, and generalizations from, the experience of pleasure and pain which is won in efforts to carry on the struggle for existence under actual life conditions.

The generalizations are very crude and vague in their germinal forms. They are all embodied in folklore, and all our philosophy and science have been developed out of them. (Sumner quoted in, Rachels, 1999: 32-33).

Thus, when we search for the root of moral philosophy, it is connected to different world views expressed in the forms of philosophy, history, religion, biology, psychology and others. Apparently these world views accept that ethics is indispensable for the life of human beings. Another concept worth-mentioning regarding the root of moral philosophy is that even though there are different world views about ethics, most of these views can be categorized as Universalist and, subjectivist. All ethical codes and theories are

summarized under these two perspectives. My personal judgment is that ethics should not be understood as only subjective or objective.

As far as I understand ethics would be practiced and should be practiced in this world from both approaches. For example, when we take the killing of innocent people this cruel act is abolished all over the world. So, there is universal ethics which aspires the abolishment of cruel acts.

In some cultures the meat of pig is edible while in others it is a taboo. Thus, both Universalist, and subjectivist outlooks prevail in this world and we have to understand ethics from both perspectives rather than understanding it through only one extreme point. Let me conclude this section by what I have read from website that Sam Harris interviewed Paul Bloom regarding the roots of Good and evil. In their dialogue Bloom told to Sam Harris that ‘even if there are moralities which are relative and invented by human, there are also hard wired moral universals-moral principles that we all possess’.

1.7 Religious and Cultural World Views toward Ethical Rules

The ethical principles can be derived from different religions of the world and also other forms of views. For example, Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity, Judaism, and Islam have their own ethical codes. What makes these religions similar is that they trace the origin of ethics to supernatural force. They insist that moral rules were dictated by God as divine revelation. Another point in which almost all religious world views are similar is that they preach that ethical principles should transcend one's race and should be applied to all human kinds. For example, the Quran of Islamic religion prescribed the principles of solidarity and justice, which is preached universally. Ishay describes it this way:

Qur'anic verses offer a universal message reminiscent of the ethical perspectives of the older religions: "O mankind we created you from a single pair of a male and a female and made you into nations and tribes, that you may know each other" (Surah 49:B quoted in Ishay, 2004:27)

Thus, according to the teachings of Prophet Mohammed the origin of all creature is one i.e. God (Allah) and hence, he recognized the universality of moral goodness all over the world.

The Christian religion also preached ethical principles like humility, love, compassion and other virtues that foster harmonious life in this world. Jesus Christ with his ethical codes came to teach all nations of the world. Ten Commandments in the Old Testaments [that God told to Moses] were universally preached.

Hinduism also has a lot of ethical principles that are important for human freedoms and virtues at good life as follows:

The first five tenets of social assurances included: Freedom from violence (Ahimsa), Freedom from want (Asteya), freedom from exploitation (Aparigraha) Freedom from early death and disease (Armrutatva and Arogaya). To these five freedoms corresponded five virtues or controls: Absence of intolerance (Akrodha), Compassion (bhutadaya, Adroha), knowledge (Jnana, Vidya), freedom of conscience and freedom from fear, frustration and despair (pravrtti, Abhaya, Dhrti). (Ishay,2004:2)

A lot of cultures across this world also have enormous ethical principles that are indispensable for the life of human beings. For example, we can take the ethical principle of ancient Egyptians, Mesopotamians, and different Nations and tribes all over the world. In general like religious world views, ethical concepts embedded in the cultural world views and hence cultural contributions for moral philosophy are great.

1.8 The Influence of Pagan Philosophy for Religious Ethical Principles

The ancient Greek pagan philosophers have contributed a lot not only to secular ethical principles but also to great religions of the world especially to Christianity and Islam. It is known that Plato's works were incorporated in the Christian ethics and Aristotelian philosophy was integrated in Islamic ethics. J.P.Mackey indicated these influences as follows:

The philosophical influence on the growing church came from two main sources, Platonism and Stoic. For Christian ethics attention has been concentrated and perhaps rightly, on the stoic influence. But before turning to it, it is important to remark on a feature of Platonism which was potentially more important to more important

because more radical, for Christian ethics. Many early Christians found Platonism attractive. It provided a theory for the type of Christianity which thought only of fleeing the world: Its two 'world' structure was ideally suited to this sort of thought. Its transcendence left man and his world in a position which was as low as even the most fervid supporters of original sin could dream out. At the same it was extremely intellectualist and believed firmly in the importance of having this imperfect world conformed to the reliable standards which did exist and which the philosophers, who would if possible be kings, were familiar with and had a duty to apply. (Mackey, 1969: 40-41)

Thus, there are a lot of terms which make Christian ethics similar with that of pagan philosophers. Specially, St. Augustine incorporated a lot of ideas from that of Plato. For example for Plato there are two worlds. These are the world of Being which is eternal immutable and un changing and the world of becoming which is changeable and imperfect. Augustine categorized these as a city of God and city of Earth. The character of city of God is similar with Plato's world of Being while the character of city of Earth is similar with world of becoming. Plato taught that philosophers can understand the truth of Good and accordingly that of genuine knowledge is gained by the intuitional understanding of Good. Augustine replaced the role of Good for Plato with that of God. Augustine himself explained that he was fascinated by Plato's thought when he said “no school has come closer to us than the Platonists”.

1.9 Moral Philosophy from Historical Point of View

This topic can take us to the conclusion of the first section of chapter one. I have tried to show the roots of moral philosophy considered through different perspectives. The reason why I have done is to show how much different world views contributed to the development of different forms of knowledge for each other. Philosophy contributed wisdom to Religion and vice versa. Greeks contributed wisdom to the Egyptians, and Egyptians to the Greeks, the Chinese and Arabs contributed to the western thinking and, the later did the same to the former. For me this world is the arena of mutual enlightening. All peoples of the world had their own contributions directly or indirectly to

the today's wisdom. Ethics is one of the wisdoms that the world has developed through teaching and learning from each other.

When we consider the historical evolution of morality we understand that it is connected to the history of the world. Just for convenience the history of the world can be divided into ancient, medieval and modern. These three historical periods affected and were affected by the development of world's civilization and philosophy. The ethical thoughts also were affected by these historical periods of the world. Accordingly, the ethics of the ancient world was largely secular especially in the western world. Because the time of classical Greco - Roman civilization had no much influence of divine revelation.

The medieval period was characterized by religious domination in the history of the world. The ethical thoughts were also influenced by religious outlooks. Especially the Greco - Roman civilization was declined and was hijacked by religious preachers. Every enquiry; whether ethical, political, scientific or others, had been considered from the perspectives of religious views. In the western world, the philosophy of St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Anselm were dominant and ethical views were based on their religious teachings. As a result, good and evil were recognized from divine point of view.

Modern era is characterized by introducing secular ethics which had its base in pagan philosophy. Before the modern era, there was a transitional period known as Renaissance, which marked the relapse of Europe to classical Greco-Roman civilization. Renaissance which flourished in the Italian city of Florence took Greco- Roman civilization as "Golden age" of the western world and criticized medieval age as "dark age". In the medieval age the pagan philosophy of was banned. For example Plato's Academy was closed. On the other hand Muslim Arab scholars were acknowledged by the scholars of the renaissance for rescuing the works of Aristotle from damage. Even it was thought that Islamic religion was influenced by Aristotelian philosophy. Modern thought of ethics has similarity with that of ancient pagan philosophers in understanding ethics from secular point of view.

Thus, Moral philosophy evolved through these historical periods and developed into modern understanding of ethics. Now let me turn to the modern understanding of ethics from different scholars of modern and postmodern period.

Among modern philosophers who have had reflections on morality Baruch Spinoza is one. Like Hobbes, Spinoza breaks away from ancient and medieval moral philosophy. Point of difference between Spinoza's and classical philosophy is the value they ascribed to emotion. Unlike ancient philosophers he gave great credit to emotion. Like Descartes Spinoza wanted to understand emotions from the action of the body and the thought of the mind as indicated on website page (<http://www.arasite.org/WLnew/Spinoza/ethics.html>).

This understanding affected the total moral philosophy of Spinoza. In this regard, Spinoza had similar view with Hobbes who also gave great emphasis to passion. Hobbes even insisted that it was fear, death and diffidence that persuaded men in the state of nature to create social contract. According to him the role of reason follows after the role of passion in creating common wealth.

Both Spinoza and Hobbes agreed that reason is one of the entities that differentiate human beings from the rest of nature. The difference between Spinoza's and Hobbes' ethics is that the foundation of morality is anchored in social contract for the latter while the foundation of morality for Spinoza is based on ontology. For Spinoza ontology is "the unique infinite substance". Here is his idea:

Individual beings, singular things, including our selves are only modes of this one infinite substance. The meaning of word "mode" is "a way of being"; so for example a tree is a way of being of substance, just as we are away of being of substance. (<http://www.arasite.org/WLnew/Spinoza/ethics.html>).

In dealing with ontology unlike ancient philosophers like Plato and Aristotle, Spinoza gave value to the existence of things rather than the essence of things. It is in this existence which Spinoza call "conatas" that we find the idea of his ethics as follows:

The most important aspect of the existence of any singular thing is the desire to preserve its existence. Each thing, as far as it can by its own power, strives to preserve in its being. This is not just a definition of human existence, but all existences such, whether we are talking about a stone, a plant or even human being. To the extent that nothing prevents it from existing, every thing that does exist will strive to preserve itself in its existence. (<http://www.arasite.org/WLnew/Spinoza/ethics.html>)

He applied this idea of existence (conatus) to ethics like this:

Everything which helps me to preserve my existence I take to be good and everything that goes against my existence I take to be bad. What is good is what is useful, relative to my existence, and what is bad, is what is dangerous, relatively speaking, to my continued existence. This striving is not only a striving for self-preservation but also, an increase in the power of action, since in relation to the external causes that world extinguish my existence, all I have is my power to act. (<http://www.arasite.org/WLnew/Spinoza/ethics.html>).

Although the foundation of ethics is different for Spinoza and Hobbes, there are two concepts that made Spinoza and Hobbes similar. The first is both philosophers gave weight to self-preservation. The second is both philosophers gave emphasis to power. Hobbes for example maintained that the restless desire that man has for power would push men to the state of nature unless they would cooperate and create common wealth:

Power of man, to take it universally his present means to obtain some future apparent good, and is either original or instrumental. Natural power is the eminence of the faculties of body or mind, as extraordinary strength, form, prudence, arts eloquence, liberality, nobility.

Instrumental are those powers which, acquired by these or by fortune, are means and instruments to acquire more, as riches, reputation, friends, and the secret working of God, which men call good luck. For the nature of power is in this point like to fame, increasing as it proceeds; or like the motion of heavy bodies, which, the further they go, make still the more haste.

The greatest of human power is that which is compounded of the powers of most men united by consent in one person, natural or civil, that has the use of all their powers depending on his will, such as is the power of a common wealth; or depending on the wills of each particular such as is the power of a faction or of divers factions leagued. (Hobbes leviathan(1962), chap 10: 78)

Thus, Hobbes legitimized the power which is found in common wealth rather than the power which is found in the state of nature. He indicated the condition of power in the state of nature in connection to competition as follows:

So that, in the first place, I put for a general inclination of all man kind a perpetual and restless desire of power after power that ceases only in death. And the cause of this is not always that a man hopes for a more intensive delight than he has already attained to, or that he cannot be content with a moderate power, but because he cannot assure the power and means to live well which he has present without the acquisition of more and from hence it is that kings, whose power is greatest, turn their endeavors to the assuring it at home by laws or abroad by wars; and when that is done, there succeeds a new desire in some, of fame from new conquest: in others, of ease and sensual pleasure; in others, of admiration or being flattered fore excellence in some art or other ability of the mind. Competition of riches, honor, command or other power inclines to contention, enmity and war, because the way of one competition to the attaining of his desire is to kill, subdue, supplant, or repel the other particularly, competition of praise inclines to a reverence of antiquity. For men contend with the living, not with the dead to these ascribing more than due that they may obscure the glory of the other. (Hobbes Levi(1962), Chapter11:86-87)

I want to conclude this section by raising Kant's understanding of ethics in relation to that of Hobbes. Immanuel Kant understood ethics through the line of Rationalistic school of thought while Hobbes comprehends ethics through the line of empiricist school of thought.

For Kant the standard which is the base for the prevalence of ethics is what he calls "Categorical imperative." Reason has immense credit in Kant's understanding of morality. Unlike Hobbes who gave great emphasis to passion, Kant gave supremacy to reason in order to deal with moral and political philosophy. For Kant, 'it is important to act according to what was understood as right, rather than according to what was understood to be good'. Here is his idea I took from website page (definition of philosophy.blogspot.com/2012/08/the-basis-of-morality-in-kant-and-hobbes.html):

Three central themes are very prominent in Kantian understanding of morality. First, Kant argues that moral acts were these acts which were unconditionally right, such that any one who found themselves in similar situations would also act in the same way. Secondly, Kant argued that the conduct that can be considered right was that which did not understand or treat other person as means to an end. In this way this conduct would not further individual interests against the other, by taking advantage of the other. Thirdly, Kant understood that every conduct was supposed to be ordered in such a way that it would amount to a universal law, such that conduct would be easily applied by others who found themselves in similar circumstances. Any conduct that violated these three principles amounted to wrong and immoral conduct pure practical reason central to this understanding.

Kant understood the good as being totally irrelevant to morality. The only way to right judgment regarding morality was a priori by means practical reason according to him. (definitionofphilosophy.blogspot.com/2012/08/the-basis-of-morality-in-kant-and-hobbes.html)

My suggestion regarding Kantian and Hobbes is that Kant argued that morality should be applicable universally. Even if there is no doubt that there are universal moral thoughts to be applicable around the globe, in my view moral rules prevail in this world either universally or uniquely. The reason is that, on one hand, there are universal moral norms all over the world, and on the other there are enormous moral rules which are differently applicable in the world. So when we universalize all moral norms like Kant, our idea lacks flexibility. Kant insisted that good is irrelevant to explain morality and the only way to right judgment regarding it is a priori or pure practical reason. In this case the way Kant explained morality is superfluous for me. That means he did not tell us the concrete definition of the words good and bad like Hobbes. The Kantian understanding of morality which insists that human conduct can be considered right is not that treats other persons as means to an end is a convincing moral rule for me. It has great contribution for moral and political philosophy.

Regarding human nature Hobbes and Kant had opposite ideas. Kant understood the human person as being guided by individual reason, but it had to be the reason that did not seek supremacy over the other. But Hobbes understood human being as a being that is

totally driven by self interest and desire. This idea of Hobbes influenced his general moral ground.

I have no trouble with idea of Kant with his concern of human nature. But regarding that of Hobbes I have reservation. Although human beings have self-interest, lust for power and of glory, they should not be totally reduced to self centered beings. In my view, human nature should be characterized by both selfishness and selflessness. Thus, despite their difference on human nature and other issues, Hobbes and Kant had great contribution to moral philosophy and politics.

Section Two: Social Contract

The concept of social contract according to Hobbes is the key for the prevalence of morality. The heyday of social contract theory is 17th and 18th centuries. The reason why I took 17th and 18th centuries as the heyday of social contract is that even though social contract has long history, a great emphasis was given to it in 17th and 18th centuries. Great philosophers of the time such as Hobbes, Rousseau, Locke, Spinoza, Montesquieu, Pufendorf and others popularized it. The time was crucial in the history of the world's politics since it was characterized by the modern formations of state. Of course, social contract was prevailed in the antiquity and medieval periods. What made the social contract of 17th and 18th century critical is that almost all the state formations that took place in them were unlike that of ancient and medieval which ruined each other's civilization and replaced it with different order. Most of the states which were formed in these centuries were strong and contributed a lot to the today's form of state which has specific and respected boundaries. Now a days societies and their states are not subject to ruin since great attention is given for social contract, as world, continent and country. In order to clarify more the concept of social contract let me mention the two divisions of social contract described by J.W. Gough:

The first of these contracts is in logical order, is the social contract proper - which supposes that a number of individuals, living in the state of nature, agreed to gather to form an organized society. A good example of men translating this theory in to practice is in the often quoted covenant of the pilgrim fathers, who, when they landed from the may

flower in November 1620, resolved: we do solemnly and mutually, in the presence of God and of one another, covenant and combine our selves together into a civil body politic. This is a theory, then, of the origin of the state. The second form of social contract may more accurately be called the contract of government or the contract of submission. A well known example of this is that original contract between king and people which James II was said to have broken. Properly this has nothing to do with the foundation of the state, but presupposing a state already in existence, it purports to define the terms on which it is to be governed the people have made a contract with their ruler which determines their relations with him. They promise him obedience and he promises them protection and good government. While he keeps his part of the bargain they must keep theirs, but if he misgoverns the contract is broken and allegiance is at an end. (Gough, 1957: 2-3)

Thus, to make the above quotation clear, there are two types of social contract. The first is the contract among citizens to escape from the dangers encountered in a state of nature and enter in to civil society (social contract proper). The second is the contract between the established government and its citizens who established the government to protect the pacts (the social contract of submission).

Regarding social contract Hobbes did not bifurcate social contract. He simply indicated that contract is indispensable for the prevalence of moral rules. First he defined contract as “The mutual transferring of right”. In contract, according to Hobbes, subjects have to either transfer or renounce their right in order to escape from the dangers of state of nature. Hobbes described this as follows:

Right is laid a side, either by simply renouncing it; or by transferring it to another. By simply Renouncing; when the intendeth the benefit here of to some certain person, or persons. And when a man hath in either manner abandoned or granted away his right; then he is said to be OBLIGE, or Bound, not to hinder those, to whom such right is granted, or abandoned, from the benefit of it: and that he ought, and it is his DUTY, not to make void that voluntary act of his own: and that such hindrance is Injustice, and injury, as being sine jure: the right being before renounced, or transfer. (Hobbes Lev (1962), chapter 4:104-105).

Rousseau is also one of the prominent advocates of social contract theory. He was influenced by Hobbes' social contract. Accordingly, he insisted that 'whatever men may do, no nation will ever be anything but what the nature of its government may make it'. By the lesson he learned from Montesquieu, also insisted that 'no government will ever be anything but that the nature of its people may make it'. From these two views we understand that issues like morality, law, justice and others are the manifestations of politics which itself is the result of social contract. Like that of Hobbes his moral philosophy overlaps with his political philosophy. He described the history of history of his social contract book together with politics and morality as follows:

I conceived the first idea of the book of social contract when I was at Venice, and had occasion to remark the defects of that much vaunted constitution. Since that time my views had been greatly enlarged by the historical study of morals. I had come to see that, in the last resort, everything depends up on politics (Rousseau, 1962:3).

Another eminent follower of Hobbes was Spinoza. His social contract theory is similar to that of except that little modification is done to it. Accordingly, he indicated state of nature and its remedy as follows:

In the state of nature, what men chiefly desire is a life as far as possible secure and free from fear. Naturally, however, under the influence of passions such as anger, envy, and hatred, men are enemies of one another, and being cleverer and more astute than all other living creatures, they are more capable of injuring one another, There are no natural rights, i.e. no moral obligations, but only power in fact, might is, or confers, right. Consequently right and wrong have no meaning except under a government which makes laws to distinguish them; by nature all things one open equally to everybody, and property, and justice and injustice, exist only in the state (Spinoza quoted in Gough,1957:113-114)

Gough identified the difference of Hobbes and Spinoza regarding social contract like this:

Spinoza diverges from Hobbes at this point, for instead of men transferring their natural powers to a sovereign ruler, they transfer them to the whole society and the state so created is a democracy. Experience shows, Spinoza says that the more absolute a kings power, the misery his

subjects have to endure, and the majority of a large community is less likely to make mistakes: consequently, democracy is preferable to monarchy. This preference is partly the result of the truer psychology of Spinoza for he recognizes that men have natural sympathy and pity, and, a natural need of one another, as well as hatred and envy; and though he thinks that enmity is usually stronger than friendliness, he does not, like Hobbes, seek to explain away all generous emotions as disguised forms of selfishness (Gough,1957:114).

In my view even if Hobbes' and Spinoza's idea are different on some circumstances, there are a lot of lessons we have to learn from these thinkers. We have to learn from Hobbes that the organ to which citizens should transfer their natural right should be strong. Because according to him, when this organ (leviathan) remains in a fragile state citizens' goal of self-preservation would fail. This idea of Hobbes is convincing and should be considered as a great contribution to the development of modern politics and morality. The type of government that Hobbes preferred in his Leviathan was monarchy. Of course, in contemporary politics democracy is preferable as Spinoza indicated. In this case I also prefer democratic government for the transfer of natural rights of citizens in order to gain security in return.

Even though democracy is more suitable for the contemporary political system, we have to examine the context that persuaded Hobbes to prefer monarchy. Blindly categorizing Hobbes' works as absolute or controversial is not logically convincing. The scholars who contributed classical masterpieces for generations were perplexed with some problems in order to reach at one point. So, we have to consider their perplexing issues either excitement or worry before we judge their idea as convincing or not. In condition of excitement or worry most scholars understood different concepts which can teach consecutive generations. If we consider the case of Hobbes, the time when he wrote Leviathan was crucial for him and his countrymen. There were political, religious, economic and other controversies which even weakened the central government and terrorized citizens. In that case more than anything consolidating the power of central government was a necessity. Of all types of governments, for Hobbes, monarchy was possible from England's context. So, we have to consider the circumstance before we judge Hobbes' view as absolute or not. This idea strengthens my view:

Most of the important books in philosophy have been written by men who were either worried or excited or both. Plato was worried by the profound social changes of his time and excited by mathematics; Kant was both worried and excited by the French Revolution and by Newtonian physics. These thinkers were perplexed by problems arising from new discoveries and social change just as many modern thinkers are perplexed by the implications of Freud, Marx, and Einstein or appalled by the social problems created by rapid industrialization and the development mass media of communication. Hobbes Leviathan ranks as one of the great books in philosophy because it attempted a systematic answer to the problems posed by the far-reaching social changes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and by the rise of mathematical sciences. The marriage of his worry with his excitement may have produced a monster-which shocked his contemporaries and successors.(Peters quoted in leviathan, 1962:7).

Even though there is no doubt about the conduciveness of democracy for the contemporary world as Spinoza insisted, we have to also consider the context that persuaded Hobbes to prefer monarchy as good government. For example, there was a circumstance in which Hobbes himself escaped to Paris for the sake of security.

In my view Hobbes social contract should not also be taken as a thought experiment. It is the concrete life existence because the condition of state of nature that Hobbes discussed was there in the past, and will occur in the future.

For me no philosopher understood the condition of state of nature, before Hobbes had made an issue critical. State of nature should not be characterized as the case of primitive society. The issue prevails in every occasion in which centralized government is at stake or in a fragile condition.

Locke insisted that state of nature should not be characterized as “war of all against all” since there is natural law which binds men to injure each other. Moreover, he emphasized the creation of civil society for the preservation of property. But for me self-preservation even should precede the preservation of property. We don't think about property when our life is in stake. Law of nature is not guarantee for us in state of nature. That is why Hobbes wanted a firm government and not a guarantee by the law of nature. In his time

monarchy is firm to preserve the life of subjects even if it is not suitable to the modern generation of politics.

Another point in which I took Hobbes as the pioneer of social contract is that, he relieved the issue of morality and politics from the law of nature and super natural entity and made it secular. Accordingly, from his point view the issue of justice, law, good and bad should be understood from secular point of view. This idea is even recommended to the contemporary politics itself. He is the pioneer of secularism for me even though his successors strengthened the concept more.

Even though circumstances persuaded Hobbes to prefer monarchy, I feel that there was still short coming in his work. If for example, the sovereign ruler safe guards the subjects' life and property, then there is no problem. But what happens if a sovereign ruler fails to protect the subjects and becomes a tyrant or despotic ruler? Hobbes did not fill this gap. In this case I appreciate Locke who filled this gap by insisting that 'if the sovereign ruler failed to fill the goals of common wealth, over thrown of the government is justified'. Thomas Aquinas fostered this idea even before Locke.

Spinoza's Argument which says, 'for instead of men transferring the natural powers to a sovereign ruler, they have to transfer them to the whole society, and the state so created is a democracy' also fills this gap. Thus, what I took as short coming of Hobbes is that he did not make boundaries to the political power of a sovereign ruler. Additionally, he did not consider whether monarchical government transcends its time and applicable to the conditions of the next generation of politics. In the contemporary times most of monarchical governments in the world faced revolution. Instead, democratic governments cope up with this generation of politics.

When citizens transfer their right to the whole society as Spinoza insisted, it is possible for them to revolt against government when it abuses its power.

More over, the point of departure between Spinoza and Hobbes is similar to some extent to that of Hobbes and Rousseau. Hobbes emphasized the sovereignty of ruler than the sovereignty of subject. Vaughan describes this by saying that 'the sovereignty of Hobbes,

it may be objected, is the sovereignty of a despot; that of Rousseau is the sovereignty of the community at large’.

Pufendorf was also one of the influential scholars of social contract school who followed Hobbes and Spinoza. In some points he supports the views of Hobbes and Spinoza while he breaks from them on some other points. Gough describes his view like this:

First of all he attacks their conception of the law of nature. According to Pufendorf it is not be equated with man's animal desires, nor is the state of nature as state of war. ‘Man’s natural condition is peaceful the condition enjoined by the law of nature, which imposes on him and binding obligation’. But though man has a duty to observe the law of nature, he is swayed by passions and desires, so that it must be admitted that the peace of the state of nature is precarious and uncertain. Accordingly, men are led to enter society’Pufendorf agrees with Hobbes that the dominating human motive is men's desire for their own conveniences so that they must have this in view if they are to choose a social life of their own will, and being free, their entry in to society must be voluntary. But he also holds, as against Hobbes, that men are naturally sociable, and that this sociability, or natural inclination to join societies, is the foundation of a man's willingness to unite his fellows (Gough, 1957:119-120)

Pufendorf breaks from Hobbes by arguing that the natural condition of man kind is characterized as peace except there is precariousness and uncertainty. His idea is similar with that of Locke who insisted that ‘life in the state of nature is not equal to state of war since men were bind by law of nature’. Both Locke and Pufendorf agree that life in the state of nature is precarious and uncertain. But they argue that state of nature is not characterized by disorder. In my view if there is uncertainty there is chaos and disorder in the state of nature as Hobbes argued.

Pufendorf argued that ‘political organization was preceded by a social existence in families, and the parties to the contract were no isolated individuals but the patriarchs’. He used this idea in order to refute what Hobbes considered as solitary life in the state of nature. But for me even if families had great contribution in the formation of political society, their role cannot refute the condition of state of nature. I.e. family cannot play the

role of state within the society. Even in a lot of circumstances family life itself is influenced by political society. For example, let us take one family even in this modern era whose their father and mother have died. In order to divide the resource that they should inherit from their family, they need firm law of political society. Unless otherwise, state of nature may prevail even in one family in order to divide the inheritance equally.

Thus, for me whether in ancient society or modern society if there is no firm social contract which Hobbes called Leviathan, 'there is no morality, justice mine, thine, industry and others' as Hobbes insisted. Even our life is in stake in the state of nature.

CHAPTER TWO

The Influences of Thomas Hobbes

Hobbes moral understanding originates from the influences of thinkers before him and his contemporaries. I classify these influences as classical, medieval, and modern.

Mostly of Hobbes's moral and political ideas differ from that of the classical and medieval thinkers. Nevertheless, there are some ideas that Hobbes appreciated especially from classical thinkers. Thucydides is among classical thinkers who turned on the mind of Hobbes. Hobbes translated Thucydides' work of "Peloponnesian war" from Greek to English language. Hobbes adopted from Thucydides secularism. Like Thucydides Hobbes relieved himself from the belief in any supernatural entity in order to formulate secular moral and political ideas.

As far as I understand Thucydides' work was not as moral as that of Hobbes. Much of Thucydides' works were political rather than moral. But it is important to show that that Thucydides' Political philosophy greatly influenced Hobbes' political philosophy. Both Thucydides and Hobbes were intersected in expounding a view known as political realism. political realism is defined as:

A theory of political philosophy that attempts to explain model and prescribe political relations. It takes as its assumption that power is (ought to be) the primary end of political action, whether in the domestic or international arena. In the domestic arena, the theory asserts that politicians do, or should, strive to maximize their power, whilst on the international stage; nation states are seen as primary agents that maximize, or ought to maximize, their power. The theory is therefore to be examined as either a prescription in of what ought to be the case, that is, nations and politicians ought to pursue power or their own interests, or a description of the ruling state of affairs-that nation and politicians only pursue (and perhaps only can pursue) power or self-interest. Political realism in essence reduces to the political-ethical principle that might is right. The theory has long history, being evidence in Thucydides' Peloponnesian war. It was expanded on by Machiavelli in the prince, and others such as Thomas Hobbes, Spinoza, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. (<http://www.iep.utm.edu/polreal/>).

Even though political realism has no direct relevance to morality, there are some moral dimensions that can be extracted from it. Hobbes himself was a political realist. But unlike most political realists he raised also moral issues in obviously. Some literary sources indicated that his ancient predecessor Thucydides' works were exclusively political and historical unlike Hobbes who raised a lot of things about moral issues especially after he wrote Leviathan.

2.1 The Lessons Hobbes Learned from Thucydides

One of the lessons that Hobbes learned from Thucydides, is that political enquiry should be separated from the belief in the supernatural force. This idea also influenced his moral thoughts. Hobbes believed in mortal god (leviathan) rather than immortal god in order to ensure justice and security of citizens.

The second lesson Hobbes learned from the political realism of Thucydides is that power is the most essential element in order to consolidate political and moral issues. But Hobbes appreciated power not for aggrandizement but rather he believed that it ensures citizens' self preservation by compelling them to act according to the pacts in common wealth.

The Third lesson, Hobbes learned and adopted to his moral and political philosophy that Democracy is not good unless it is guided by matured person. Honestly I did not read any expression in the works of Hobbes that states directly "I hate democracy". But his preference of monarchical system seems that he has suspicion in democratic system in order to ensure peace and security within the society as far as I understood. Thucydides directly indicated that he had suspicion in the strength of democracy by talking about Pericles who was the ruler of Greek during the outbreak of Peloponnesian war.

Moreover, Thucydides argued that 'democracy which was practiced by Pericles in Greek had the effect of liberating individual daring, enterprise and questioning spirit, but the same liberation according to him, by permitting the growth of limitless political ambition, led to imperialism, civic strife' (Peloponnesian war). That means according to Thucydides the democratic system was fragile to manage people's interests which finally led to Peloponnesian war.

As an individual experiencing contemporary world I am not agree with Thucydides and Hobbes that democracy is not the suitable type of governance. But from their idea I want to share especially with Thucydides who argued that ‘democracy need precaution from both the ruler and the citizens in order to use both rights and duties’ in a balanced way.

Both Thucydides and Hobbes faced loosely organized commonwealth which led to chaos. Thucydides faced destructive Peloponnesian war which took place between Athens and Sparta and ruined the marvelous Greek civilization. In this case Thucydides wished great power which can compel both Athens and Sparta not to attack each other. He remarked that “war is a violent teacher”. From that war he learned that power is an important tool in order to rule the common wealth efficiently in a peaceful manner. That is why he is considered as “the father of real politik “. That means he obviously indicated that power is the most indispensable for state.

Hobbes also adopted power politics from him and fostered real politik. As Thucydides was terrorized by Peloponnesian war Hobbes also faced the horror of English revolution which was the result of fragile condition of central power. Hobbes needed politicians like Oliver Cromwell who smashed all reactionary groups and compelled to be ruled under the centralized government. Among the modern thinkers Hobbes had the lion share in philosophizing about power.¹

¹ See also en.Wikipedia.org/wiki/Thucydides/

His predecessor Machiavelli advised the prince to be strong in order to own glory. But Hobbes needed the strength of the prince in order to get power. Power for Hobbes is the great means in order to get everything.

Thus, in my view, the moral dimension of real politik is that, if the state is powerful, this is the precondition for the prevalence of moral rules. If there is no powerful state; then there can be no strong moral rule. For example, in the Peloponnesian war, as Thucydides indicated 'there were no just and unjust, moral and immoral. Everything was looted to the ground.('en Wikipedia. org/wiki/Thucydides). So, we can say that it was "war of all against all" as Hobbes indicated.

Sophists were also considered to have greatly and positively influenced Hobbes. Especially he appreciated Protagoras who argued that "man is the measure of all things". For Hobbes also moral rules, politics and other enquires were human terms. That is why he emphasized mortal god than immortal god in order to ensure peace and security among human society.

2.2 Machiavellian Influence On Hobbes Philosophy

No Philosopher, among modern thinkers had greater influence on the Hobbes moral and political philosophy than Italian philosopher, Niccolo Machiavelli. Machiavellian thoughts are dominated by political philosophy. That is why Machiavelli is regarded as the father of modern political philosophy. But they still have moral grains which in turn contributed to Hobbes moral philosophy. Machiavelli is one of the thinkers who foster political realism.

Leo Strauss in his master piece known as "what is political philosophy?" mentioned the realist political thoughts of Machiavelli which has moral dimension "might make right" as follows:

The founder of modern political philosophy is Machiavelli. He tried to effect, and he did affect, a break with the whole tradition of political philosophy. He compared his achievement to that of men like Columbus. He claimed to have discovered a new moral continent. His claim is well founded; his political teaching is "wholly new" (Strauss, 1987:40)

Like Hobbes, Machiavelli breaks from both classical and medieval philosophers in many ways. He indicated that traditional philosophy religions preached men in order to escape from cave of darkness to glorious area. For example, when we take Plato's philosophy thought how human beings reach on the form of good in his allegory of cave.

World great religions also preached men in order to escape from this world of becoming (earth) to the world of being (heaven) which is perfect. But Machiavelli indicated that he will advise human beings not to escape from darkness to light, but how to struggle in that darkness in order to change it to light. That means he advised men to discover earthly morality that makes life comfortable. He discovered other options of morality and politics .Here is his idea:

The traditional approach was based on the assumption that morality is something substantial; that it is a force in the soul of man, however ineffective it may be especially in the affairs of states and kingdoms .Against this assumption Machiavelli argues as follows: Virtue can be practiced only within society; man must be habituated to virtue by laws, customs and so forth. Men must be educated to virtue by human beings .The original educators, the founders of society, cannot have been educated to virtue: the founder of Rome was a fratricide. Morality is possible only within a context which cannot be created by morality, for morality cannot create itself. The context within which morality is possible is created by immorality. Morality rests on immorality; justice rests on injustice, just as all legitimacy ultimately rests on revolutionary functions. (Machiavelli quoted in Strauss, 1987:41-42)

Machiavellian works influenced Hobbes a lot as I have mentioned above. Even the idea of psychological egoism which is advocated by Hobbes has its root in Machiavelli .The critique of most classical philosophy and religion is also another aspect that Hobbes developed from Machiavelli. Hobbes' appreciation of power was also a modified form of Machiavelli's appreciation of glory .Machiavelli even insisted that 'armed prophets succeeded in preaching their ideology as they like while unarmed prophets failed in the history of the world '.He indicated armed prophets as 'those who became princes by their own abilities rather than by good fortune'. The most outstanding armed prophets who Machiavelli appreciated were people like Moses, Cyrus, Romulus, Theseus, Alexander

the Great and others. Thus, when he appreciated armed prophets he indirectly appreciated power politics which Hobbes and other realist philosophers fostered.

Moreover, Machiavelli indicated that in order to learn morality man has to be compelled since he has bad and selfish character. He described like this:

Patriotism itself is not natural. Just as man is not by nature directed toward virtue, he is not by nature directed toward society. By nature man is radically selfish. Yet while men are by nature selfish, and nothing but selfish, hence bad, they can still become social, public spirited, or good. This transformation requires compulsion. The success of this compulsion is due to the fact that man is amazingly malleable much more so than had hitherto been thought. (Machiavelli quoted Straus, 1987:42-43)

2.3 Hobbes and Antiquity

Despite his appreciation of Thucydides, Sophists and some other thinkers, Hobbes was frustrated by most of the philosophical works of the antiquity. He criticized the grand Philosophical theories of the popular Greek Philosophers.

One of the movements that inspired Hobbes' philosophy and enabled him to criticize most of the traditional philosophy was scientific outlooks. Scientific ideas shaped all philosophical ideas of Hobbes. According to Hobbes the Greek popular thinkers like Plato and Aristotle lacked scientific ideas in their philosophy. He insisted that even medieval thinkers had no room for scientifically convincing ideas except adopting the ideas of Plato and Aristotle and that of Scriptures. He even indicated that Philosophy itself was not originated in Greek. If there is no Common wealth there is no room for philosophical enquiry. In order to philosophize, leisure is important, and to have a leisure time according to Hobbes, Common wealth is indispensable. He argued that Greeks started to philosophize after they got united and created their own Common wealth within their territory. The same is true for moral ideas since they were also one part of Philosophy. Hobbes discussed about Greek moral philosophy as follows:

Their moral philosophy is but a description of their own passions, for the rule of manners, without civil government is the law of nature; and in it, the law of civil, that determine what is honest and dishonest, what is just and unjust, and generally what is good and evil. Whereas they make the rules of good and bad, by their own liking and disliking; by which means, in so great diversity of taste, there is nothing generally agreed on; but everyone do as far as he dares what so ever seem good in his own eyes, to the subversion of Common wealth. (Leviathan 1962, chap 46:481)

Regarding the above quotation from Leviathan there are views that I agree with Hobbes and there are also points that I want disagree. I agree with Hobbes that philosophy and other enquiries are not only the possession of Greeks. Greeks were influenced by other wondering civilizations of other people especially by that of Egyptians and Persians. In his work of "stolen legacy" J. Jams indicated that the root of Greek philosophy was Egyptians. He indicated evidences that most of Giant Greek philosophers such as Pythagoras, Aristotle and others visited ancient Egypt and adopted a lot of concepts from Egyptian people.

Hobbes' view that insists 'leisure is important for Philosophy' is also convincing for me. Some sources indicated that ancient Egyptian monks had leisure time, and this enabled them to philosophise many mathematical concepts. For that leisure time the advantage of Common wealth was undeniable. Hobbes also emphasized that leisure which is the mother of all Philosophies (moral, political and others) is unthinkable without Common wealth.

Even though most of Hobbes' Philosophy is convincing, I do not fully support Hobbes. That means even though most of my comments focused on supporting Hobbes' views I have also some criticisms regarding Hobbes Ideas below. The following are the gaps I want show for Hobbes to fulfill.

In my view we should read any given philosophical texts not as faith value but we should analyze and criticize if there are unconvincing ideas. Moreover, some skepticism is healthy in dealing with Philosophical, Historical and Scientific works. The same true for Hobbes and other thinkers for me. Of course, I support personally most of realist

philosophers since they tell me the concepts directly rather than going around the bush .But I have also the room for their criticism especially on their extreme points.

Hobbes for example said that ‘Greek Philosophy is unprofitable’ (leviathan, 1962, 481). This is an extreme idea. Even if Greeks were influenced by other contingent events of the time and people they had their own color of philosophical enquiry that have contribution for Medieval and modern thinkers. For me one of the Hobbes’ mistakes is that since he totally took the scientific path of philosophizing as sacred idea, he did not appreciate other philosophers that were out of scientific path. This is wrong. As Descartes indicated method is good for philosophizing .But taking only one method as the only way of philosophizing is not important. In my view Philosophy should not be reduced to only the domain of science .It has even the power to analyze and check scientific methods since science itself was developed from it.

Thus, the reductionist assumption of Hobbes which analyzes all enquiries only by the lens of scientific fact has its own shortcomings. For example, science has a lot of disadvantages such as global warming, Nuclear weapons, ethical, political and problems of nature. Even if science itself has solutions for these problems, its solutions are not enough to tackle the problems. The problems need philosophical remedies. Although Science contributed a lot to material achievements for Humans it has no power to marginalize philosophy. In general why I am criticizing Hobbes in this context is that he has chosen only scientific path to deal with philosophy.

Regarding ethics Hobbes is obviously relativist. In this case I follow the mean between relativism and objectivism as far as I understood from world’s concrete circumstances. Let me conclude this topic by what Hobbes argued about good and bad in his leviathan:

Aristotle and heathen philosophers , define good and evil, by the appetite of men; and well enough, as long as we consider them governed every one by his own law; for in the condition of men that have no other law but their own appetites, there can be no general rule of good, and evil actions. But in a Commonwealth this measure is false: not the appetite of private men, but the law, which is the will and appetite of the state, is the measure. And yet is this doctrine still practiced; and men judge the goodness or wickedness of their own, and of other men’s actions, and of

the actions of the Common wealth itself, by their own passions; and no man called good or evil but that which is so in his own eyes, without any regard at all to the public laws.(Hobbes leviathan, 1962:489).

2.4 Hobbes Contemporaries

There are thinkers and Scientists who were contemporaries of Hobbes. Thinkers that I will discuss here are those who were influenced by Hobbes. The two great modern philosophers whose works were greatly influenced by Hobbes are John Locke and Baruch Spinoza.

2.4.1 John Locke

Basically in the history of English political philosophy Hobbes was regarded an absolutist philosopher while Locke was considered as a libertarian thinker. Accordingly, within Anglo-Saxon world Locke is accepted more than Hobbes. This is not to nullify Locke's philosophy under the guise of Hobbesian Philosophy .My aim is to show that Locke's political and moral thoughts were greatly anchored on that of Hobbes .For example, when we take "state of nature", this thought experiment was more clarified and consolidated by Hobbes. Following from this thought experiment the idea of "self-preservation" adopted by Hobbes himself. These two concepts which were adopted by Hobbes to the theory of social contract influenced many modern philosophers such as Locke himself, Rousseau, Spinoza, Pufendorf and others. The concept of self-preservation and state of nature are contained in the works of all philosophers that I mentioned above. But the pioneer of these concepts is Hobbes. Even as far as I know these concepts are not raised in the works of giant Greek philosophers accurately. The reason why I am impressed by these concepts is that the concepts carried great political and moral ideas. When we come from the 'state of nature' to 'Common wealth' or civil society, the establishment of one body politic by escaping from 'state of nature 'is political concept. Second the establishment of one body politic presupposes the consolidation of moral rules which in turn enables society to determine what is just, unjust ,good or bad. This is the moral dimension of social contract which is the remedy of state of nature. Of course the above political philosophers said a lot about law of nature, state of nature, self-preservation and social contract .But the Projector behind them is Hobbes. Locke modified the idea of Hobbes

when he argued that ‘the desire for self-preservation turns into the desire for property’. Thus, Locke needed the establishment of Common wealth not for self-preservation but for property. That is why some times he is regarded as a bourgeoisie Philosopher. In my view the goal of Common wealth should be focused on self-preservation. If our life is protected from danger then property can be protected along with our peace and security.

2.4.2 Baruch Spinoza

Spinoza is one of the prominent modern Philosophers who were influenced by Hobbes’ moral and political Philosophy. Spinoza adopted secularism from Hobbes. He argued that ‘Philosophy and religion should be bifurcated in order to do free thinking’. Second Spinoza’s ideas on the foundation of state, right of sovereign and other issues denoted in his work “*a Theologico-political Treatise part three*” were contribution of Hobbes leviathan .In this case Spinoza did not argued that he was fascinated by Hobbes works and adopted them in his works .But I want to indicate that their political and moral ideas were supplementary to each other. Spinoza cleared the way for philosophy by deeply discussing the confusion between religion and philosophy or faith and reason by secular ideas he gained from Hobbes .In this case he tried to reconcile the two thinkers who took extreme points by arguing that either reason should triumph faith or the opposite. These thinkers are Maimonides andR. JehudaAlpakhar respectively. My intention here is the reconciliation of reason and faith which accomplished by Spinoza was the contribution of Hobbes’ moral and political ideas which were totally secular. Spinoza described the division of philosophy and religion like this:

(1) Those who know not that philosophy and reason are distinct, dispute whether Scripture should be made subservient to reason, or reason to Scripture: that is, whether the meaning of Scripture should be made to agreed with reason; or whether reason should be made to agree with Scripture: the latter position is assumed by the skeptics who deny the certitude of reason, the former by the dogmatists. (2)Both parties are, as I have shown, utterly in the wrong, for either doctrine would require us to tamper with reason or with Scripture.(3) We have shown that Scripture does not teach philosophy, but merely obedience, and that all it contains has been adapted to the understanding and established opinions of the multitude. (4) Those, therefore, who wish to adapt it to philosophy, must needs ascribe to the prophets many ideas which they never even dreamed

of, and give an extremely forced interpretation to their words: those on the other hand, who would make reason and philosophy subservient to theology, will be forced to accept as Divine utterances the prejudices of the ancient Jews, and to fill and confuse their mind therewith. (5) In short, one party will run wild with the aid of reason, and the other will run wild without the aid of reason. (Theologico-political Treatise chap xv page: 18)

Moreover, Spinoza tried to diagnose the controversy between faith and reason in his master piece *Theologico- political Treatise*. It seems “the doctrine of two truths’ that Medieval Muslim adopted in order to reconcile faith and reason. The reason why I emphasize the reconciliation of religion and philosophy by Spinoza here is that at the end of the day if Philosophy and religion become independent and free thin king is accomplished political and moral terms become human terms which are the influence of Hobbes. Spinoza again expressed this as follows:

We may, take it for indisputable that theology is not bound to serve reason, nor reason theology, but that each has her own domain. The sphere of reason is, as we have said, truth and wisdom; the sphere of theology is piety and obedience. The power of reason does not extend so far as to determine for us that men may be blessed through simple obedience, without understanding. To sum up, we may draw the absolute conclusion that the Bible must not be accommodated to reason, or reason to the Bible.

(Theologico-political Treatise,1883, chap xv:20).

Another point on which Hobbes and Spinoza overlapped is their notion on the foundation of state. Spinoza also emphasized social contract in order to think about morality. He followed the path of Hobbes and finally concluded that Cooperation among men is indispensable to escape state of nature:

(16:22) Nevertheless, no one can doubt that it is much better for us to live according to the laws and assured dictates of reason, for, as we said, they have men's true good for their object. (23) Moreover, everyone wishes to live as far as possible securely beyond the reach of fear, and this would be quite impossible so long as everyone did everything he liked, and reason's claim was lowered to a par with those of hatred and anger; there is no one who is not ill at ease in the midst of enmity, hatred, anger, and deceit, and who does not seek to avoid them

as much as he can. [16:3] (24) When we reflect that men without mutual help, or the aid of reason, must needs live most miserably, as we clearly proved in ChapV, we shall plainly see that men must necessarily come to an agreement to live together as securely and well as possible if they are to enjoy as a whole the rights which naturally belong to them as individuals.(Theologico-political Treatise,1883:)

Here is also Hobbes idea regarding cooperation as was indicated in one of the best commentaries. Accordingly, he denoted that' each of us is enormously better off living in a mutually cooperative society than we would be if we tried to make it on our own.

The benefits of social living go far beyond companionship: Social cooperation makes possible schools, hospitals, and highways; houses with electricity and central heating; airplanes and telephones; newspapers and books; movies, opera, and bingo; science and agriculture. Without social cooperation we would lose these benefits and more. Therefore, it is to the advantage of each of us to do whatever is necessary to establish and maintain a cooperative society .But it turns out that a mutually cooperative society can exist only if we adopt certain rules of behavior –rules that require telling the truth, keeping our promises, respecting on another's lives and property, and so on. Thus, "social contract" is the basis of morality. Indeed, morality can be defined as nothing more or less than 'the set of rules that rational people will agree to obey, for their mutual benefit, provided that other people will obey them as well. (Hobbes, quoted in Rachels, 1999:8-9)

The idea of Hobbes quoted above from the commentary of Rachels make Hobbes social contract with that of socialism to some extent. My comment on this is that Hobbes cooperation by social contract is for security of life and property only. He has no the idea of socialism political ideology like that of Rousseau. Finally let me conclude this topic by Spinoza's argument which emphasizes that there is no morality without Common wealth and sovereign power as Hobbes insisted. In this case we have to bear in mind that Spinoza's sovereign power is that of democracy while that of Hobbes is Monarchy:

[19:2] (16) In order that the true doctrines of reason, that is (as we showed in Chapter IV.), the true Divine doctrines might obtain absolutely the force of law and right, it was necessary that each individual should cede his natural right, and transfer it either to society as a whole, or to a certain body of men, or to one man. (17) Then, and not till then, does it

first dawn upon us what is justice and what is injustice, what is equity and what is iniquity.

(19:18) Justice, therefore, and absolutely all the precepts of reason, including love towards one's neighbor, receive the force of laws and ordinances solely through the rights of dominion, that is (as we showed in the same chapter) solely on the decree of those who possess the right to rule. (19) Inasmuch as the kingdom of God consists entirely in rights applied to justice and charity or to true religion, it follows that (as we asserted) the kingdom of God can only exist among men through the means of the sovereign powers; nor does it make any difference whether religion be apprehended by our natural faculties or by revelation: the argument is sound in both cases, inasmuch as religion is one and the same, and is equally revealed by God, whatever be the manner in which it becomes known to men.(Theologico-political Treatise1883, Chapter XIX:25)

CHAPTER THREE

3.1 Scientific Ideas and Hobbes Moral Philosophy

Among the reasons that made Hobbes' philosophy to break from most of the classical and medieval thought was his scientific thought. The contributors of these scientific thoughts were both philosophers and scientists. Some of the initiators of scientific theories were philosophers like Descartes, Bacon, and others. Scientists who influenced Hobbes were Galileo, William Harvey and others. Hobbes influenced much by ideas of Descartes. Melchert described the relation like this:

For various reasons, Descartes, one of the heroes of the new science, stops short of that his geometrical mechanics can account for every thing. The most obvious exceptions are mental activities: Thinking, imagining, doubting, feeling and willing. Because Descartes believes it is beyond question that each of us first and foremost a thinking thing-and as free in our decisions as God himself-there can be no Cartesian physics of human beings. Hobbes accepts without reservations the new physics of the non-human world and embraces the rejection of the medieval (Aristotelian picture of the world).Some salient features of this new science, and contrast with that earlier view, Whereas for Aristotle, and his medieval disciples, motion is development toward fulfilling some goal (a change from potentiality to actuality), for the new science, motion is simply body's change of place in a neutral geometrical space. (Melchert, 2007: 360-361)

The Aristotelian world view which dominated the western philosophical thought was finally examined by the emergence of new science. One of the forerunners of the new sciences was Descartes. These new scientific thoughts directly influenced Galileo and Harvey from which Hobbes adopted the scientific ideas of resolution and composition. Hobbes also learned from Descartes that method is a great tool for philosophical and scientific development. Moreover, on the introductory part of Leviathan it was described that Hobbes had the chance to visit philosophers and scientists who inspired him.

3.2 What is the Moral Dimension of Scientific Thoughts?

As Descartes insisted the philosophers who advocated scientific thoughts wanted to provide “unshakable foundation” for philosophy. Descartes who is the pioneer of these philosophers attempted to provide this “unshakable foundation “to science and vice versa. Descartes insisted that ‘the basis for knowledge is a clear and distinct perception’ (Barry, 1998, 257). From this according to him we can reach at “certainty”. That is why he is regarded as “a seventeenth century giant who not only invented analytic geometry but advanced a theory of knowledge that has greatly influenced philosophy” (Barry, 1998, 253)

In his work “The principles of philosophy” Descartes insisted that ‘even if metaphysics is considered as the roots of all philosophy we have to give great credit for the branches such as geometry, mathematics, and others since we can grapple fruits from the branch rather than the root’(Descartes, quoted in <http://www.blackmask.com>). He described like this:

All philosophy is like a tree, of which metaphysics is a root, physics the trunk, and all other sciences the branches that grow out of this trunk, which are reduced to three principal, medicine, mechanics and ethics.²

But as it is not from the roots or the trunks of trees that we gather the fruit, but only from the extremities of their branches, so the principal utility of philosophy depends on the separate uses of its parts, which we can only learn last of all.(Descartes quoted in <http://www.blackmask.com>).

After Descartes assured that branches of philosophy like medicine, geometry, mechanics and others as fruits of philosophy and science, Hobbes directly adopted this idea which is considered as the influence of Descartes:

² See also Descartes’ meditation two on <http://www.blackmask.com>

For as arithmeticians teach to add and subtract in numbers; so the geometricians teach the same in lines ,figures, solid and superficial, angles, proportions, times, degrees of swiftness, force, power, and the like; the logicians teach the same in consequences of words; adding together two names to make an affirmation, and two affirmations to make a syllogisms: and many syllogisms to make a demonstration; and from the sum, or conclusion of a syllogism , they subtract one proposition to find the other. Writers of politics add together pactions to find men's duties; and lawyers, laws and facts to find what is right and wrong in the actions of private men. In sum, in what matter so ever there is place for addition and subtraction, there also is place for reason; and where these have no place, there reason has nothing at all to do.(Hobbesleviathan,1962:41)

For Hobbes in geometry, arithmetic, and mathematics, there is clarity that which Descartes called 'certainty and 'distinction'. As far as I understood Hobbes also needs these clarity and distinctions in politics and morality .Accordingly, it was clear like the truth of geometry and mathematics for Hobbes that in the state of nature there were no moral rules. In my viewtoo, the issue of morality and politics should be clear as that of science and its methods. If there is no coercive power, there is chaos and disorder .If there is disorder there is no morality. Of course in normal conditions human beings have both altruistic and selfish characters in moderate way. But, in the condition of the chaos of state of nature, human beings are dominated by selfish interests. Their potential of charity, sympathy, humility and other altruistic behaviors cannot develop but rather represent passion of preserving their life in the 'state of nature'. These facts of morality and politics should be clear for citizens and sovereign power just like the fact of mathematics and geometry. I agree with Hobbes and Descartes for their assumption which indicates that 'morality and politics also should be based on science and its methods'.

Bad men in the state of nature persuade innocent men in the pursuit of their selfish interests. In other words, there is no place for just and unjust in the state of nature .In De Cive Hobbes indicated this as follows:

The wickedness of bad men also compels good men to have recourse, for their own protection, to the virtues of war, which are violence fraud (De Cive, Epistle, Dedicatory) quoted in [www. iep.utm. edu/hobmoral/](http://www.iep.utm.edu/hobmoral/).

Other scientific concepts which directly indicate the relation of science and philosophy are resolution and composition. Hobbes fixed these concepts to moral philosophy in an interesting way. Basically these words are purely scientific which Hobbes adopted from two Scientists Galileo and William Harvey. William Harvey is an English scientist who clearly explained about blood circulation by using resolution and composition. Resolution is when we divide complex things for simplification while composition is when we organize again the dispersed entity. Accordingly, William Harvey dispersed the blood circulatory system into its parts and studied it efficiently. Since the Circulatory system is complex to be understood in its normal condition, when he resolved and composed, Harvey simply analyzed this complex system. Hobbes applied these systems to morality and politics. I also support the idea of Hobbes in this case. Because in my view, society is a complex entity just like blood circulatory system, society has a lot of aspects such as politics, morality, and others. In order to know this complex entity we divide it in to its parts and reorganize it. In the moment of division (resolution) and organization (composition), we can enhance deep understanding of what society is. For example, when we remove what we call common wealth from society; one can understand what is it to mean government, the disadvantage and advantage of it within the society. In my opinion among the social aspects that could be clarified by resolution of government are moral rules. Because by the absence of common wealth, it is clear that there is robbery, theft, violent death and other tensions. This means indirectly there is no justice and injustice, bad and evil. Every sane person can know that the source of this chaos is the resolution of government. Again every one could know that composition of common wealth restores peace and moral rules. Thus, by resolving and composing common wealth we clearly understood what common wealth is itself, morality and other political aspects. The pioneer of such kind of understanding was Hobbes. Let me add another example that indicates the importance of resolution and composition to understand concepts. For example, when we take some one who took narcotic drug that damages the nervous system, understanding the condition of that man is simple. Since

cerebral system was resolved by drug, the person can tell us even his most private life. So, we can understand who and what that person really is. But under normal condition understanding the personality of that person within short period of time is may be difficult. Because under normal situation that person may looks like moderate in speech and behavior to the second and third person even though he/she is not in reality. That is why Hobbes applied resolution and composition to clarify moral and political concepts. He applied these concepts to human society by taking them from science.

Hobbes also adopted from Galileo that 'motion, not rest, was the natural state of bodies'. Additionally Galileo argued that 'bodies continued to move unless they were impeded and every thing was moving'. From this idea of Galileo Hobbes understood that 'even thinking itself was but the movement of some internal substance in the head' (Leviathan, 1962, 9-10). On the basis of the idea of Galileo Hobbes also understood that every thing should be reduced to motion. Accordingly, it seems to me that Hobbes understood that even society is moved from state of nature to civil society. Injustice, hatred, and lust for power would continue in the state of nature until it would be impeded by the sovereign power of commonwealth. This is one instance how Hobbes applied the idea of both scientists to analyze society itself:

Hobbes tried to use these methods to understand both mind and society. His aim is to analyze human beings into their simplest elements-which we take to be bits of matter in motion – and to understand a community of persons in terms of the way these elements interact. Hobbes aspires to be the Galileo or the Harvey of the human world. He is convinced that a scientific understanding of human nature will be both a contribution to knowledge and a practical benefit .According to Hobbes if we could but organize society on the basis of truths about ourselves rather than on the basis of ignorance and superstition, we could avoid conflict and live together in peace. (Melchert, 2007: 362).

3.3 Hobbes Psychological Egoism

Hobbes moral philosophy was also backed by psychology. Before he wrote the marvelous philosophical works like Leviathan, Behemoth, De Cive and others, Hobbes first developed the idea of human nature based on egoistic Psychology. It was after he understood that human nature is dominated by selfish interest that Hobbes warned people

that living without common wealth is impossible. By insisting that selfish interest causes 'state of nature' in which actions of men cannot be judged as just or unjust, he recommended men to form social contract to escape from disorder. Hobbes moral philosophy was also developed from the idea of psychological egoism and social contract. The following passage explains what psychological egoism means:

Psychological egoism is the view that humans are always motivated by self-interest; even in what seem to be acts of [altruism](#). It ultimately because of the personal benefits that they themselves expect to obtain, directly or indirectly, from doing so. This is a [descriptive](#) rather than [normative](#) view, since it only makes claims about how things are, not how they ought to be. It is, however, related to several other normative forms of egoism, such as [ethical egoism](#) and [rational egoism](#). (en. wikipedia. org/ wiki/ psychological- egoism)

As we understand from the above quotation, there human beings are egoistic. Accordingly, every deed of human beings is reduced to the egoistic benefits of individuals. Accordingly, even actions such as empathy, compassion, charity and others which are regarded altruistic themselves are taken by psychological egoists [like Hobbes and others] as if they are done for selfish interest.

Even though I support most of Hobbes Philosophy I do not accept his view that insists human beings are totally selfish. To me, human beings are endowed naturally with both altruistic and selfish character. Moreover, even though their selfish character dominates them in the case of state of nature, the aggregate nature of human beings under normal condition is characterized as both altruistic and selfish.

CHAPTER FOUR

4.1 Hobbes Moral Rules and Contemporary World

In this chapter I want to show the relevance of Hobbes moral rules to the contemporary world and the benefits and short comings of these rules. Among the reasons that indicate the relevance of Hobbes' moral rules to the contemporary world is that his philosophy was backed by science. He made science the stepping stone of his philosophy. His moral philosophy cannot also escape contemporary science. When we notice the general overview of Hobbes philosophy, his reliance on science is apparently convincing and reasonable to understand. But when we go in detail into his works especially into moral and political ideas, we understand that they need deep analysis to understand. For example, when we take his works like *leviathan* and *Behemoth*, the names of these terms themselves indicate the name of monsters. Hobbes took them from bible although he secularized them. From these metaphors we need to disentangle the positive moral rules of Hobbes. Leviathan is a strong sea monster while Behemoth is strong earth monster in the history of Hebrew Bible. The reason why Hobbes gave leviathan for common wealth and Behemoth for citizens needs deep analysis.

As far as I understood the reason why Hobbes used words like Leviathan and Behemoth to indicate common wealth and citizens is to indicate the aggressiveness of these entities. That means even though Leviathan (common wealth) is thanked among society to insure peace, in order to achieve that peace the common wealth (Leviathan) should aggressively act on the criminals who disturb the society. Citizens (Behemoth) are also aggressive unless they are controlled by Leviathan especially in the state of nature according to Hobbes:

Although the book title is not elucidated in the text, the behemoth is presented as symbol of the monarchy brought about the religious fanaticism and sectarianism that destroyed English common wealth during the puritan revolution. How do the monsters, leviathan and Behemoth, relate to each other in Hobbes' theory? That the leviathan signifies the state and the Behemoth represents revolution has obviously not been derived by Hobbes from mythical speculations. Yet it is no accident that for the seventeenth century Englishman the sea animal

becomes the symbol of peace making order, for the leviathan, “the huge whale “was not an animal alien to the imagination of the English people .In essence, however, both the peace enforcing function of the state and the revolutionary anarchistic force of the state of nature are comparable elementary forces. According to Hobbes, the quintessential nature of state of nature, or the Behemoth, is none other than civil war which can only be prevented by the overarching might of the state, or the leviathan. It follows that one of the monsters, the leviathan “state” continuously holds down the other monster, the Behemoth “revolutionary people”.(Schmitt,1888:21).

When we see literally, Hobbes characterization of the state as leviathan (sea monster) and citizen as Behemoth (earth monster), the metaphors he used seems aggressive i.e.they are the names of monsters .In my view, the citizens whom Hobbes characterized as Behemoth are not normal citizens in an organized common wealth. They are rather citizens who are devoid of stability and peace in the state of nature. Hobbes indicated this in his work”Behemoth” like this:

If in time, as in place there were degrees of high and low, I verily believe that the highest of the time would be that which passed between 1640 and 1660. For that thence, as from the devil’s mountain, should have looked up on the world and observed the actions of men, especially in England, might have had a prospect of all kinds of injustice, and of all kinds of folly, that the world could afford, and how they were produced by their hypocrisy and self-conceit, whereof the one is double iniquity, and the other double folly. I should be glad to behold that prospect. You that have lived in that time and in that part of your age, wherein men used to see best into good and evil, I pray you set me, that could not so see well, upon the same mountain, by the relation of the actions you than saw, and of their causes, pretensions, justice, order, artifice, and event.(Hobbes Behemoth,1962:3)

So, according to Hobbes in order to ensure justice within the society, the sea monster (Leviathan) should swallow the earthly monster (Behemoth) or revolutionary people in the state of nature and change it to civil society. As far as I understood, this does not mean ruthlessly crashing innocent citizens. Rather it is the adjustment of state of nature by Leviathan for peace and security.

When I conclude the general idea of leviathan and behemoth I think the intention of Hobbes is nothing other than saying that in order to settle the problems of justice and injustice, bad and evil within the society the state should be strong to be feared by the given society. That means as sea monster (Leviathan) engulfs the earthly monster (Behemoth), state should have the capacity to punish arrogant and violent citizens, because they are the anti thesis of peace and security. Moreover, this idea of Hobbes is related to the idea of Machiavelli who argued that ‘morality comes from immorality (Machiavelli quoted in Strauss, 1987:42) .As my understanding of the ideas of Machiavelli and Hobbes goes, when state aggressively punishes criminals it contributes for the blossoming of morality.

In this chapter what I want to emphasize is that although he used the name of monsters(Leviathan and Behemoth) as metaphors, there are great lessons that the contemporary world particularly the realist philosophers learn from Hobbes. The general moral principle of the realist philosophers is the concept “might makes right”. This is literally to mean the morality of totalitarians. When we push the concept “might makes right” to its extreme point, it takes us to the totalitarianism and aggrandizement of reactionary groups and their thoughts. But I think Hobbes’ concept of power politics does not go to that extreme, and hence we should focus on the positive side of his concept of power politics (might makes right).When we take his notion of power politics, we understand that his intention is to appreciate power not for fostering totalitarian agenda but for the security of people.

Within the concept of security and peace there is concept of morality which insures what is just, unjust, bad and good. If there is no power which punishes the criminals who commit unjust act on innocents, then the concept of morality and peace becomes only a matter of a word.

In this contemporary era a lot of political chaos were and are being committed. For example, when we take the two world wars, they destroyed enormous wealth and life. Within the episode of two world wars, there was no common power which punishes the reactionary countries. So, the moment was similar with the state of nature even though there was little difference with that of primitive society. Both League of Nations and

United Nations were formed after at the end of First World War and Second World War respectively. They were created after the destruction of a lot of life and property. But the world had learned from those two world wars that common power is important to protect the security of innocent citizens all over the world. So, power which is the centre of Hobbes philosophy was recognized as indispensable element as a country, continent and as a world. For example, during the Second World War, totalitarian rulers like Mussolini and Hitler came to power and committed many unjust acts to humanity. Especially Hitler was officially a racist ruler. Racism is immoral act. During the Second World War Hitler used power to commit such immoral act against innocent people. On the other hand Allied groups like America, Britain , France, Russia, China and others had also used power .In both camps there was power. But the kind of power which was sought by Hobbes was not that of Mussolini and Hitler who massacred innocent people indiscriminately. The type of power which was needed by Hobbes was that of the Allied groups like that of America and others that had released and relieved enormous Jewish and other minorities from Nazi concentration camps. But let us say that there was no common power that can punish totalitarians like Hitler. What was the destiny of targeted people like Jewish and others? It was obvious. Massacre could have devoured them. In order to abolish racism not only peaceful demonstration but power is also important to crash. Abolishing racism is respecting moral rules. Thus, the moral dimension of Hobbes philosophy is that, in order to escape disorder in state of nature social contract is important. As I understood from Hobbes, social contract should have power to consolidate moral norms within the society. People cannot abide to these moral norms unless they would oblige. Thus, indirectly as far as understood from Hobbes, power is an indispensable tool to ratify what is just, unjust, moral or immoral within the society.

Hobbes philosophical works faced a lot of critics. Even though mentioning the total critics to Hobbes is beyond the capacity of this thesis, let me raise some points from Quintine Skinner who had objection on Hobbes works. Skinner argued that ‘all classical books written on different issues especially politics and moral philosophy should be understood from the context and intentions of author and specific time’. Accordingly Skinner argued that ‘even political theories of Hobbes, Machiavelli and others should be understood only from their context’.

So, when I selected Hobbes' philosophy my aim was first to bring out to light that his philosophy has moral dimension. Another point I want to raise in this chapter is that Hobbes political philosophy had not only moral dimension but also it transcends the contexts of 17th century England. In this case I am obviously against skinner who insisted that classical books should be understood only within the context of their time and intention of the author. For example, as Skinner's view, Machiavellian works like "The prince" and others should be understood only in the context of Italian government. The same is true for Hobbes as Skinner argued. Accordingly, In Skinner's view Hobbes works especially Leviathan and Behemoth should be understood only within the context of the 17th century English revolution. In this regard I am against thinkers of contextualism. The reason is that there are books and works which can transcend the generation they occurred in. For example, the Confucian philosophy, Indian philosophy, western philosophy and the like transcended many generations. In my view the same is true for Hobbesian works. There is one point I appreciate from thinkers who understand books by their context. That is, the authors of books have written books depending on their own context. That means there should be some issues which either stimulate or excite the thinker to write books. But the mistake of Skinner, in my opinion, is that he failed to understand that the advantage of books is not completed by the context in which they were produced.

Moral philosophy is a wide branch of philosophy. Moral issues existed and newly emerged as the life of human beings changed over time. Hobbes' moral rules which are filtered from his political philosophy were also reached 21st century by teaching political and moral issues starting from 17th century. In my view, they will also continue to teach future generation. They could be understood as axioms and theorems of mathematical concepts. I say this in order to tackle the campaign of Quintin Skinner who argued that 'Hobbes must be understood in the context of social and political change in 17th century England, particularly in relation to the civil war, which so frightened and preoccupied him'.

As I have tried to show in the previous chapters, the pillar of Hobbes' moral and political philosophy was social contract. Social contract is a precondition for the establishment of

common wealth (state). It is after the establishment of common wealth that we can talk about moral issues.

I stand in support of Hobbes since we cannot have an idea of just and unjust in the 'state of nature'. The concept of 'state of nature' was raised as thought experiment by Hobbes. But through my investigation of many works of Hobbes, I understood that the concept (state of nature) is should not taken as thought experiment (teaching metaphor) but it has practical dimension. This is my own understanding. The reason why I regard the 'state of nature' as practical phenomenon is that even if Hobbes raised the issue by connecting to primitive society, it is occurred since the time of Hobbes up to present practically.³

³ See also a [Quintin Skinner's Hobbes](#) by Jonathan M. Wiener at University of California (Irvine)

In order to teach society how the emergence of state took place, connecting state of nature with primitive society was plausible. Rousseau himself used primitive society in order to describe the importance and safety of socialism. But from my life experience and what I have read from different sources, 'state of nature' transcends primitive society and should be understood as practical phenomena. For me absence of government in one country can be regarded as 'state of nature' despite its little difference from that of primitive society. Because, if there is no coercive power, most people think that they are free to do what ever they like. In my view this is a fact of the past, present and future. Of course, they are section of society who are abide by religious other societal norms to live peacefully. But at the end of the day by selfish individuals the total society can be spoiled and the condition can be changed to robbery, theft, murder and other crimes since there is no state. We cannot think of morality in this context. This is one of the points that we have to learn from Hobbes.

Hobbes also argued that power is indispensable for state to rule people. The remedy for chaos and disorders in the 'state of nature' was social contract and establishment of state for him. But what make the commonwealth the remedy for the chaos in the 'state of nature' is power. This is also one of the great concepts of Hobbes philosophy that I support.

Starting from Hobbes' time this world had experienced different wars and revolutions. To mention some as sample; English revolution, French revolution, American war of independence, American civil war, and the two world wars are the major ones. The crisis created was finally solved by using power. That means peaceful solutions were gained after power was used to arbitrate reactionary groups. If non violent solutions for conflicts by both conflicting groups fail, at the end of the day using power is inevitable to restore peace within the society on the occasion of war.

There are different controversial issues that seek power in this world.

For example, in the contemporary world there are different moral and political challenges such as the proliferation of Nuclear weapons, unjust wars, ethnic cleansing,

environmental problems and others. In order to resolve these moral issues in a moderate way power is important.

For me power is also a liberator for the oppressed people over the globe if it is used wisely. Power is destructive when it is not managed wisely. In my view, even state can be regarded only as the assembly of oppressors if it uses power to intimidate society rather than using it for the safety and prosperity of the society. In this regard St. Thomas Aquinas insisted that ‘without justice, states(kingdoms) are nothing but a great bands of robbers’ (Aquinas quoted in Frederich, 1957:16).

In general what the contemporary world should learn from Hobbes is that social contract which is the precondition of state is an important tool to create peaceful society. In order to create peace full society, moral norms which have positive advantage for society should be respected. What society regards as just or unjust, evil or bad could not be safely guarded unless just common wealth is established. That just common wealth also should have power in order to consolidate such moral values.

The power of state should not be that which destroys society but that which enhances the prosperity, harmony and peace of society. This is the moral dimension that the present generation should adopt from Hobbes.

4.2 Hobbes Moral Philosophy and Reason of State

Reason of state is a political concept which insists that state is justified to take whatever major in order to preserve political order. It was defined by different scholars. Here is its general definition:

‘The well-being and stability of the state is paramount, and all of the government’s actions should be directed to this end. This includes actions which would be considered illegal or immoral under ordinary circumstances. (www.cliffs.com/literature/p/the-prince/)

Niccolo Machiavelli, who is considered as the father of modern political philosophy, is recognized by scholars who support the prevalence of reason of state as the finder of the concept. Even though Machiavelli is considered for the adoption of reason of state of

tyranny systematically in his political philosophy, he did not use the term directly. The term was popularized by Italian scholar Giovanni Botero who published his book in 1589, by the title of “Della ragion di stato (The reason of the state)(en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Giovanni-Botero).

It has also the moral concept which indicates might makes right. The reason why I am raising this concept is in order to analyze between power and morality. It persuades us to think about the question of to what extent power should be used without passing the boundary of morality.

The idea of reason of state was raised not only by realist philosophers. It is also discussed by liberal philosophers. In contemporary political world, reason of state is known as national interest or constitutional defense. We can divide philosophers in to two depending on which kind of reason of state they support. Those who support absolutist reason of state, and who foster constitutional reason of state. Realist philosophers [like Harrington, Machiavelli and Hobbes] support absolutist reason of state while liberal philosophers [like Spinoza, Montesquieu] support constitutional reason of state. Both realist and liberal political philosophers agree on one point. I.e. The security and survival of political order is precondition for all moral virtues. In my view, reason of state has moral dimension even though it is political concept. Because when reason of state is committed in some circumstances, there are acts which are justified or unjustified in the eye of moral philosophy. Regarding the reason of state I don't support Hobbes since he advocates absolutist reason of state. Rather I agree with that of liberal political philosophers who advocate constitutional reason of state. Even though reason of state is inevitable, it would be accomplished in a condition that does not follow dehumanization and humiliation. I feel that constitutional reason of state does like that.

Basically reason of state is controversial concept. Because by the name of reason of state (national interest), a lot of unjust acts were committed over the world. In another way, there are countries leaders who unjustly declare war on sovereign people and country in irresponsible way that results aggrandizement of life and property by the name national interest. For such rulers harsh punishment is important. Unless other wise it is difficult to tackle their destruction.

Before I reach on conclusion regarding reason of state let me share some ideas from scholars. James Harrington in his work “system of politics” argued like this:

Neither Hippocrates nor Machiavelli introduced diseases into man's body nor corruption in to government, which were before their times; and seeing they do but discover them, it must be confessed that so much as they have done tends not to the increase but the cure of them, which is the truth of these authors.(Harrington quoted on Frederich,1957:35).

From the above quotation we understand that reason of state (using power) in some circumstances is inevitable like disease. Both Machiavelli and Hippocrates discovered these things (reason of state and diseases) respectively. Frederic him self elaborated the idea of Harrington by saying that:

‘what Machiavelli was writing about in the prince was the reason of state of tyranny. Every form of state, including a constitutional democracy, has its own ‘reason’, and such reason has an external and internal aspect. Externally, it is concerned with maintaining a balance so that it may expand, or at least not be “gained upon”. Internally it consists of maintaining its form that is to say, its basic institutions intact, provided the internal structure is bound; if it should be unsound, then reason of state would be directed toward their being mended(Frederic,1957:35)

In my view, I don't support the general concept of reason of state which insists that state can take any measure in order to safe guard the survival and security of political order. This is hard concept for me in order to accept it generally. Because in this case state is justified even in committing genocide on reactionary groups to it s politics which is immoral act for me. Even though it is difficult for me to accept this literal definition of reason of state, it is inevitable for me to accept the existence of this of this controversial concept. In my opinion the existence of reason of state (constitutional defense) is should be recognized by giving attention to human rights only.

The reason of state which advocated by Machiavelli was that of tyrannical government. That of Hobbes was that of monarchical government.

In my view, the reason of state that should be applied in the contemporary political world is constitutional reason of state which was advocated by Spinoza and Montesquieu.

Especially a kind of constitutional reason of state fostered by Spinoza which paid attention to human rights is worth quoting like this:

Disciplined ethical behavior is the natural consequence of man's reason with which he reaches out for that perfect rational existence which is God's. This development of man's power does not constitute self denial at all; not asceticism, but the higher self fulfillment of freedom is the end of human existence. Every man exists by the highest law and right of nature, and consequently by this same right he does what follows from the necessity of his own nature; thus, by the highest right and law of nature every man judges what is good and what is bad, and consults his own advantage as he thinks best, revenges him self and tries to preserve what he loves and to destroy what he hates. Now if men lived according to the guidance of reason, every man would enjoy his right without injury to another. (Spinoza quoted in Frederic, 1957: 41)

In general the moral dimension of the concept of reason of state (constitutional defense) is that it should be accomplished in accordance with human right. Let me indicate some concrete examples from contemporary political arenas.

During Second World War America entered the war by the hijack that was done by Japanese Marine Force at the island of Pearl Harbor. In this case Japan's act is not justified since she violated the sovereignty of American people. On the other hand the offensive war of America was also did not cope up with that of Japanese. Even though America argued that she bombed Nagasaki and Hiroshima (Japan cities) for her constitutional defense (reason of state), it is difficult to justify this act. Because hijacking some people on boat and bombing two cities by Atomic bomb (the latest weapon at that time) is not equal. The same is true during Vietnamese war. The war of Vietnam was also the war the war between unequal groups. On that war also America used absolute reason of state which resulted severe destruction on Vietnamese people. This was ethically unjustified.

Another example which is related to the concept of reason of state is current Syrian civil war. This civil war is current phenomenon that took place for 3 years between the Syrian government leaded by Basher Al-Assad and oppositional parties. In this year Assad government used restricted chemical weapons to crash the reactionary groups. As

a result, innocent citizens were killed. The issue raised controversy between Assad government and world super powers especially America and Russia.

In this case I want acknowledge the two super powers for they interfered the Syrian government for its violation of human rights. In my view, even though Syrian government argued that it did that for the constitutional defense it is unacceptable. This is not constitutional reason of state. It was immoral act for me.

Thus, even though totally rejecting reason of state is impossible, it is reasonable to think about the humiliation of people. State should not reach on that status. Even though power is good it should be managed toward liberty, prosperity and peace of society. In this regard I support constitutional reason of state of Spinoza which differs from that of Hobbes and Machiavelli (absolutist reason of state) in considering human rights.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

Hobbes is considered as one of the profound who contributed a lot for the social contract theory that was popular in the 17th and 18th centuries. It is this social contract theory that is taken as base for Hobbes' moral philosophy.

Hobbes contribution was not only on the sectors of political and moral philosophy. He was also popular in optics and other natural sciences. Even his moral and political concepts were anchored on his concepts of natural sciences, geometry and mathematics.

His exposure to European genius scientists and philosophers like Descartes, Galileo, Newton, Gassendi, Francis Bacon and others made him to be occupied by scientific thinking. Again his exposure to ancient literary works like Peloponnesian war which was written by Thucydides made him to foster political thought known as political realism.

Even though ancient literary works like Thucydides and Sophists had great influences on Hobbes, the scientific thoughts which prevailed in his time left great influences on His works. For example, Newtonian mechanics which inspired philosophical thought known as determinism influenced Hobbes to advocate mechanistic materialism which again is similar with the concept of determinism. The reason why I am connecting mechanistic materialism with determinism is that both ideas indicate that cosmic world necessarily determined to operate in a specified manner. For example, for Hobbes, everything whether corporeal or incorporeal is reduced to matter. Even our thinking is categorized under matter according to him. Moreover, the moral and political system was analyzed by him on the root of mechanistic materialism. For example, moral philosophy he said that good and evil are not objective and unchanging qualities of things but the subjective description of the apparent beneficial or harmful effects of things and this description being ultimately based upon the effects that these things have upon vital motion, either immediately or as a result of a chain of consequences. Accordingly, for him what ever helps vital motion is good and whatever hinders it is evil. He reduced even morality to the status of motion and matter. In this regard his main influences were Galileo and his

successor Isaac Newton. From Descartes Hobbes adopted method to deal with philosophy. Like Descartes he had the idea of placing Philosophy on the base of Mathematics and geometry. What Hobbes modified from Descartes was that he rejected mind-body dualism and assured that there is only matter (body).

My aim is not to discuss Hobbes natural sciences and geometry in detail. I have raised the above concepts since those concepts influenced Hobbes moral philosophy directly or indirectly.

Even though Hobbes' base for his works was science, he was not become famous by scientific contributions like other scientists. His popularity was on the sector of political Philosophy. He wrote marvelous political texts that transcend generations. That is why I use his political texts in order to deal with his moral philosophy.

Before Hobbes started his moral and political philosophy, he identified the nature of human beings. He used psychology to accomplish this task. Accordingly, he argued that human beings are selfish creature by nature. Their desire for glory and power is unlimited. Their continuous lust for power and glory led them to compete each other for the sake of possession of glory and power individually as Hobbes insisted.

The moral Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes also leads us to his idea of natural condition of human kind which is commonly known as state of nature. It was primitive condition of man in which there was no social order. When I say social I want say denote social formations like morality, politics and others. In this natural condition human beings were judged by their passions and desires. Their selfish character which persuade them to satisfy their unlimited desire proceed for continuous satisfaction which ceases only after death. He also argued that this continuous desire of satisfaction is changed to the desire for power which again is continuous in order to gain power over power.

The reason why men need power over power in the state of nature according to Hobbes is that past power was guarantee for present glory and present power is guarantee for present and future glory. For him power is means to get honor, wealth, and knowledge. Additionally, since men in the state of nature are equal in strength, and wisdom, fear follows from this equality. There is what Hobbes called 'natural right' in the state of

nature. It is the right that all men have to do all things. Regarding this equality he argued that 'if all men were possessed of their maximum natural right, then all men would be in contention with all other men for all things at all times- a maximal state of nature is insecurity and contention'.

Thus, since by nature resource is limited in contrary to men's desire, competition and hatred follows among men to own the limited resource. This leads to war of all against all according to Hobbes. The remedy for this chaos and disorder is social contract for Hobbes. Morality itself arises from social contract according to him. In my view the core point when we deal with Hobbes' moral Philosophy is this social contract. Because in the absence of social contract, we cannot judge, whether the action is just or unjust, and good or evil.

Another advocator of social contract theory Jean Jacques Rousseau argued that state of nature was 'state of peace'. In his work 'The origin of Inequality' he indicated that inequality of wealth and other things came after primitive society was changed to complex system by science and modernity. In his view, primitive society was characterized by harmonious life in which there was no greed or lust for power and glory. Even though both Hobbes and Rousseau agreed that establishing civil society is indispensable, they disagreed on the characterization of state of nature.

As far as I understood, Hobbes understanding of State of nature is convincing and plausible to accept. Rousseau's understanding could not express state of nature in its proper way. I understand State of nature in Hobbessian manner. Accordingly it is impossible to judge whether an action is good or bad in the state of nature. Because judging an action as good or bad needs convention among society. In the state of nature there was no agreement whether an action is bad or not. Every body can do what ever he/she likes. There was no punishment and compulsion to live according to agreements. In these circumstances moral norms were unthinkable. That is why I support Hobbes whose moral philosophy was based on social contract.

In addition to Psychology Hobbes also used other scientific methods to deal with moral Philosophy. He used resolution and composition to accomplish moral and political works.

When he starts from state of nature, he divided society in to simple elements (resolution). By the social contract the dispersed society in the state of nature is organized (composition). He understood these concepts from Galileo and William Harvey.

The moral dimension of Hobbes political philosophy is concluded not only by the concept that social contract is indispensable for moral philosophy. It can be extended to different ideas. This topic also inspires me to deal with political realism. Political realism is a political thought that advocates moral idea of might makes right. The root of political realism was ancient Greek. Thucydides was the advocator of it. Modern realist Political Philosophers are philosophers like Machiavelli, Hobbes, James Harrington and others. Realist political philosophers emphasize the advantage of power and security of political order. They have obvious idea which insists that 'survival of political order is primary issue to consolidate any moral issues.

The search for morality from political philosophers especially like Hobbes and others needs deep analysis. Because their morality of might makes right is indicated in their semi-ironic literary works. When they are noticed literally the works of realist political philosophers can be regarded as the morality of dictators who rule their citizens by the iron fist. It seems as if these writers were advocators of dictator's and totalitarian's manifesto. But when we understand deeply, the intention of political realists is that without strong (powerful governance), the establishment of peaceful and prosperous society and nation is difficult. The prosperous society includes that in which morality blossomed. Even to determine what is good and evil, power is indispensable for realist political philosophers. Good and evil depends on the convention of society. This convention of society needs an organ which compels who breaks societal norms. It is in this method that power politics influences the moral philosophy.

Thus, in my analysis of moral philosophy I have also understood that power is precondition in order to safeguard moral issues. For example, it is difficult to protect citizens from immoral acts like rape, racism, and others in the state of nature. Hobbes

emphasized political order when he did social contract theory. Moral philosophy of Hobbes is the son of his political philosophy as far as I understood. Because from social contract, political society was formed. Then by the established political order moral order was consolidated.

Bibliography

- Barry, Vincent.(1998).**Philosophy, Text with Readings**. California: wads worth Inc.
- Frederic, Joachim (1957).**The Constitutional Reason of State**.Brown University press.
- Gough, J. W. (1957). **The Social Contract: A critical Study of its Development**. Oxford: The Clarendon press.
- Hobbes, Thomas. (1651). **De Cive**, London: Printed by J.C Publishing Company.
- Hobbes, Thomas. (1840). **Behemoth**.New York: Burt Franklin publishing Company.
- Hobbes, Thomas. (1958).**Leviathan Part one and Two**.(Oscar Piest, ed) ,New York: The liberal arts pressing
- Hobbes, Thomas. (1962).**Leviathan: or the Matter, Form and Power of Common Wealth Ecclesiastical and Civil** (ed, Oakeshoot). London: Collier Macmillan Pvt. Ltd.
- Ishay, Micheline. (2004).**The History of Human Rights: from Ancient Times to Globalization Era**. California: University of California press.
- James, G.G.(1992).**The Stolen Legacy**. Trenton NJ: Africa world press.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. (1961). (,ed. George Bull).**The Prince**. England: Penguin Books.
- Mackey, J.P. (1969).**Morals, Law, and Authority**. Ohio: platinum press.
- Melchert, Norman. (2007).**The Great Conversation: A Historical Introduction to Philosophy**. Oxford: Oxford University press.

Miller, Ed. L. (1997). **Questions that Matter: An Invitation to Philosophy**.
New York: McGrawHill companies.

Peikoff, Leonard. (1991). **Objectivism: The philosophy of Ayn Rand**. New
York: Meridian printing

Rachels, James. (1999). **The Right Thing to Do**. New York: McGraw Hill
companies.

.Rousseau, J.J. (1962). **The political writings**. (edited by Vaughan), Oxford:
Basic Black well.

Spinoza, Baruch. (1883). **Theologico-political Treatise** (edited by R.H.M
Elwes). Indiana: Hackett publishing company.

Strauss, Leo . (1987). **What is Political Philosophy?** Chicago: Chicago
University Press.

Websites

Definition of philosophy. Blogs pot.com/2012/08/the-basis-of-morality-in-
kant-and-hobbes.html.

En. Wikipedia.org/wiki/Giovanni-Butero.

En. wikipedia.org/wiki/psychological-egoism

En-Wikipedia, org/wiki/Thucydides.

[http://www.Arisite.org\(wlnew/Spinoza/ethics.html](http://www.Arisite.org(wlnew/Spinoza/ethics.html).

<http://www.blackmask.com>.

<http://www.cliffsnotes.com/literature/p/the-prince/>.

<http://www.iep.utm.edu/hobmoral/>.

<http://www.iep.utm.edu/polreal/>

<http://www.samharris.org/blog/item/the-roots-of-good-and-evil>.

<http://www.wiringthebrain.com/2011/06/where-do-morals-come-from.html/>.

Plato.stanford.edu/entries/Spinoza/political.