

Thomas Hobbes' views on Philosophy, State of Nature and International Relations

Aabid Majeed Sheikh, Mahdi Musse Hassan, Saima Rashid

¹Ph.D. Candidate, Department of International Relations, Selçuk University, Turkey.

Email: aabidamu7@gmail.com

²Ph.D. Candidate, Department of International Relations, Selçuk University, Turkey.

³Research Assistant, Centre for Islam and Global Affairs, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Turkey.

Abstract— *The state of nature of Hobbes is like a reflection of the depression of 1640s that prevailed in the United Kingdom. The basic concept that determines the state of nature is individuality. This phenomenon is the expression of individuality, the beginning of Renaissance but not of full competence, of expressing individuality, liberating oneself from doctrinal teachings and medieval conceptions. According to Hobbes, human beings are individuals who have the desire and choice to choose. The person's ability to use his will and preference determines his happiness or unhappiness. The emotions of feeling, fear, desire etc. which are the basic characteristics of human life, are not merely physical and factual phenomenon, but a moral phenomenon that becomes evident by loving, enjoying or disliking, desiring or avoiding oneself. For Hobbes, human life is competition and struggle. As a creature that thinks of the future, human beings are constantly struggling to secure their future ambitions. It is the basic survival condition of a person that wants to be sovereign. It is inevitable that people who are equal in terms of physical and mental force will fight everyone in natural condition. This paper tries to elucidate Thomas Hobbes' understandings of the concepts of philosophy, state and state of nature. This article will further try to shed light on the Thomas Hobbes's views on International Relations.*

Keywords— *State, Sovereign, State of Nature, Philosophy.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), the English Philosopher is best known for his political thought, and deservedly so. His vision of the world is strikingly unique and still relevant to contemporary political issues. The ideas of Hobbes and his vision of the world is very unique and still applicable to modern-day politics. His principle concern is the issue of social and political order: how peace can prevail between individuals and how can individuals elude the peril and fear of common conflict. Hobbes postures unambiguous options: we should give our compliance to an inexplicable sovereign (an individual or an association engaged to choose each social and political issue). Generally what anticipates us is a "state of nature" which nearly looks like civil war, a circumstance of all inclusive insecurity, where all have reason to fear ferocious demise and where remunerating human collaboration is everything except impossible. Hobbes is the considered as the founding father of contemporary political philosophy. Specifically or in an

oblique way, he has set the terms about the essentials of political life right into our own circumstances. Maybe couple of people have enjoyed his theory, the issues of political life imply that a general public ought to acknowledge an inexplicable sovereign as its only political authority. In any case, regardless we live in the world that Hobbes tended to head on: a world where human authority is something that entails justification and is consequently acknowledged by few; a world where social and political disparity additionally seems flawed; and a world where spiritual authority faces huge argument. We can put the issue as far as the apprehension with equality and rights that Hobbes's thought proclaimed: we live in reality as we know it where every individual should have rights that are moral claims that ensure their fundamental interests.

Hobbes's significance can be seen if we momentarily associate him and the other popular political thinkers before and after him. A century prior, Nicolo Machiavelli had underlined the unforgiving certainties of power and

additionally reviewing ancient Roman encounters of political freedom. Machiavelli shows up as the primary present day political thinker since like Hobbes he was never again willing to discuss political issues in terms set by religious faith (for sure, he was still more offensive than Hobbes to numerous universal believers) rather he viewed political issues as a mainstream secular discipline separated from spirituality. Nevertheless, dissimilar to Hobbes, Machiavelli offers us no systematic philosophy: we need to remake his perspectives on the significance and nature of freedom; it stays unverifiable which, assuming any standards Machiavelli attracts on his obvious acclaim of flippant power politics.

Composing a couple of years after Hobbes, John Locke had unquestionably acknowledged the terms of discussion Hobbes had set down: by what method would humans be able to live together, when religious or conventional supports of authority are not any more viable or powerful? How is political authority vindicated and how far does it expand? Specifically, are our political rulers legitimately as boundless in their power as Hobbes had proposed? Furthermore, in the event that they are not, what system of politics will guarantee that they don't violate the imprint, don't intrude on the privileges of their subjects?

Things being what they are, in evaluating Hobbes' political rationality or philosophy, our main inquiries can be: What did Hobbes compose that was so significant? How was he ready to set out a mindset about politics and power that remaining parts unequivocal almost four centuries later? We can get a few pieces of information to this second inquiry on the off chance that we take a glimpse at Hobbes' views on Philosophy.

II. AN OVERVIEW OF THOMAS HOBBS' PHILOSOPHY

Hobbes' philosophy can be said to be a consistent materialism. Hobbes thought about the philosophy teaching, first with materialism, then with anthropology. Finally, the formation of man, society and the state finds the expression of competence in the philosophy of politics which examines its structure. Hobbes, one of the British philosophers, had developed a mechanical philosophy of teaching from the philosophical considerations of Galileo and Descartes. According to Hobbes, the universe we live in consists of the

sum of objects governed by the laws of mechanical motion.¹ Hobbes describes philosophy in the following way: Intelligence-based knowledge of causes and consequences. Philosophy is to think right, to think now, to add a concept to another, or to separate them, to sum up or subtract, to count, to calculate. Hobbes here says that everything that exists in the world takes place within a cause-and-effect cycle. Moreover, joining and leaving is a characteristic sole to objects. The philosophy of Hobbes at that time was to create motion, as moving objects that have time and space.² The fundamental theme of philosophy is to search for ways to think correctly. Philosophy deals with the concrete issues of life, that is, the problems we perceive with our five senses. It does not deal with topics of divine origin, with souls, with angels, and with God, because these are the issues of theology. Philosophy does not examine the purpose of souls or deaths and why they exist, but it examines the nature of humans. Because human beings are physical beings and humans move on in time. For example, not one of us is the same as in the first years of our lives, but the body of man also grows and changes over time.³ Everything in motion is in actually in living; every change is in a process of motion. Every object has to be in motion according to its location in time and space. Because everything that exists in time grows and develops and moves. The movement process is continuous if it is not obstructed by an external force. There is a reason that determines each movement, not movement on uncertainty. In short, everything that exists at the moment has a cause. The reasons for the present events are in the past, and the present events are shaping future events. Hobbes thinks that the source of all of our knowledge is emotional as the source of information and empirical in terms of its results. We reach information by using experiment and observation method. According to Hobbes, the view that we can have geometric knowledge of everything can be obtained even if everyone thinks that everything exists and is in motion. For Hobbes, mathematical or geometric knowledge should come to mind when it comes to scientific knowledge. Hobbes sees the science of geometry as the science that

¹ Edwin Curley. "Reflections on Hobbes: Recent Work on his Moral and Political Philosophy". *Journal of Philosophical Research*, 1989–90, 15, 169–250.

² Ryan Alan. "Hobbes's Political Philosophy": In the *Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, p.45.

³ Deborah Baumgold. *Hobbes's Political Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, p.30.

delivers real and definitive results. Hobbes uses all mathematical sciences, research on motion and strength, and mathematical physics. Our thoughts in our mind are formed by our senses, known as sensations. It is mediating senses to establish causal relationship between thought and objective and to produce information.⁴

It is necessary to be reasonable and think rightly in order to grasp the cause and effect relations between existing objects and to find the connections between the objects. For example, it is a developing cause in the context of the consequence that the thunder, will result in a thunderstorm. We think about it in our minds. But nobody knows this information unless we transmit this knowledge. Actually thought comes first. Language is a vehicle for understanding and transferring thoughts. One distinguishes between thinking about other beings and expressing what they think with language. Hobbes says that "Elements of Law" is the knowledge of the names given to objects of science. According to Hobbes, there is no truth other than the naming of man by words. Hobbes, who does not speak of a universal reality outside of the names in the world, is nominalist in this sense. Hobbes is the nominalist, as it is, according to him, anything that is universal cannot be explained. Without a language we cannot say right or wrong for any judgment. The name of reality is defined as a particular object, that is, a particular object, such as a pen, apple, or house, to which we have been informed by sensory organs. There is nothing universal that is real. For example, humanity does not reflect the reality of the collective, but when John is personally conceived as a person, that is, the concept becomes reality when humanity embodies John as a human being.⁵

As for Hobbes' political philosophy, Hobbes bases his political philosophy on the argument that "human being is the foundation of everything." The person is innately innocent and wants everything for just himself. According to Hobbes, before people lived in society, everyone had the right to get everything so that man wants everything to be his own. So he wants to destroy everything else that can be common to everything except his own. Everyone is at war with each other. However, this war does not have any benefit to anybody, and there is no life safety of people. As a result, the minds of people come into commission and make

contracts with each other. They choose the state leader, a sovereign power to enforce the sanctions of this contract, the laws of nature, and they transfer all their rights to the sovereign gentry. Sovereign power directs the people to comply with natural laws and punishes those who do not. The state must be the only power, but it is ensured that people can live in peace and without harming each other.⁶

III. CONCEPT OF STATE

Basically, the state is an institution formed by the combination of people, land and sovereignty. According to this, there are three basic building blocks that make up the state: the country (land); is a piece of land in which the state is founded and where the citizens live. Sovereignty; power authority, is the rule of the individual and the regular functioning of the society. In other words, the state is the institution formed by the superiority of the power of the human community living in a country. Citizens; the state is an institution that is the result of individuals forming a community. According to this approach, the state is an asset brought by the dominant nation over a certain country. When one of these three basic building stones is missing, the state does not emerge. The right to sovereignty, legislative, executive and judicial use of these three basic organs is in their own hands.⁷ The state emerges in the place where society exists. Society is made up of people. Every human being is selfish, he wants to have everything alone because of his selfishness, and when he tries to take away the rights of the people, chaos and civil war take place in the country. The state tries to prevent this chaos by making laws. It manages people in society with the law and provides people in the society with a safe and prosperous life.

The state is designed as a means to protect the peace and security of the people who create the state. There are small institutions in the state, such as military, executive, health, education, which will continue systematically the functioning of the state. They work in a certain systematic way. If they do not work in a certain systematic way, the state is disorganized within itself and cannot provide the well-being of the people. When viewed as a system to the state; two kinds of states are mentioned. The first of these is defined as the "system of dominance". This is state style; centralist and

⁴ Stephen Finn. *Thomas Hobbes and the Politics of Natural Philosophy*, London: Continuum Press, 2006, p.84.

⁵ Bertrand Russell. *History of Western Philosophy: Collectors Edition*. Routledge, 2013, p. 74.

⁶ Mark Peacock. "Obligation and Advantage in Hobbes' *Leviathan*", *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 40 (3): 2010, 433–458.

⁷ George Shelton. *Morality and Sovereignty in the Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992, p. 141.

unionist. According to this comprehension, it carries not only political but also social and economic affairs. The second "welfare system" is related to state understanding. This understanding of the state is a political structure that takes into consideration the social conditions of the people.⁸ In political philosophy, there are thinkers who accept the state as a natural institution as well as those who accept it as an artificial institution. Plato and Aristotle are the thinkers who defend the state as a natural institution. In this comprehension, the source of government is found in human nature.

According to Plato, the best form of state is the ideal state. While struggling with sophists, Plato was investigating what form of life would lead to happiness that people regard as natural. Plato takes this problem into consideration when it comes to a community that has come together on a city-state basis, not just one person. Plato didn't regard happiness only for a class, but for the happiness of all the people in the country, so that the purpose of establishing the state is to make the state, the whole society happy, the most virtuous people in the ideal state of *Platon* are the ones who govern the state because they are philosophers at the same time. According to Plato, it reflects the character of the state in which the individual lives. Therefore, a good state must be wise, bold, moderate and fair. A state should take all its decisions, both good and bad, wisely. People should decide by their knowledge.⁹

According to Aristotle, the state is a whole; the family that constitutes the state, institutions such as the educational institutions are the parts that form the state. The state comes before individual in terms of importance. For example, separate your eyes or nose from your head and they will have no meaning. In this approach, the family or educational institution has no function independently of the state.¹⁰ The second approach to the nature of the state is that of the state as an artificial entity. According to this approach, the state emerges as a means to protect people. People come together and make a contract between themselves. They appoint a power to represent their common will as a judge. John Locke and Thomas Hobbes are the leading representatives of this approach.

According to Hobbes, the state's acquisition of wealth is an expression of the fact that people in their natural state have abandoned harmful actions against one another. The natural state of human beings is that everyone is fighting every Tom, Dick, and Harry. In the case of nature, for the same cause, and not equally violent, there is a desire to harm every human being. The covenants are words and unless there is a need for it, it is not enough to secure the person.¹¹ John Locke is one of the most important thinkers of the 17th century. He is known as the father of liberalism in the history of thought. Locke has made great contributions to the theory of social contract. According to his thoughts, people are liberated from the nature by a social contract which reveals a civilized administration. At the same time, Locke defends the principle of separation of the legislative and executive powers.¹²

IV. CONCEPT OF STATE OF NATURE

According to Hobbes, insecurity arises from inequality and war is born from insecurity. The basic approach of thinking is that people are born equal. Nature, God, created man equal in creation. This equality is physical and mental equality. For example, a person who is weak in physical condition equals this weakness to a strong person. According to another person mentally, an inadequate person does not accept this inadequacy and sees himself equally mentally.¹³ This person who is physically weak will refer to himself/herself in different ways against a strong person, for example by combining with others who are in the same danger. Hobbes argues that people are equal in their mental abilities to their physical characteristics. From a mental point of view everyone's mind is working with different characteristics. Whose mind is accomplished in verbal talents, that is, in areas such as literature, art, history, is more successful in numerical abilities. Some people are more successful in areas such as mathematics, physics and chemistry. A person, who is successful in verbal ability but fails in numerical ability, enjoys himself in his mind as if he has succeeded in both fields. If he succeeds in numerical talent, he says that I have succeeded in verbal ability, and he is equal to himself and the

⁸ Ali Seyyar, Sosyal Siyaset Terimleri Ansiklopedik Sözlük, Sakarya Yayıncılık, İstanbul, Ocak, 2008, p.97.

⁹ Julia Annas. An introduction to Plato's Republic, 1981, p.34.

¹⁰ Aristotle, Politics. Vol. 264. Heinemann, 1959, p. 9.

¹¹ Rogers and Sorell (eds.), Hobbes and History. London: Routledge, 2000, p.67.

¹² Burns Lawrence. "Thomas Hobbes," in History of Political Philosophy, Eds. Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey, Chicago: 1987.

¹³ Thomas Hobbes. "1651 Leviathan." Classics of moral and political theory, ed. M. Morgan, 1968, p. 581-735.

other person in his mind. In the human mind, he thinks he has the talent that other successful person possesses, and he equals himself with that person. People do not think that they are less unsuccessful and less foolish than others. According to Hobbes, this is a sign that everyone's self-esteem is equal, since they are better acquainted with the mental nature of people.¹⁴

As pointed out above, "Insecurity arises from inequality." Even though we think that people are equal in all respects in every way, there is an unlimited freedom for them. In unlimited freedom, people think they will have everything that exists. Hence war is born from insecurity. For example, because there are those who want to increase their power through conquests more than their security requires; if this were not the case, people would be able to stay within modest limits because people are equal in every way. If they want to have two commanders on the same borders, there will be contention between them, and this contest will be carried to the extent of hostility to have that territory. Even if he wants to have one person in that geography, he does everything he can to destroy the person who wants to own it. Everyone is equal in their place where everyone is equal and everyone is free to do everything. In the absence of a force to keep people in peace, there is enough equality to attack each other. In such a case, the person tries to make a bigger value by scaring people, damaging others and scaring them.¹⁵ Thus, 'Human beings are settled by man'. *Homo hominid lupus* is a political term used by Hobbes to express the state of war, which is the state of the nature of the human condition.¹⁶

As a result, everyone will be in danger for another person. Nobody will trust anyone. It is accepted as the truth of what people are doing, that is, for their own safety, to put others under their sovereignty. In the past, people looked at conquests and wars to establish dominance. To expand the boundaries of their own countries, they have organized 'conquests' in other countries and added them to their borders. There were many lives and property lost during conquests. However, these are accepted as the right steps in the continuation of human life. According to this approach,

the first and basic natural law is to seek and follow peace, while the second is to protect oneself by all means.¹⁷

Against of all these events, when there is not enough power to stop them, actually Hobbes thinks now is the necessity of the emergence of state. If people are not afraid of a force, neither friendship nor the value of mankind will be possible. Every individual will enter into the struggle to destroy the people around him in order to be the sole ruler of everything. Man regards himself as a superior and precious being, according to other people, and contemplates that he is more talented and smarter. For this reason, the opposite person enters into the expectation that he or she will value this measure. According to Hobbes: "The law of nature, *lex naturalis*, is a principle or general rule that is intellectually found, and which prohibits man from doing things that are harmful to his own life or that reduce the ways of protecting his life, or that he can best protect his or her life. Rights consist of freedom to do or not to do; the law determines and affirms one of these: the law and the right are as different as the obligation and freedom that are incompatible with each other in the same subject.¹⁸ In the creation of man and in the nature of human being, there are the reasons that push humans to fight; the first is competition, the second is insecurity, and the last is glory and honor. According to Hobbes, the first reason to push people into a fight is for material benefit. One goes to the house, to the animals, to the other person, to which he cannot own, and goes to violence to have his family. Second, it seems more logical than the first fight. Every person has a basic right to live. The only person's right is to secure the right to life. When a person feels threatened to damage his or her own safety, he or she will stand against the person who will damage his safety and even take measures. The third, on the other hand, takes physical action against the insulting and disdainful interpretations of man's direct personality and his profession.¹⁹ As the person turns to the things that give pleasure to him, he exhibits an attitude of avoiding things that hurt him. People describe things that are pleasing to themselves as good and things that are painful as bad. There is a desire for survival and a desire to maintain its life in the best possible way, based on the urge to lead the people to war and only to see themselves as the only force and to destroy other people. The greatest fear of man is fear of death. He

¹⁴ Thomas Hobbes. "1651 Leviathan." Classics of moral and political theory, ed. M. Morgan, 1968, p. 581-735.

¹⁵ George Shelton. Morality and Sovereignty in the Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992, p.89.

¹⁶ Thomas Hobbes. Leviathan. A&C Black, 2006, p.94.

¹⁷ Thomas Hobbes. Leviathan. A&C Black, 2006, p.97.

¹⁸ Thomas Hobbes. Leviathan. A&C Black, 2006, p. 96-97.

¹⁹ Thomas Hobbes. Leviathan. A&C Black, 2006, p.94.

wants to destroy people around him in order to continue his own life because he sees other people as a threat to him. Hobbes thinks that things that keep people alive are good and things that threaten their lives are bad.²⁰

Everyone is always at war with everyone else, unless there is no state.²¹ When people are not in a power to stop themselves, a phenomenon arises that everyone is equal and free. In this case, the war situation is inevitable. Every man's life is to live, and man destroys every human being he sees as an element of threat. There is no progress in the event of war, there is constant regression. The land is not processed, the produced goods are not transported by ship, and there is no transportation. In the case of war, we can say that the darkness is ambiguous, a period in which there is no sense of darkness, and only emotions that push people to insecurity.²² The war situation has had a very negative effect on people. One suspects everything, thinks it is under constant threat. When traveling, one takes precautions due to possible armed threats. One does not want to be alone because of the threat that may come from someone else. Man has a problem of trust against his/her family, friends and relatives. Locking the doors of their homes while they are sleeping is a measure taken against insecurities. They do not know that the threats to insecurity in this process are not correct. Because there is no "law" to declare that they are not true. According to Hobbes, it may seem strange that nature, in this way, separates people and makes them prone to loot and destroys one another, does not consider these matters.²³

In the case state of nature; Even being strong does not diminish the fears, people live in constant disturbance. Fear is so effective that it is felt by all people. People gradually begin to realize that nobody out of the natural power will struggle to win.²⁴ According to Hobbes, the state and the laws need to lift the state of war from the middle and ensure the peace and prosperity of the community. Because, in the case of war, it is not possible to define actions as just or unjust, as concepts such as justice, right, wrong, good and evil are not fully known and there are no states and laws.

Algebra and deception are two great virtues in battle.²⁵ If there is no general power to be scared, how can life be understood only by looking at the way people have lived under peaceful rule in the event of a civil war? The war situation is a very painful period. It is a period when people are constantly skeptical, unhappy and without guarantees of their survival. People want to get rid of this period and to live a peaceful life and not to get involved in war. People cannot work because of fear of death, and they cannot meet their needs. People think with their mind to get out of war. As a result, the mind shows the conditions of peace in which people can agree on them and which will bring them comfort and peace. These conditions are called "natural law".²⁶

V. HOBBS' VIEWS ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Thomas Hobbes' name and the conception of anarchy frequently appear to be for all intents and purposes synonymous in debates of International Relations. Undoubtedly in the arguments amongst neorealists and neoliberals; structuralists, poststructuralists, feminists and rationalists, constructivists, and realists that presently subjugated our fields; the competence of a Hobbesian idea of Global Politics gives a typical logical and expository criterion, much as it has in fluctuating structures for ages. The normal explanation of Hobbes' notion of Global Politics revolves around his well-known delineation of the state of nature as a jurisdiction in which "it is shown that amid the time that men live without a typical power to keep them in astonishment, they are in that condition which is referred to as war, and such is a war of each man against other man."²⁷ In the conventional "realist" vision, this gives an imperishably powerful plan of the quintessence of international relations.

Hobbes' notion of international relations offers troublesome inquiries for yet another part of modern international relations hypothesis. For if, as some contend today, we have to appeal to tenets and standards (or, all the more comprehensively, to postmodern or constructivist techniques, and ideas, for example, governance) in our comprehension of international relations, Hobbes' perspectives raise a progression of major issues. From one viewpoint, it should be perceived in any event that Hobbes' not as much as

²⁰ Mark Murphy. "Hobbes on the Evil of Death", *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, 2000, 82: 36–61.

²¹ Thomas Hobbes. *Leviathan*. A&C Black, 2006, p. 94.

²² Eric Schwitzgebel. "Human Nature and Moral Education in Mencius, Xunzi, Hobbes, and Rousseau", *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 2007, 24 (2): 147–168.

²³ Thomas Hobbes. *Leviathan*. A&C Black, 2006, p.95.

²⁴ David Raphael. *Hobbes: Morals and Politics*, London: Routledge Press, 1977, p.43.

²⁵ Thomas Hobbes. *Leviathan*. A&C Black, 2006, p.96.

²⁶ Thomas Hobbes. *Leviathan*. A&C Black, 2006, p.96

²⁷ Thomas Hobbes. *Leviathan*. A&C Black, 2006, 76.

energetic vision of international governmental issues can't be expelled as gullibly positivist, and those speculations reproachful of positivist-propelled hypothesis of international relations would be very much served by a genuine engagement with his idea instead of with its outline rejection. His political vision is personally entwined with epistemological and moral issues at the core of current arguments. On the off chance that Hobbes' view is held to be lacking (which from numerous points of view, we would contend it is, however that is another inquiry), such judgments must deal with the advanced and troublesome inquiries around which his idea rotates.²⁸

Hobbes' focus on issues of knowledge, agreement, and authenticity in social activity, make his ideas of incredible value, if regularly stropy and positively new, pertinence to ebb and flow investigate into international regimes, epistemic groups, political discourse, and so forth. However this idea likewise shams large difficulties to as well simple a conviction that a swing to standards and subjectivity speaks to inalienably dynamic contrasting options to the essentialist dreams of human instinct, political agitation, or the state frequently found in authenticity or the logical claims of basic neorealism. His hostility towards objectivist epistemological position does not prompt a cheerful realm of receptiveness, play, and distinction; rather it features the manners by which such a position can underlie unsafe and possibly ridiculous progression.²⁹ As a scholarly collaborator in a hostile objectivist campaign, Hobbes is an exceptionally dubious and troublesome accomplice. He builds up a modern vision of the challenges associated with developing and securing delicate and intrinsically unexpected political requests, regardless of whether they are national or international. It is an entirely different and more modern vision than that which centers upon timeless natures or as far as anyone knows unceasing basic assurance, yet in its weight on the idea of human subjectivity and the points of confinement of human comprehension, Hobbes' examination brings up exceptionally troublesome issues. For the individuals who might want to appeal to ideas, for example, relativity and inter-subjectivity in the development of an alternate comprehension of international relations, a commitment with Hobbes serves, to obtain an expression from John Dunn, as a "tart reminder" of

the less constructive insinuations that such a locus can produce and the queries that it must challenge.³⁰

Hobbes' hypothesis of international relations, to condense, does not give the substance to a goal basic examination of international relations invulnerable from the inquiries of morals and the local character of states. While some may recommend that his contentions open a bigger number of inquiries than they answer and that Hobbes' own particular endeavors to answer them might be eventually unconvincing, a satisfactory grasp of Hobbes' ideas requests that international relations involve with a progression of inquiries long vital to current political idea. Instead of disjoining international relations (both in theory and practice) from inquiries of the political order of development, Hobbes' philosophy of international relations puts these inquiries at the focal point of any endeavor to get a hold of contemporary world politics.³¹

VI. CONCLUSION

According to Thomas Hobbes, human beings have a tendency to tackle the problem of trust in the natural state, and the evil that precedes the state of war. It is based on the human being, which is the smallest part of society and the founder of the state, as put to forward in these things in work. There is a natural person in front of the society and the state. This approach is also one of the main arguments of Plato's political philosophy; the state, the similarity of an organism, and the approach of seeing people and the state as similar approaches. And unlike Aristotle, he does not accept the thesis that man is a social creature. Therefore, state building, socialization do not have a state of empowerment.

Hobbes' state of nature is an approach to Aristotle's natural goal of understanding. A person in a natural situation does not have the tendency to socialize. The natural situation is a war between people. Thomas Hobbes concepts are based on the selfish nature of human beings. The necessity of the state has arisen due to the negative consequences of the selfish nature of man. According to Hobbes, man is in distrust of nature and wants to seek trust. This negative situation should not be sustained much for people's lives and trust establishment. People only try to destroy people outside their own self in order to be able to protect their own assets and to

²⁸ Alexander Wendt. The agent-structure problem in international relations theory. *International Organization*, 1987, 41:335-70.

²⁹ Kenneth Waltz. *Man, the state, and war*. New York: Columbia University Press 1959, p. 83.

³⁰ John Dunn. Political obligation. In *Political theory today*, edited by David Held. Stanford, Calif.: Polity Press, 1991, p. 32.

³¹ Donald Hanson. Thomas Hobbes's "highway to peace." *International Organization*, 1984, 38: 329-54.

be superior everywhere, considering their own interests. This selfishness of the people ultimately drags it into a chaotic atmosphere. In a chaotic atmosphere, people cannot improve their ability to deal with each other; their life span shortens because at any moment people can kill each other. When people realize that they cannot win anything in this situation, they tend to create a contract that they think and not harm each other. People make a contract by inheriting their rights as a necessity in order to get rid of this war, which is caused by natural law structure.

Hobbes basically tried to determine that people are equal and that they are equipped with certain natural and irrevocable rights. Hobbes has determined that the state is established as a result of a kind of agreement or contract between individuals. According to Hobbes, Leviathan is the absolute ruler of civil and religious institutions. Absolute sovereign has complete authority and there are no religious or civilian controls on it. This approach of Hobbes is the most successful expression of absolutism and absolute government. According to the contract theory, it takes the sovereign authority at the expense of its citizens and fulfills the basic needs and desires of those who are governed by their absolute authority and peace and security. Hobbes's contribution to the formation of the liberal discourse in his later periods has introduced an absolute authority, explaining the emergence of this by adhering to the social contract theory.

REFERENCES

- [1] ANNAS Julia, "An introduction to Plato's Republic." (1981).
- [2] ARISTOTLE, Politics. Vol. 264. Heinemann, 1959.
- [3] BAUMGOLD Deborah, "Hobbes's Political Philosophy." (1988).
- [4] CURLEY Edwin, "Reflections on Hobbes: recent work on his moral and political philosophy." *Journal of Philosophical Research* 15 (1990): 169-226.
- [5] FINN Stephen J, Thomas Hobbes and the politics of natural philosophy. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2006.
- [6] GOLDSMITH Maurice Marks, Hobbes's science of Politics. Columbia University Press, 1966.
- [7] HANSON Donald W, "Thomas Hobbes's "highway to peace"." *International Organization* 38.2 (1984): 329-354.
- [8] HELD David, Political theory today. Stanford University Press, 1991.
- [9] HOBBS Thomas, Leviathan. A&C Black, 2006.
- [10] HOBBS Thomas. "1651 Leviathan." *Classics of moral and political theory*, ed. M. Morgan (1968): 581-735.
- [11] HOOD Francis Campbell, "The divine politics of Thomas Hobbes: an interpretation of Leviathan." (1966).
- [12] JOHNSTON David, The rhetoric of Leviathan: Thomas Hobbes and the politics of cultural transformation. Princeton University Press, 1989.
- [13] KROM Michael, The limits of reason in Hobbes's commonwealth. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2011.
- [14] MALCOLM Noel, "Hobbes and the European Republic of Letters." *Aspects of Hobbes* (2002): 457-545.
- [15] MURPHY Mark, "Hobbes on the Evil of Death by Mark C. Murphy (Washington, DC)." (2000).
- [16] PEACOCK Mark, "Obligation and advantage in Hobbes' Leviathan." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 40.3 (2010): 433-458.
- [17] RAPHAEL, David Daiches. Hobbes: morals and politics. Vol. 6. Routledge, 2014.
- [18] ROGERS, GA John, and Thomas Sorell, eds. Hobbes and history. Routledge, 2013.
- [19] RUSSELL, Bertrand. History of Western Philosophy: Collectors Edition. Routledge, 2013.
- [20] RYAN, Alan. "Hobbes's political philosophy." *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes* (1996): 208-245.
- [21] SCHWITZGEBEL, Eric. "Human nature and moral education in Mencius, Xunzi, Hobbes, and Rousseau." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 24.2 (2007): 147-168.
- [22] SEYYAR, Ali. "Sosyal Siyaset Terimleri Ansiklopedisi, 2." Baskı. Sakarya: Sakarya Yayıncılık (2008).
- [23] SHELTON, George. Morality and Sovereignty in the Philosophy of Hobbes. Springer, 2016.
- [24] SOMMERVILLE, Johann P. "Thomas Hobbes: Political ideas in historical context." (1992). WALTZ, Kenneth Neal. Man, the state, and war: A theoretical analysis. Columbia University Press, 2001.
- [25] STRAUSS Leo, Joseph Cropsey, eds. History of political philosophy. University of Chicago Press, 2012.
- [26] WENDT, Alexander E. "The agent-structure problem in international relations theory." *International organization* 41.3 (1987): 335-370.