

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352905045>

The Social Contract Theories of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke: Comparative Analysis

Article in *Shanlax International Journal of Arts Science and Humanities* · July 2021

DOI: 10.34293/sijash.v9i1.4042

CITATIONS

5

READS

16,439

1 author:



John Michael Sasan

PAU Excelencia Global Academy Foundation, Inc.

26 PUBLICATIONS 617 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

The Social Contract Theories of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke: Comparative Analysis

OPEN ACCESS

Manuscript ID:
ASH-2021-09014042

Volume: 9

Issue: 1

Month: July

Year: 2021

P-ISSN: 2321-788X

E-ISSN: 2582-0397

Received: 20.04.2021

Accepted: 25.06.2021

Published: 01.07.2021

Citation:

Sasan, John Michael V.
"The Social Contract
Theories of Thomas
Hobbes and John Locke:
Comparative Analysis."
*Shanlax International
Journal of Arts, Science
and Humanities*, vol. 9,
no. 1, 2021, pp. 34-45.

DOI:


<https://doi.org/10.34293/sijash.v9i1.4042>



This work is licensed
under a Creative Commons
Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0
International License

John Michael V Sasan

PAU Excellencia Global Academy Foundation, Philippines

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5987-6937>

Abstract

This study engages in the concept of social contract of Hobbes and Locke, and the similarities and differences of their ideas. Thomas Hobbes and John Locke both begin their political ideas with a discussion on the state of nature and the danger of living outside the community. For Thomas Hobbes, the state of nature is chaotic; it is in the state of mutual competition. He claims that the state of nature is a state of war, every man against everybody. Due to a constant competition for power and reputation, the man's equality leads the state of nature into chaos. Man who is bestowed with equal capacities for thinking and reasoning is moved by whatever he wants for survival and preservation no matter what it takes. This state of nature, according to Thomas Hobbes, is a state of egoistic self-preservation and necessity for survival. Meanwhile, John Locke is rather optimistic in his view in the state of nature, compared to the pessimistic view of Thomas Hobbes. He sees humans as decent species which are capable of knowing what is right and wrong. Although man in the state of nature lives with full freedom, yet he is still at risk of harm and invasion. The property is very unsafe and insecure, however, free yet full of fears. On this matter, man realizes and decides to create a contract and agree to the terms for peaceful and secure life for the safe and security of their liberty and possession. Furthermore, for Thomas Hobbes, social contract is a mutual transferring of rights to the sovereign. For him, social contract is responsible for the morality and the conception of right and wrong, just and unjust. Hence, social contract is very significant to every individual because it is the source of law and regulations and basis of morality. For Locke, the chief reason why man in creating an agreement or contract is the property. The main argument is Locke's social contract.

Keywords: Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Social contract theory, Comparative study, Leviathan, Second Treatise of Civil Government

Introduction

In every field of political study, man is the most important subject. No society can be imagined without a man. "Greeks called a man a political animal" (Papadis, 2006). Man is not an individualistic being for he does not live only by his own accord. He seeks to live in a society where he can be who he is and become who he will be.

History tells us how humans live in a small group, in a small family, or a small community. The concept of *balangay*, for instance, in Philippine history, has the attributes of a paternal commonwealth run or ruled by a *datu* or a chieftain.

Long before the Spaniards came from the Philippines, Filipinos had a civilization of their own (Mabahague). This civilization partly came from the Malay settlers and slowly adapted to the new environment (Mabahague). So, with this, we see how a man lives as a group, a tribe, as a community, and as a nation.

The concept of the Social Contract Theory is that in the beginning man lived in the state of nature. A state where there is no government, no common power, laws, and regulations (Elahi).

There were hardships and oppression in this state and, to overcome this hardship, they entered into two agreements which are: *pactum unionis* and *pactum subjectionis* (Elahi).

In the first union, people sought the protection of their lives and property. As a result of it, a society was formed where people promise to respect each other and ought not to harm one another (Elahi). In the second pact, people unite together and pledge to obey one authority (Elahi).

Hobbes and Locke were not the first to use the Social Contract Theory as a tool to explain the foundations of human society (Mourtiz, 2010). The theory can be traced further back to Ancient Greece. We find, in Plato's Republic, a friendly communal debate about the meaning of justice (Mourtiz, 2010).

Hobbes and Locke both share a vision of the Social Contract Theory as an instrument in a state of political stability. However, their theory has a starkly contrasting vision of human nature (Mourtiz, 2010). Thus, this study shows the comparison and contrast of ideas of the two modern social contract theorists namely; Thomas Hobbes and John Locke attempt to design an effective and efficient government that creates peace, long-lasting defense, and ideal to live in. Hence, this study compares and analyzes the concept of social contract of the mentioned philosophers above.

Methodology

The researcher employs qualitative research methodology that aims to analyze and understand Thomas Hobbes' and John Locke's concept on Social Contract Theory. It also seeks to find the similarities and differences of their ideas after exposing them.

This research will give much attention on the primary sources, namely: *Leviathan* of Thomas Hobbes and *Second Treatise of Civil Government* of John Locke to avoid huge misinterpretations. Furthermore, the researcher utilizes some electronic sources, secondary resources and commentaries from the different authors to gain more information and sufficient ideas on the said endeavor.

Thomas Hobbes Theory of Social Contract State of Nature

Thomas Hobbes begins his philosophy in the

social contract in the discussion of the state of nature. The state of nature is a state before the formation of government or societies without a common power or common law. The state of nature may be considered as a historical fact or hypothetical claim (Steele, 1993).

According to Dean Allen Steele, it is not important if this state of nature existed or not nor does it matter if there are still men living in this situation today. What is important is that assuming that this state of nature allows one to analyze society in such a way as to provide a good solution presented in the state of nature or in a way we can have direction on how or what to do in the society (Steele, 1993).

Though in the state of nature man lived in unbounded liberty, yet this liberty can be very dangerous and harmful to the neighbor and even to themselves because of no common power to keep them in awe, no rules, and regulations (Browne). Nature bestowed man with equal freedom and faculty in mind and body and also the equality in need. We have the same basic needs, such as food, clothing, and shelter. The problem here is that we do not have an unlimited supply of these basic needs, such as food, clothing, and shelter (Browne). Man has their desire. Some desire for reputation, authority, power, glory, or to be master of other people, and others are greedier. Though some are selfless, compassionate, merciful, and kind, yet we cannot reject the fact that we have our limits and that we are not infinitely compassionate so taken all together here arises the real problems in the state of nature (Browne).

The State of War

Thomas Hobbes presented the worst scenario in the state of nature: a place of no industry, no culture exist, no knowledge of the face of the earth, and no arts.

There is no place of industry because fruit thereof is uncertain and consequently no culture of the earth, no navigation, nor use of commodities, buildings, no instruments of moving and removing such things as require much force, no knowledge of the face of the earth, no account of time, no arts, no letters, no society and which is the worst of all, continual fear and danger of violent death and the life of man is solitary, poor nasty, brutish and short. (Hobbes, 1950, p. 10)

Hobbes gave three causes of quarrel: first competition, second the diffidence, and lastly the glory. First, they fight for gain. They use violence to overcome the other person and claim his property. Next, they will defend their lives, their family, and their loved ones for preservation and survival. Finally, they fight for the reputation (Cottingham, 2008). In the state of nature, there is constant destruction and continuous fear.

According to Thomas Hobbes, nature bestowed man equal in faculty in the body and mind though we have seen sometimes that some are wise and stronger body than the others for as the strength of the body the weakest can kill the strongest either by secret machination or by assassination or with the help of the others (Pojman, 1996). Though we have seen in nature that some are wiser and more learned than others, yet we cannot argue the fact that there are so many who are as wise as themselves (Pojman, 1996). Hence, if two men desire or love the same thing and they cannot enjoy it, both they will become enemies and try to destroy one another and this is what Hobbes called the state of war (Stumpf & Fieser, 2003).

Hereby it is manifest that during this situation men live with no law, no fear of punishment; they are in the condition of war (Pojman, 1996). The war consists not in actual fighting only but known disposition according to Hobbes (Pojman, 1996). The state of war is lawless, no common power to keep them in awe and men live according to their perspective and for their survival and nothing else (Steele, 1993).

Social Contract

The rise of the Social Contract Theory is the possibility of peace, social order, and the preservation of lives (Browne). Thomas Hobbes (1950) defined a social contract as the mutual transferring of rights to the sovereign in exchange for protection and security. The agreement of the social contract is the basis for morality and moral obligation (Rusling). Hobbes describes life without a social contract is known as the state of nature (Rusling). Social contract plays a big role in the lives of the individual and in their moral duty (Rusling).

Thomas Hobbes describes the state of nature without a common power to keep them in awe, a common power to fear of and the condition of the state without rules and regulations. Hobbes explains that the social contract is the responsibility of moral obligation and the one who gives rules and regulations to the society (Browne).

The social contract is the source of law and the concept of justice and injustice. In short, the social contract is the basis for morality. The construction of the social contract is to promote equality and fairness and to have the concept of right and wrong justice and injustice (Browne).

John Rawls, one of the contemporary philosophers, defends the question of whether the social contract had a basis in history. He said that social contract is not necessary to refer to a historical event but the social contract is a justification of moral principles (Browne).

For Hobbes, the only way to solve the problem in the state of nature and to avoid war is to enter into a social contract. Every individual must enter into a covenant with every other person, agreeing not to harm one another and aim to achieve peace and order in the society. However, agreement alone is not sufficient for peace and harmony. Therefore, a social contract requires a powerful sovereign to oversee the society and to provide peace (Mourtiz, 2010).

The Common Wealth

Love of liberty and dominion over others are the final cause, end, design of men particularly (Pojman, 1996). The construction of the commonwealth is to acquire peace, to prevent the worst evil which is death, and getting themselves out of the miserable condition of war (Cottingham, 2008). The only reason to put up such power is the defense from the foreign invaders, preventing injuries and providing common security for all, protecting businesses, infrastructure, industry, culture, property in the long term (Minton, 2008). The only way to establish such power is that all men give their rights and will to one single man, so that their strengths may be reduced to one strength, their powers to one power, their wills to one will, and their judgment to his judgment (Castel, 1963). This is more than consent, it is more than agreement and this is real unity and this is the

covenant of every man to every man and in such a manner as if everyone should say to every man.

I authorize and give up my rights to governing myself to this man and I authorize all his actions in a like manner (Hobbes, 1950).

This, done in multitude so united in one person, is called a commonwealth, the generation of the great leviathan of that "mortal god" which we owe under immortal god our peace and defense. The essence of the commonwealth is one person, of whose act a great multitude, by a mutual covenant of one another, have made themselves everyone as the author to the end, he may use the strength and means of them all. (p. 143)

The commonwealth, as it expressed in its definition and its essence, may use strength and impose law and willed punishment to obtain common defense, order, and security to all. Hobbes (1950) said that a "covenant without the sword are but words and of no strength to secure them all" (p. 139). In any way and in what meaning with or without the consent of everyone, he can use his strength to secure the community no matter what it takes.

The end of the commonwealth is mutual peace, security, common defense, and the necessary means to keep them in awe and to preserve the lives of the citizens (Hood, 1964). Law of nature forbids the individual to do such evil action; the commonwealth on the other hand imposes and implements such law. There is no peace, no harmony, and no security if there is no commonwealth.

Commonwealth by Institution

There are two ways to form commonwealths according to Thomas Hobbes: the commonwealth by an institution and the commonwealth by acquisition. The commonwealth is instituted when a multitude of men do agree, and covenant of men shall be given by the major part, the right to present the person of them all, everyone as well he that voted for it as he that voted against it, shall authorize all the actions and judgment of that man or assembly of men, in the same manner, as if they were his own to the end, to live peacefully among themselves and he protected against other men (Hobbes, 1950). The definition and essence of the commonwealth by institution express the absolute power and will and complete trust, in exchange for protection against external attack. Every member of the covenant carries an

obligation of conscience. Hence, the obligation of conscience is indispensable, but covenants without a sword are insufficient. Therefore, it is necessary to keep everyone in awe, for mutual peace and understanding and common defense against external enemies (Hood, 1964).

The Commonwealth by Acquisition

The second form of the commonwealth is the commonwealth by acquisition wherein the sovereign power is acquired by force (Hobbes, 1950). According to Thomas Hobbes (1950), this form of a commonwealth is formed by the result of fear so that the men who chose their sovereign did it out of fear either of one another or of him whom they instituted. Some physical concurrence and punishment are necessary to have a strong and firm commonwealth. Some change their will because of fear but the power of the mighty can lead the multitude of men to their end (Hood, 1964).

Everyone seeks their preservation and it is up to them to choose how they give their will and rights. They renounce voluntarily or through force. It is up to their judgment about the best way to preserve oneself (Gert, 2010).

The Sovereign

The sovereign is the source of law because when we speak of a sovereign, we think of a person or rather a king. The king has the absolute authority to decide whatever is best for everyone in maintaining peace and harmony. His decision is irrevocable and cannot be challenged (Gert, 2010). The sovereign holds absolute authority and unlimited power. The sovereign is committed to the power of rewarding with riches or honor and of punishing corporal or pecuniary punishment or with ignominy every subject according to the law he has formerly made (Hobbes, 1950).

The sovereign may have dominion over everything but the rights and consequences of his sovereignty are the same. His power cannot, without his consent, be transferred to another. He cannot forfeit. He cannot be accused by any of his subjects for inquiries. He cannot be punished by them, he decides what is necessary for peace, and makes a judgment on doctrines. He is the sole legislator and the supreme judge of controversies. In an occasion of war and peace, to him belongs the

power to choose magistrates, counselors, commanders, and all other officers, and ministers. He determines rewards and punishment, honor and order. (p. 168)

Hobbes advocated absolute monarchy and he presented the three kinds of the commonwealth. These are monarchy, democracy, and aristocracy. When it is ruled by a single person or one ruler, it is called monarchy. When there is an assembly of all, it is a democracy or popular commonwealth. When the assembly is only a part, it is called an aristocracy (Hobbes, 1950). Thomas Hobbes prefers monarchy because for him a kingdom divided in itself cannot stand (Hobbes, 1950) and regulate its power effectively and efficiently.

The difference between these three kinds of a commonwealth consists not in the difference of power but in the difference of the convenience or aptitude to produce peace and security of the people (Hobbes, 1950). The people acquire the same rights in monarchy, democracy, and aristocracy. Hence, monarchy is the source of genuine harmony between private interest and public interest. The corrupt and ambitious members of the assembly will seek their riches, glory, honor, and fortune (Hood, 1964).

Thomas Hobbes' purpose in his absolute sovereign is to have an organized and peaceful human society. Generally speaking, Thomas Hobbes lived in the era of war. The 33 years of war (1618-1648) and is a good illustration of how the weak sovereign can provide and maintain the peace and order of the society and the necessity to have absolute power in government (Mourtiz, 2010). So, therefore, Thomas Hobbes' argument in the absolute sovereign is based on experience.

John Locke's Theory of Social Contract

The State of Nature

John Locke starts his Social Contract Theory in the state of nature. Locke (1980) said "to understand the political power correctly and derive it from its original we must consider what state all men are naturally in, and that is the state of perfect freedom, without asking anyone's permission" (p. 3). The state of nature of John Locke is the state of equality wherein there is no greater power, no superior and inferior (Minton, 2008). Everyone is born with the same privileges, benefits, and the same faculty.

The reason why man lived in peace and harmony is that man is governed by the law of nature and the law of nature teaches man the ideal concept of morality. John Locke (1980) said that the reason which is that laws teach anyone who takes the trouble to consult it is that because we are all equal and independent, no one ought to harm anyone else in his life, health, liberty, and possessions. The state of nature has the law of nature and the law of nature is governed by right and moral reason. This natural law is not just simply selfishly self-preservation but instead, it is positive recognition of a person's value and dignity as his status as created by God out of love (Locke, 1980).

The state of nature, although a state wherein there was no civil authority or government to punish people for committing bad or causing harm to their neighbor, yet is not state without morality. This state of nature is pre-political but not pre-moral (Elahi).

The state of nature governed by the law of nature creates obligations and duties for everyone; everybody is obliged to preserve his life, liberty, health, and goods, so that all men might be prohibited to invade one's life, liberty, and possessions. He may be forbidden to harm his neighbor and may be forced to maintain order and peacefulness (Locke, 1980).

Everyone in the state of nature has the right to preserve their life and the life of others, their property, and their possessions but all men are restrained to invade one's right, possession, liberty, and life (Minton, 2008). This idea of restriction comes from the law of nature that teaches man what is wrong and what is not. The execution of the law in the state of nature under the law of nature is that everyone has the right to punish the criminal to stop the violent crime (Minton, 2008). Everyone has the right to preserve the whole of humanity so John Locke (1980) said, "for this reason, every man has the right to enforce the law of nature and punish the offenders" (p. 4). So to preserve humanity and to protect property, every man has the power to execute the law and punish the offender for every evil he has done.

The State of War

The difference between the state of war and the state of nature is that the state of nature means

living together with unconditional freedom without common superiority on earth. On the other hand, the state of war is a force, or a declared design of force upon the person of another, state of enmity, malice, and violence (Cottingham, 2008). According to John Locke, the state of war is a state of mutual destruction when someone declares by word or action. That he intends to end another man's life. He puts himself into a state of war against the other person (Locke, 1980). And, he who attempts to get another man into absolute power thereby puts himself into the state of war (Locke, 1980). Nobody can slave someone or be subject to his control or power to the right of his freedom. Anyone who is treating the freedom and security of others put himself in the state of war and to be free from such force is the only way to preserve his life and his freedom is to look at him as an enemy (Minton, 2008) for his survival (Minton, 2008).

For John Locke, to kill is lawful for that is the risk he ran when he started a war in which he is the aggressor (Minton, 2008). The main purpose of the law is to secure the health and wellness of everyone and to protect the innocent from the harm

Private Property

Property plays a big part in Locke's argument in his Social Contract Theory. Property is the number one of Locke's arguments for the social contract and civil government because it is the protection of their property (Elahi). When we speak of property in John Locke's Social Contract Theory, we speak of liberty, state, life, and even one's body (Elahi).

At the beginning of Chapter 5, John Locke (1980) quoted Psalm 16, God, as a king David says, has given the earth to the children of me and given it to mankind in common. Locke said that the right to private property precedes the civil law, for it is grounded on the natural moral law. The justification for this is his labor (Stumpf & Fieser, 2003). Though men as a whole own the earth and all inferior creatures, every individual man has a property in his person (owns himself)... The labor of his body and the work of his hands, we may say, are strictly his (Cottingham, 2008).

John Locke considered property in the state of nature as insecure because of the three conditions; they are:

- The absence of established law;
- The absence of an impartial judge;
- The absence of natural power to execute natural laws.

Thus, a man in the state of nature felt the need for protection of their properties so for this reason men entered into the social contract (Elahi).

The Social Contract and the Rule of Majority

Man in the state of nature is the king of his own, free, independent, and subject to no authority. Then, why will he give up control of any power? (Minton, 2008) Yes! Everyone in the state of nature has their complete freedom but the enjoyment of their freedom and property is in the state of continual fear and danger of invasion of others. Putting themselves in the government is the preservation of their life, liberty, and estate (Stumpf & Fieser, 2003).

Though in the state of nature he has the unrestricted right to his possessions, he is far from assured that he will be able to get used to them because they are constantly exposed to invasion by others. All men are king as much he is, every man is his equal and most men are not strict observers of fairness and justice, so his hold on the property he has in this state is very unsafe, very insecure, this makes him willing to leave a state in which he is in very free but which is full of fears and continual dangers and not unreasonably he locks for others with whom he can enter into a society for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties with I call by general name property (Minton, 2008).

Everyone wants to establish a well-known law and standard for right and wrong and give due punishment to the offender and enforcer to maintain peace and order. John Locke said that when any numbers of men have in this way consented to make one community or government that immediately incorporates them. Turn them into single body politics in which that majority has a right to act on behalf of the rest and to bind them by its decisions (Locke, 1689).

Also, he said that majoritarian rule is the only possibility for united action (Locke, 1689). The consent of the majority made the community; hence, they make one body community with the power to act as one body which is the only determination and

will of the majority (Smith & Grene, 1957). People agree with other men to make one body community for their security, safe and peaceful living. The duty of the community is impartial execution of equal laws, to secure all people, and establish to measure one's property (Stewart et al., 2010).

The Sovereign and the Division of Power

The main purpose of men uniting into the commonwealth and putting themselves under government is the preservation of their property (Locke, 1689). John Locke (1689) put the supreme power to the legislative for legislative is the combined power of every member of the society. He also emphasizes the importance of the division of executive and legislative (Stumpf & Fieser, 2003). The supreme power of the legislation does not promote absolute power and has its limit, the legislature can never have the right to destroy or enslave anybody and the legislature or the supreme authority cannot give itself the power to rule by sudden arbitrary decrees (Locke, 1689). The legislative power has the right to direct how the force of the commonwealth shall be employed for the good of all (Locke, 1689).

John Locke carefully separates the legislative power and executive power for one reason: corruption. He said that it is too great a temptation to human power-seeking frailty for the very people who have the power to enforce them, for if they did, they might to come to exempt themselves from obedience to the laws they made and to adapt the law both in making and enforcing it to their private advantage (Locke, 1689). There must always be executive power to enforce the law and always in existence (Locke, 1689). His supreme power is not so as a supreme legislature but as a supreme executor of the law. He can claim obedience not as a private person but only as the public person vested with the power of the law (Locke, 1689).

Comparative Analysis

In this chapter, the researcher would further dig, interpret and explain Thomas Hobbes' Social Contract Theory and John Locke's theory of social contract, basing their claims on how they came up with the idea as such. Moreover, in this chapter,

the researcher would also identify their points of convergence and divergence regarding the subject matter.

Thomas Hobbes' and John Locke's Theoretical Orientation and Analysis

Thomas Hobbes and John Locke are both modern philosophers who advocate the Social Contract Theory. Thomas Hobbes, a socio-political theorist, posits his idea to construct a society or government that will promote long-lasting defense, oversees the health and wellness of every individual in the community, upholds peace and order that will protect the citizen from the threat of foreign invasion and lastly a government that will support the good of multitude (Pojman, 1996).

Thomas Hobbes promotes the absolute sovereign in a monarchy form of government as the best of all the commonwealths. He describes the state of nature without the civil government as a state of war, wary of every man against every man. He designs a strong and firm government with absolute power to keep every member of community safe (Hobbes, 1950).

John Locke was influenced by Thomas Hobbes in his political theory specifically in the theory of social contract. John Locke formulates his design of government as a majoritarian rule. Locke posits the importance of the government in the life, liberty, and property of the individual. The main duty of the government is to secure the property of the individual and to protect them from harm (Stewart et al., 2010).

The Similarities Between Thomas Hobbes' and John Locke's Concept of Social Contract

In this part, the researcher would present the converging points of Thomas Hobbes' Social Contract Theory and John Locke's Social Contract Theory. In this section, the researcher would present and identify all the important details on what particular points are similar.

Thomas Hobbes' the Beginning of Commonwealth and John Locke's the Beginning of the Political Societies

Thomas Hobbes, in his cause, generation, and definition of a commonwealth, posits the idea of why people transfer their rights and makes a covenant, pact or contract to create a government. The only

reason is that people naturally love liberty and preserve their lives and to have a contented life and a force to defend them from the foreign invasion and harm and injury from the neighbor (Hobbes, 1950).

For Thomas Hobbes, social contract is the root of morality and moral obligation (Rusling). As discussed above, social contract plays a big role in the concept of morality. The social contract is the source of law and justice. To solve the problem of the state of nature of Thomas Hobbes which is the state of war, everybody should enter into a contract and make a covenant not to harm one another and respect one's right (Browne).

John Locke's the beginning of the political societies emphasizes the unified single body, that by agreeing with others to make one body politic under one government for the preservation of their lives, liberties, and estates which he calls in general name as a property (Stumpf & Fieser, 2003).

Property plays a big role in Locke's concept of social contract. Property is the main reason why man creates a contract and makes one body government because when we speak of property in John Locke's terminology we speak of life, freedom, and even one's body (Elahi).

Thus, Thomas Hobbes' and John Locke's chief purpose in creating a contract is the preservation of property which is life, state, liberty and to create a long-lasting defense, and to make a peaceful society.

Thomas Hobbes' Concept of Law of Nature and John Locke' Concept of Law of Nature

Thomas Hobbes posits the law of nature as lay down by nature and covered by the right reason. This law of nature is common to all human beings and the law of nature is universally valid. The law of nature is not the same as civil law or municipal law; it is simply a precept of what ought to do and not to do (Hobbes, 1950).

John Locke's state of nature, as he stated, has the law of nature. The law of nature is governed by the right reason and reasoning and in this matter the law of nature obliges everybody to act accordingly and rightfully. The law of nature which is governed by the right reason teaches all mankind about morality and consults everyone that no one ought to harm another life, health, and liberty (Locke, 1980).

The Difference between Thomas Hobbes' and John Locke's Social Contract Theory

In this section, the researcher would present all the differences between Thomas Hobbes' Social Contract Theory and John Locke's theory of social contract. The researcher mainly focuses on the divergence of their opposing ideas regarding the subject matter.

Thomas Hobbes' State of Nature and John Locke's State of Nature

Thomas Hobbes describes the state of nature as a state of war, in the state of nature everybody is equal and equally has the right to whatever they want on what they need for their survival. The equality here for Hobbes is that people are capable of harming their fellow human beings. It is a state of competition for power and glory. Thomas Hobbes firmly said that it is a state of war of everybody against everybody (Cottingham, 2008).

Though in the state of nature man is all free and he can do what he wants, yet this liberty can be harmful to other people because of no government to keep them in awe and no fear of punishment (Browne).

John Locke's state of nature is a state of perfect freedom, a state of equality where there is no superior and born with the same privileges and under with no authority. This state of nature is a state of liberty, enjoyment of freedom, and independence and subjected to any political power without his consent (Minton, 2008).

The state of nature, although a state wherein there was no civil authority or government to punish people for committing bad or causing harm to their neighbor, yet is not state without morality. This state of nature is pre-political but not pre-moral (Elahi).

The reason why man lived in peace is because of the law of nature. The law of nature teaches mankind the concept of what is good and what is right. Gives an idea of what is just and unjust.

The difference between Thomas Hobbes' and John Locke's concept of the state of nature is that for Hobbes' the state of nature is a state of war for the reason that man is egoistic by nature. For Locke, the reason why man lived peacefully in the state of nature is that man is governed by the law of nature and also because man is good by nature.

Thomas Hobbes' Absolute Monarchy and John Locke's Majoritarian Form of Commonwealth

Thomas Hobbes elaborates the three kinds of the commonwealth: the monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy. The difference between these three kinds of the commonwealth is not in the difference of power but in the difference of the convenience, the aptitude to produce peace, order, and security; the people in the three forms of government share the same rights and privileges; the only thing is the capability of the government to protect the people from harm and danger. Thomas Hobbes' monarchy is the best form of government for according to him a kingdom divided in itself and cannot stand. The commonwealth can use its sword to protect and secure the security and welfare of the individual in the community (Hobbes, 1950).

Thomas Hobbes posits absolute sovereignty, a man with absolute power, the combined power of legislative, executive, and judicial power. His power is no limit, he cannot be accused, he cannot be punished, he is the judge of what he thinks is necessary for peace and harmony, he is the supreme judge, and he is the law and the commander in chief (Hobbes, 1950).

Hobbes' main purpose in his absolute monarchy is to have a peaceful society and to create a firm and strong government. For him, a weak government cannot provide a long-lasting defense and cannot maintain peace and order (Mourtiz, 2010).

John Locke's form of government is that the people are the sovereign. He posits the rule of the majority. The people are the source of power and authority. The people form one body politic and act as one body, the majority gives the power to the legislative and appoints enforcer to impose the law, and the majority has the right to give power and to employ officials and also has the power to take it back if the authority does not meet the need of the people (Stewart et al., 2010).

John Locke's extent of the legislative power puts the supreme power in the legislative; he can make edicts that have the force of law and create obligations as a law does unless the majority has been permitted to do this. The legislature does not have arbitrary power over the lives and property of the people. The legislative power is the combined

power by the individual in the community. John Locke divided the power into two: the legislative and the executive power. The legislature has the supreme power that has the power to direct how the force of the commonwealth shall be employed for preserving the lives of the individual members. The executive power has the power to enforce and execute the law (Locke, 1689).

For John Locke, majoritarian rule is the only possibility for unified action. The one body government with the power to act and move as one is the best way to form a strong and powerful government (Smith & Grene, 1957).

Hence, Thomas Hobbes and John Locke differ in the idea of forming a good and strong government. Hobbes advocates an absolute monarchy ruler with absolute authority and power. Meanwhile, John Locke prefers the majoritarian form of government as the only way to make a strong government.

Summary

Hobbes and Locke both supported Social Contract Theory, that is, they held that the authority of the government to rule over us, as subjects or as citizens, is that we agree to empower it because it is in our best interest as individuals to do so. To gain the various benefits of living within a stable society, we agree to curtail our behavior in certain ways as dictated by the explicit terms of our agreement to ensure the stability of society and the integrity of the contract.

The dissimilarities of Hobbes' and Locke's political views begin with their different accounts of the state of nature. Locke did not hold as pessimistic a view of human nature as Hobbes. According to Locke, humanity is decent with only a few exceptions, in contrast to Hobbes who believed that humanity is egoistic.

Hobbes and Locke held similar positive views in entering into a commonwealth that is for protection against intruders and those who attempt to harm the property or person.

According to Hobbes, nature made man equal in faculty body, thinking, and reason, though we found some are stronger, wiser, and more learned than the others yet, even the weakest can kill the strongest (Pojman, 1996). Thomas Hobbes describes the

state of nature as a state of war “everyman against everybody” that there is no manifestation of equal distribution of goods or a man contended by his share. That if two men love the same thing and they cannot enjoy it, both they will become enemies and try to destroy one another. He said that if man possesses a convenient seat, having a good life, authority, and property others may probably come to unite with force and try to deprive him not only the fruit of his labor but also his life or liberty (Pojman, 1996).

He presented some reasons why men invade: First for gain, second for safety, and lastly for reputation. Hence in this time without a common power to keep them in awe the state of nature is in the state of war “every man against every man” (Stephen, 1961, p. 185).

There is no law when there is no commonwealth; when there is no law in the state of nature, there is no application of justice. The idea of just and unjust only exists in the perimeter of law. When there is no government, there is no common power to fear. They can do what they want if there is no place of right and wrong, justice and injustice (Pojman, 1996).

The only thing to have a standard morality and law is to form a single body government or to create a contract. The reason that pushes man to form a single body government is the necessity for survival and seeking peace, to have a common power to keep them in awe, and the power to fear and punish the offender. To make a contract is the solution to solve the horrible problem of the state of nature according to Hobbes.

Meanwhile, Locke is more optimistic of his view in the state of nature of Thomas Hobbes as a state of war “everybody against every man”. Locke sees the state of nature as inferior due to the lack of unity, common power who rule, and standard law for all. For Hobbes, government exists through a social contract in which the individual agrees to be bound by a single ruler, by the common law which represents the will of the people. For Locke, the government loses its legitimacy if it fails to represent the will of the people. Locke cites one of the best examples that social contract exists is that we remain in the country, living under common laws and receiving benefits from the country for security and peace for instance (Pojman, 1996).

For Locke, just like Hobbes, man is free by nature, equal and independent and no one can put out of his estate without his consent (Minton, 2008). For Locke, government comes into existence when men come to unite, join, and consented to form one body government, act as one body and one will. Every member of the community should be aware and must be understood to give up some of their rights and will to unite and form a single body government In exchange for protection and security (Stewart et al., 2010).

Findings

Hobbes’ political theory in the first place involves the acceptance of the law of nature, a nature that strengthens political and human rights, a tool for peace and harmony. Law of nature is a law laid down by nature, a product of human nature, and a law that is common to all and covered by the right reason. Thomas Hobbes posits that the ideal government is an absolute monarchy, ruled by the absolute king or ruler. The source of all power and authority, the mortal god, his power can never be fortified, his word is absolute. Morality and immorality are just his commands. The ruler invested with the fullest power of legislative, judicature, and military command. The law means the command of the sovereign or the leviathan (mortal god) and whatever he commands is therefore law. The sword of justice belongs to him. The leviathan has to protect the people against foreign enemies as well as to protect each man against his neighbor. Locke starts his political theory in the account of the state of nature. Locke maintains that before there are any states to make statues men are aware of a natural law, which teaches that all men are equal and independent and that no one ought to harm one another in his life, health and liberty. A human possesses natural rights, particularly the right of life, self-defense, and freedom. They also have duties, in particular, the duty not to give away their rights. Locke believed that there was a natural right not just to acquire, but also to inherit private property.

Conclusion

People only focused on the differences between Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, such as the differences in the state of nature. Locke’s idea of

the state of nature is good and pleasant. For him, the state of nature is the state of pre-government but not pre-moral. Locke sees the state of nature as inferior due to a lack of governance and lack of stable laws and regulations.

The only thing that pushes man to enter into a contract is the preservation of property. On the one hand, Hobbes' idea of the state of nature is chaotic and disorder. He stated in his book the Leviathan that, in the state of nature, there is no society; and which is worst of all, continual fear and danger of violent death. He added that man's life in the state of nature is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short. Also, Locke is unwilling to accept Hobbes' views of human nature as egoistic beings and Hobbes' absolute form of government.

On the other hand, when someone speaks of a sovereign in Hobbes' language, it speaks of a ruler or rather a king. For him, the king has absolute authority; his decision is irrevocable and cannot be challenged. Hobbes was driven to the conclusion that we should choose for tyranny if necessary. On the one hand, Locke was able to defend a more moderate political system. Recall Locke's belief that it is impermissible to violate other basic human rights, so then it is impermissible for us to enter into contact with a tyrannical government because this would be to do something that results in failing to observe our rights. Thus, it is impermissible to enter a Hobbesian kind of government. But another way, although it is true for Locke that we enter into commonwealths for the benefits obtained, it is also true that people are better off living in the state of nature, than agreeing to make themselves slaves of the state.

For Locke, people are the source of power and the soul of government. In contrast to Hobbes' idea that people have no right to revolt against the government or king; for Locke, people have the right to revolt and withdraw their support to the government if the government failed to fulfill and support the needs of citizens and if the government became a tyrant. He says that legislation is given through trust and once that trust is violated the people can overthrow the government. Meanwhile, Hobbes and Locke hold some similar views, such as both of them agree that social contract is the remedy for the horrible condition in the state of nature. The social contract

raised the purpose of peace and self-preservation. We give up some of our rights and liberty to the state in return for impartial justice and protection from the harm of neighbors.

The social contract is made for the conservation and protection of property. And, when one speaks of property in Locke's language, it speaks of the human body, state, freedom, and life.

References

- Aldrich, R. *John Locke*. UNESCO. 1999.
- Browne, Kevin J. *Introduction to the Social Contract Theory*. <https://www2.econ.iastate.edu/classes/econ362/hallam/Readings/SocialContractHelium.pdf>
- Castell, Alburey. *An Introduction to Modern Philosophy in Seven Philosophical Problems*. Macmillan Company, 1963.
- Charles, M. *John Locke & Thomas Hobbes: Social Contract Theory, Its Roots in Natural Law and Effect on the U.S. Public Administration*. 2012.
- Copper, David E., and Peter S. Fosl. *Philosophy: The Classic Readings*. Wiley Blackwell, 2010.
- Cortez, Felipe. *John Locke: A Teacher's Guide*. Center for History Teaching and Learning, 2009.
- Cottingham, John. *Western Philosophy: An Anthology*. Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- Elahi, Manzoor. *What is Social Contract Theory?*, http://www.sophia-project.org/uploads/1/3/9/5/13955288/elahi_socialcontract.pdf
- Gert, Bernard. *Hobbes: Prince of Peace*. Polity Press, 2010.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Dutton, 1950.
- Hood, Francis Campbell. *The Divine Politics of Thomas Hobbes: An Interpretation of Leviathan*. Clarendon Press, 1964.
- Kleinman, Paul. *Philosophy of 101: From Plato and Socrates to Ethics and Metaphysics, An Essential Primer on the History of Thought (Adams 101)*. Adams Media, 2013.
- Laslett, Peter. *John Locke Two Treatise of Civil Government*. Cambridge University Press, 1988.

- Locke, John. *Second Treatise of Civil Government*. 1689, <https://english.hku.hk/staff/kjohnson/PDF/LockeJohnSECONDTREATISE1690.pdf>
- Locke, John. *Second Treatise of Civil Government*. Edited by C.B. Macpherson, Hackett Publishing Company, 1980.
- Mabahague, E.R. *Philippine History Pre-Colonial Period*.
- Minton, Arthur J. *Philosophy Paradox and Discovery*. McGraw-Hill, 2008.
- Mourtiz, Thomas. "Comparing the Social Contracts of Hobbes and Locke." *The Western Australian Jurist*, vol. 1, 2010, pp. 123-127.
- Papadis, Dimitris. "Is Man by Nature a Political and Good Animal, According to Aristotle?" *Phronimon*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2006, pp. 21-33.
- Pojman, Louis P. *Philosophy: The Quest for Truth*. Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1996.
- Robinson, Dave, and Judy Groves. *Introducing Political Philosophy A Graphic Guide*. Icon Books, 2012.
- Rudbeck, Jens. *Social Contract Theory and the Historical Origin of the Social Movement*. 2012, <http://politicsandprotest.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2012/07/Rudbeck-Historical-Origin-of-the-Social-Movement.pdf>
- Rusling, Louise. *Introduction to the Social Contract Theory*. <https://www2.econ.iastate.edu/classes/econ362/hallam/Readings/SocialContractHelium.pdf#page=4>
- Saetra, Henrik. "The State of No Nature - Thomas Hobbes and the Natural World." *Journal of International Scientific Publications: Ecology and Safety*, vol. 8, 2014, pp. 177-193.
- Smith, Thomas Vernor, and Marjorie Grene. *Philosopher Speak for Themselves: From Descartes to John Locke*. University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Sotard, Michel. "Jean-Jacques Rousseau." *Prospects Journal*, vol. 24, 1999.
- Steele, Dean Allen. *A Comparison of Hobbes and Locke on Natural Law and Social Contract*. The University of Texas, 1993.
- Stephen, Leslie. *Hobbes*. University of Michigan Press, 1961.
- Stewart, David, et al. *Fundamentals of Philosophy*. Prentice Hall, 2010.
- Stumpf, Samuel Enoch, and James Fieser. *Philosophy: History and Problems*. McGraw-Hill, 2003.
- Stumpf, Samuel Enoch, and James Fieser. *Socrates to Sartre and beyond: A History of Philosophy*. McGraw-Hill, 2007.
- "Thomas Hobbes." *Britannica*, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Thomas-Hobbes>
- "Thomas Hobbes: Moral and Political Philosophy." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://iep.utm.edu/hobmoral>
- Tuckness, Alex. "Locke's Political Philosophy." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/locke-political/>.
- Turner, William. *History of Philosophy*. Forgotten Books, 2016.

Author Details

John Michael V Sasan, PAU Excellencia Global Academy Foundation, Phillippines,
Email ID: Johnmichaelsasan27@gmail.com