

COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS

WORKSHEET

COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS WORKSHEET: A DEEP DIVE INTO SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY

UNDERSTANDING THE FOUNDATIONAL PHILOSOPHIES THAT SHAPED WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT IS CRUCIAL FOR GRASPING THE EVOLUTION OF GOVERNANCE AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS. A COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS WORKSHEET IS AN INVALUABLE TOOL FOR STUDENTS AND ENTHUSIASTS ALIKE, OFFERING A STRUCTURED WAY TO EXPLORE THE CONTRASTING VISIONS OF THESE TWO TITANS OF ENLIGHTENMENT PHILOSOPHY. BOTH LOCKE AND HOBBS GRAPPLED WITH FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS ABOUT HUMAN NATURE, THE ORIGINS OF GOVERNMENT, AND THE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CITIZENS. THEIR DIFFERING PERSPECTIVES ON THE STATE OF NATURE AND THE NECESSITY OF A SOCIAL CONTRACT HAVE PROFOUNDLY INFLUENCED SUBSEQUENT POLITICAL DISCOURSE, FROM THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION TO MODERN DEBATES ABOUT LIBERTY AND AUTHORITY. THIS ARTICLE AIMS TO PROVIDE A COMPREHENSIVE OVERVIEW THAT WOULD EFFECTIVELY COMPLEMENT ANY COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS WORKSHEET, DELVING INTO THEIR CORE CONCEPTS, SIMILARITIES, AND, MOST IMPORTANTLY, THEIR SIGNIFICANT DIVERGENCES. BY EXAMINING THEIR ARGUMENTS, WE CAN GAIN A CLEARER PICTURE OF THE INTELLECTUAL LANDSCAPE THAT BIRTHED MODERN POLITICAL SCIENCE AND CONTINUE TO INFORM OUR UNDERSTANDING OF SOCIETAL ORGANIZATION.

- INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY
- THOMAS HOBBS: THE LEVIATHAN AND ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGNTY
 - THE STATE OF NATURE ACCORDING TO HOBBS
 - HOBBS'S SOCIAL CONTRACT AND THE ROLE OF THE SOVEREIGN
 - KEY CONCEPTS IN HOBBS'S PHILOSOPHY
- JOHN LOCKE: NATURAL RIGHTS AND LIMITED GOVERNMENT
 - THE STATE OF NATURE ACCORDING TO LOCKE
 - LOCKE'S SOCIAL CONTRACT AND THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED
 - NATURAL RIGHTS AND THE RIGHT TO REVOLUTION
 - KEY CONCEPTS IN LOCKE'S PHILOSOPHY
- COMPARING HOBBS AND LOCKE: KEY DIFFERENCES
 - HUMAN NATURE: PESSIMISM VS. OPTIMISM
 - THE STATE OF NATURE: WAR VS. NATURAL LAW
 - THE SOCIAL CONTRACT: ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY VS. LIMITED GOVERNMENT
 - SOVEREIGNTY: INDIVISIBLE VS. SEPARABLE
 - THE PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT: SECURITY VS. PROTECTION OF RIGHTS

- THE RIGHT TO REBELLION: FORBIDDEN VS. PERMITTED
-
- SIMILARITIES BETWEEN LOCKE AND HOBBS
 - THE SOCIAL CONTRACT AS A FOUNDATION
 - THE NECESSITY OF GOVERNMENT
 - THE REJECTION OF DIVINE RIGHT
-
- RELEVANCE OF COMPARING LOCKE AND HOBBS TODAY
 - INFLUENCE ON CONSTITUTIONALISM
 - DEBATES ON INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY VS. STATE AUTHORITY
 - UNDERSTANDING POLITICAL STABILITY
-
- UTILIZING A COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS WORKSHEET EFFECTIVELY

INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY

SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY IS A CORNERSTONE OF POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY, ATTEMPTING TO EXPLAIN THE ORIGIN AND LEGITIMACY OF GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY BY POSITING THAT INDIVIDUALS VOLUNTARILY SURRENDER CERTAIN FREEDOMS IN EXCHANGE FOR THE BENEFITS OF LIVING IN AN ORGANIZED SOCIETY. THIS THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK IS CENTRAL TO UNDERSTANDING THE CONTRASTING PHILOSOPHIES OF THOMAS HOBBS AND JOHN LOCKE, TWO OF THE MOST INFLUENTIAL THINKERS OF THE ENLIGHTENMENT. THEIR IDEAS, THOUGH BOTH ROOTED IN THE CONCEPT OF A SOCIAL CONTRACT, DIVERGE SIGNIFICANTLY ON THE NATURE OF HUMANITY, THE CONDITIONS OF THE STATE OF NATURE, AND THE IDEAL STRUCTURE OF GOVERNMENT. A THOROUGH EXPLORATION OF THEIR ARGUMENTS IS ESSENTIAL FOR ANYONE SEEKING TO GRASP THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL THOUGHT AND THE ENDURING DEBATES ABOUT THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE STATE. THE DIVERGENCE IN THEIR VIEWS PROVIDES A RICH BASIS FOR ANALYTICAL STUDY, MAKING A COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS WORKSHEET AN EXCELLENT PEDAGOGICAL TOOL. THIS ARTICLE WILL UNPACK THEIR CORE TENETS, HIGHLIGHT THEIR CRITICAL DIFFERENCES, AND UNDERScore THEIR LASTING IMPACT ON POLITICAL THEORY AND PRACTICE, SETTING THE STAGE FOR A DEEPER UNDERSTANDING OF THEIR SEMINAL WORKS.

THOMAS HOBBS: THE LEVIATHAN AND ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGNTY

THOMAS HOBBS, WRITING IN THE TURBULENT 17TH CENTURY AMIDST THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR, DEVELOPED A POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY CENTERED ON THE NEED FOR A STRONG, ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGN TO MAINTAIN PEACE AND ORDER. HIS SEMINAL WORK, LEVIATHAN, PUBLISHED IN 1651, PRESENTS A STARK VIEW OF HUMAN NATURE AND THE CONDITIONS THAT NECESSITATE A POWERFUL GOVERNING BODY. HOBBS'S PRIMARY CONCERN WAS TO ESTABLISH A STABLE POLITICAL ORDER, BELIEVING THAT THE ABSENCE OF SUCH ORDER WOULD INEVITABLY LEAD TO CHAOS AND PERPETUAL CONFLICT. HIS THEORIES PROFOUNDLY

INFLUENCED SUBSEQUENT POLITICAL THOUGHT, OFFERING A FOUNDATIONAL ARGUMENT FOR STATE AUTHORITY THAT CONTINUES TO BE DEBATED. UNDERSTANDING HOBBS'S PERSPECTIVE IS A CRUCIAL STEP IN ANY COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS WORKSHEET, AS IT SETS A BENCHMARK AGAINST WHICH LOCKE'S MORE LIBERAL IDEAS ARE OFTEN MEASURED.

THE STATE OF NATURE ACCORDING TO HOBBS

HOBBS'S CONCEPT OF THE "STATE OF NATURE" IS ARGUABLY HIS MOST FAMOUS AND CONTROVERSIAL CONTRIBUTION TO POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY. HE ENVISIONED A PRE-POLITICAL CONDITION WHERE HUMANS EXIST WITHOUT ANY GOVERNING AUTHORITY, LAWS, OR SOCIAL STRUCTURES. IN THIS STATE, HOBBS FAMOUSLY DESCRIBED LIFE AS "SOLITARY, POOR, NASTY, BRUTISH, AND SHORT." HE BELIEVED THAT HUMAN BEINGS ARE FUNDAMENTALLY DRIVEN BY SELF-INTEREST, A DESIRE FOR POWER, AND A FEAR OF DEATH. WITHOUT A COMMON POWER TO KEEP THEM IN AWE, INDIVIDUALS WOULD BE IN A PERPETUAL STATE OF "WAR OF ALL AGAINST ALL" (BELLUM OMNIUM CONTRA OMNES). IN THIS CONDITION, THERE IS NO INDUSTRY, NO AGRICULTURE, NO ARTS, NO SOCIETY, AND, MOST IMPORTANTLY, NO JUSTICE OR INJUSTICE, AS THESE CONCEPTS ONLY ARISE WITH LAWS. EVERY MAN HAS A "RIGHT TO EVERYTHING," EVEN TO ANOTHER MAN'S BODY, LEADING TO CONSTANT COMPETITION, DIFFIDENCE, AND GLORY. THE PRIMARY MOTIVATION FOR INDIVIDUALS TO LEAVE THIS STATE IS THE OVERWHELMING DESIRE FOR SELF-PRESERVATION, WHICH IS CONSTANTLY THREATENED IN A WORLD WITHOUT SECURITY.

HOBBS'S SOCIAL CONTRACT AND THE ROLE OF THE SOVEREIGN

TO ESCAPE THE HORRORS OF THE STATE OF NATURE, HOBBS ARGUED THAT INDIVIDUALS ENTER INTO A SOCIAL CONTRACT. THIS CONTRACT IS NOT AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PEOPLE AND THE SOVEREIGN, BUT RATHER AN AGREEMENT AMONG THE PEOPLE THEMSELVES TO RELINQUISH THEIR NATURAL RIGHTS TO A SOVEREIGN POWER. THIS SOVEREIGN, WHETHER A MONARCH OR AN ASSEMBLY, IS NOT A PARTY TO THE CONTRACT AND THEREFORE CANNOT BE BOUND BY IT. THE SOVEREIGN IS GRANTED ABSOLUTE AND INDIVISIBLE POWER TO ENFORCE LAWS, MAINTAIN ORDER, AND PROVIDE SECURITY. THE PEOPLE CONSENT TO BE GOVERNED BY THIS SOVEREIGN IN EXCHANGE FOR PROTECTION FROM EACH OTHER AND FROM EXTERNAL THREATS. FOR HOBBS, THE SOVEREIGN'S POWER MUST BE ABSOLUTE BECAUSE ANY DIVISION OR LIMITATION OF POWER WOULD LEAD BACK TO THE STATE OF NATURE. THE SOVEREIGN'S PRIMARY DUTY IS TO ENSURE THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF THE COMMONWEALTH, AND TO DO SO, THEY MUST HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO COMMAND OBEDIENCE IN ALL MATTERS, INCLUDING RELIGIOUS DOCTRINE AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF PROPERTY, AS LONG AS IT SERVES THE PURPOSE OF MAINTAINING PEACE.

KEY CONCEPTS IN HOBBS'S PHILOSOPHY

- **STATE OF NATURE:** A HYPOTHETICAL CONDITION OF ANARCHY WHERE LIFE IS A "WAR OF ALL AGAINST ALL."
- **HUMAN NATURE:** FUNDAMENTALLY EGOISTIC, DRIVEN BY SELF-PRESERVATION AND A DESIRE FOR POWER.
- **NATURAL RIGHT:** THE LIBERTY EACH MAN HATH TO USE HIS OWN POWER AS HE WILL HIMSELF, FOR THE PRESERVATION OF HIS OWN NATURE.
- **LAWS OF NATURE:** PRECEPTS DISCOVERED BY REASON THAT GUIDE INDIVIDUALS TOWARD SELF-PRESERVATION, SUCH AS SEEKING PEACE AND LAYING DOWN RIGHTS.
- **SOCIAL CONTRACT:** AN AGREEMENT AMONG INDIVIDUALS TO TRANSFER THEIR NATURAL RIGHTS TO A SOVEREIGN IN EXCHANGE FOR SECURITY.
- **SOVEREIGNTY:** ABSOLUTE, INDIVISIBLE, AND UNACCOUNTABLE POWER VESTED IN A RULER OR RULING BODY.
- **LEVIATHAN:** THE POWERFUL, ARTIFICIAL PERSON (THE STATE) CREATED BY THE SOCIAL CONTRACT, EMBODYING ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGN POWER.
- **JUSTICE:** THE OBSERVANCE OF COVENANTS, WHICH ONLY EXISTS ONCE A SOVEREIGN POWER IS ESTABLISHED TO ENFORCE

THEM.

JOHN LOCKE: NATURAL RIGHTS AND LIMITED GOVERNMENT

JOHN LOCKE, A CONTEMPORARY OF HOBBS BUT WITH A SIGNIFICANTLY MORE OPTIMISTIC OUTLOOK, PRESENTED A POWERFUL ARGUMENT FOR NATURAL RIGHTS AND LIMITED GOVERNMENT. HIS TWO TREATISES OF GOVERNMENT, PUBLISHED IN 1689, OFFERED A PHILOSOPHICAL JUSTIFICATION FOR THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION AND LAID THE GROUNDWORK FOR MODERN LIBERAL DEMOCRACY. LOCKE'S IDEAS CHALLENGED THE DIVINE RIGHT OF KINGS AND EMPHASIZED THE INHERENT RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS, WHICH GOVERNMENTS ARE ESTABLISHED TO PROTECT RATHER THAN INFRINGE UPON. HIS INFLUENCE ON THE AMERICAN DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND SUBSEQUENT CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS IS UNDENIABLE. WHEN COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS WORKSHEET MATERIALS, LOCKE'S EMPHASIS ON INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY AND LIMITED GOVERNMENTAL POWER STANDS IN STARK CONTRAST TO HOBBS'S ADVOCACY FOR ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGNTY, MAKING HIM A PIVOTAL FIGURE IN THE EVOLUTION OF POLITICAL THOUGHT.

THE STATE OF NATURE ACCORDING TO LOCKE

UNLIKE HOBBS, LOCKE'S STATE OF NATURE IS NOT A STATE OF WAR BUT A STATE OF PERFECT FREEDOM AND EQUALITY, GOVERNED BY THE LAW OF NATURE. THIS LAW OF NATURE, WHICH LOCKE BELIEVED IS DISCERNIBLE BY REASON, DICTATES THAT NO ONE OUGHT TO HARM ANOTHER IN HIS LIFE, HEALTH, LIBERTY, OR POSSESSIONS. HUMANS, IN LOCKE'S VIEW, POSSESS NATURAL RIGHTS, INCLUDING THE RIGHTS TO LIFE, LIBERTY, AND PROPERTY, WHICH PRE-EXIST GOVERNMENT. WHILE INDIVIDUALS IN THE STATE OF NATURE ARE FREE TO ACT AS THEY SEE FIT, THEY ARE BOUND BY THE LAW OF NATURE. THE STATE OF NATURE IS INCONVENIENT BECAUSE, ALTHOUGH INDIVIDUALS HAVE THE RIGHT TO ENFORCE THE LAW OF NATURE, THE LACK OF A COMMON JUDGE AND ESTABLISHED LAWS CAN LEAD TO DISPUTES AND A BIAS IN SELF-JUDGMENT, MAKING THE PROTECTION OF PROPERTY UNCERTAIN. THEREFORE, INDIVIDUALS AGREE TO LEAVE THE STATE OF NATURE TO SECURE THESE NATURAL RIGHTS MORE EFFECTIVELY.

LOCKE'S SOCIAL CONTRACT AND THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED

LOCKE'S SOCIAL CONTRACT DIFFERS FUNDAMENTALLY FROM HOBBS'S. FOR LOCKE, THE SOCIAL CONTRACT IS AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS AND THE GOVERNMENT THEY ESTABLISH. INDIVIDUALS CONSENT TO GIVE UP SOME OF THEIR NATURAL RIGHTS—SPECIFICALLY, THE RIGHT TO EXECUTE THE LAW OF NATURE THEMSELVES—to the GOVERNMENT, IN RETURN FOR THE PROTECTION OF THEIR FUNDAMENTAL NATURAL RIGHTS: LIFE, LIBERTY, AND PROPERTY. THIS CONSENT IS CRUCIAL; GOVERNMENT LEGITIMACY DERIVES FROM THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED. THE GOVERNMENT IS BOUND BY THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT AND IS OBLIGATED TO ACT FOR THE COMMON GOOD AND TO PROTECT THE PEOPLE'S RIGHTS. IF THE GOVERNMENT FAILS IN THIS DUTY OR ACTS CONTRARY TO THE TRUST PLACED IN IT, THE PEOPLE HAVE THE RIGHT TO RESIST AND OVERTHROW IT.

NATURAL RIGHTS AND THE RIGHT TO REVOLUTION

CENTRAL TO LOCKE'S PHILOSOPHY IS THE CONCEPT OF INALIENABLE NATURAL RIGHTS. HE ARGUED THAT INDIVIDUALS ARE BORN WITH INHERENT RIGHTS THAT NO GOVERNMENT CAN JUSTLY TAKE AWAY. THESE RIGHTS, PRIMARILY LIFE, LIBERTY, AND PROPERTY, ARE NOT GRANTED BY THE GOVERNMENT BUT ARE INHERENT TO HUMAN BEINGS BY VIRTUE OF THEIR HUMANITY. PROPERTY, IN PARTICULAR, HELD SIGNIFICANT IMPORTANCE FOR LOCKE, AS HE SAW IT AS AN EXTENSION OF AN INDIVIDUAL'S LABOR. THE PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT, THEREFORE, IS NOT TO SUPPRESS THESE RIGHTS BUT TO PROTECT THEM. THIS LEADS TO LOCKE'S CRUCIAL DOCTRINE OF THE RIGHT TO REVOLUTION. IF A GOVERNMENT BECOMES TYRANNICAL, ABUSES ITS POWER, OR FAILS TO PROTECT THE NATURAL RIGHTS OF ITS CITIZENS, THE PEOPLE HAVE NOT ONLY THE RIGHT BUT THE OBLIGATION TO ALTER OR ABOLISH IT. THIS RIGHT TO REVOLUTION IS A SAFEGUARD AGAINST GOVERNMENTAL OVERREACH AND A CORNERSTONE OF LIBERAL POLITICAL THOUGHT.

KEY CONCEPTS IN LOCKE'S PHILOSOPHY

- **STATE OF NATURE:** A STATE OF PERFECT FREEDOM AND EQUALITY GOVERNED BY THE LAW OF NATURE, WHERE INDIVIDUALS POSSESS NATURAL RIGHTS.
- **LAW OF NATURE:** REASON DICTATES THAT ALL PEOPLE ARE EQUAL AND INDEPENDENT AND SHOULD NOT HARM ANOTHER'S LIFE, HEALTH, LIBERTY, OR POSSESSIONS.
- **NATURAL RIGHTS:** INHERENT RIGHTS TO LIFE, LIBERTY, AND PROPERTY THAT PRE-EXIST GOVERNMENT.
- **PROPERTY:** ACQUIRED THROUGH LABOR, SEEN AS AN ESSENTIAL NATURAL RIGHT THAT GOVERNMENT MUST PROTECT.
- **SOCIAL CONTRACT:** AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PEOPLE AND THE GOVERNMENT, BASED ON CONSENT, WHERE INDIVIDUALS GIVE UP SOME FREEDOMS FOR THE PROTECTION OF THEIR NATURAL RIGHTS.
- **LIMITED GOVERNMENT:** GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY IS CONSTRAINED BY NATURAL LAW AND THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED.
- **RIGHT TO REVOLUTION:** THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO RESIST OR OVERTHROW A GOVERNMENT THAT ACTS AGAINST THEIR TRUST AND NATURAL RIGHTS.

COMPARING HOBBS AND LOCKE: KEY DIFFERENCES

THE CONTRASTING PHILOSOPHIES OF THOMAS HOBBS AND JOHN LOCKE OFFER A COMPELLING FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO POLITICAL ORGANIZATION AND THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT. WHILE BOTH ARE KEY FIGURES IN SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY, THEIR FUNDAMENTAL ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT HUMAN NATURE AND THEIR CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE IDEAL POLITICAL STRUCTURE DIVERGE DRAMATICALLY. A DETAILED COMPARISON IS ESSENTIAL FOR ANYONE ENGAGING WITH A COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS WORKSHEET, AS IT HIGHLIGHTS THE INTELLECTUAL DIVERGENCE THAT HAS SHAPED CENTURIES OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE. THESE DIFFERENCES ARE NOT MERELY ACADEMIC; THEY HAVE PROFOUND IMPLICATIONS FOR HOW SOCIETIES ARE GOVERNED AND HOW INDIVIDUAL LIBERTIES ARE PROTECTED.

HUMAN NATURE: PESSIMISM VS. OPTIMISM

PERHAPS THE MOST SIGNIFICANT DIVERGENCE LIES IN THEIR VIEWS OF HUMAN NATURE. HOBBS HELD A DEEPLY PESSIMISTIC VIEW, BELIEVING HUMANS ARE INHERENTLY SELFISH, DRIVEN BY A CONSTANT DESIRE FOR POWER, AND MOTIVATED BY A FEAR OF DEATH. THIS INHERENT EGOISM, IN HIS ESTIMATION, WOULD LEAD TO CHAOS WITHOUT STRONG EXTERNAL CONTROL. LOCKE, CONVERSELY, WAS MORE OPTIMISTIC. HE BELIEVED HUMANS ARE BORN AS RATIONAL BEINGS, CAPABLE OF REASON AND COOPERATION, AND ARE GOVERNED BY NATURAL LAW THAT GUIDES THEM TOWARD RESPECTING THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS. WHILE ACKNOWLEDGING SELF-INTEREST, LOCKE DID NOT SEE IT AS AN ALL-CONSUMING FORCE THAT WOULD INEVITABLY RESULT IN UNIVERSAL CONFLICT.

THE STATE OF NATURE: WAR VS. NATURAL LAW

STEMMING FROM THEIR VIEWS ON HUMAN NATURE, THEIR DESCRIPTIONS OF THE STATE OF NATURE ARE STARKLY DIFFERENT. FOR HOBBS, THE STATE OF NATURE IS A STATE OF WAR—A CONSTANT STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL WHERE LIFE IS "SOLITARY, POOR, NASTY, BRUTISH, AND SHORT." THERE IS NO MORALITY, JUSTICE, OR PROPERTY IN THIS CONDITION. LOCKE, HOWEVER, VIEWED THE STATE OF NATURE AS A STATE OF LIBERTY AND EQUALITY, GOVERNED BY THE LAW OF NATURE. IN THIS STATE, INDIVIDUALS POSSESS NATURAL RIGHTS, AND WHILE IT IS INCONVENIENT DUE TO THE LACK OF A COMMON JUDGE, IT IS NOT

INHERENTLY A STATE OF WAR. INDIVIDUALS CAN AND DO LIVE TOGETHER ACCORDING TO REASON AND NATURAL LAW, BUT THE ABSENCE OF ESTABLISHED LAWS AND IMPARTIAL JUDGES MAKES THE PROTECTION OF PROPERTY PRECARIOUS.

THE SOCIAL CONTRACT: ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY VS. LIMITED GOVERNMENT

THE NATURE OF THE SOCIAL CONTRACT AND THE RESULTING GOVERNMENT ALSO DIFFERS SIGNIFICANTLY. HOBBS PROPOSED THAT INDIVIDUALS SURRENDER ALL THEIR RIGHTS TO AN ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGN IN EXCHANGE FOR SECURITY. THIS SOVEREIGN IS NOT A PARTY TO THE CONTRACT AND THUS HOLDS UNLIMITED POWER TO PREVENT A RETURN TO THE STATE OF NATURE. LOCKE, ON THE OTHER HAND, ARGUED THAT INDIVIDUALS ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH THE GOVERNMENT, CONSENTING TO GIVE UP ONLY CERTAIN POWERS (LIKE THE RIGHT TO ENFORCE LAWS) IN EXCHANGE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THEIR NATURAL RIGHTS. THIS CREATES A GOVERNMENT WITH LIMITED POWERS, ACCOUNTABLE TO THE PEOPLE IT GOVERNS.

SOVEREIGNTY: INDIVISIBLE VS. SEPARABLE

HOBBS CHAMPIONED INDIVISIBLE SOVEREIGNTY. HE BELIEVED THAT FOR THE SOVEREIGN TO BE EFFECTIVE, ITS POWER COULD NOT BE DIVIDED AMONG DIFFERENT BRANCHES OR BODIES. ANY DIVISION WOULD WEAKEN THE SOVEREIGN AND INVITE DISSENT, POTENTIALLY LEADING BACK TO THE STATE OF NATURE. LOCKE, WHILE NOT EXPLICITLY DETAILING SEPARATION OF POWERS IN THE MODERN SENSE, IMPLICITLY ALLOWED FOR IT BY ARGUING THAT GOVERNMENTS ARE FORMED BY CONSENT TO PROTECT RIGHTS. THE LEGISLATIVE POWER, FOR LOCKE, WAS SUPREME BUT NOT ABSOLUTE, AND IT COULD BE CONSTRAINED BY THE TRUST PLACED IN IT BY THE PEOPLE, SUGGESTING A MORE NUANCED UNDERSTANDING OF AUTHORITY THAN HOBBS'S ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGN.

THE PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT: SECURITY VS. PROTECTION OF RIGHTS

THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT, ACCORDING TO HOBBS, IS TO PROVIDE SECURITY AND PREVENT CIVIL STRIFE. THE SOVEREIGN'S ABSOLUTE POWER IS JUSTIFIED BY ITS ABILITY TO MAINTAIN ORDER AND PREVENT THE CHAOS OF THE STATE OF NATURE. FOR LOCKE, THE PRINCIPAL PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT IS THE PRESERVATION OF NATURAL RIGHTS—LIFE, LIBERTY, AND PROPERTY. SECURITY IS A COMPONENT OF THIS, BUT IT IS THE PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTIES AND PROPERTY THAT FORMS THE CORE JUSTIFICATION FOR GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY. GOVERNMENT EXISTS TO SERVE THE PEOPLE AND THEIR RIGHTS, NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND.

THE RIGHT TO REBELLION: FORBIDDEN VS. PERMITTED

HOBBS STRONGLY OPPOSED ANY RIGHT TO REBELLION. HE ARGUED THAT IF SUBJECTS COULD RESIST THE SOVEREIGN, IT WOULD INEVITABLY LEAD TO CIVIL WAR AND THE COLLAPSE OF ORDER, RETURNING SOCIETY TO THE STATE OF NATURE. THE SOVEREIGN'S POWER MUST BE ABSOLUTE, AND OBEDIENCE IS PARAMOUNT FOR PEACE. LOCKE, IN DIRECT CONTRAST, ARGUED THAT THE PEOPLE HAVE THE RIGHT TO REVOLUTION IF THE GOVERNMENT OVERSTEPS ITS AUTHORITY OR FAILS TO PROTECT THEIR NATURAL RIGHTS. THIS RIGHT TO REVOLUTION IS A FUNDAMENTAL SAFEGUARD AGAINST TYRANNY AND AN ASSERTION OF THE PEOPLE'S ULTIMATE SOVEREIGNTY.

SIMILARITIES BETWEEN LOCKE AND HOBBS

DESPITE THEIR PROFOUND DISAGREEMENTS, THOMAS HOBBS AND JOHN LOCKE SHARED SOME COMMON GROUND, PARTICULARLY IN THEIR FOUNDATIONAL APPROACH TO POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY. BOTH WERE INSTRUMENTAL IN DEVELOPING AND POPULARIZING SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY, OFFERING RATIONAL EXPLANATIONS FOR THE EXISTENCE AND LEGITIMACY OF GOVERNMENT THAT MOVED AWAY FROM DIVINE RIGHT JUSTIFICATIONS. ACKNOWLEDGING THESE SIMILARITIES IS IMPORTANT WHEN ENGAGING IN

COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS WORKSHEET EXERCISES, AS IT PROVIDES A MORE BALANCED UNDERSTANDING OF THEIR INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

THE SOCIAL CONTRACT AS A FOUNDATION

- BOTH PHILOSOPHERS UTILIZED THE CONCEPT OF A SOCIAL CONTRACT AS THE THEORETICAL BASIS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CIVIL SOCIETY AND GOVERNMENT. THEY AGREED THAT INDIVIDUALS IN A PRE-POLITICAL STATE VOLUNTARILY ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT TO FORM A POLITICAL COMMUNITY.
- THEY BOTH BELIEVED THAT THE TRANSITION FROM A STATE OF NATURE TO A CIVIL SOCIETY INVOLVED A TRANSFER OF CERTAIN RIGHTS OR POWERS FROM INDIVIDUALS TO A GOVERNING AUTHORITY.

THE NECESSITY OF GOVERNMENT

- BOTH HOBBS AND LOCKE CONCLUDED THAT A GOVERNING AUTHORITY WAS NECESSARY TO OVERCOME THE DEFICIENCIES AND DANGERS OF THE STATE OF NATURE.
- THEY BOTH RECOGNIZED THAT WITHOUT SOME FORM OF POLITICAL ORGANIZATION, HUMAN LIFE WOULD BE SIGNIFICANTLY WORSE, EITHER DUE TO CONSTANT CONFLICT (HOBBS) OR THE INSECURE PROTECTION OF RIGHTS (LOCKE).

THE REJECTION OF DIVINE RIGHT

- BOTH THINKERS DEPARTED FROM THE PREVAILING IDEA OF THE DIVINE RIGHT OF KINGS, ARGUING INSTEAD FOR A RATIONAL, SECULAR BASIS FOR POLITICAL AUTHORITY GROUNDED IN THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED, ALBEIT IN DIFFERENT FORMS OF CONSENT AND FOR DIFFERENT ENDS.
- THEIR THEORIES SOUGHT TO EXPLAIN HOW POLITICAL POWER COULD BE LEGITIMATELY HELD AND EXERCISED WITHOUT RECOURSE TO SUPERNATURAL CLAIMS.

RELEVANCE OF COMPARING LOCKE AND HOBBS TODAY

THE ENDURING RELEVANCE OF COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS IS UNDENIABLE. THEIR FOUNDATIONAL CONCEPTS CONTINUE TO INFORM CONTEMPORARY DEBATES ABOUT GOVERNANCE, INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, AND THE BALANCE BETWEEN ORDER AND LIBERTY. EXAMINING THEIR CONTRASTING PHILOSOPHIES PROVIDES A CRUCIAL LENS THROUGH WHICH TO UNDERSTAND MODERN POLITICAL STRUCTURES AND IDEOLOGIES, MAKING ANY COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS WORKSHEET A VALUABLE EDUCATIONAL ENDEAVOR. THEIR WORK REMAINS A TOUCHSTONE FOR DISCUSSIONS ON THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS OF POLITICAL LEGITIMACY AND THE SOCIAL CONTRACT.

INFLUENCE ON CONSTITUTIONALISM

LOCKE'S EMPHASIS ON NATURAL RIGHTS, LIMITED GOVERNMENT, AND THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED HAS BEEN PROFOUNDLY INFLUENTIAL IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CONSTITUTIONALISM WORLDWIDE. THE AMERICAN DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, WITH ITS ASSERTION OF UNALIENABLE RIGHTS TO "LIFE, LIBERTY, AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS," DIRECTLY REFLECTS LOCKEAN PRINCIPLES. THE IDEA OF A GOVERNMENT BOUND BY A CONSTITUTION, WITH CHECKS AND BALANCES AND PROTECTIONS FOR INDIVIDUAL FREEDOMS, OWES A SIGNIFICANT DEBT TO LOCKE'S THINKING. WHILE HOBBS'S IDEAS OF ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGNTY ARE LESS DIRECTLY REFLECTED IN DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTIONS, HIS ARGUMENTS FOR ORDER AND THE NECESSITY OF A STRONG STATE CAN BE SEEN IN DISCUSSIONS ABOUT NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE POWER OF THE EXECUTIVE.

DEBATES ON INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY VS. STATE AUTHORITY

THE FUNDAMENTAL TENSION BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY AND STATE AUTHORITY, SO CLEARLY ARTICULATED BY HOBBS AND LOCKE, REMAINS AT THE HEART OF MODERN POLITICAL DISCOURSE. DEBATES OVER FREEDOM OF SPEECH, PRIVACY RIGHTS, GOVERNMENTAL SURVEILLANCE, AND THE EXTENT OF STATE POWER DURING EMERGENCIES OFTEN ECHO THE CORE DISAGREEMENTS BETWEEN THESE TWO PHILOSOPHERS. HOBBS'S CONCERN FOR SECURITY, EVEN AT THE COST OF SIGNIFICANT INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM, RESONATES IN ARGUMENTS FOR ROBUST LAW ENFORCEMENT AND NATIONAL DEFENSE. CONVERSELY, LOCKE'S PRIORITIZATION OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND HIS SKEPTICISM OF UNCHECKED STATE POWER INFORM CALLS FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES AND LIMITED GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION.

UNDERSTANDING POLITICAL STABILITY

BOTH HOBBS AND LOCKE OFFER INSIGHTS INTO THE CONDITIONS NECESSARY FOR POLITICAL STABILITY, ALBEIT THROUGH DIFFERENT MEANS. HOBBS BELIEVED STABILITY IS ACHIEVED THROUGH THE ABSOLUTE POWER OF THE SOVEREIGN, ENSURING THAT NO CHALLENGE TO AUTHORITY CAN ARISE. LOCKE BELIEVED STABILITY ARISES FROM A GOVERNMENT THAT RESPECTS AND PROTECTS THE NATURAL RIGHTS OF ITS CITIZENS, FOSTERING CONSENT AND PREVENTING THE CONDITIONS THAT WOULD NECESSITATE REBELLION. UNDERSTANDING THESE CONTRASTING PATHS TO STABILITY HELPS US ANALYZE THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF DIFFERENT GOVERNMENTAL SYSTEMS AND THE SOCIETAL FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO OR UNDERMINE POLITICAL ORDER.

UTILIZING A COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS WORKSHEET EFFECTIVELY

TO MAKE THE MOST OF A COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS WORKSHEET, IT IS ESSENTIAL TO APPROACH IT WITH A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF THE CORE CONCEPTS BEING EXPLORED. THE WORKSHEET SERVES AS A STRUCTURED GUIDE, PROMPTING CRITICAL THINKING AND DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THESE TWO SEMINAL THINKERS. BY ACTIVELY ENGAGING WITH THE QUESTIONS AND PROMPTS ON THE WORKSHEET, STUDENTS CAN DEEPEN THEIR COMPREHENSION OF SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY, NATURAL RIGHTS, SOVEREIGNTY, AND THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT. IT IS BENEFICIAL TO FIRST READ PRIMARY OR SECONDARY SOURCES THAT DETAIL THEIR PHILOSOPHIES AND THEN USE THE WORKSHEET TO CONSOLIDATE THAT KNOWLEDGE. DIRECT COMPARISON, FILLING IN TABLES THAT CONTRAST THEIR VIEWS ON SPECIFIC POINTS LIKE HUMAN NATURE OR THE STATE OF NATURE, CAN BE PARTICULARLY EFFECTIVE. FURTHERMORE, ACTIVELY LOOKING FOR CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THEIR IDEAS AND CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL ISSUES WILL SOLIDIFY THE LEARNING EXPERIENCE, TRANSFORMING A SIMPLE COMPARISON INTO A NUANCED UNDERSTANDING OF ENDURING PHILOSOPHICAL DEBATES.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

WHAT IS THE FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN LOCKE'S AND HOBBS' VIEWS ON THE STATE OF NATURE?

HOBBS VIEWED THE STATE OF NATURE AS A 'WAR OF ALL AGAINST ALL,' CHARACTERIZED BY FEAR AND A LACK OF MORALITY, WHERE LIFE WAS 'SOLITARY, POOR, NASTY, BRUTISH, AND SHORT.' LOCKE, CONVERSELY, SAW IT AS A STATE GOVERNED BY NATURAL LAW, WHERE INDIVIDUALS POSSESSED INHERENT RIGHTS TO LIFE, LIBERTY, AND PROPERTY, AND COULD GENERALLY COEXIST PEACEFULLY.

ACCORDING TO HOBBS, WHY DO PEOPLE LEAVE THE STATE OF NATURE TO FORM A SOCIETY?

HOBBS BELIEVED PEOPLE LEAVE THE STATE OF NATURE OUT OF A DESIRE FOR SELF-PRESERVATION AND TO ESCAPE THE CONSTANT FEAR AND VIOLENCE. THEY SURRENDER THEIR INDIVIDUAL FREEDOMS TO AN ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGN FOR SECURITY AND ORDER.

WHAT IS LOCKE'S PRIMARY JUSTIFICATION FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOVERNMENT?

LOCKE ARGUED THAT GOVERNMENT IS FORMED THROUGH THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED TO PROTECT THEIR NATURAL RIGHTS, PARTICULARLY PROPERTY RIGHTS. THE GOVERNMENT'S LEGITIMACY RESTS ON ITS ABILITY TO UPHOLD THESE RIGHTS.

HOW DO LOCKE AND HOBBS DIFFER ON THE CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY?

HOBBS ADVOCATED FOR ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGNTY, WHERE THE RULER'S POWER IS INDIVISIBLE AND UNQUESTIONABLE, NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN ORDER. LOCKE PROPOSED LIMITED SOVEREIGNTY, ARGUING THAT GOVERNMENTAL POWER IS DERIVED FROM THE PEOPLE AND CAN BE REVOKED IF IT OVERSTEPS ITS BOUNDS OR INFRINGES UPON NATURAL RIGHTS.

WHAT IS THE ROLE OF CONSENT IN THE SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORIES OF LOCKE AND HOBBS?

FOR HOBBS, CONSENT TO THE SOCIAL CONTRACT IS LARGELY IRREVOCABLE AND ESTABLISHES AN ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGN. FOR LOCKE, CONSENT IS ONGOING AND CONDITIONAL; PEOPLE CONSENT TO BE GOVERNED AS LONG AS THE GOVERNMENT PROTECTS THEIR RIGHTS. IF IT FAILS, THEY HAVE THE RIGHT TO ALTER OR ABOLISH IT.

WHAT SPECIFIC NATURAL RIGHTS DID JOHN LOCKE EMPHASIZE AS CENTRAL TO HIS POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY?

LOCKE FAMOUSLY EMPHASIZED THE NATURAL RIGHTS TO LIFE, LIBERTY, AND PROPERTY AS FUNDAMENTAL AND INALIENABLE RIGHTS THAT PRE-EXIST GOVERNMENT AND THAT GOVERNMENT IS OBLIGATED TO PROTECT.

HOW DID HOBBS' FEAR OF ANARCHY INFLUENCE HIS IDEAS ABOUT GOVERNMENT?

HOBBS' PROFOUND FEAR OF ANARCHY, STEMMING FROM HIS EXPERIENCES DURING THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR, LED HIM TO CHAMPION A STRONG, CENTRALIZED, AND ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGN AS THE ONLY MEANS TO PREVENT SOCIETAL COLLAPSE AND ENSURE PEACE.

UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES DID LOCKE BELIEVE CITIZENS HAD THE RIGHT TO RESIST THEIR GOVERNMENT?

LOCKE BELIEVED THAT CITIZENS HAD THE RIGHT TO RESIST OR REVOLT AGAINST THEIR GOVERNMENT IF IT ACTED TYRANNICALLY, VIOLATED THEIR NATURAL RIGHTS, OR FAILED TO UPHOLD ITS END OF THE SOCIAL CONTRACT BY BECOMING DESTRUCTIVE OF THE PEOPLE'S LIBERTIES.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

HERE ARE 9 BOOK TITLES RELATED TO COMPARING THE IDEAS OF JOHN LOCKE AND THOMAS HOBBS, EACH BEGINNING WITH " " AND FOLLOWED BY A SHORT DESCRIPTION:

1. *IN SEARCH OF THE SOCIAL CONTRACT: LOCKE, HOBBS, AND THE FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN GOVERNMENT*

THIS BOOK DELVES INTO THE SEMINAL WORKS OF LOCKE AND HOBBS, CONTRASTING THEIR VIEWS ON THE STATE OF NATURE, THE PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT, AND THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENS. IT EXPLORES HOW THEIR DIVERGENT PHILOSOPHIES LAID THE GROUNDWORK FOR VASTLY DIFFERENT POLITICAL SYSTEMS. READERS WILL GAIN A DEEP UNDERSTANDING OF THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND ENDURING RELEVANCE OF THEIR IDEAS.

2. *THE LEVIATHAN AND THE LIBERTARIAN: HOBBS, LOCKE, AND THE EVOLUTION OF POLITICAL THOUGHT*

THIS COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS HIGHLIGHTS THE CORE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOBBS'S EMPHASIS ON ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGNTY AND LOCKE'S ADVOCACY FOR INDIVIDUAL LIBERTIES AND LIMITED GOVERNMENT. IT TRACES THE INTELLECTUAL LINEAGE OF THESE CONCEPTS, SHOWING HOW THEY CONTINUE TO SHAPE CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL DEBATES. THE BOOK OFFERS A NUANCED LOOK AT THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO WESTERN POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY.

3. *PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS: HOBBSIAN SECURITY VS. LOCKEAN LIBERTY*

THIS TITLE FOCUSES ON THE FUNDAMENTAL TENSION BETWEEN THE SECURITY OFFERED BY HOBBS'S SOVEREIGN AND THE LIBERTY CHAMPIONED BY LOCKE. IT EXAMINES THEIR RESPECTIVE ARGUMENTS FOR THE LEGITIMACY OF POLITICAL AUTHORITY AND THE RIGHTS RETAINED BY INDIVIDUALS. THE WORK PROVIDES A CLEAR AND ACCESSIBLE INTRODUCTION TO THESE CRUCIAL PHILOSOPHICAL DISTINCTIONS.

4. *ORDER AND ANARCHY: EXAMINING HOBBS AND LOCKE'S VISIONS OF SOCIETY*

THIS BOOK SCRUTINIZES THE CONTRASTING SCENARIOS PRESENTED BY HOBBS AND LOCKE REGARDING THE STATE OF NATURE AND THE NECESSITY OF GOVERNMENT. IT EXPLORES HOW THEIR DIFFERING CONCEPTIONS OF HUMAN NATURE LED TO PROFOUNDLY DIFFERENT MODELS FOR SOCIETAL ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE. THE TEXT ENCOURAGES CRITICAL THINKING ABOUT THE TRADE-OFFS BETWEEN ORDER AND FREEDOM.

5. *RIGHTS, REASON, AND REVOLUTION: A DIALOGUE BETWEEN LOCKE AND HOBBS*

THIS WORK IMAGINES A DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE TWO INFLUENTIAL THINKERS, DRAWING OUT THEIR KEY DISAGREEMENTS ON NATURAL RIGHTS, THE ROLE OF REASON, AND THE JUSTIFICATION FOR REBELLION. IT ILLUMINATES THEIR INTELLECTUAL SPARRING AND ITS IMPACT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL THEORY. THE BOOK OFFERS A COMPELLING WAY TO GRASP THEIR COMPLEX ARGUMENTS.

6. *THE SOCIAL CONTRACT: FROM HOBBS'S BEHEMOTH TO LOCKE'S COMMONWEALTH*

THIS EXPLORATION TRACES THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY THROUGH THE LENSES OF HOBBS AND LOCKE. IT CONTRASTS HOBBS'S VIEW OF THE SOCIAL CONTRACT AS A SURRENDER OF RIGHTS FOR ABSOLUTE PROTECTION WITH LOCKE'S VISION OF A CONTRACT BASED ON CONSENT AND THE PRESERVATION OF NATURAL RIGHTS. THE BOOK PROVIDES A COMPREHENSIVE OVERVIEW OF THEIR FOUNDATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

7. *SOVEREIGNTY AND SELF-PRESERVATION: THE ENDURING LEGACIES OF HOBBS AND LOCKE*

THIS TITLE EXAMINES THE DISTINCT CONCEPTS OF SOVEREIGNTY AND SELF-PRESERVATION AS ARTICULATED BY HOBBS AND LOCKE. IT ANALYZES HOW THESE CONCEPTS INFLUENCED SUBSEQUENT POLITICAL THOUGHT AND CONTINUE TO RESONATE IN DISCUSSIONS OF STATE POWER AND INDIVIDUAL AUTONOMY. THE BOOK OFFERS A HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE ON THEIR LASTING IMPACT.

8. *NATURAL LAW AND POLITICAL OBLIGATION: COMPARING HOBBS AND LOCKE*

THIS BOOK DELVES INTO THE DIFFERING INTERPRETATIONS OF NATURAL LAW AND THE SOURCES OF POLITICAL OBLIGATION BY HOBBS AND LOCKE. IT EXPLORES HOW THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF NATURAL LAW SHAPED THEIR VIEWS ON THE LEGITIMACY AND SCOPE OF GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY. THE WORK PROVIDES A SCHOLARLY COMPARISON OF THEIR ETHICAL AND POLITICAL FRAMEWORKS.

9. *THE STATE OF NATURE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF HOBBS AND LOCKE*

THIS FOCUSED STUDY DISSECTS THE CONTRASTING THEORIES OF THE STATE OF NATURE PROPOSED BY THOMAS HOBBS AND JOHN LOCKE. IT ANALYZES THEIR ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT HUMAN NATURE AND HOW THESE ASSUMPTIONS LEAD TO THEIR DISTINCT CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE NECESSITY AND FORM OF GOVERNMENT. THE BOOK OFFERS A DETAILED COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THIS FOUNDATIONAL CONCEPT.

Comparing The Ideas Of John Locke And Thomas Hobbes Worksheet

Comparing The Ideas Of John Locke And Thomas Hobbes Worksheet

Related Articles

- [cognition exploring the science of the mind 5th](#)
- [connect ed mcgraw hill answer key](#)
- [conners 3 scoring manual](#)

[Back to Home](#)