



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

THE DISCOURSE OF MACHIAVELLI AND HOBBS ON AUTHORITY

By

Meron Chanyalew

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Addis Ababa University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in
Philosophy

June, 2022 G.C

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

THE DISCOURSE OF MACHIAVELLI AND HOBBS ON
AUTHORITY

BY
MERON CHANYALEW

THESIS ADVISER
Dagnachew Assefa (PhD)

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY,
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, Addis Ababa University
FOR PARTIAL FULFILLMENTS OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN
PHILOSOPHY

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

DECLARATION

This is to certify that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and all sources of material used for the thesis have been properly indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

Declared by: - Meron Chanyalew Zigem

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Place: Addis Ababa University College of Social Sciences, Department of Philosophy

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by **Meron Chanyalew Zigem** entitled **the discourse of Machiavelli and Hobbes on Authority** which is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Philosophy, complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS:

Approved by Board Examiners:

Dagnachew Assefa (PhD) _____

Advisor Signature Date

Internal Examiner Signature Date

External Examiner Signature Date

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....	vi
Abstract	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
Objectives.....	6
CHAPTER ONE.....	8
1. WHAT IS POLITICAL AUTHORITY?.....	8
1.1 Classical political philosophy	11
1.2 Medieval (Christian) philosophy	16
1.3 Modern political philosophy	20
CHAPTER TWO.....	25
2. NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI’S POLITICAL DISCOURSE ON AUTHORITY	25
2.1 Machiavelli’s concept of authority and state	25
2.2 Machiavelli’s political thought in the prince	30
CHAPTER THREE	42
3. THOMAS HOBBS’S CONCEPT OF AUTHORITY AND STATE.....	42
3.1 What is state and authority in Hobbes political philosophy?.....	42
3.2 Hobbes implication of state and authority in his leviathan	49
CHAPTER FOUR	58
4. CRITICAL ANALYSIS ON MACHIAVELLI’S AND HOBBS’S IDEA OF AUTHORITY	58
4. Conclusion	71
Bibliography.....	75

Acknowledgement

The completion of this paper could not have been possible without the participation and assistance of so many people whose names may not all be enumerated. Their contribution are sincerely appreciated and gratefully acknowledged. I would like to express my deep appreciation and indebtedness particularly to my advisor Dr. Dagnachew Assefa and Dr. Fasil Merawi their endless support.

To all informants who took part in this research without whom it could not have been accomplished. Also, to all friends and others, who, in one way or others, shared their support, thank you.

Above all, praises and thanks to God the almighty for his showers of blessing throughout my work.

Abstract

Machiavelli is regarded as the father of modern political philosophy. His contributions to political philosophy continue to have an impact on current political philosophers and politicians. He particularly defied the medieval tradition that political authority was under the control of the church. He wished to discover how to establish a strong state against foreign oppression and domestic conflict. To him, the best state was a republic in which the system could draw upon the talent of mass of people, and their virtues could operate unchecked. Failing this a limited monarchy might achieve national security. He considered public spirit essential for the establishment of an ideal republic. In true platonic spirit, he believed that a state is what its people make it.

Hobbes was obsessed with societal order and discipline. Furthermore, he is extremely concerned about the power vacuum that may occur as a result of anarchy, instability, or split of authority. As a result, he expresses his understanding of legal sovereignty in a clear and unambiguous manner. He helped people recognize the critical importance of a strong government, as well as security and peace.

Because of the time or generation gap, these two significant political theorists have limitations. Our thinking styles and contemporary political beliefs may differ, yet they have a wonderful perspective and insight that cannot be confined by time or political ideas. We need a patriotic generation that loves their country enough to give their life for it. We also require justice for the benefit of citizens and the government. In general, we require peace and security.

INTRODUCTION

Political philosophy has been practiced as long as human being has a natural order of questioning and arguing about different things. It is a branch of philosophy which studies about political practices, activities and concerns of the government. Political philosophy main concerns have been the political economy, which defines property rights and regulates access to capital, the demands of justice in distribution and punishment, and the rules of truth and evidence that determine legal judgments. But in this particular thesis my discussion is on the other issue of political philosophy which is authority. Political philosophy also concerned about how to deploy or limit public power in order to ensure human survival and improve the quality of life. Political philosophy, like all aspects of human experience, is influenced by the environment as well as the scope and limitations of the mind, and the answers given by successive political philosophers to perennial problems reflect the knowledge and assumptions of their times. Political philosophy is more theoretical and normative than descriptive, as opposed to the study of political and administrative organization. It is inextricably linked to general philosophy and is a topic of cultural anthropology, sociology, and knowledge sociology.

Political philosophy can also be defined as an investigation into the nature, causes, and effects of good and bad government. Good and bad governments have a significant impact on the quality of people's lives. It makes a real difference in our lives whether we are well or poorly governed. We cannot turn our backs on politics, retreat into private

life, and believe that the way we are governed will not have a significant impact on our personal happiness.

Leo Strauss defined philosophy as, “philosophy is the quest for eternal truth and political philosophy is the quest for the eternal truth about political things. Political philosophy, to be sure, is a philosophical discipline, for it is a branch of philosophy. Philosophy is prior to political philosophy, as nature is to nature right.”(Jung, 1967)

In their political ideas, many philosophers have different definitions of what authority implies. "Everything is not political," according to Machiavelli, "but politics is interested in everything."(Harris, 1957) Politics, according to Hobbes, is a common agreement that appeals to the people in order to provide equality and freedom. According to Aristotle, the best sort of state is one that can suit the wants and characteristics of its people.

There are three characteristics embodied in classical political philosophy, according to Strauss. The first is political philosophy, which as a philosophical discipline was founded on the notion that contemplation comes before and is superior to action. The second is theoretical knowledge, which is derived from a basic common-sense understanding of a political man. Finally, it was concerned with the best political regime or constitution.

The emergence of Christianity as a religion and the establishment of the church constituted a substantial break from the ancient Greek city-states. Plato's Republic was seen as a watershed moment in the formation of political thinking. The prudential application of laws aiming toward virtuous citizens defines Aristotle's political theory.

Any other allegiance that might compete with claims of civic duty was out of the question. Christian thinking had a significant impact, particularly on European medieval political theory.

St. Thomas Aquinas was a medieval political philosopher who was possibly the most influential. People's loyalty was split since there was no such thing as common citizenship or common law. The Prince by Niccolo Machiavelli brought this period to an end.

The question of whether political philosophy is a science or a normative inquiry began after the rise of logical positivism. Normative political theory derived from an ancient tradition. Plato and Aristotle are usually considered as founders of this school. Their political point of view is focused on normative political theory and hence did not separate politics and values.

In contrast to the ancient Greek view as cited by Gerring et.al. Aristotle says,

The 'positive' paradigm treats the scientific study of politics as associated with a value neutral approach to the subject and argues that theory can be applied only to what is, not to what ought to be. Neopositivists such as Lucien Levy Bruhl claimed that science cannot be a science in so far as it is normative. And Peter Laslett in his introduction to Philosophy, Politics and Society (1956) famously declared that 'political philosophy is dead' at least 'for the moment'. Its death was largely a consequence of the rise of logical positivism that reflected a deep faith in scientific understanding and suggested that propositions that are not empirically verifiable are simply meaningless. (Reeves, 2017)

However, some scholars such as Michael Oakeshott and Leo Strauss did not agree on the separation of normative and empirical approaches. And after the publication of John Rawls' a theory of justice, political philosophy and also normative approach gain its strength.

In modern political philosophy, the philosophers' concerns revolve around the state and government. What do we require from the state, and what type of state is the best? And these large questions centered on the conceptual distinction between "state" and "government." In essence, the term "state" refers to a set of long-lasting institutions through which power is distributed and justified in its use. The term "government" refers to the people who occupy these institutions and carry out specific policies. After world war 2nd it focuses on the morality aspect of human being and the political and human rights of the people in the modern way of understanding.

In my thesis, I will concentrate on two modern political philosophers: Machiavelli and Hobbes. Machiavelli described power in "The Prince" as "domination and ruling." People are forced to follow because they are indifferent to the state's greater authority, according to him. His fundamental premise in The Prince was how to gain and keep power. He described politics as a perception of power, as well as power as a political action. Hobbes defined power in Leviathan as "the power of man"—his present means of obtaining certain future seeming goods. He is mostly concerned about sovereignty. He contends that the greatest approach to construct a commonwealth is via civil peace and social solidarity.

Machiavelli's political philosophy focuses on controlling and dominating one's own Fortuna and his politics all about constant struggle of power by force. He thinks that violence is an opportunity for the leader to control the people because violence is mostly unavoidable so we can use these things as a good thing. He also said sometimes the leaders need to encourage violence. On the other hand for Hobbes competition and a need to power leads to war so by whatever means we need to try to stop this struggle to power. To avert civil conflict amongst men, we need a social compact between the state and the people.

In this thesis, I will describe and analyze Nicolo Machiavelli's and Thomas Hobbes's notions of authority by chiefly concentrating on their celebrated books, *The Prince* and *Leviathan*, respectively. Putting aside their pessimistic approach in line with human nature, in this thesis I will argue that it is possible to learn some significant lessons from these two thinkers. For instance, I believe we may apply Machiavelli's huge emphasis on "security" so as to improve human existence in economic, social, and cultural aspects. On top of that, Hobbes's focus on the essentiality of sovereign power and his fear of a power vacuum that may occur as a result of anarchy, instability, or a split of authority play a vital role in our understanding of the government. Even if my point of departure lies in relation to the form of government he chooses, I will inevitably appreciate Hobbes' fear of and repudiation of statelessness.

The main difference between the above two philosophers with regard of their focus is for Machiavelli's theory focuses on how to be a successful leader whereas Hobbes's theory focuses on mechanistic human behaviors. According to Hobbes:

Human behavior is to be understood primarily in terms of a mechanistic psychology of the passions/ those forces in man, which, so to speak, push him from behind; it is not to be understood in terms of those things which, could be thought of as attracting man from in front, the ends of man, or what for Hobbes would be the objects of the passions. The objects of the passions, Hobbes says, vary with each man's constitution ' and education and are too easy to disguise. (Strauss and Cropsey, 1963)

And also his political philosophy focuses on the contract between the state and the people.

Despite the fact that there is a vast literature on the above topics, to the best of the researcher's knowledge, there are no significant studies on the ideas of authority from Thomas Hobbes and Nicolo Machiavelli. It compares and contrasts their discourse on political authority and assesses their influence on current political understanding of the world. This study aims to fill a void in this field.

Objectives

To describe and analyze how Machiavelli understands authority

To describe and analyze Hobbes views on authority and

To describe Machiavelli and Hobbes implications for how the relationship between the state and the people should be.

The whole thesis is composed of four chapters. The first chapter will focus on Historical backgrounds of what is political philosophy and state and authority. It emphasizes what political philosophy is? And how philosophers defined political authority and state? The second chapter will be about Machiavelli concept and

implication of state and authority in the *prince*. How he defines and understands politics and the relation between rulers and the people. The third chapter will focus on Hobbes concept and implication of state and authority. How he describes about political philosophy and how his political theory articulate about state and authority. Finally, the fourth chapter will be critical analysis about their implication of state and authority.

CHAPTER ONE

1. WHAT IS POLITICAL AUTHORITY?

Political philosophy is a branch of philosophy in which concepts and arguments are about government and political power. The central issues in political philosophy usually focus on how to arrange or limit the power of the authorities to maintain the survival and improvement of the living conditions of the people in a particular country. In political philosophy, political authority is defined as a person or group of people who have lawful power over another person or group of people. “Political authority, unlike parental or supernatural authority, is generally connected with the power of governments and their many expansions (such as the laws, officials, courts, the police, etc.). Political power is a subset of the broader idea of practical power (which includes parental and divine authority). A practical authority, as opposed to a theoretical authority, such as a knowledgeable friend or an expert, gives us reason to act.”(Landemore, 2011)

According to Leo Strauss:

The meaning of political philosophy and its meaningful character are as evident today as they always have been since the time when political philosophy came to light in Athens. The awareness of the good which guides all our actions has the character of an opinion: it is no longer questioned but, on reflection, it proves to be questionable. A good society requires comprehensive political action. (Dame, 2018)

Philosophical inquiry, for him, is a search for eternal truth. It belongs in everyone's life. It aids in problem solving and the development of critical thinking, which aids in making better decisions. In metaphysics and philosophy of language, truth is the property of sentences, statements, beliefs, thoughts, or propositions that are claimed, in common discourse, to accord with the facts or to state what the case is. People need to know the truth about the world in order to thrive. Philosophical inquiry seeks to make sense of human experience. Philosophy produces enlightenment and action. Political philosophy is also concerned with the pursuit of political ideas and comprehensions. It is not a matter of knowing the truth; rather, it is a matter of the pursuit of the truth.

Strauss also said that:

Political philosophy is a branch. Political philosophy will then be the attempt to replace opinion about the nature of political things by knowledge of the nature of political things. Political things are by their nature subject to approval and disapproval, to choice and rejection, to praise and blame. It is of their essence not to be neutral but to raise a claim to men's obedience, allegiance, decision or judgment. One does not understand them as what they are, as political things, if one does not take seriously their explicit or implicit claim to be judged in terms of goodness or badness, of justice or injustice, i.e., if one does not measure them by some standard of goodness or justice. (Strauss, 1957)

Some say that political science is more of a political philosophy than science. Political science is an art form, in my opinion, since it depends on intuition and logical reasoning to reach conclusions or make judgments on specific political phenomena. Political

science is not and cannot be an accurate science in the same way that scientific sciences like physics and chemistry are. Political philosophy engages in the examination and assessment of political institutions, practices, understandings, and ideals.

In political philosophy, justice, the aim of government, exercising individual rights, legitimacy of power, different kinds of theories, the consent of the government, sovereignty, and its epistemological understanding or definition have been discussed, asked, and answered in the past centuries. Various philosophers have tried to answer this question, and theories have been developed to address the fundamental issues of political philosophy.

Political philosophy has been practiced for as long as human beings have regarded their collective arrangements not as immutable but as potentially open to change. In medieval Europe, the proper relationship between Church and State became a central issue in political philosophy. In the early modern period, the main argument was between defenders of absolutism and those who sought to justify a limited, constitutional state.
(David, 1998)

Theories and questions of political philosophers naturally depend on the characteristics of political institutions' of their period. They try to address the questions of their society at that current period of time by criticizing and giving suggestions. Beside that all political philosophers talk about the needs and capacity of human being, justice, human rights and freedom of the society.

The Greek city state is considered as the corner stone of the ancient Greek political philosophy. “They believed that the state is meant for the development of the human personality. State is meant for the man not man is for the state.” There is no separation between state and individual and also between state and society. The concept of justice has a major role or appreciation for the Greek ancient philosophers.

1.1 Classical political philosophy

Greek city state Athens believed to be the founding place of ancient political philosophy. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy states that, “*Political philosophy as a genre was invented in the ancient period by Plato and reinvented by Aristotle.*” (Lane, 2011). Even though he did not produce any books, in my opinion Socrates is considered the father of ancient political philosophy. As a result, his student, Plato, regarded him as the father of ancient political philosophy.

Plato considers him one of the most significant thinkers in the history of political philosophy. His writings included discussions on aesthetics, political philosophy, religion, cosmology, epistemology, and language philosophy. And also he established the Academy in Athens, one of the first universities in the Western world. In *the Republic* Plato's technique is to first explain the fundamental concept of social, or political, justice before deriving a comparable concept of individual justice. He says that every individual's soul has a three-part structure, similar to society's three classes. The logical element of a just person's soul dominates, the spirited component supports this rule, and

the appetitive part submits and follows wherever reason leads. Each of Plato's three levels of society is ruled by a distinct component of the soul in Plato's Republic.

Plato defined "justice" as "having and doing one's own thing." To put it another way, everyone is responsible for their own task. When every part of the mind functions in its own field under the overall leadership of reason, which is the pilot of mind and soul, it is said to be just. Justice is a concept of moral rightness based on ethics, rationality, law, natural law, religion, equity and fairness, and the administration of the law, taking into account all human beings and citizens' inalienable and inborn rights, as well as the right of all people and individuals to equal protection before the law. Justice, according to Plato, is harmony, and justice is each portion doing its own thing without interfering with the work of others. These two definitions of justice fall short of fully describing what justice entails.

Justice is, for Plato, at once a part of human virtue and the bond, which joins man together in society. It is the identical quality that makes good and social. Justice is an order and duty of the parts of the soul; it is to the soul as health is to the body. Plato says that justice is not mere strength, but it is a harmonious strength. Justice is not the right of the stronger but the effective harmony of the whole. All moral conceptions revolve about the good of the whole-individual as well as social. (Bhandari, 2000)

"His deep influence on Western philosophy is asserted in the famous remark of Alfred North Whitehead: "the safest characterization of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato."(Korab-Karpowicz, 2021) He was also the prototypical political philosopher whose ideas had a profound impact on subsequent

political theory. His greatest impact was Aristotle, but he influenced Western political thought in many ways.”(Klosko, 2015)

Most of Plato’s writings are dialogues in which discussions and arguments between two parties are present. He wrote numerous dialogues, the most famous of which are the Republic, the State, and the Laws. In his *state*, the main purpose is to give political science its proper place in the scheme of knowledge. And Plato's more mature and down-to-earth ideas on city-state problems are presented in his laws.

The Republic was, until today, regarded as the masterpiece of Plato. In *The Republic*, he aims to represent human life in a state of perfect justice and to govern according to the idea of the good. One of the most basic concepts of political philosophy is justice. And it is the main concept in Plato’s political thought. The word "justice" comes from the Greek word "Dikaiosune". Plato analyzed and rejected three points of view in his republic. The first one was Cephalus’s theory, which believed that justice was "giving to each man what is proper to him". Thus, justice is the art or capacity to do well as well as cause harm. But for Plato, this theory isn’t sufficient; he's getting old and not strong enough to win the upcoming new challenges. The second one was Thrasymachus's idea of justice as "the interest of the stronger". Laws are upheld for the interests of the rulers. To obey means to satisfy the ruler. To be unjust is to satisfy one.

So for them injustice is better than justice, the unjust man is wiser than the just one. And it is not sit right for Plato because it is an advantage for the one that has power and

disadvantage for the powerless. It gives the powerful ones a right to use their power wrongly. The last one was Glaucon's theory that believed "justice is the artificial thing". It is the product of social convention. Justice is the child of fear. It favors the interest of the weaker rather than the stronger. In his republic Plato tries to correct the wrong/ false concepts of justice.

The aim of Plato's political philosophy is to rehabilitate a strong and impartial authority. He was so much concerned by the idea of dividing state into two cities one for the poor, the other is the rich. *"According to him the origin of the state is found in the need of individual. Because of unlimited wants and self insufficiency, the society is forced to be introduced in exchange of service. Exchange of service implies the division of labour so for Plato division of labour is not based of economic rather based on moral well being of the community."*(Jain, 1995) Plato divided the community into three groups because he believed that every society has three types of people. The first one is those who are workers but not those who rule by nature. The second type was those who were able to rule but were under the control or direction of others. The final is for those who will fill the highest position and duties of statesmanship. And each group should focus on its own function and strive for excellence in its work.

His idea of philosopher king; Plato believed that the true philosopher is a passionate seeker of truth. He has the noblest virtue of wisdom. He is fearless and has no desire for the satisfaction of his sensual appetites. So he entrust the governing power of idea state is in the hands of the philosophers.

Plato's achievement as a political philosopher may be seen in that he believed that there could be a body of knowledge whose attainment would make it possible to heal political problems, such as factionalism and the corruption of morals, which can bring a city to a decline. The doctrine of the harmony of interests, fairness as the basis of the best political order, the mixed constitution, the rule of law, the distinction between good and deviated forms of government, practical wisdom as the quality of good leadership, and the importance of virtue and transcendence for politics are the political ideas that can rightly be associated with Plato. They have profoundly influenced subsequent political thinkers.
(Klosko, 2015)

In my opinion, Plato's effect as a thinker and writer has been greater than that of any other historical individual throughout the course of Western civilization. He, like Socrates and Aristotle, provided the groundwork for Western civilization by presenting a clever and perceptive analysis of man's moral and political nature.

Above all, Plato was a great and a very influential ancient Greek political thinker. We call him as a father of political philosophy because his idea and writings are having a great place in the recent time political philosophy/philosophers.

Aristotle was the most renowned Greek political philosopher. He has had a major influence on modern political philosophy. His method is more scientific and historical. He discussed it based on history and observations that were precise and clear. This clearly indicates that there is a difference between practical and theoretical science. Theoretical, which is purchased for the purpose of knowledge, and practical, which is

purchased for the sake of benefits derived from them practically. From his books, *politics* is one of the most celebrated. Because it contains the great art and science of government, it can be a guiding book for constitution-makers.

In his *Politics*, Aristotle frequently compares the politician to a craftsman. The analogy is imprecise because politics, in the strict sense of legislative science, is a form of practical knowledge, while a craft like architecture or medicine is a form of productive knowledge. However, the comparison is valid to the extent that the politician produces, operates, and maintains a legal system according to universal principles.

1.2 Medieval (Christian) philosophy

The emergence of Christianity as a religion was considered as departure from classical Greek city state and Roman Empire. In the medieval period, religion played a great role in every political opinion and decision. In European history, the medieval age is regarded as a dark age. It was the time of the rise of the feudal system. The rulers of that time also assumed that they were appointed by God. It changed the classical tradition of society. People are obligated to follow and respect their rules and demands; if not, God will punish or disappoint them.

The church's ideas influenced the majority of political philosophers. The source of their articles and books was the Bible and the fathers of the church.

The influence of the Roman Law and Aristotle, and of the culture of late antiquity familiar to the Fathers of the Church, also meant that ideas originating outside the

framework of the Christian religion had an impact on religious thinking. The duality between kingship and priesthood (perhaps originally due merely to the fact that Christians had no political power), and the conflicts that resulted from that duality, meant that religious thinking had to accommodate the concerns of powerful people who were not officials in the religious institutions. (Jonathan, 2017)

In medieval time religion affects all aspects of life; including social, economic and political thinking of that period. The church fathers as well as the most influential religious thinkers were St. Augustine and St. Aquinas.

St. Augustine was a medieval period church father and a well-known religious philosopher. His philosophy mostly influenced by Plato's republic. His most celebrated work was "*the city of God*" which explains about Christian thoughts against the non-believers. In the modern time he is known by the idea of the city of god. For Augustine there are two cities. These are the city of god; which has a spiritual pursuits and earthly city; which has earthly desire and actions. Human history is the struggle between these two cities. To have the love of God or to love oneself that results two destinies heaven or hell.

Citizens of the "earthly city" are distinguished by their lust for material goods and for domination over others. On the other hand, citizens of the City of God are "pilgrims and foreigners" who (because God, the object of their love, is not immediately available for their present enjoyment) are very much out of place in a world without an earthly institution sufficiently similar to the City of God. No political state, nor even the institutional church, can be equated with the City of

God. Moreover, there is no such thing as “dual citizenship” in the two cities; every member of the human family belongs to one—and only one.(Mattox, 2019)

Augustine said that this world is imperfect even for one who lives in the city of God. They must aware of the imperfectness of the world.

“Justice,” says Augustine, “is love serving God only, and therefore ruling well all else.” Accordingly, justice becomes the crucial distinction between ideal political states (none of which actually exist on earth) and non-ideal political states—the status of every political state on earth. “Remove justice,” Augustine asks rhetorically, “and what are kingdoms but gangs of criminals on a large scale? What are criminal gangs but petty kingdoms?” No earthly state can claim to possess true justice, but only some relative justice by which one state is more just than another.” (Mattox, 2019)

Political states are imperfect but they do serve a higher purpose by creating laws and maintaining order. And serving a divine is mandatory to protect humanity from chaos. He said that the emergence of church helps to unite the human race under the leadership of the church because “a true state (commonwealth) must be a Christian.” The ruler is the representative of God on earth. He also believed that state is established by God for the remedy of human sins. By nature human being loves peace so the existence of state is to establish peace.

In medieval time St. Augustine has a very important place in the history of political philosophy. He was a most significant figure of Christian thinker of his time. Especially in his works he tried to give a religion a critical definition and also to defend itself.

The other important medieval age religious philosopher was St. Thomas Aquinas. His thoughts and works are influenced by Aristotle. He tried to synthesis the works of Aristotle with the Christian principles. His work also considered as the modification of Aristotelian ideas in the lights of Christian thoughts. His most celebrated work was “*Summa Theologica*”.

According to Aquinas,

The Christian tradition before him, is rooted not in man's nature as such but in man's fallen nature. Political authority differs from slavery in that it constitutes the rule of freemen over free men and has as its object the good of all the citizens, who as free men exist for their own sakes. The slave on the other hand exists for the sake of another and hence is not ruled for his own good but for the good of the master. (Koritansky, 2017)

He argues that the power of the ruler is derived from God. And his duty is to ensure that the people of that country live a happy and virtuous life. This must lead to a good life beyond the earthly kingdom. He regards orderly political life as a factor contributing to the ultimate end of salvation.

Moral virtue is acquired precisely by the repetition of those acts which the law prescribes or by habitual living and education under good laws. Laws are the privileged instrument of Politics and stand in relation to the works of man as universals to particulars. Through them more than through any other agency that the ruler promotes justice and moral goodness among the citizens.(Koritansky, 2017)

He believed that the best regime must be the harmonized the mixer of the best features of monarchy, aristocracy and polity.

Over all, St. Thomas Aquinas's political philosophy was the modified version of Aristotle's ideas but under the influence of the Christian thoughts and laws.

1.3 Modern political philosophy

Modern political philosophy began to develop in the 15th century. European thinkers were beginning to change their analysis and views about the state and authority. They started to question the traditional and religious ways of understandings about the political system. In the ancient time there was no commonwealth or common law and the leader was not loyal to the people to give a good life. The individual owned his own loyalty to his landlord. And also in the medieval period there is a confusion and conflict between the church and the authorities of the state. There was no central authority.

The Renaissance and Reformation had a great role in picking up the pace of the change in the conception of government. In the middle ages, the church was a state and the king had absolute power. The state was under the influence of the church; the pope, at some point, also took the legitimate power of the king.

In recent times, the development of theories and ideas on rationality has been witnessed, and in people's minds, rationality has a great role in the epistemological understanding of political philosophy. Because there was no individual right prior to this time, the legitimacy of power and government was typically based on divine approval or historical precedent, rather than the consent of the governed. Because of that, individuals began to

ask questions about justice and their rights. The idea of consent of legitimacy is part of exercising individual rights.

The first modern political philosopher was the Italian political philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli, who lived from 1496-1527 A.D. His most celebrated work is “the prince”. He has a great influence in the modern political philosophy. And I will be discussing about his ideas and arguments mainly on the next chapter.

The other one of the great political philosopher was an English philosopher Thomas Hobbes, who lived from 1588-1679 A.D. His most known book was “*Leviathan*”. He was also recognized for his social contract theory, and I shall address his beliefs and concepts in further detail in the following chapter of this thesis. I chose to explore these philosophers' ideas because they are comparable in their iconoclastic goals to unseat and discredit the medievalist and ancient traditions, despite fundamentally differing on both the objective of politics and the best approach to attain that goal. And both intellectuals lived through periods of intense political turbulence.

The next influential modern political philosopher was John Locke, who lived from 1632-1704 A.D. In his “*Two Treatises of Government*” said that men are by nature free and equal but for him men’s physical powers and capacities have nothing to do with their moral equality. Men are morally equal when they naturally identify their rights and duties. Locke’s fundamental concept in his political philosophy was natural right and natural laws. Natural laws are the moral obligations that are applied to all people. They are universally agreed kind of laws to all human beings. These laws mostly influenced by

religious thoughts and laws. Christianity's 10 commandments had a role in the idea of Locke's natural laws.

He also argued that people have rights, such as the right to life, liberty, and property that have a foundation independent of the laws of any particular society. *“His theory of the state of nature and his idea of natural law attached together, since the latter defines the rights of persons and their status as free and equal persons. The stronger the grounds for accepting Locke's characterization of people as free, equal, and independent, the more helpful the state of nature becomes as a device for representing people.”* (Tuckness, 2010)

According to him the state of nature is the state of goodwill, mutual assistance and preservation of peace. They have also freedom but not the absolute kind of freedom because they have to respect and follow the natural laws. Each and every person in the state of nature required to obey these laws. If there was any one who was not willing to follow the laws there must be the consequences. Locke thought about this and come to his idea of social contract theory. *“But in such a state of nature, it is obvious that placing the right to punish in each person's hands may lead to injustice and violence. This can be remedied if humans enter into a contract with each other to recognize by common consent a civil government with the power to enforce the law of nature among the citizens of that state.”* (Rogers, 2020)

In my introduction, the final political philosopher is the Switzerland political philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau, who lived from 1712 to 1778 A.D. His most well-known work was "the social contract," which he attributed to Locke's concept of a social contract.

Rousseau utilizes the old theories of contract and transforms them into the concept of the "general will." This general will, a moral will that aims at the common good and in which all participate directly, reconciles the individual and the community by representing the will of the community as deriving from the will of moral individuals, so to obey the laws of such a community is in a sense to follow one's own will, assuming that one is a moral individual.(Duignan, 2019)

Rousseau's theory of "General will" contains an element of permanent value. The same thing may be said of the union between law and liberty which is fundamental point in his political thought.

In this thesis, I will analyze Machiavelli's and Hobbes' understandings of authority and state, as well as their implications. These two powerful political theorists each had their own interpretation of what authority is and how they implied it in their own ways.

In addition, I will attempt to demonstrate how their conceptions of power and state, as well as their thoughts, influence present political philosophy and system.

It also examines the political philosophers Machiavelli and Hobbes. Machiavelli defined power in "The Prince" as "domination and controlling." People are compelled to obey because they are oblivious to the superior power of the state, according to him. The prince's central idea was how to gain and keep power. He defined politics as a sense of

power, as well as power as a political activity. In *Leviathan*, Hobbes defined power as "the power of man is his present means of obtaining some future apparent goods." He is primarily concerned with sovereignty. He contends that the best way to achieve common wealth is through civil peace and social unity.

Machiavelli's political philosophy is based on controlling and dominating one's own fortune, and his politics are based on a constant struggle for power through force. He believes that violence provides an opportunity for the leader to gain control of the people because violence is almost always unavoidable, so we can use these things to our advantage. He also stated that leaders must sometimes provoke violence. For Hobbes, competition and a desire for power lead to war, so we must use whatever means necessary to put an end to this struggle for power. To avoid civil war between men, we need a social contract between the state and the people.

The primary distinction between these two philosophers in terms of focus is that Machiavelli's approach concentrates on how to be a successful leader, whereas Hobbes' method relies on mechanistic human behaviors.

CHAPTER TWO

2. NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI'S POLITICAL DISCOURSE ON AUTHORITY

2.1 Machiavelli's concept of authority and state

Niccolo Machiavelli (1469–1527) was a brilliant and influential political thinker in the Western tradition. He was born in Florence, Italy, on May 3, 1469 a time when Italy was divided into four rival city-states and, thusly, was at the mercy of stronger governments throughout the rest of Europe.

Machiavelli worked as a diplomat for 14 years after the Medici house of Florence was deposed in 1494. After his involvement in a failed attempt to form a Florentine militia, he was tortured, imprisoned, and forbidden from active political action. During his absence, he was able to research Roman history and creates political treatises, most notably *The Prince* (Editors, 2022).

According to Machiavelli, any prince should keep his power by any means necessary. And, according to him, the state is above morality because it is the highest form of institution as well as the most necessary organization for the protection and advancement of human welfare. As a result, it should not be treated on an equal footing with private citizens and governed by the same moral norms that govern their affairs. If the state limits itself to morality, it will be unable to keep in check and control men's inherently egoistic and aggressive tendencies. As a result, similar to the old saying "business is business," "politics is politics." That is not the same thing as morality. Therefore, forming a strong

national state of Italy under a princely rule that defends itself from internal and external enemies is possible through power. “For him, power is the first and most important thing. The security of the people and the state is maintained through power. As a result, the Prince seeks to establish a strong state capable of defending itself against both internal and external enemies.”(Degie, 2014)

The literal definition of authority is “the power or right to command.”And, that authority can come from a variety of sources, including influence, capability, and force. Machiavelli, on the other hand, advocated using cruelty to gain authority; and power is an end in itself, and whatever means are necessary for a prince to acquire and maintain political power are justified. If a prince’s goal is to maintain sovereign authority over a dominion, power may be viewed as an end in itself.

Machiavelli’s political philosophy can be expressed by the word ‘authority,’ which clarifies our meaning. Niccolo Machiavelli's entire political philosophy revolves around the game of power and authority. He recognized the imperative of power devoid of morality, as well as the moralizing aspect of legitimately-anchored authority.

Machiavelli believed that stable political authority and order were essential for social cohesion and moral regeneration. For this reason, he emphasized the importance of a unified polity as well as a republican and free government committed to the liberty of its people. Leonardo, a personal friend whose writings he was familiar with, had a significant influence on his new perspective on political behavior. Leonardo, by the way, was a Borgia architect and the prince's hero."Its heist for power, its admiration of success, its care freeness of means, its rejection of medieval bonds, its frank pragmatism, its conviction that national unity makes for national strength," Machiavelli

understood the realities of politics. Neither his cynicism nor his praise for craftiness is enough to mask the truth.(The Concept of 'Power and Authority' in Niccolo Machiavelli, 2020)

For centuries, philosophers, politicians, and social scientists have explored and commented on the nature of power.

Pittacus (c. 640–568 B.C.E.) said, "The measure of a man is what he does with power," and Lord Acton famously said, "Power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely" (1887).Indeed, power can have decidedly negative connotations, and the term itself is difficult to define. Many scholars agree with German sociologist Max Weber's definition of power as "the ability to exercise one's will over others" (Weber 1922).Power has an impact on more than just personal relationships; it has an impact on larger dynamics such as social groups, professional organizations, and governments.(Griffiths & Keirns, 2015)

Prior to Machiavelli, the central question of what constitutes the end of the state was assumed to be justice, a good life, freedom, and also God. But he ignores or rejects these things because power is an end in itself for him. According to Machiavelli, a man cannot be both a good politician and a good man. In his political philosophy, morality and religion have no place. Also, keep religion and politics separate. If it affects his political power, he would rather the prince be feared than loved.

If he adheres to the state's value system, the statesman may violate other value systems such as religion, ethics, or morality. Machiavelli thus develops the concept of the reason of state, under which many acts that would be considered heinous crimes if judged in a court of religion or morality are permissible, even obligatory. Machiavelli does not assert that ethics and morality are inferior to the precepts of power, the reason of state; from a general, theoretical standpoint,

the canons of power and moral tenets are independent of each other. When it comes to practical collisions, it all depends on who is confronted with the alternatives. The moralist will acknowledge the superiority of his moral code over competing value systems. The ecclesiastic will not accept a challenger to his religious code. Similarly, the statesman will be guided solely by the precepts of his code, whose end is different from other codes in that it seeks to acquire, retain, and expand power, and whose means are thus different as well.(Ebenstein, 1960)

His political philosophy could be regarded as political calculus which guides the actions of the statesmen in the pursuit of power in the right direction. In *the prince* Machiavelli highlighted the importance of the security and unity of the state as primary concerns of a ruler, since the central purpose of *the prince* is to create a whole new kind of prince to Italy. It is the founder of a new kind of leader, who learns from the previous failed leadership, and “the foundation of justice is injustice, the foundation of morality is immorality, the foundation of legitimacy is illegitimacy or revolution, and the foundation of freedom is tyranny,” said St. Augustine.

As I said above, for Machiavelli, “the end justifies the means.” Which means, if the end is always power or authority, he did not bother about how it comes, whether it is by force or by peace. His definition of authority is domination and the prince's control over all political power in his subject. He gives priority to the state rather than morality or ethics. He gives three reasons why he prefers the state over morality.

The first is that it is a higher form of social organization and the most important of all institutions for the protection and advancement of human welfare. The second is that he believed that if the state relied solely on moral means, it would be impossible to keep in check and control men's

inherently egoistic and aggressive tendencies. And the last is that, in his opinion, the state was neither moral nor immoral, but rather non moral. (Jain, 1995)

Politics would be impossible to imagine without the concept of morality. The same definition could be applied to a law, and one could argue that a law is nothing more than a political moral. Political life is also a social phenomenon governed by rules that are recognized and created by our peers. Laws are political extensions of our morals, the universally accepted virtues by which we live our lives. As a species, we have universally agreed on morals that we expect others to follow. While he believes that politicians who try to be good in defiance of the good of the state are not successful, he also recognizes the importance of necessity in immoral actions. He never claims that immoral actions are ever justified, only that they may be required as a politician. Machiavelli claims that the ends justify the means, but he never advocates violence. He also opposes excessive violence, focusing on the importance of necessity. He argues against excessive violence because it is harmful to the state. According to Machiavelli, a prince should carefully calculate all the wicked deeds he needs to commit in order to secure his power, and then execute them all in one stroke, so that he does not need to commit any more wickedness for the rest of his reign. In this way, his subjects will gradually forget his cruel actions, and his reputation will be restored. The Princes who fail to do so, who hesitate in their ruthlessness, find that their problems grow over time and force them to commit evil deeds throughout their reign. As a result, they continue to tarnish their reputations and alienate their constituents. He claims that being feared is preferable to being loved, but not at the expense of a politician's reputation or relationship with their constituents. He also refers

to violence as a criminal virtue and emphasizes the importance of using it only when necessary. While he advocates for the use of violence rather than nonviolence, he makes it clear that this is done for the greater good. If violence is not used, the politician is forced to commit even more evil acts.

Machiavelli, in my opinion, primarily concentrated on two aspects of human behavior: curiosity and selfishness, but morality is another component of our daily lives that distinguishes humans from animals. He also neglected to address all political difficulties, therefore his theories are incomplete.

2.2 Machiavelli's political thought in the prince

Niccolo Machiavelli's political thought is one of the most remarkable issues in the world of politics. And modern political philosophy would be incomplete without mentioning Machiavelli and his book "The Prince."

From Greek philosophy to the Renaissance, all philosophers and thinkers addressed the state's demise. They believed that the state's political power would be used to further their goals. From Plato and Aristotle to the Middle Ages (till the 16th century), all political thinkers were concerned with the central question of the end of the state and saw state power as a means to a higher end conceived in moral terms. But Machiavelli took a different approach. To him, the state's power is the end of the state. In other words, every state must strive to maximize its power. The failure of the state in this enterprise will cause great upheaval. Consequently he confined his attention to the means best suited to the acquisition, retention and expansion of power.(Ambedkar, 1994)

This same, highest form of human association is the state. Machiavelli's work was marked by a strong allegiance and loyalty to the state as opposed to any individual ruler or its people. It is required for the advancement of human welfare. The state is to be worshiped even if it means sacrificing the individual for the sake of the state. Before it can promote the welfare of its people, the state must first preserve itself. A ruler must remember that whatever success he or she achieves is due to power. He can use any means he wants to gain political power. Political leaders play an important role in organizing the state and ensuring its safety and security. The state must use force and coercion; otherwise, it will be impossible to protect and provide safety and security to the people.

In this chapter, I will concentrate on his most celebrated and well-known work, *The Prince*. Machiavelli is best known for *The Prince*, a thin volume that claims to teach hopeful princes how to gain and keep power. The book has 26 chapters, with the exception of the final chapter, all of which are about power. The Prince's final chapter is a prophetic call for the liberation of Italy from the barbarians. *The Prince* is a handbook that describes the essential qualities that a prince must have in order to rule and maintain power (Strauss, 1957).

Machiavelli divides principalities into acquired and inherited principalities. In general, he contends that the more difficult it is to gain control of a state, the easier it is to keep it. The fear of a new prince is stronger than the love of a hereditary prince; thus, the new prince who relies on "a dread of punishment that never forsakes you" will succeed, whereas a prince who expects his subjects to keep their promises of support will be disappointed. When the prince needs his

subjects, he will discover that "each wants to die for him when death is at a distance," but when the prince needs his subjects, they will generally refuse to serve as promised. Thus, every prince, whether new or old, must look upon himself as a new prince and learn to rely on "one's own arms," both literally in raising one's own army and metaphorically in not relying on the goodwill of others. (Fay, 2017)

In this book the central idea is how the prince should lead and also acquire power and maintain a strong state.

Machiavelli was looking for the root causes of domestic insecurity and he emphasized that the prince must establish new principalities because (as Machiavelli believed) acquiring and maintaining command and control over new principalities was the most difficult task for a prince. He theorized that the task of the prince is the diplomatic but powerful acquisition of new principalities through the use of one's own resources and men. Machiavelli also emphasized the importance of having a powerful and disciplined army that must obey the prince if he is to rise to power. An army that is not disciplined and does not obey the prince is extremely dangerous.(Walker, 2008)

The process of acquiring power is a major theme in "the Prince." He went on to say that the main foundation of any state is good laws and a strong army, and that we cannot have good laws without a strong army.

Machiavelli wrote "*the prince*" as the form of advice to the prince. He said that if the prince wants to maintain himself in power, there are significant things the prince has to learn or follow. He talks about Raison D'Etat' means reason of state. He elaborates that actions and policies have to support or give priority for the safety and security of the state. "*Because the state must first protect itself before it can promote the welfare of its citizens. Machiavelli justifies all means used by the state to preserve and safeguard it.*

According to him, the harsh realities of political life, which is a struggle for power and survival, guide one's actions in politics.”(Ambedkar, 1994)

In *The Prince*, Machiavelli explains several principles for a leader to follow and establishes that if one cannot balance both, it is better to be feared than loved. A ruler who is well-liked but not always respected by his subjects can easily lose control of his subjects, especially when others have nefarious motives. A leader can maintain power while maintaining the respect of his subjects by instilling fear and avoiding hatred in his subjects. There will always be adversity as a leader, and doing what is best for the state of affairs should always come first. Nothing is worse than gaining the people's aversion and eventually losing control of power. When it comes to leadership, one must be both feared and respected by those around him. When a ruler is concerned about their constituents, vulnerability enters and takes control of their thoughts. A person in authority does not need to be loved in order to supervise and direct others. However, being admired and respected as a leader is not a bad thing. Machiavelli's explanations throughout the book easily lead one to believe that he believes violence and aggression are necessary for retaining power. He discusses how violence can be necessary for power, but his accounts are almost always supported by exceptional reasoning. When it comes to leading others, it is all about striking a balance and acting appropriately when chastising individuals. When people dislike or disrespect the person in charge, all control is lost. Machiavelli saw aggression and war as necessary for any leader's success and to gain respect.

Many dictators and democratic leaders have almost always desired to be loved, whereas those responsible for maintaining law and order through force such as corporate executives, department heads, and police desire to be feared. In some ways, having one without the other is impossible. To be loved would imply a lack of leadership strength; to be feared would imply that a ruler is heartless and unconcerned about his people and their well-being. Too much love breeds a desire for a more respectable, terrifying figure who cannot be overthrown or exploited, and vice versa. It is human nature to desire what we cannot have, as the proverbial grass in politics will always appear greener on the other side.

In “the prince,” Machiavelli prioritizes the concept of state, and the term state refers to an independent and self-sufficient state. Power should be prioritized by the Prince. A prince’s power of state is of the utmost importance to him. The state’s self sufficiency implies that it will have its own army, a strong and unified government, unity and integrity among the people, and a solid economic foundation. As a result, the prince must use force and coercion in order to protect and provide security and safety to the people who live within that particular boundary. As a result, Raison D’Etat’ is an inseparable component of state life. He also said that the prince must be cruel to maintain the power of the state. A prince must not mind the degree of his cruelty in order to keep his subject united and faithful.

He famously stated that “the end justifies the means,” regardless of how cruel, calculating or immoral those means may be. Politics is the riskiest game. It can never be played in a

civilized and orderly manner. As a result, a ruler must remember that whatever brings success and power is virtuous, even slyness and hardheadedness. He also suggests that the prince be both loved and feared, but if the two don't go well together, it's better to be feared than loved. Machiavelli said,

This raises the question of whether it is better to be loved than feared, or vice versa. The answer is that one wishes to be both, but because it is difficult to be both, it is far better to be feared than loved if you cannot be both. One can generalize about men: they are ungrateful, fickle, liars and deceivers, they avoid danger, and they are greedy for profit...Men are less concerned with injuring someone who makes himself loved than with injuring someone who makes himself feared...Fear, on the other hand, is fueled by a fear of punishment, which is always effective.(Walker, 2008)

Here, he was meant that maintaining discipline and implementation of laws is not an easy task so law enforcer cannot be a beloved one.

Human nature, according to Machiavelli, is mean, low, and ungrateful, and a prince must take this into account. Machiavelli does not advocate for princes to be moral and virtuous individuals. What matters most, however, is the appearance of greatness. Simply put, he believes that nice guys finish last and that princes should act immorally when it is necessary to advance their agenda and maintain power. Fortune and God are not to be trusted. Men are ungrateful by nature; they are also selfish as long as it benefits them.

A prince should forge his own path and take risks. A prince should not be concerned about being perceived as cruel, but rather should be loved whenever possible. He said that "Men have less remorse in offending someone who makes himself loved than one who makes himself feared; for love is held by a chain of obligation that, men being

selfish, breaks whenever it serves their purpose; whereas fear is held by a dread of punishment that never fails.” (Ricci, 1903) Cruelty may be necessary to instill the correct amount of fear in the people.

Machiavelli does not condemn evil as a means of gaining power. Instead, he suggests that immoral acts be committed quickly and in one blow. Machiavelli also believed that when leaders are not moral, it is critical that they pretend to be so in order to maintain appearances. “A prince must always appear moral, even if he is not.” A prince must also find ways to keep the people dependent on the state.

Another mechanism used by Machiavelli (Ricci, 1903) to ensure the success of his program was to build one's own military. For him, relying on native troops to protect the state's security and maintain power is essential, while auxiliary, mercenary, and mixed troops are ineffective. However, the use of mixed troops is more important than the use of either type of troop. According to him, the military is a measure of a state's strength.

Constructing a powerful army for one state, in my opinion, is vital; nevertheless, merely building and making no attempt to improve the people's living conditions may cause the prince to become aggressive and authoritarian, perhaps leading to internal turmoil.

A prince who prefers luxury over arm can easily lose power and the state. As a result, the prince should have no other goals or thoughts than to build a strong army and organize and discipline the state.

Above all, when choosing companions, the prince should follow in the footsteps of the lion and fox. Machiavelli advises being not only strong and ferocious, but also cunning

and outmaneuvering. All of these qualities may not be possessed by the prince or a single advisor; thus, the prince should choose wise men of varying intelligence to assist him from various angles. With various points of view, the wise prince will be able to choose the most effective points and consider them when making final decisions.

A prince must always instill fear in the people. If he does not get to be loved, he must strive to avoid hatred. And the prince must not interfere with an individual's property rights. He stated that he must be feared or despised, and that he will always refrain from interfering with the property or women of his citizens and subjects. He also said that when the prince "If he is forced to take someone's life, he must do so only when there is a proper justification and a clear reason for it, and he must always refrain from taking other people's property. For men, the death of their father is more easily forgotten than the loss of their patrimony."(Jain, 1995)

In Chapter 23 of *The Prince*, Machiavelli stated that the prince must have a council of wise men rather than flatterers. However, the prince should have complete control over who his advisors are and what type of advice they provide. Advisors should be loyal servants who are closely monitored for any behavior that suggests selfish motives or ambitions.

A prudent prince must therefore take a third course, by selecting wise men in his state and giving them full liberty to speak the truth to him, but only of those things that he asks and nothing else; but he must ask them about everything and hear their opinion, and then deliberate by himself in his own way, and in these councils and with each of these men comport himself in such a way that everyone can see that the more freely he speaks, the

more he will be accepted. Outside of these, he should listen to no one, proceed with caution, and be firm in his decisions. (Ricci, 1903)

For any state a powerful government and internal unity were essential, so the prince must be careful when select the counsel of advisors.

He said that how a prince can attain a praise or a blame. All men and specially princes are placed at a greater height, are reputed for certain qualities which bring them either praise or blame. “Thus, one is considered liberal, another miserly; one generous, another rapacious; one cruel, another merciful; one a liar, another faithful; one effeminate and pusillanimous, another fierce and high-spirited; one humane, another proud; one lascivious, another chaste; one frank, another astute; one hard, another easy; one serious, another frivolous; one religious, another incredulous, and so on.”(Ricci, 1903)A man who wishes to profess goodness in everything must inevitably fail in the midst of so many who are not good. As a result, if a prince wishes to maintain himself, he must learn how not to be good and how to use and not use it depending on the circumstances.

Leaders are not always used to being told the truth and allowing others to understand them, but Machiavelli believes that a virtuous prince is one who uses the people around him to realize his power. Being told the truth by everyone may reduce people’s respect for the prince, but the prince should allow it to make people understand that the truth does not offend him. On the other hand, he should select wise men that will be free to speak the truth to him; the prince will listen to their opinions and, after questioning them, he will make his final decisions. Listening to others is also important, according to Machiavelli, because it teaches the prince to appreciate what others understand; however,

he should not understand issues through others. Nonetheless, a close examination of his political principles demonstrates the importance of a community electing a patriotic and intelligent leader to lead it. The prince, according to the book, should first serve the interests of his subjects and country, and only then consider ways to maintain his political position. These ideas, on the other hand, believe that the latter is harmful because it does not promote democracy. Democratic countries have a faster rate of development. "The Prince" has been used as a political guidebook by many despotic rulers, and it is frequently used to justify their actions. As a result, some philosophers suspected Machiavelli of deceiving and manipulating his subjects. Some of Machiavelli's political theories are still relevant today. According to Machiavelli, political leaders should try to come up with novel ideas that will help them shape the destiny of their countries.

Among Machiavelli's political ideas, the one with which his name is most closely associated and which marks his most complete break with the Middle Ages is his formal and conscious separation of politics from religion and morality. *"According to Machiavelli, Italy's servitude is due in large part to its reliance on certain 'false interpretations' of the Christian God. Such interpretations encourage people to think about enduring their beatings rather than avenging them. He appears to be open to the possibility that not all interpretations are incorrect."*(Honeycutt, 2019)

Religion's place in Machiavelli's writing was, and continues to be, debatable. He appears to intentionally and completely separate politics from ethics, morality, and religion.

He was influenced by his beliefs about the nature of man and government, as well as his belief that power is an end in itself. It is critical to remember that, while all political

thinkers from Plato and Aristotle down to the end of the Middle Ages were concerned with the central question of the state, they saw state power as a means to a higher end conceived in moral terms. Machiavelli broke completely with this tradition, ignoring the issue of the state's ethical purpose. He saw state power as an end in itself, rather than a means to a higher moral or ethical end. (Jain, 1995)

Machiavelli rejects the doctrine of Divine Law and denies that man has any supernatural end; this includes heaven and hell. He also rejects St. Thomas Aquinas' theory that man requires divine law to be guided in order to be blessed in the afterlife. For him, the only thing a man should prioritize in his life is his own well-being.

Machiavelli also advises princes to take control of their own fates rather than relying on fate or God. Because "fortune is a woman... and it is seen that she allows herself to be mastered by the adventurous," a prince should be daring and risk-taking. As a result, she is always womanly and a lover of young men, who are less cautious." According to Machiavelli, a prince can forge his own successful path rather than relying on good fortune or God to do so.(Mohan, 2020)

His famous quote "the end justifies the means" summarizes his moral philosophy. Machiavelli promotes a selfish and consequentiality morality. The end can always be used to justify the means, and power is an end, not a means.

Scholars also contend that the founding fathers of the United States adopted Machiavelli's political ideas. "Politics has changed over time, and it is no longer the same as it was in 1513, when Machiavelli wrote his treatise *The Prince*, but the fundamentals of politics have remained the same." (Milner, 1995)As a result, many of his political

ideas are still relevant today. Many writers have also embraced the majority of his arguments, which are still relevant for studying modern political processes. “Machiavelli’s enduring contribution to political thought and practice is the remarkably resilient idea that political success requires the transcendence of ordinary moral principles.” (Musa, 1983) Abraham Lincoln, Louis XIV, Cardinal Richelieu, Napoleon Bonaparte, and Benito Mussolini were among the politicians and leaders who found Machiavelli's principles useful. However, we don't know how well they understood Machiavelli’s principles. Machiavelli believed that leaders could gain wisdom by observing rather than understanding human nature. He emphasized that leaders should pay attention to how their subordinates act. This knowledge can be applied when leading the same subjects, allowing the leader to anticipate. He was also in favor of the use of punishment and laws in government. “He believes that they are both important in maintaining social order and peace.” In his opinion, a prince should enact laws and impose punishments to facilitate the maintenance of order. Machiavelli also recognized the importance of morality, which is still relevant in our societies today. A leader with virtues is capable of acting without inhibition and with vitality.

In general, Machiavelli is regarded as the father of modern political philosophy. His contributions to political philosophy continue to have an impact on current political philosophers and politicians. He particularly defied the medieval tradition that political authority was under the control of the church. He stated unequivocally that morality and religion come second to the state. He first advocates for state autonomy.

CHAPTER THREE

3. THOMAS HOBBS'S CONCEPT OF AUTHORITY AND STATE

3.1 What is state and authority in Hobbes political philosophy?

The theories about the state, nation, and authority advanced by Machiavelli in the sixteenth century were expanded and perfected by the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes in the seventeenth century. He boldly backed the absolute state, which meant absolute monarchy. He was born in England in 1588 and died in 1679. He was a well-known English philosopher and historian who had a significant impact on the history of modern political philosophy. Hobbes's most important work and one of the most influential philosophical texts produced during the seventeenth century, "Leviathan" described as "of commonwealth". Hobbes defines a commonwealth as a great multitude, by mutual consent, one with another, has made them every one of the other, to the end that he (the sovereign power of the commonwealth) may use the strength and means of them all, as he shall think expedient, for the peace and common defense. Leviathan was also written partly in response to Hobbes's fear during the political turmoil of the English Civil Wars. However, the book's main ideas developed prior to the outbreak of the conflict. We can say that Leviathan developed the first general theory of politics in English.

Hobbes lived during the most turbulent period in English history. He had witnessed the Civil War, which had resulted in the beheading of the king as well as the restoration of

the state. The ensuing chaos and anarchy confirmed his faith in the monarch's absolute rule. Hobbes' writing was prompted by the Civil War and was intended to exert influence on the king's behalf. However, he had attempted to uphold the sovereignty of the state, which at the time resided in the person of the king, through his writing.

In the politically unstable years following the Civil Wars, Leviathan's argument for the necessity of absolute sovereignty emerged, and its publication coincided with that of many Republican treatises seeking to justify regicide (king's assassination) to the rest of Europe. Hobbes' materialist philosophy was based on a mechanistic view of the universe, believing that all phenomena could be explained purely in terms of matter and motion and rejecting concepts like incorporeal spirits or disembodied souls. As a result, many critics labeled Hobbes an atheist (although he was not, in the strict sense). Hobbes became known as the "Monster of Malmsbury" and the "Bug-bear of the Nation," as he was associated with both atheism and the many deliberately terrifying images of Leviathan.

Hobbes's conception of human nature was influenced by his birth and unhappy childhood. "His mother gave birth to twins; himself and fear," he said. As a result, his views on human nature and motives, as well as the motivations behind human behavior, form the foundation of his entire political philosophy.

Hobbes sees the world as made up of bodies (atoms) in motion, arranged in a disorderly pattern, and obeying well defined causal laws in his metaphysics. He believes that human societies are made up of atoms and that using a "causal definition," he can construct human societies from their constituent parts. Atoms, he believes, are prone to smashing

into one another. This pessimistic view of Hobbes's human natural world explains his concept of a state of nature preoccupied with civil strife and warfare; the state of lawlessness. According to him, the primary causes of an ordered society are a desire for security and freedom, whereas the primary causes of disorder are competition, distrust, and conflict.

In political philosophy, the term "state of nature" refers to the actual condition of a human being prior to the establishment of a legal government or political organization. Hobbes assumes the existence of a hypothetical state of nature and refers to it as the pre-social phase of human nature. He paints a dull picture of nature and declares, "The life of man in the state of nature was solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short." Men engaged in warfare and savagery on a daily basis.

For Hobbes, the authority of the sovereign is absolute, in the sense that no authority is above the sovereign and that its will is law. The social contract allows individuals to leave the state of nature and enter civil society, but the former remains a threat and returns as soon as governmental power collapses. Because the power of Leviathan is uncontested, however, its collapse is very unlikely and occurs only when it is no longer able to protect its subjects.(Andremunro, 2015)

Hobbes argues that civil peace and social unity are best to achieve the establishment of commonwealth.

Human behavior, according to Hobbes, is to be understood primarily in terms of a mechanistic psychology of the passions/ those forces in man, which, so to speak, push

him from behind; it is not to be understood in terms of those things which, could be thought of as attracting man from in front, the ends of man, or what for Hobbes would be the objects of the passions. The objects of the passions, Hobbes says, vary with each man's constitution and education and are too easy to disguise. Furthermore, good and evil, the words with which men characterize the objects of their desires and aversions, are strictly relative to the man using the words, "there being nothing simply and absolutely so ; nor any common Rule of Good and Evil, to be taken from the nature of the objects themselves"(Cropsey, 1987) What men really mean when they say something is good is that it pleases them. Yet it is true that as the passions issue in actions, men are guided by their imaginations and their opinions of what is good and evil; but the thoughts do not control the passions; on the contrary, "for the Thoughts are to the Desires, as Scouts, and Spies, to range abroad, and find the way to the Things Desired.";(Cropsey, 1987) Hobbes was in agreement with the tradition, stemming from Socrates and including Thomas Aquinas, that the goals and character of moral and political life should be determined by reference to nature, especially human nature. However, he determined the way in which nature sets the standards for politics very differently than did the tradition, namely, through the construction of a theory of "the state of nature." The theory of the state of nature, deduced; Hobbes says, from the passions of man, is one way of dealing with the old psychological problem, a problem of decisive importance for political philosophy.

Hobbes treats the numerous passions of man in mastery way and reduces all of them to the two original and primitive feelings: desire and aversion. Desire is the feeling

produced when a motion set up by an external object heightens the vital processes going on in the body; aversion is the feeling produced when such a motion retards the vital processes. Desire is endeavor to secure such an object; aversion is endeavoring to get rid of it. Desire for object creates love for it; aversion from it produces hatred. The possession of what one loves gives one joy; failure to possess it or loss of it is followed by grief. In the same way Hobbes traces other emotions like glory, envy, pity and humility to the two primitive feelings, desire and aversion. The central feature of this derivation is that all of them are ultimately made to refer to the self of man; they are the forms which egoism or selfishness assumes. Hobbes's man is completely self-centered. It is this effort to base all human behavior on egoism that makes the theory of Hobbes an improvement on that of Machiavelli and gives his system a distinct scientific form.

Attention may be drawn to two important features of this derivation of all emotions from desire for objects and aversion from them. In the first place, the mode of derivation is deductive. Hobbes does not merely make a list of the various emotions and passions of man on the basis of observation; he tries to show the different forms of reaction which occur under complex situations on the assumption that the only motives to action are desire for what furthers the process of life and aversion from what spoils it. In the second place, Hobbes theory must be clearly distinguished from hedonism. He does not say that good is what pleases us and bad what causes pain, that we desire nothing but pleasure and avoidance of pain. The fundamental fact for him is that men desire objects which will satisfy their wants, and not pleasure by it. He is thinking in terms of stimulus response and not in those of pleasure- pain. Every stimulus affects the organism either favorably or

unfavorably. If the effect is favorable, the organism tries to get rid of it. The rule behind all behavior is that the living body is set instinctively to preserve or to heighten its vitality. In brief, the physiological principle behind all behavior is self-preservation. The self-preservation means just the continuation of individual biological existence. Good is what conduces to this end evil what has an opposite effect.

Is man by nature social and political? Hobbes denies that man is naturally social and political. The grounds of this denial are made evident by the theory of the state of nature, that pre political condition in which men live without civil government or without a common power over them to keep them in fear. By mere nature men are irreligious so he regarded them as apolitical. Hobbes said that the natural state of man would be unsocial and warlike, if it were not for certain natural instinct and for natural reason which made him social and peaceful. Man would be naturally apolitical, if he did not possess irresistible inclinations of become political.

When there is no common power to keep men in awe, then they are in that condition that is called war. John Milto said that “state of (war) nature was formed to avoid the discord and violence that sprang from Adam’s transgression. When discussing the state of nature, Hobbes consistently adheres to his principle.

“Thus much for the ill condition which man is actually placed in by mere nature; though with a possibility of coming out of it, consisting partly in his passions, partly in his reason,” he observes.

The fundamental law of nature imposes upon the natural man some fourteen commandments to observe. These are(1) that every man ought to seek peace; (2) that he

should be willing to give up his right -to all things, provided other men do the same; (3) that men perform their covenants made; (4) to be grateful for a favor rendered; (5) and, singularly enough for a 'state of war', the command of complaisance or adaptability. "The observers of this law," says Hobbes, "may be called sociable; the contrary, stubborn, unsociable, forward, and intractable;" (6) to pardon past offences; (7) to punish only for future good, hatred or contempt for others; (9) forbidding pride; (10) forbidding arrogance; (11) commanding equity; (12) commanding common ownership of things divisible; (13) commanding respect towards mediators; (14) commanding submission of controversies to arbitration.(Edward, 1906)

All men are commanded by nature fundamental law to be not only peaceful, but also complaisant and social. Even while the belligerents are at war, Nature mandates that they be socially conscious and love one another. In short, Hobbes declared that man is actually selfish and hostile to his fellows, and that the state of nature is a war of all against all, while yet admitting that both emotion and reason drive man to seek the company of his peers.

Hobbes (1651, p. 53) states that "the power of a man, to take it universally, is his present means to obtain some future apparent good...." No one is certain whether the next person will not harm him; or in state of nature everyone is under constant threat from other persons; and it is not comfortable to continue in such situation. However, in the state of nature, there are three natural laws: the first is that "every man ought to desire peace," the second is that "giving up the right to everything, given that others are also ready," and the third is that "perform whatever agreements you made." Then Hobbes goes over the social compact, in which everyone agrees to give up their right to everything, and they can't

readily retrieve their rights once they've given them up. As a result, in Hobbes' view, the social contract is an alienation pact because it is irreversible and places individuals under absolute responsibility while giving the sovereign total authority. In this situation, Hobbes is either in opposition to modern liberalism or a political absolutist.

3.2 Hobbes implication of state and authority in his Leviathan

The seventeenth century England was manifested by series of civil wars; and also there were differences regarding how the country should be ruled. He lived during the most turbulent period of England. Thomas Hobbes's writings were occasioned by civil war and were intended to exert influence on the side of the king. But, he had attempted by his writing to uphold the sovereignty of the state which during his time resided in the person of the king. Some thinkers believed that monarchical rule was proper, whereas others assume that it was better for the people to govern themselves. He assumed a condition where there is no government and rose the question for themselves what life would be like in such situation. From his description of life in the absence of government he derived the appropriate role of government. State of nature is a hypothetical formulation where there is no human laws, rules, regulations that govern human actions and behaviors.

Hobbes claimed that traditional philosophy had never reached irrefutable conclusions, instead offering useless sophistries and insubstantial rhetoric; he thus called for a philosophical reform that would enable secure truth claims on which everyone could agree. As a result, Hobbesian philosophy would eliminate disagreements over

fundamental aspects of human nature, society, and proper government. Furthermore, Hobbes believed that civil wars were caused by disagreements in the philosophical foundations of political knowledge; thus, his plan for a reformed philosophy to end divisiveness would also end the conditions of war. Civil war, according to Hobbes, was the ultimate terror, the definition of fear itself. As a result, he desired to reform philosophy in order to reform the nation and thus vanquish fear. Hobbes stated in his book that there are three major causes of conflict in the nature of man. First, there is competition, then there is uncertainty, and finally there is glory. The first use violence to gain control of other men's persons, wives, children, and cattle; the second, to defend them; and the third, for trifles such as a word, a smile, a different opinion, or any other sign of undervalue, either directly in their persons or through reflection in their kindred, friends, nation, profession, or name.

The state of nature, according to Hobbes, is one of insecurity and warfare. Men are at odds with one another because conflicts, struggles, and war are the norm. Men lived in constant danger and fear of death in their natural state. Nobody can claim permanent ownership of anything. Whatever anyone can grab is his for as long as he can keep it. A strong man could appear and snatch such property from Hobbes, and it would be his until another, stronger man snatched it from him. Hobbes put it this way:

And so it is that where an invader has nothing to fear but another man's single power; if one plant, sow, build, or possess a convenient seat, others may be expected to come prepared with forces united to dispossess, and deprive him, not only of the fruit of his

labor, but also of his life or liberty. And the invader is once again in danger from another. (Hobbes, 1909)

Leviathan attempted to provoke controversy in politics and science, thereby radically challenging both contemporary government and philosophy it; however, despite its invocation of controversy, Leviathan ultimately sought to annihilate controversy for good. Hobbes's philosophical method claimed to provide incontrovertible conclusions, and its depiction of society's Leviathan implied that the Hobbesian method could put an end to controversy, war, and fear.

Leviathan rigorously argues that civil peace and social unity are best achieved by the establishment of a commonwealth through social contract. Hobbes's ideal commonwealth is ruled by a sovereign power responsible for protecting the security of the commonwealth and granted absolute authority to ensure the common defense. In his introduction, Hobbes describes this commonwealth as an “artificial person or chain” and as a body politic that mimics the human body. The frontispiece to the first edition of *Leviathan*, which Hobbes helped design, portrays the commonwealth as a gigantic human form built out of the bodies of its citizens, the sovereign as its head. The chains are weak because Hobbes believes that subjects are free only when the laws do not interfere. This is not a limitation of sovereignty because the laws could intervene if the sovereign decided to do so. As a result, except for what the sovereign voluntarily concedes, the subjects have no rights against the sovereign. Hobbes calls this figure the “Leviathan,” a word derived from the Hebrew for “sea monster” and the name of a monstrous sea

creature appearing in the Bible; the image constitutes the definitive metaphor for Hobbes's perfect government. His text attempts to prove the necessity of the Leviathan for preserving peace and preventing civil war.

Leviathan is divided into four books: "Of Man," "Of Common-wealth," "Of a Christian Common-wealth," and "Of the Kingdome of Darkness." Book I contains the philosophical framework for the entire text, while the remaining books simply extend and elaborate the arguments presented in the initial chapters. Consequently, Book I is given the most attention in the detailed summaries that follow. Hobbes begins his text by considering the elementary motions of matter, arguing that every aspect of human nature can be deduced from materialist principles. Hobbes depicts the natural condition of mankind--known as the state of nature--as inherently violent and awash with fear. The state of nature is the "war of every man against every man," in which people constantly seek to destroy one another. This state is so horrible that human beings naturally seek peace, and the best way to achieve peace is to construct the Leviathan through social contract.

Book II details the process of erecting the Leviathan, outlines the rights of sovereigns and subjects, and imagines the legislative and civil mechanics of the commonwealth. Book III concerns the compatibility of Christian doctrine with Hobbesian philosophy and the religious system of the Leviathan. Book IV engages in show up false religious beliefs and arguing that the political implementation of the Leviathan state is necessary to achieve a secure Christian commonwealth.

Hobbes's philosophical method in *Leviathan* is modeled after a geometric proof, founded upon first principles and established definitions, and in which each step of argument makes conclusions based upon the previous step. Hobbes decided to create a philosophical method similar to the geometric proof after meeting Galileo on his extended travels in Europe during the 1630s. Observing that the conclusions derived by geometry are indisputable because each of constituent steps is indisputable in itself, Hobbes attempted to work out a similarly irrefutable philosophy in his writing of *Leviathan*.

As a result, Hobbes establishes two important government ideas. The first is that every government will unavoidably use force against its subjects. Even in the presence of self-governance, it is unavoidable that the majority of the government is controlled by a few or one individual. If there is true self-government, the ruled have mechanisms in place to monitor and control the acts of those who rule them. As a result, the ruled may have direct or indirect influence over the ruler in policy making and other matters. The ruled may exert direct influence, especially when there are few people and a referendum is required for policymaking; yet, even in this situation, there are some subjects that should not be compromised for a referendum and should instead be left to the government.

The fundamental disadvantage of a referendum is that it limits government responsibility and delegate's policy-making and implementation authority to individuals who are not accountable.

The second point on which Hobbes concentrated was that the creation of government in a commonwealth is a voluntary act on the part of the subjects. As history shows, governments are formed by the consent of their constituents only in exceptional circumstances. However, if Hobbes' consent is understood as permanent rather than irrevocable, it identifies the cornerstone upon which democratic government is built.

For Hobbes sovereignty is an undeniable fact of political life; whereas there is civil or political society, sovereignty must exist. According to Hobbes, the essence of sovereignty lies in the power to determine on behalf of the entire community what should be done to maintain peace and order and promote their welfare. "The sovereign, as Hobbes defines, is single person or a group of persons to whom the rights of the government (as Hobbes terms it commonwealth) are transferred to and under which the great multitude are united; and individuals other than the sovereign are taken to be the subjects. As said before, the commonwealth or the sovereign is formed when individuals give up their rights in the state of nature for their common peace and security. And this commonwealth can be formed in two ways: either by institution or by acquisition."(Murray, 1953)

According to Hobbes, "the sovereign by institution has the following rights: to control and judge the opinions, actions and decisions of subjects; to prescribe the rules and regulations by which the actions of subjects judged or determines what is good, bad, right, wrong etc. for the fact that these concepts can have their place only after the establishment of commonwealth; to administer of justice, that is, hearing and deciding all

disagreements regarding law; engaging in war and peace with other states and commonwealths for the sake of public good; choosing any kind of administrative staff like counselors, ministers, judges, and officers both in war and peace; giving awards and titles of honor, and imposing punishments.”(Thomas Hobbes, 1651)

However, the reality in Hobbes seems that “he did not differentiate between the *absolute* and *irreversible* transfer of rights. One may transfer an absolute right to the sovereign, but this does not imply that the transfer is irreversible. The main points that Hobbes focuses are: it is the heart and soul of the sovereign to be absolute and unreserved; and the government possessing an absolute and unreserved powers is the groundwork of stable and orderly community. But as Hobbes himself admits, such government is allowed to remain in power so long as it exercises its powers for the purpose that it was established to”.(Murray, 1953)

Hobbes' political philosophy was his response to the threat and reality of civil war in Britain during his lifetime. His problem was figuring out how to avoid civil war and turmoil. He, like Plato, concluded that absolute obedience on the part of subjects was the only way to ensure political stability, and his political theory was an attempt to demonstrate the necessity of absolute rule and absolute obedience. In Hobbes' state, the Leviathan has the power of life and death, and can easily become drunk with such absolute power to the detriment of his subjects, because power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

John Plamenatz, on his own part, paraphrases Hobbes this way: “The rules governing the use of power are more likely to be followed when the final decision-making authority in

all spheres of government (in other words, supreme authority) is concentrated in the hands of one man or assembly rather than divided among several.” (Plamenatz, 1963)

Plamenatz believes Hobbes overlooked the fact that there is a common interest, particularly among political elites, in resolving political disputes in an orderly and peaceful manner. Of course, this was not the case in Hobbes’ England. Plamenatz, on the other hand, believes that the mere presence of a Hobbesian sovereign is unlikely to deter rebellion. Hobbes exaggerates the importance of political institutions while underestimating the extent to which government in general is dependent on subjects’ willingness to obey. Furthermore, Hobbes is well-known for proposing that the division of sovereign authority leads to civil war; for example, he believed that the English Civil War resulted from power-sharing between the Monarchy and the Assembly.

The main purpose of the Hobbesian political philosophy was to argue that the rebellion against the established authority was wrong and therefore, should not be attempted. Hobbes was witness to the English Civil war and according to him, the direct cause of the English civil war was that the king, instead of retaining full sovereignty, had, allowed parliament to grow up as an independent rival power. Thus, the country had come to have two masters which to Hobbes meant, that it had no master. To divide sovereignty, according to Hobbes, is to destroy it. The fact that the country had been brought to chaos by conflicting religious and political ideas was at the root of the loss of sovereignty.

Men who advocated for these ideas have placed their consciences, personal preferences, private visions, and interests above the established laws and religious of their society,

putting everything, including them, in jeopardy. As a result, Hobbes suggested and passionately approved state is an absolute state.

In fairness to Hobbes, let us admit that his purpose was not historical analysis. He was supremely concerned with social order and discipline. Besides, he was deeply concerned about the power vacuum that may arise due to anarchy or disorder or division of sovereignty. Therefore, he states his concept of legal sovereignty in clear and precise manner. He made people realize the fundamental necessary of strong government as well as security and peace. He outlined a theory of the nation state, which summed up the whole Renaissance spirit, and gave a philosophical basis to the movement whose origin we saw in *The Prince* of Machiavelli.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. CRITICAL ANALYSIS ON MACHIAVELLI'S AND HOBBS'S IDEA OF AUTHORITY

The primary goal of discussing authority is to demonstrate and justify how it has the ability to change the likelihood of outcomes. Authority can be used to bring order and security into people's lives, as well as to resolve conflict in a peaceful and equitable manner. For example, air traffic controllers prevent accidents and ensure the safety of airplane passengers. Laws guarantee that all children have equal access to a free public education. Leadership requires authority as well, and great leaders can help their teams achieve great things. "Authority is the subordination of an individual's judgment or will to that of another person in a way that is binding, independent of the content of what that person says or requires. To have authority in matters of belief is to have theoretical authority; to have authority over action is to be 'in authority'. The notion of authority has two main senses: expertise and the right to rule."(Green, 1998)

Authority is viewed differently from one political thinker to another. For instance, Niccolo Machiavelli viewed authority is the first and the most essential thing for him; it's about dominating and controlling, whereas Thomas Hobbes said that state of nature is state of war and to avoid these problems, the king or the monarchy should have an absolute authority or power.

Thomas Hobbes and Niccolo Machiavelli lived in different eras, but their philosophy is very similar. Hobbes and Machiavelli outline the need for sovereignty in 'The Prince'

and 'Leviathan,' respectively, to achieve the ideal peace. To have sovereignty, you must be skilled at war, because others will try to fight you, and sovereigns must protect their citizens. However, Hobbes and Machiavelli see a different path to achieving that ideal peace and becoming sovereign. Hobbes believes that the ruler should be both liked and feared, whereas Machiavelli believes that a sovereign should always be feared because it reduces the likelihood of an uprising. They both believe that power should be held by someone who is liked but not loved. They all agree that leaders should always be good at war so that citizens can be protected during critical times, allowing citizens to have complete trust in the leader. This also protects the leader from potential citizen attacks. Being skilled at war instills fear in both citizens and potential adversaries. Both Machiavelli and Hobbes, I believe, are terrified of war. There is a lot of information about wars and what to do about them in both of their texts. They did, however, always want the sovereign to be on the strongest side and to have the most power.

The methodological differences between Hobbes and Machiavelli are the other parallel between the two realists. Hobbes was a scholar whose goal was to establish politics on a scientific basis; as a result, he approached his work with a strict logical method. Machiavelli, on the other hand, was a doer, working primarily as a civil servant in the Florentine Republic. He drew conclusions from observations of how people behaved in the real world rather than how they should behave in a hypothetical and intangible world. This difference in methodology ultimately underpins the two philosophers' opposing political viewpoints.

Hobbes's work aimed to make political analysis more scientific; he believed that by analyzing politics scientifically, one would be able to draw conclusions that would eventually lead to the establishment of a lasting state of peace. Although Hobbes did not always specify his philosophical method, most academics agree that he used a "resolutive-compositive" approach. This strategy proposes that one begins to understand a given object of inquiry by cognitively "resolving" it into its constituent components and then "composing" it back into a whole. Hobbes believed that society and politics should be studied at different levels in this way. He began by dividing the commonwealth into pieces, such as humans, and then reduced humans to "natural body motions," before finally reducing the whole to the "state of nature." Following such a conclusion, Hobbes recomposed the commonwealth, shifting it from an abstract study of human nature to a study of human bodies, and finally to a study of political bodies. This reductionist methodology explains Hobbes's high regard for human nature. Unlike this logically structured scientific method, Machiavelli was a practical man who watched people for who they were and how they actually behaved rather than developing a hypothetical viewpoint to explain reality. Machiavelli used the empirical or inductive technique in *The Prince* and to draw conclusions from genuine observations of what people actually did.

Both Thomas Hobbes and Machiavelli lived during the same time period. Both thinkers were interested in political theory and lived more than a century apart. Hobbes's theory centered on the social contract; that exists between people and their government. The characteristics of a successful ruler were central to Machiavelli's theory. When comparing

the two theories, it becomes clear that Machiavelli and Hobbes are both discussing the human nature of society. In *Leviathan*, Thomas Hobbes depicts human nature as a constant state of war and individual survival. Men are constantly at odds. What is causing this male conflict? Hobbes believes that competition and glory are the root causes of war between men. He claims that if two men have the same desire that they cannot both enjoy, they become enemies with the intent of destroying one another. He realizes that self-preservation is the only way to avoid total annihilation. The only way to keep one alive is for one to surpass the other in power. In addition, a government must be established to ensure peace and security by any means necessary. Hobbes believes that without government, life would be “poor, nasty, brutish, and short.”

In the *Prince*, Machiavelli sees human nature as pertaining to both those who are ruled and those who rule. He advocated for a secular society and saw morality as a hindrance. He distrusts people and believes that in times of adversity, when the state requires the most of its citizens, there are few to be found. He questions the citizens' allegiance. As a result, he advises the Prince, “Because men are wretched creatures who will not keep their word to you, keep yours to them.” The secular form of government, according to Machiavelli, was the most successful. His priorities were to benefit the prince by retaining power over the citizens' wellbeing. Hobbes and Machiavelli both have interesting perspectives on human nature. Both of their ideas have a consistent theme. The central theme is the use of fear to gain and maintain power. Hobbes's work does not go as deeply into the theme of fear as Machiavelli's. Nonetheless, there is an intriguing parallel between the two.

Hobbes believes that everyone is born with a fear of death. The simplest and safest way to avoid death was to establish a centralized state. An autocracy would guarantee the universal desire for life. Hobbes predicted that the people would collectively give up power to a single ruler. As a result, the people would remain silent and follow orders. The only right they would have would be to be spared death. They would be ruled by a tyrant who would have total control over what was good and bad for the people. He believes that fear is necessary for people to maintain their power and authority. “Without the sword, covenants are just words, and strength isn’t enough to secure a man,” he says in his text. “Is it better to be loved than feared, or vice versa?” Machiavelli asks the Prince. He responds to this question by focusing on what is most beneficial to a ruler. He concludes that a prince cannot be feared and loved at the same time. According to Machiavelli, being feared by the citizens is preferable. This is referred to as a “violence economy,” in which violence is used to instill fear in the minds of the people. This “economy” must occur at the start of an event in which timing is critical. The violent act must be performed in public so that all can witness and judge it. People are influenced by what they see, so what they see influences their mental state. The more violent the act, the more fearful the individual will be of it being committed against them. Fear is used in some ways by both authors to train people. For the regime to be successful, it must be instilled in them. It's comparable to animal training. The master must instill in the animal that he is in charge. He will be overpowered if he does not. When the animal misbehaves, the master must instill fear in it.

According to Walle (2001), “Machiavelli was first and foremost a humanistic empiricist who used the empirical method combined with a humanistic worldview to examine people and their behaviors on their own terms, rather than making unfounded assumptions about human behavior. Machiavelli believed that empirical descriptive research was essential and that normative conclusions would follow naturally.”

Machiavelli drew his views about human nature from real observation. In order to draw conclusions about human nature, he studied how many people behaved and looked for a common trait in men. Machiavelli concludes that a variety of characteristics are inherent in human nature as a result of this. To some extent, Machiavelli agrees with Hobbes that humans are primarily motivated by self-interest, albeit their affection for others can be earned and lost. In times of prosperity, they may be trustworthy, but in times of difficulty, they will rapidly become selfish, deceptive, and profit-driven.

During the turbulence of the Italian Wars, Machiavelli wrote *The Prince* for the Medici family, circumstances that contributed to his negative opinion of human nature.

“Ungrateful, changeable, deceitful, cowardly, and covetous,” wrote Machiavelli about humanity. Man has the power to be good, according to Machiavelli, but only when it is in his own self-interest. Machiavelli, according to my view, recognized men’s tendency for evil. Hobbes’ conception of human nature was identical to Machiavelli’s, but because he wrote in the aftermath of a civil war, he emphasized man's innate brutality.

Hobbes maintained a lower opinion of human nature than Machiavelli when he wrote *Leviathan* following the turbulence of civil war and failed attempts at republicanism in England. “Any two men who desire the same thing but cannot both enjoy it,” Hobbes

writes, “become enemies.” He claimed that people who lived in the wild were always at war, didn't know right from wrong, and had “solitary, impoverished, terrible, brutish, and short” existence.

Hobbes was intrigued by the idea of a society without rules. People, Hobbes said, would simply act in their own self-interest and would go to any length to achieve that goal. Another point of contrast in nature-based existence is how we should behave. Hobbes makes morally corrupt claims as a result of this.

“To this war of every man against every man ... this also is consequent: nothing can be unjust. The notions of right and wrong, justice and injustice have no place.”(Thomas Hobbes, 1651)According to Hobbes(Hobbes, 1651), life is not immoral, but amoral in a state of nature. He further argues that in the state of nature we each have a right to all things, “even to one another’s body”. As a result, in a natural setting, killing someone is the same as allowing them to live. According to Hobbes, when there is no government to tell peoples how to behave, they are free to do anything they want.

In Leviathan, Thomas Hobbes argued that there is no moral code in man, and that all men naturally achieve a warlike state. He believed that order must be imposed from above in order to prevent the destruction of man in an anarchic society. Ultimately, Hobbes believes that man inherently has no morality, and will kill in order not to be killed, and suspect all others of trying to take his life.

In Machiavelli’s opinion, tyrants defy convention in order to maintain power, and man kinds were naturally evil creatures who did not fully comply with reason. People’s divisions lead to a weaker state, and the weaker state is eventually eaten by a stronger

one. Because the Prince is the sole figurehead of the state, his interests in maintaining power and order are strongly intertwined to the interests of the nation and its population.

Machiavelli stated that because the Prince's interests are the foremost of the state, he may do everything to maintain power and prevent instability in the state. This is his explanation for the Prince's immoral behavior. It is worth noting, however, that it is a Prince's job to proclaim that he has the authority to do whatever is necessary, not for personal gain or vanity. In removing personal goals from view, in thinking for the state, the Prince's motives are not open to moral inspection as much as their outcome.

He said that The Prince must rule in the real world with men as they are, not in some ideal universe where men behave as they should. This is crucial to grasp because so much of what Machiavelli advocates may appear shocking or immoral to us today, in a different political environment, but he views it differently because he has seen what has happened to those who acted in a "virtuous" way, in the sense that we use the word today. He has noticed that these men were not effective. To summarize, the Prince leads in a world where man is not good, thus he must do everything it takes to succeed.

Hobbes claims that no one is secure or impenetrable in his anarchic system, and that individuals want for a higher quality of living. He contends that because it can be advantageous to act immorally while others act properly, no one can be expected to act morally. He believes that the only way to make society act morally is to have a superior government that can compel morality by "fear of punishment."

Men, according to Machiavelli, are universally wicked, but we must remember that civilization is built on men's social and cooperative inclinations. Even if man is an

animal, he is the most superior type of animal. Humans may make mistakes, but we cannot overlook his significant contributions to the world. Holding those beliefs and neglecting the noble qualities of human nature would not assist us in properly conceiving the nature of politics and the goals of the state. We can't think of politics without considering human involvement.

For Machiavelli politics is a means to an end and authority is the core of politics which is only a tool for achieving improvement in human life in terms of economic, social, and cultural dimensions. Politics in the modern world is about advancements in technology, military might, influence over other countries, and commerce transactions, among other things. As a result, his political philosophy only explains the essence of politics in part.

He investigates and analyzes the specific traits of the nation state in order to develop a theory of this new political organism. He wanted to figure out how to build a powerful state that could stand up to foreign oppression and domestic conflict. Machiavelli devoted much of his writing to the art of war, as the most obvious means of sustaining security in the context of international as well as domestic chaos, as the primary purpose of the state was security.

Machiavelli was the first to disrupt the symbiotic tie that existed between religion and morality and politics. He questioned the origins of society and the state as a divine institution. He pointed out that men had collected to meet their needs, not because of divine providence, but because they needed to survive. Machiavelli, in this way, set the groundwork for modern political thought.

Hobbes was preoccupied with maintaining social order and discipline. He was also concerned about the power struggle that would occur as a result of anarchy, chaos, or sovereignty split. As a result, he expresses his legal sovereignty concept in a clear and exact manner. He reinforced in people the importance of a strong government, as well as security and harmony. As an account of the behavior of the big nations on the international stage, the theory articulated in *Leviathan* is equally persuasive. We have international anarchy and lawlessness in the absence of an international authority.

Machiavelli and Hobbes' works are reflections on the various stages and features of the evolution of the nation-state concept. Machiavelli's concept of self-sufficiency and 'state reason' was virtually widely recognized by the end of the 16th century. Machiavelli emphasized the importance of patriotism, political virtue, and civic spirit, and he was concerned about citizens' divided loyalties.

Hobbes expanded the role of government beyond the administration of law and even its invention to include the application of a feeling of justice in citizens' hearts. He underlined the necessity of legal sovereignty and revealed that the state is *Leviathan* in disguise, yet no one likes or opposes a *Leviathan* for its own sake.

According to Bowle, "the *Leviathan* of the 17th c came into its own, in theory as well as practice. The price of order and security was the naked power of the great state; the natural depravity of the man asked and deserved this authoritarian answer." (Bowle, 2019)

Their impact on the modern political system and thought is evident. Because today's humans are always looking for the most power and will go to any length to obtain it. Many politicians in the twenty-first century, for example, are compared and contrasted to

Machiavelli. Machiavellianism was a phrase used to describe and explain the technique of gaining power by misleading, manipulating, and abusing others. Most political leaders have been observed to have features that are strikingly comparable to Machiavelli's or Machiavellian theories. "It is better to be feared than loved if you cannot be both," he once said. This is demonstrated by his ideals and theories. In Machiavelli's book *The Prince*, he explains how politicians should be noble in their character, like a prince, but he mocks this idea by saying that a prince is just a fairytale, and that a leader should be able to set aside the ethics of honesty and kindness in order to maintain the stability of the state. Machiavelli also believed in empiricism; he believed that action should be based on what we learned from previous experiences and historical events, rather than our imagination. He believed that people relied too much on chance and that ambition and glory were the most essential things in life. He also believed that bad actions done for the sake of the collective good are permissible if the conclusion is positive; this concept gave rise to one of the most important modern economic philosophies, capitalism. The economy in capitalism is founded on private ownership of means of production in order to maximize profit, even if this jeopardizes social good or natural resources.

The easiest way to spot a Machiavelli personality according to Dale is "they perform best in work and social circumstances where the norms and boundaries are uncertain because they use emotional detachment and a cynical view point. Others like Machiavellians in competitive settings (debating, negotiating), but they are not preferred as friends, coworkers, or wives. When possible, they use charm, friendliness, self-disclosure, remorse, and (if required) pressure to disguise their genuine motives." (Hartley, 2015)

And also Machiavelli's recommendations for keeping power, spreading discontent, and crushing opposition can be used to analyze the political views and behaviors of 21st century authoritarian and hierarchical leadership. Domestic power is typically interpreted in Machiavellian terms through acts such as political jail, electoral control, censorship of the public, and attempts to transform government resistance into an act of political suicide. The employment of non-defensive military force, trade wars, sanctions, and other kinds of foreign interventionism can be seen in international politics.

Niccolo Machiavelli left a legacy and a trait that highlights the significance of going to any length to become the most powerful leader imaginable. This frequently leads to manipulation, lying, emotional detachment, and exploitation of others. Current world politics have strikingly similar characteristics to Machiavelli's, such as his manipulative ways of using fear and anger to promote their ideas and put all other non-supporters of their ideologies groups down, and the way they present themselves as the superior person and that he or she is the only one capable of solving that country's problems. Overall, Machiavellianism will continue to have an impact on modern politics and many future leaders.

Hobbes' influence stems primarily from his understanding of authority as "the available means by which the future apparent good can be attained." His concept of authority is all-encompassing, influencing the foreign policies of many countries around the world, at least in the domestic political arena, particularly in developing countries. Because those with political power in developing countries have more freedom to do whatever they want regardless of the individual freedom of the citizens of the country than those in

developed countries. Individual rights violations may occur anywhere in the world, but the severity varies, with developing countries suffering the most.

His perspective on authority has a significant influence on international relations. Nowadays, as the world becomes more of a “village,” the decisions and activities of one country are more likely to affect those of another. At the international level, the most powerful nations make global decisions, and the so-called powerless nations have no choice but to follow agreements, decisions, and the like that benefit powerful nations.

Contrary to the individual right, developed countries consistently violate this right in order to gain greater power over developing countries. They compel developing nations to accept their ideologies, beliefs, and systems. It can be found in education, art, technology, or politics. Developed countries, particularly in the political arena, indirectly position their people as leaders in developing countries by providing aid, either military or economic. They will then be able to impose their ideology and system on those countries. Many African countries are deeply in debt, and by canceling or reducing the debt, they can easily control the political systems of those countries.

No government could survive in an emergency unless it had the ability to crush opposition. Even a democratic state must crush constitutional challenges. As a result, in a modern state, we have no rights that can be absolutely protected by constitutional means.

We violate the constitution and destroy democracy if we enforce them through civil war.

Every modern state, in this sense, is a Leviathan that crushes all opposition. And there is no security for the officers unless the state has absolute powers in an international situation of perpetual war, because every ordinary man desires peace and security far

more than liberty. A democratic state that guarantees liberty but not security is replaced by a totalitarian state that has or gains popular support.

Hobbes also discusses individualism, liberty, and equality. Because everyone is at odds with everyone else in nature, they must band together to form a social contract. This means that the individual takes priority over society or the government. In other words, the parts come first, followed by the whole. This belief is the foundation of the well-known notion that government is formed by the consent of the governed. Democratic governments today use this concept as a platform to launch efforts to develop their own constitutions.

4. Conclusion

This thesis aimed to describe and analyze how Niccolo Machiavelli understands authority and also how Thomas Hobbes views on authority by mainly focused on their celebrated books *the Prince* and *Leviathan*. In these books Machiavelli and Hobbes tried to explain their thought about how the relationship between the state and the people should be.

Machiavelli was the first thinker to examine and analyze the characteristics strange to the nation state, and to attempt to produce a theory of the new political organism. He wished to discover how to establish a strong state against foreign oppression and domestic conflict. To him, the best state was a republic in which the system could draw upon the talent of mass of people, and their virtues could operate unchecked. Failing this a limited monarchy might achieve national security. He considered public spirit essential for the establishment of an ideal republic. In true platonic spirit, he believed that a state is what its people make it.

Machiavelli's major goal for the state was security, which we have yet to attain in the modern world. Even if his political ideas explain the incomplete nature of politics and the worst dictators like Hitler and Mussolini utilized his ideas for the wrong goal, I believe we may apply his security theory to improve human existence in economic, social, and cultural aspects. Peace and security are essential for the society's economic, social, and political well-being. Without security, the government cannot handle societal concerns, which may impede the government's duty. In the future, society will begin to challenge its leaders, resulting in internal conflict. The state that fails to sustain social peace and security is not powerful enough to safeguard the state from foreign persecution.

A society that lacks faith in its leaders may be lacking in patriotism. The generation may not love their nation and may be suffering from a psychological disorder, such as a lack of trust and pessimism. If a country has a generation that is hopeless, we might assume that the state has failed as a state.

Despite his belief that humans are inherently evil, Machiavelli thought that a state is what its people make it. Power is in the hands of the people in democratic countries of the twenty-first century. The parliament is the highest power of the state, while the people enjoy indirect power through their representatives. However, if the authorities of that country want to keep their power, they must listen to the problems and answer their queries. The state is only as good as its people.

Hobbes was obsessed with societal order and discipline. Furthermore, he is extremely concerned about the power vacuum that may occur as a result of anarchy, instability, or split of authority. As a result, he expresses his understanding of legal sovereignty in a clear and unambiguous manner. He helped people recognize the critical importance of a strong government, as well as security and peace.

Machiavelli and Hobbes' works are written at various periods and parts of the formation of the concept of nation-state. Hobbes provided a philosophical foundation for Machiavelli's views. Machiavelli's concept of the state's self-sufficiency and reason was nearly generally embraced. He highlighted the importance of patriotism, political morality, and civic spirit; he was concerned with the problem of people's split loyalties.

Hobbes expanded the functions of government beyond the administration of law and even its invention, to the application of citizens' sense of justice. Hobbes stressed the necessity of legal sovereignty, revealing that the state is a Leviathan, yet no one likes or opposes a Leviathan for its own purpose.

Because of the time or generation gap, these two significant political theorists have limitations. Our thinking styles and contemporary political beliefs may differ, yet they have a wonderful perspective and insight that cannot be confined by time or political ideas. We need a patriotic generation that loves their country enough to give their life for it. We also require justice for the benefit of citizens and the government. In general, we require peace and security.

Bibliography

- AMBEDKAR. (1994). *POWER AND STATE* (Eddiez (Ed.)). Moi University.
- Andre munro. (2015). state of nature | Definition, Theories, & Facts | Britannica. In *Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/state-of-nature-political-theory>
- Bhandari, D. R. (2000). Plato's Concept Of Justice: An Analysis. *J.N.V. University Jornal*.
- Bondaella, P. and Musa, M.(ed).(1983). *The Portable Machiavelli*. Indiana University.
- Bowle, J. E. (2019). Political philosophy - Western Political Philosophy To The End Of The 19th Century. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*.
- Cropsey, L. S. and J. (1987). *Political Philosophy & History - Leo Strauss.pdf*. The University of Chicago press.
- Dame, N. (2018). Leo Strauss ' s Conception of Political Philosophy : A Critique. *Cambridge University Press*, 29(4), 492–517.
- David, M. (1998). Political Philosophy. In *Routledge*.
- Degie, T. (2014). *THE POLITICAL PROGRAM OF NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI ON THE PRINCE AND THE DISCOURSES ON TITUS LIVY*. Addis Abeba University.
- Duignan, B. (2019). Rousseau Political Philosophy. In *Britannica*.
- Ebenstein, W. (1960). *Great Political Thinkers* (3rd ed.).
- Edward, C. (1906). Hobbes's Doctrine of the State of Nature Charles Edward Merriam Proceedings of the American Political Science Association, Vol. 3, Third Annual

- Meeting. (1906), pp. 151-157. *Political Science*, 3, 151–157.
- Editors, B. (2022). *Biography.com Editors*. Retrieved June 23, 2022, from www.biblograpgy.com/scholar/niccolo-machiavelli
- Fay, B. (2017). Philosophy of social science | Britannica. In *Britannica*.
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/philosophy-of-social-science>
- Green, L. (1998). Authority. *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- Griffiths, H., & Keirns, N. (2015). Power and Authority. In *Introduction to Sociology 2e*.
Lumen. <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/wmopen-introtosociology/chapter/power-and-authority/>
- Hartley, D. (2015). Meet the Machiavellians. In *Psychology Today*.
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/machiavellians-gulling-the-rubes/201509/meet-the-machiavellians>
- Haselhurt, G. (2018). Politics: Philosophical definition. [https:// www.the-philosophy.com/politics-philosophical-definition](https://www.the-philosophy.com/politics-philosophical-definition).
- Hobbes, T.(1909) *Leviathan*
- Honeycutt, K. (2019). *Machiavelli, Niccolò*. Mercer University.
- Jonathan, K. J. and R. (2017). Medieval Political Philosophy. In *standford*.
- Jung, H. (1967). Leo Strauss's conception of Political Philosophy: A critique. Cambridge University press.
- Klosko, G. (2015). Plato's Political Philosophy. In *The Routledge Companion to Social and Political Philosophy*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203092231.ch1>

- Koritansky, P. (2017). Aquinas: Political Philosophy. In *Internet Encyclopedia of philosophy* (pp. 1–31). Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
<http://www.iep.utm.edu/aqui-pol/>
- Landemore H. (2011) Political Authority. In: Chatterjee D.K. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Global Justice*. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9160-5_349
- Lane, M. (2011). *Ancient Political Philosophy*. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ancient-political/>
- Mattox, J. M. (2019). Augustine: Political and Social Philosophy. In *Internet Encyclopedia of philosophy*. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/aug-poso/>
- Milner, S. (1995). *The Prince and other Political writing*. New York: everyman papers back.
- Mohan, A. (2020). *Book Review of The Prince*.
- Murray, A. R. M. (1953). *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Nederman, C. (2009). *Niccolò Machiavelli (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)*.
<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/machiavelli/#3>
- Plamenatz, J. (1963). *Man and Society*.
- Reeves, D. (2017). *Normative Political theory*. Jagiellonian University.
- Ricci, L. (1903). *The Prince*. Oxford University Press.
- Rogers, G. A. J. (2020). John Locke | Philosophy, Social Contract, Two Treatises of Government, & Facts. In *Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/John->

Locke

Strauss, L. and Cropsey, J. (1963). *The History of Political Philosophy*. University of Chicago press.

Strauss, L. (1957). What is Political Philosophy ? *Chichago University Press*, 19(3), 343–368.

The concept of ‘Power and Authority’ in Niccolo Machiavelli. (2020). Iproject.

Thomas Hobbes. (1651). *Leviathan*. In *Leviathan*. St.Paul church Yard.

Tuckness, A. (2010). Locke’s Political Philosophy. In *standford*.

Walker, D. A. (2008). Book Review: The. *International Journal of Maritime History*, 20(1), 401–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/084387140802000147>