

HOBES'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Lulzim Vrapca

South East European University, Contemporary Social Science, Pristine, Kosovo
vrapcalulzim@gmail.com

Abstract: Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) was an English philosopher. He is known as the father of modern political philosophy. His work *Leviathan* represents the first theory of the modern state and is the most complete expression of Hobbes's philosophy. Hobbes builds his theory on the state "not starting from a historical point of support, but from the superiority of logic and analysis" (Stumpf, 2020, p. 223). So, he tries to find the cause of the creation of the civil society and through this to arrive at the explanation of the cause of the creation of the state. In this context, Hobbes described the natural state as "the war of all against all", while he understood the social contract as an agreement, through which people avoided primitivism (the monetary state) and entered the civilized society. Based on the analysis of Hobbes's views, this publication aims to elaborate the concept and definition of the state of nature, the exit from the state of nature and the social contract.

Keywords: Political philosophy, natural state, social contract, modern state, individualism.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the 17th century, political philosophy took an important turn the thought of Thomas Hobbes, a thinker who marked a new era in the understanding of the structure of society and the state. Hobbes, known as one of the founders of modern political philosophy, offers a unique perspective on the organization of society and the creation of the state. In his most famous work, *Leviathan* (according to biblical or talmudic sources, *Leviathan* is described as a sea monster or a snake. For Christians, *Leviathan* is called a demon like Satan or the Devil, a representative of the forces of chaos. Today, this term is used to denote a sea monster, the largest fish that can prevent the big fish from devouring the small fish), presents a deep analysis of human nature and how individuals move from a chaotic and uncertain state in an organized and stabilized social order. Starting from his concepts of the "war of all against all" and the social contract, Hobbes aims to illuminate how people, through the agreements they made, managed to create a system of government that puts an end to natural chaos and it provides stability and order. This publication aims to examine these ideas in more detail and to reveal their importance for the development of political and social thought. Consequently, this analysis of Hobbes, built on the principle of the superiority of logic and analysis over historical evidence, offers a new framework for understanding how individuals help create the state and the rules that keep it stable. By examining these ideas, this publication aims to provide an in-depth look at the concepts of the state of nature and the social contract, and reveal their influence on political theory and the development of modern institutions. The analysis of these concepts will help in understanding the founding of modern states and in reflecting on the different modes of governance that have been created to balance individual and collective interests in society. The challenges of the state of nature according to Hobbes included uncertainty and fear, lack of rules and laws, conflict and war, lack of solidarity, difficulties for survival and peace, and the lack of a central authority. These are facts as to why Hobbes argues that individuals must enter into a social contract to create a state and ensure order and security. Through a centralized and powerful authority, individuals manage to avoid these problems and build a more organized and stable society.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in the analysis of Thomas Hobbes's theories includes a combination of conceptual and theoretical analysis, historical and critical approach, and logical and argumentative method. In this analysis, an in-depth approach is used to interpret and understand Hobbes's concepts, such as the state of nature and the social contract, placing this in the context of the historical period and the philosophical influences of the time. Analysis of Hobbes's original texts, such as *Leviathan*, is combined with comparison of his ideas with other philosophical theories to build strong arguments and assess the influence and coherence of his theories in modern political philosophy.

3. RESULTS

Overall, the results of this analysis contribute to a deeper understanding of how Hobbes's theories have helped shape today's ideas about the state and society and provide a basis for further reflection and analysis of political philosophy and governance structures. Consequently, thanks to the analysis of the theories of Thomas Hobbes, the results of this analysis reflect a deep understanding of the concept of the state of nature and the social contract, helping to shape

the understanding of the structure and function of the modern state. The main results of this publication are presented as an examination of the concept of the state of nature, the definition of the social contract, the importance of authority and the state and the influence on modern political philosophy, which are subject to the understanding and criticism of different ways of governance and organization of society in the context of later political theories.

4. DISCUSSION

Hobbes describes the natural state based on the principle of equality by nature of people. This is the first definition that Hobbes makes clear at the beginning of his elaboration on the state of nature. His work *Leviathan* specifically elaborates on the natural state of humanity, trying to find the principles of a new agreement and the transition from the natural state to the social state. Among other things, Hobbes in *Leviathan* mentions that "the feelings that drive men to peace are the fear of death, the desire for things that are necessary for a comfortable life, and the hope of securing them by one's own work. But reason suggests peace clauses, which lead them to agreement" (Hobbes, 2000, p.80). Hobbes calls this conception the law of nature.

Hobbes defines the natural state not as a long-standing state that would precede the history of political society, but as a state where there is no central political power, where there are no laws and courts to punish crimes and mistakes. As a result, Hobbes thinks, man in the state of nature is weak, because the depraved actions of men do not take the right direction of judgment. This is because, when in the natural state there are no common norms and laws, human rights are defined by their strength (Scruton, 2018, p.206).

First of all, Hobbes's two expressions, "the war of all against all" and "man to man is a wolf", best reflect his view on the natural state of people. Based on the state of nature, rights cannot be imposed, because Hobbes understood how fragile human concepts of justice are when they are not supported by material power. Therefore, we have the war of all against all. According to him, this thing will continue to exist, until an agreement is reached between people, which would determine the imposition of the right, where the right would not be identified with power.

Exactly, in the natural state, says Hobbes, "right reason works, because to reason means to calculate, while people calculate to satisfy their desires" (Gyshe, 2005, p.322). In the natural state, man is devoted to his own self, and even if it is something contrary to others, it is an individual desire that no one can stop, because there is no imposition from above. From this point of departure, Hobbes makes it clear that the natural state is a state without law and everyone in this state tries to achieve their goals, even if these goals are harmful to others.

One of the researchers of Hobbes's political theory, Leo Strauss, points out that "the Hobbesian man is politically hedonistic, where Hobbes is not interested in the generalization of human ethics" (Sparks, Isacs, 2004, p.76). His discussion of human nature leads to a self-defense of man, whose primary goal is his survival in this circle. Hobbes describes the nature of man only in individual terms, which does not tend towards a general will of his attitudes and thoughts. Wanting Hobbes to invent modern man, he does not mention the common judgmental morality of human nature. So, the individualism that Hobbes described was the basis of a society (Sparks, Isacs, 2004, p. 89). Hobbes defines the state without power as that which only enables the development of a war between people. In order to achieve the distribution of goods and the fair judgment of people, the existence of power is necessary. Regarding this, he affirms that "as long as people live without a power to keep them under control, their condition is what is called war, and this is the war of all against all. Because the war is not only the battle or the act of the match, but a period of time in which the will to fight in battles is expressed" (Hobbes, 2018, p. 78). This implies that the state of nature, according to Hobbes, is not an enviable state, but one that causes trouble among people.

It should be mentioned that "in the state of nature there is no property, justice or injustice, but, according to Hobbes, there is only war, and force and deception are in war as the two most important virtues" (Rassel, 2005, p. 97). Man in this state wants to preserve his freedom and dominate others, that is, not only to survive, but in some cases to dominate. It is this kind of individualism that leads to war or conflict, which is a consequence of the lack of power, where people in their natural state do not have the imposition of rights and obligations from above.

The description of the natural state, starting from the nature that everyone has the right to everything, manages to pass to other stages of withdrawal from this state, because as noted the natural state causes effects that are not desirable for man as a human being. This is because the very nature of man is such that it is connected with many personal virtues, and that in the natural state leaves no room for something common. In this way, the essence of the natural state is the limitlessness of people in action, doing what they want, which is driven by passion and human nature.

In the natural state, man is influenced by various elements. According to Hobbes, "in human nature we find three main causes of strife: rivalry, mistrust and thirst for glory" (Hobbes, 2018, p. 96). So, the man in this condition is endowed with the character of an egoist, and not only that, but he tends to the worst thing, domination over others. As a result of this, the war of all against all becomes inevitable, considering that in this midst of actions the bad vices of man are not removed, which lead to the formulation made by Hobbes, that man for man is wolf.

In this regard, Hobbes states that “the first induces men to attack for profit; the second for safety and the third for fame. In the first case, people use violence to become masters of other people’s subjects, women, children and cattle; in the second case to protect them; and in the third case, they use violence for insinuations, such as a word, a smile, a different opinion, and any other sign that despises their person, either directly, or indirectly to their relatives” (Hobbes, 2018, p. 108). From this we observe that man is not satisfied with his efforts, if they were rational. So, not being satisfied even with subduing others in order to feel secure, man is seized with the desire to increase his own power by attacking. In fact, satisfaction increases if the power they possess acts in the attack of others, and this really shows the natural state of people (Kullashi, 2005, p. 105-108).

In Hobbes's state of nature every man has the right to self-defense and absolute freedom to do things as he pleases. Although man was free from rules, laws and institutions, he received the right to do harm, which, according to Hobbes, brought about the war of all against all. This made "man's desires and other passions for himself to be insurmountable" (Sparks, Isacs, 2004, p. 76). Based on this, we understand that Hobbes defines man as selfish, who does not consider the interests of others and as a man who has given up the use of reason.

So in the natural state there is no power that would impose the right, then in this state the right of man is defined by his strength that he has. In the meantime, when everyone is equal and when there is no authority to judge people fairly, then conflict arises from this. Hobbes mentions that "if two men wish to be one thing, but cannot enjoy it both they and the other, they fight and enemies to achieve their goal, those others have nothing to do with each other" (Rossen, Wolff, 2007, p. 21). For this reason, man in the state of nature was not bound to a matter, which will make a different principled solution to matters. In view of this man was free in his actions, aiming at the best, without the will of others.

The natural state according to Hobbes, is describes as state that man did not have and what man can acquire and preserve in this state, then it also belongs to him. Otherwise, their possession becomes an object of war, that people come into conflict with each other. It is understood in such a war that it is not fair, but it is not what drives the human rights unit. As a result, the notion of its products has its own value, because it is not in this state that everyone aims to get what seems necessary for themselves, which also shows the equality between people, but which according to Hobbes has "from equality comes distrust, while from distrust comes war" (Hobbes, 2018, p. 107), in which case they are connected to each other.

THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL CONTRACT

When the state of nature is described as a selfish state of people, when people do their best to get what they want and when they are enemies with each other, then the necessity of getting out of the state of nature appears. Getting out of this situation enables the establishment of authority among people, where there would be an imposition of law. Hobbes points out that people with reason are able to understand the value that must have coordination of their actions, to reach a general rule.

As a result, he explains that man has the possibility to get out of the natural state, using partly passions and partly reason. In particular, reasons according to Hobbes are those that build a favorable agreement on which people can rely to achieve peace. Hobbes thought that "if the social environment is ordered and reasonable in one, then the human being will try to take care of himself more" (Sparks, Isacs, 2004, p. 88). From this appears a radical conflict between the nature of man and the social environment, knowing that between them there is no compatibility of individual attributes with collective ones, which would make the exit from this state.

The search for peace among people is seen as the main pillar of the possibility of getting out of this situation. Hobbes explains that if in the natural state people want to live, then some rules must be followed on the basis of which they would enable this. For this reason, the first law of nature is that each person must "seek peace and pursue it" (Stumpf, 2020, p. 230). This is in the interest of all people and if they would like to live, then they should seek peace. From the fundamental law of nature derives the second law, which says: "everyone, if others are for it, should be ready to give up the right to do anything, to the extent that this is necessary for peace and self-defense" (Stumpf, 2020, p. 231) The agreement for peace, as Hobbes calls it, constitutes the binding of a contract between people, where there would be a common harmony for the rules that would be determined later.

From this agreement between people, it would result that a power is necessary. This is because, even if people in the natural state act in accordance with the laws of nature, they will still only disregard this if they want to, trying to cause harm to others. The way out of this natural state is when, by reaching an agreement, an authority would be accepted that would regulate various issues between them. Hobbes tried with such an agreement to delegate power to a man or even an assembly that would take responsibility for people's personality. So that, then, everyone is responsible for their actions and to account for the actions taken (Ory, 2008, p. 25-30).

This enables "the conflicting diversity of the state of nature to be turned into a single being, through the complete fusion of individuals" (Ory, 2008, p. 26). Therefore, according to Hobbes, man must submit to everything the sovereign. For this reason, the exit from the natural state is accompanied by a series of transformations, but the most

important is the delegation of responsibility for the conclusion of an agreement, where the person would respond in case of causing damage to others and that would be saved from conflicts among people.

The peculiarity of this, which Hobbes explains, is that people conclude this type of contract between themselves, while in no way do they conclude a contract with a third party. While the terms of this contract are those that each hand over to Leviathan the power, which they exercised under dangerous conditions in the natural state. So, to escape the natural state, people must find a way to cooperate and obey the governing power (Gyshe, 2005, p.325). Their political power would end, in which case man does not have the right to everything, to act as he would like.

This contract would create a stable society based on a kind of agreement between people, whereby they (the people) must accept certain rules to govern their relations with each other, with the aim of serving the good. theirs. Hobbes finds the escape from evil only in the union of people in communities, where each subject is subject to the central authority. Hobbes calls this agreement, in which every citizen is a party, a social contract.

Hobbes's social contract means the purpose of the state, where people for their conflicts, for the right judgment, and many other issues, would turn to the state, which would have the final say in this aspect. This contract that establishes political institutions makes possible the transition from the natural state to the social state. Hobbes, unlike Locke and Rousseau, does not conceive of the contract as an agreement between citizens and political power, but only between citizens. As a result, the citizen would have to agree to every decision made by the sovereign, and "this proves that there is no right to rebel, since the ruler is not bound by any contract, while the subjects are". (Russell, 2005, p. 89).

In this situation benefits the sovereign who remains inviolable and is not bound by any principle that would make him dependent in relation to the citizens. This shows that Hobbes does not weaken political power, on the contrary, it strengthens it, giving it very great rights. Hobbes, "understood the contract as the best peace, but that each one has abandoned his natural and absolute tax that he had and passed it to the sovereign, until the passing of this tax has been complete" (Pitkin, 2020, p.42). Hobbes did not accept compromise, and insisted that if men had preserved any of their natural liberty, then the state of natural war between them would still continue. This compromise would later be accepted by Locke, who would call it only part of the natural law, which is in complete contradiction to Hobbes.

The power of the sovereign, according to Hobbes, is unlimited, regardless of whether the power belongs only to one person or to an assembly that is called sovereign. He liked the monarchy, in which case "he thought that everything for which the monarchy was criticized, exists in other forms of the state, even more" (Sparks, Isacs, 2004, p. 120-121). Prioritizing monarchy, Hobbes elaborates the public interest as a function of the sovereign's self-interest, explaining that any wealth of the sovereign comes from the public interest, where the sovereign would enjoy strength, fame and wealth from their subjects. Based on the initial contract that Hobbes thought, it can be concluded that individuals could not address their criticisms of various issues to the sovereign, because he was not a party to this contract.

Thus, man from an individual being begins to socialize and sees himself within a society, which has political institutions, which make the general social regulation, even though the sovereign was not a party to the contract. The influence of the people in the system as described by Hobbes ends with the first election of a sovereign, after the people have agreed to the contract between themselves. But what will the sovereign do for his citizens? Hobbes defines the duties of the sovereign towards his citizens in three points as the most important. First, that the sovereign must bring security to his citizens, which was the only reason the state was created. Second, it has the duty to ensure an innocent freedom, in the sense that this freedom does not harm the peace. And third, it must guarantee its citizens equality before the law and public taxes (Chevallier, Gucher, 2006, p. 70-74). However, "whatever the sovereign does, he cannot be punished by the subjects, because any violation of state authority is equivalent to civil war, and people are protected from this danger" (Hobbes, 2018, p. 113). Such a definition makes it clear that Hobbes wrapped the sovereign with the unlimited power of the state, which underlined that the sovereign cannot be limited by the laws he has made himself. Indeed, Leviathan "is an authority composed of the will of man, where, for some reason, he decides to give consent to the creation of a powerful sovereign, in exchange for an existing peace among men." (Urbinati, 2021, p. 139). For Hobbes, the sovereign was an absolute institution, where subjects only follow the sovereign's command.

The concept of the social contract according to Hobbes contains the intention that political institutions are the result of the free agreement of individuals, where the individual accepts the idea of having an authority which would exercise the imposition of law. In this way, the people would be restrained in limiting their actions and not allowing them to do what they want, otherwise they would be punished by the sovereign power. The power that the sovereign would enjoy, he had to justify with his obligation to protect all citizens. Consequently, the sovereign's main interest consists in maintaining internal peace, where he will not use the power of censorship to suppress the truth. Therefore, according to Hobbes, the sovereign was an instance for the resolution of issues between people and that he did not owe to anyone else but himself.

Hobbes states that "the ultimate end for which men impose on themselves those limits within which they are obliged to live in a state, is to care for the preservation of life, as well as for a more satisfactory living" (Hobbes, 2018, p. 106). So, the state is founded on the basis of a will derived from the people as a necessity for equal treatment and sharing of rights. Thus, the main goal of Hobbes's state is the security of everyone, which the sovereign takes as his duty, based on the laws he himself approves.

In order to have everyone's safety, he mentions that power and strength are needed, where he asserts that "agreements without the sword are just words that have no power to guarantee a person's safety. And regardless of natural laws, in conditions where there is no elevated power, everyone can rely on their own ability to provide against all other people" (Hobbes, 2018, p. 107). Thus, political institutions are clothed with power, and this power is identified with force. With this, it is possible to impose the right, where the political power interprets the laws of the sovereign. On the other hand, Hobbes illustrates as possible the fact when the sovereign cannot exercise power because of his abilities.

In this way, the sovereign is the only legislator who makes and repeals laws. However, the sovereign respects the law that he issued himself, as long as he has not abolished it. In this respect, his absolute power is not arbitrary power. This means that the state is protected by the absolute principle and the full exercise of all taxes by the sovereign. Whereas, the sovereign's rights are the means through which he exercises his duty, where according to Hobbes, whoever gives up the means, gives up the goals (Sparks, Isacs, 2004, p. 120-121). He explains that the state is destroyed by the lack of authority, which is a very important foundation of the social contract, because the state bodies are stripped of their authority.

The state, according to Hobbes, is based on laws, which describe in detail the prior obligations that the citizen has towards the state. By civil laws he meant "the laws that people are obliged to adhere to, not because they are members of this or that state in particular, but as members of a state in general. Whereas, special laws are to be known by those who study the laws of their different countries, while civil law in general should be known by everyone" (Hobbes, 2018, p. 107). Undoubtedly, the importance that Hobbes attaches to laws is also observed in his work, because he explains in detail how the law is interpreted, which, according to him, depends on the sovereign power (Tuck, 2021, p. 19).

In *Leviathan*, Hobbes also questions the power of the sovereign, because in this way everyone considers himself a judge, then people return to the previous state of nature, where there was no law and order. So, uniform actions fall into a state that does not coincide with the social state, but which have elements of a previous state, which are created as a result of disobedience to the law that the sovereign creates. For this reason, a way to cooperate must be found. Cooperation is the basis of the social contract. However, according to Hobbes, for this to happen, two things must be fulfilled. "First, people must be able to work together without fear of violence, theft or infidelity. And second, people must be able to trust each other to keep their agreements" (Sparks, Isacs, 2004, p. 80). This is a consequence of the contract, because the only interpreter of natural law is the political power. This is because, says Hobbes, the sovereign makes the laws, which everyone must adhere to, without discussing whether a law or decision is right or not.

Among other things, Hobbes makes a distinction between right and wrong, making us understand that no law can be unjust, which means that it cannot be against right. Thus, the law may not be impartial, it may be against natural law, that is, not to conform to those rational rules that Hobbes calls the laws of nature, and therefore the law may be bad, but by no means it cannot be unfair. According to Hobbes, law does not have and cannot have but one source, which is the state, and by this was meant the sovereign power. Hobbes claimed that in primitivism (the natural or monetary state) people knew natural laws and in a way applied them. However, according to him, only after the establishment of the sovereign, a legal rule can exist, because only then is the legal apparatus created, which acts with a binding power in the implementation of laws (Stumpf, 2020, p. 224-225). This meant that the right must always be enforced by the body that has the authority to impose the right.

The power of the sovereign, Hobbes saw as unstoppable, where the sovereign had the absolute right to govern and the citizens always submit to him. He explains that in order to transform the will of many into one, it must be understood that the will and judgment of a single sovereign represents the will and judgment of all citizens. This is what Hobbes calls an agreement, when people agree to surrender the right to govern themselves. While the resistance of the citizens against the sovereign, Hobbes sees it as illogical in two ways: "first, because this is counted as a resistance to oneself. And secondly, to resist means to return to independent judgment, which leads to the return of primitivism or anarchy" (Stumpf, 2020, p. 229) By this we understand that the power that Hobbes gave to the sovereign is absolute, in order to ensure order, peace and law.

In general, Hobbes' social contract is understood as a harmony of all citizens for a surrender of their natural liberties to the sovereign. Hobbes also asks the question that "if the instance of political power is not an authority that must define what is right and what is wrong, then who can be the legitimate interpreter of natural law" (Kullashi, 2005, p .

219). And according to him, it was only the sovereign and no one else. These elements of this nature distinguish the natural state from the social state, where man behaves according to this contract.

The definition of the natural state, the characteristics of this state, the exit from the natural state, the idea of the social contract and the sovereign, were objects of elaboration that were elaborated in this chapter. It should be mentioned that within the social contract of Hobbes, a special importance has been given to civil laws, through which Hobbes brings the sovereign with absolute power. Even, according to him, the doctrine of the personality of the state cannot exist except through the sovereign, because this is a personality that is desired for others. Definitively, Hobbes justifies the state as the only organism, which can fulfill the interest of individuals, through an unlimited state power.

5. CONCLUSIONS

From this analysis it emerges that for Hobbes, the sovereign is the supreme and unlimited authority that preserves society from the chaos and conflict of the natural state. It represents a form of absolute power, designed to maintain order and security, and to end the war of all against all. In this arrangement, individuals give up their natural freedom and transfer it to the sovereign in exchange for protection and stability. Hobbes emphasizes that the sovereign, whether an individual or an assembly, has the necessary power to impose laws and ensure their implementation. He is inviolable and is not bound by the laws he himself has created, making it impossible for him to stand before any form of direct responsibility to the citizens. This absolute authority gives the sovereign the power to maintain order and ensure that individuals follow certain rules. For Hobbes, this social contract is essential to the creation of a stable society, where each individual is protected from violence and has the opportunity to pursue his own interests without fear of permanent conflict. Any attempt to challenge the sovereign is forbidden and would lead to chaos and a return to the natural state.

Through *Leviathan*, Hobbes presents a vision of a political order where stability and security are guaranteed through a powerful and unlimited authority. This model of absolute sovereignty is a response to the consequences of the natural state and aims to create a stable and fair structure for all individuals, eliminating conflicts and promoting harmony and cooperation in society. Hobbes has had a profound influence on modern political philosophy. One of his main contributions is the development of the concept of sovereignty and the role of a powerful government in maintaining order and stability. He argued that individuals, to avoid anarchy and violence, must create a social contract that gives power to a centralized and unlimited authority. This concept of the social contract has become one of the foundations of political philosophy, helping to shape ideas about the relationship between individuals and the state.

In addition, Hobbes helped define human nature and morality. He believed that people are motivated primarily by self-interest and fear, and that human nature is imbued with the desire for self-preservation. This approach has stimulated debate and reflection on the morality and motives of human actions in the context of society and the state. Hobbes also presented a rational and rationalizing approach to politics, arguing that strong government is necessary to maintain order and prevent chaos. This attitude has contributed to the development of theories on power and authority. However, his ideas have also influenced the criticism of authoritarianism and the definition of freedom and individual rights in democratic systems. In this way, Hobbes' influence is manifoldly felt in modern political philosophy, providing foundations for the understanding and discussion of power, morality and social relations.

REFERENCES

- Gyshe, Iv, (2005). *The History of Political Ideas (I)* – JSTOR Publish;
- Hobbes, Thomas, (2018). *Leviatani*, Toena Publish.
- Kullashi, Muhamedin, (2005). *Modern Political Thought*, Dukagjini Publish.
- Ory, Pascal, (2008). *History of Political Ideas*, Routledge;
- Rassell, Bertrand, (2005). *History of Western Philosophy – Modern Philosophy*, Routledge Publish;
- Rosen, M, & dhe Wolff, J, (2007). *Political Thought*, JSTOR Publish.
- Scruton, Roger, (2020). *Short History of Modern Philosophy - from Descartes to Wittgenstein*, Publish;
- Sparks, Ch, dhe Isaacs, S, (2004). *Political Theorists in Context*, London.
- Stumpf, Samuel-Enoch, (2000). *Philosophy, History and Problems*, Routledge.
- Tuck, Richard, (2021). *Hobbes – a very short Introduction*, Oxford.
- Urbinati, Nadia, (2021). *Hobbes and the Law*, Publish Comf.
- Pitkin, Hanna, (2020). *Hobbes and Modern Political Theory*, Press Publish.
- <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hobbes-moral/>, 2024