

HUMAN NATURE, EQUALITY AND VIOLENCE: HOBBS A POLITICAL REVIEW

NATUREZA HUMANA, IGUALDADE E VIOLÊNCIA: HOBBS

UMA REVISÃO POLÍTICA

Mehmet Şirin ÇAĞMAR
Şirnak University - Turquia
E-mail: mcagmar@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT :

This article discusses the effects of the political structures that emerged with the civilization process on human nature in Hobbes. Hobbes constructs the state of nature in an area where humans can live their nature completely freely. Although this situation creates a certain area of freedom for human nature, when it comes to social relations, this freedom endangers the lives of all people. As is known, Hobbes' solution on this issue is to build political structures such as states that will benefit everyone, rather than people acting as in the state of nature. However, what I am trying to draw attention to here is whether human nature is dispensable with this transition. My main purpose in this article will be to show that even if there is a change in human position, his nature repositions itself as a fundamental determinant that in a sense manages and shapes all processes within political structures under different appearances, as in the state of nature. In the article handled for such a purpose, it is shown that human nature is no longer possible to remain in its pure form and has transformed into something that we can deal with through a political relationship. The basic view defended in this article is that with this new situation, which we can call the emergence of political nature, human nature emerges as a new force shaping the entire political field.

KEYWORDS:

Human Nature, Equality, Violence, Political Violence

RESUMO :

Este artigo discute os efeitos das estruturas políticas surgidas com o processo civilizatório sobre a natureza humana em Hobbes. Hobbes constrói o estado de natureza em uma área onde os humanos podem viver sua natureza com total liberdade. Embora esta situação crie um certo espaço de liberdade para a natureza humana, no que diz respeito às relações sociais, esta liberdade põe em perigo a vida de todas as pessoas. Como se sabe, a solução de Hobbes para esta questão é construir estruturas políticas,

como estados, que beneficiarão a todos, em vez de pessoas agirem como se estivessem no estado de natureza. No entanto, o que estou tentando chamar a atenção aqui é se a natureza humana é dispensável com esta transição. Meu principal objetivo neste artigo será mostrar que mesmo que haja uma mudança na posição humana, sua natureza se reposiciona como um determinante fundamental que, de certa forma, gerencia e molda todos os processos dentro de estruturas políticas sob diferentes aparências, como no estado de natureza. No artigo tratado para tal fim, mostra-se que a natureza humana não é mais possível permanecer em sua forma pura e se transformou em algo com o qual podemos lidar por meio de uma relação política. A visão básica defendida neste artigo é que com esta nova situação, que podemos chamar de emergência de natureza política, a natureza humana emerge como uma nova força que molda todo o campo político.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE:

Natureza Humana, Igualdade, Violência, Violência Política

Introduction

Every philosopher has been influenced by the social and political atmosphere of the period in which he lived. The same can be said for Hobbes. In this sense, when we look at the 17th century Europe, the period in which he lived, we see that many important developments took place in that period. Monarchy gained great power among European states, especially with the transfer of wealth gained through geographical discoveries to Europe and the collapse of feudal lords. Hobbes was also an important philosopher who witnessed such a period. Therefore, in his philosophy, it has always been possible to find traces of the political developments in this period, especially in discussions about human nature.

Within these political developments in that period, human nature has become an important focal point in many aspects. The reason for this is due to the discussion of whether human nature is compatible with these structures, together with the fact that all authority is gathered in a monarch in monarchical structures. If human nature is compatible, the debate is largely answered. However, if human nature is not compatible or cannot be harmonized, then a conflict will occur between human nature and political structures. This situation may bring various problems for the existing political structures, as well as endanger their sustainability and legitimacy in itself. Until that time, many philosophers attributed positive meanings to human nature and generally treated it as something that works in harmony with political structures. However, unlike these philosophers, Hobbes not only treats human nature as something with various destructive effects, but also accepts all people as equal by nature and creates a new political power that legitimizes monarchical structures with human nature from this equality. Therefore, in this article,

we will try to show whether human nature becomes the subject of violence with Hobbes in such a situation, and to what extent this subject is compatible with a political structure by turning into a political determinant.

For this reason, in our article, we will first discuss how people are equal by nature and how this equality lays the groundwork for the political arena. Then, with such a field, we will discuss the issue of whether people have moved away from their own nature in the context of political violence. Finally, we will try to show that although it has undergone a political determination in the current process, human nature actually preserves its pure state before being politicized in the political arena.

1. Dialectic of (in)equality

When it comes to human nature, we do not mean, of course, any particular individual person. We try to deal with the nature of man within the framework of a generality that can include all people. Sometimes we try to grasp human nature through a single person. However, even in this case, we still see this person as a part of other people. As a result, when it comes to the nature of a person, it should not be forgotten that it is something that other people have in common. Well, if human nature is something that everyone has in common, then all people must have equality at certain points. Otherwise, instead of human nature, we are talking about the personal characteristics of individual people.

It should be noted that in Hobbes, equality is what determines the entire political process of people, from the state of nature to the construction of a contract, in the historical process. Because, according to him, the main reason that forced people to make a contract was equality, which became so problematic that it became unlivable in the state of nature, which is the beginning of the historical process. In this sense, I would like to start this grounding of Hobbes with the following two questions that are important for our article: Is the problem due to equality? Or is it because of inequality?

Hobbes actually answered this question directly in *Leviathan* by saying because of equality. However, I think his answer is somewhat controversial when we consider his other texts. In this sense, Hobbes expresses the following words about equality in *Leviathan*:

Nature hath made men so equal, in the faculties of the body, and mind; as that though there be found one man sometimes manifestly stronger in body, or of quicker mind than another; yet when all is reckoned together, the difference between man, and man, is not so considerable, as that one man can thereupon claim to himself any benefit, to which another may not pretend, as well as he. (1998, p. 82)

This quote tells us that people are equal and that various differences cannot “break” this equality. However, Hobbes, in his other text, *The Elements of Law*, draws a different path and mentions that from the very beginning, physical and mental differences have the power to affect equality. Because, according

to him, people simply have different body structures. These body structures determine all the vital activities of the person; sometimes it prevents a person from doing something, and sometimes it makes him do it with pleasure. As a result of all this, it also shows us that the intellectual differences that people have experienced enable them to aim at different passions and appetites.(HOBBS, 1984, 10.2.) Hobbes' ideas about equality were also controversial by his younger critics. According to François Peleau, there is no equality in the state of nature that Hobbes talks about. Because equality is possible in line with the power of human nature. However, none of these faculties¹ are equal in human beings.(Letter to Hobbes of 18/28 August 1656, 1994, p. 304) In fact, John Eachard satirically expresses this situation as follows: “Men by Nature are all equal. I.e. though Roger may chance to have huge Legs, yet Dick may have the quicker eye: and though Tumbler may have a very large fist, and a great gripe, yet Tower may be in better breath, and have longer nails.”(HOEXTRA, 2013, p. 82)

Well, isn't Hobbes aware of this inequality between people? In my view, we would be oversimplifying it if we said that Hobbes was unaware of inequality. I think, of course, that Hobbes was aware of this inequality. Therefore, perhaps considering the ways in which Hobbes considers people equal will enable us to understand him better.

Equality simply involves a comparison between two things. For example, if one person is more dominant or stronger than another person, we cannot talk about equality here. However, humans are beings with various emotions. Along with these feelings, they desire to have certain things; A person may sometimes desire to have a delicious meal and sometimes to have a beautiful house where they can live comfortably. Therefore, in my opinion, we can say that the equality in Hobbes corresponds to the right in the state of nature, which we define as “everyone has the right to want everything in himself” in the classical sense.

The right in the state of nature that Hobbes talks about is something that can be dealt with by the individual desires and wishes of the person, rather than corresponding to an institutionalized social law. In this sense, when we look at the state of nature, nature has given every human being a right over everything. However, in such a case, since there is no political superstructure or institution that binds the individual, the individual has the freedom to act only according to the various abilities given by his nature.(HAMPTON, 1995, p. 25) As a result of this freedom, the individual is equal with other individuals in terms of using his freedom within the cycle that nature has presented to him.(PALLADINI, 2008, p. 57) Therefore, in Hobbes, equality is dealt with in a context that allows individuals to dominate one another as a result of their violence in a situation where there is no obligation to obey, thus allowing

¹ The faculties of human nature may be reduced unto four kinds: physical force, experience, reason, passion.(HOBBS, 2003, p. 21)

natural rulers or “tyrants” to emerge.(LLOYD, 2013, p. 216) As for inequality, according to Hobbes, people are basically equal; Although the differences are sometimes obvious, when we think in general terms, in the end, all things balance each other in humans. In other words, considering all the abilities of people together will lead us to the conclusion that they are approximately equal despite an inequality. However, in such an equal situation, one person should not be victorious over another, but what ended the state of nature was when one side among the equals prevailed in this struggle. Therefore, it is possible to say that there is an inequality arising from equality here.

2. Renunciation of one's own nature

In this struggle, Hobbes considers inequality as (not) seeing the right of individuals in the state of nature to demand something on an equal basis with other individuals like themselves. However, I prefer to deal with the (in)equality here in the context of a dynamic that will ignite the conflict in one's own nature, rather than in the framework of the comparison between two individuals in the classical sense. Because, in my opinion, the origin of inequality is a result of the tension created by the internal dynamics of one's own nature in the social sphere. Therefore, I would like to start this conflict first of all with a discussion about whether one can live in accordance with one's own nature.

Hobbes, like other social contract theorists, starts the conflict on this issue with the State of Nature. According to them, the state of nature was the period in which the individual lived completely in accordance with his own nature.² In this sense, first of all, in the state of nature, there was no binding political law to be imposed on people. This has ensured that all of people's behavior and thinking styles are in harmony with their own nature, together with their inner impulses. However, this situation has not been very sustainable for humans. Because even in the state of nature, where there is nothing to impose on their nature, some of the qualities³ that human beings possess by nature have prepared the ground for the formation of a turmoil.⁴ The main thing that I deal with in this part of this article is the change and transformation that takes place on human nature as a result of the conflict brought about by such qualities in the state of nature.

Undoubtedly, people always need the help of other people like themselves to survive. This situation can be observed more closely in the world where we are civilized. However, this is not only a

² This view is not only limited to Hobbes, but also a general understanding of social contract theorists such as Rousseau and Locke.

³ These qualities, as Hobbes puts it: “First, competition; secondly, diffidence; thirdly, glory.”, (1998, p. 83)

⁴ Social Contract theorists such as Rousseau and Locke have seen that human beings live in accordance with their nature in the state of nature, but that the resources in nature are insufficient after a certain point, which makes it necessary for them to make a contract. See (ROUSSEAU, 2000 and LOCKE, 2008)

reality that exists with civilization, but also, even in the state of nature, an individual appears as an entity that needs the help of another individual like himself. In fact, Hobbes built his entire political philosophy on this simple but equally important point.

Hobbes, like other social contract theorists, deals with the human being in a state of nature and emphasizes his basic needs. Just as Rousseau emphasizes the basic needs of human beings such as food and shelter in the state of nature, there is a similar approach in Hobbes. However, what is different in Hobbes is the conflict problem created by the individual's own nature in the relationship with other people at the stage of meeting these needs. Undoubtedly, in the state of nature, every human being has the right to have whatever they want. But even if it's okay when people make any claims about different things, the problem starts when we come to the situation that the same people want the same things. Because two people who claim a right on the same thing have an equal right on that thing. Since there is no political force restricting them, the only decisive thing among these equal people who want the same things is physical power, and in this case, a conflict begins between the parties. (LOUGHLIN, 2012, p. 8) The conflict here is basically about human desires. According to Hobbes, there is no limit to human desires by nature. Even if people's desires are satisfied, desires still have an insatiable appetite. (HÜTTEMANN, 2004, p. 30)

At first glance, although it seems that conflict in Hobbes arises from various physiological needs, I think that this conflict actually arises from the tension created by the resistance of human nature to socialization. Because Hobbes considers the state of nature as a logical hypothesis rather than a part of the historical process. (MACPHERSON, 2011, p. 21) Parallel to this logical hypothesis, human nature is made suitable for society not through nature but through education. (HOBBS, 2003, p. 25) However, such a process is not easy for human nature. For although human nature has the appropriate means for socialization, this does not mean that human nature will easily come to terms with the essential elements of socialization.

Hobbes mentions something important about the state of nature and socialization in his book *The Citizen*:

Since we see that men have in fact formed societies, that no one lives outside society, and that all men seek to meet and talk with each other, it may seem a piece of weird foolishness to set a stumbling block in front of the reader on the very threshold of civil doctrine, by insisting that man is not born fit for society. Something must be said in explanation. (2003, p. 24)

With this quotation, Hobbes wants to make us comprehend certain aspects of the process that basically expresses the transition from the state of nature to the social contract. In this sense, as he showed us, people had to accept to live together under a social contract “necessarily” due to various disagreements in the state of nature. However, a series of problems created by the disagreements that Hobbes expressed

for the state of nature are only discussed in a hypothetical⁵ context.(CURRAN, 2021, p. 223) the state of nature or the natural conditions of humanity is specifically about the person whose desires are civilized, rather than the "natural man" as the opposite of civilisation.(MACPHERSON, 2011, p. 18)

Hobbes, who considers civilization as the main point of the hypothetical state of nature, also thinks that people do not have a nature that is completely unsocial.⁶ According to him, it is difficult for us humans to endure eternal loneliness from the moment we are born. Because a person is physically weak when he is born, he needs the help of his parents and close people in the face of natural conditions. This does not indicate that the person has a nature that desires an institutional political structure, nor does it indicate that one's nature is directly compatible with such a thing.

There is an important quote from Hobbes about this disharmony:

And if people happen to be sitting around swapping stories, and someone produces one about himself, everyone of the others also talks very eagerly about himself; if one of them says something sensational, the others bring out sensations too, if they have any; if not, they make them up.(2003, p. 23)

With this quote, we see that Hobbes deals with human nature in a very simple way. Because, first of all, in him, man is a simple being: in Hobbes, man is treated as an ordinary being with all his emotions; jealous, selfish.(STRAUSS, 2001, p. 231) At first glance, such aspects of the human being are seen only to meet certain needs. In other words, it is seen that the reason why a person is jealous or selfish is due to the person's effort to seize or acquire the things that others have in order to maintain his life. However, at this point, it should not be forgotten that if this were the case, when the needs of people were met, feelings such as jealousy and selfishness would have to disappear, albeit temporarily. Hobbes, who is aware of this situation, already considers these as the most basic emotions in the pure nature of human beings. Therefore, they appear before us as something that is always ready as a part of the pure nature of the person and determines all of his existential conditions, rather than standing as motivations that only provide a certain satisfaction in the person and then disappear by themselves.(HOBBS, 2003, p. 53)

These conditions, according to Hobbes, are compelling for man as an internal impulse. It enables a person to do some things and prevents them from doing other things. In such a dilemma, if the person

⁵ Although Hobbes deals with the turmoil in the state of nature in a hypothetical context, his inferences on this subject are based on what he witnessed. Hobbes, who witnessed the civil war in England and observed the primitive tribes in America, tried to express what could happen in an environment where laws, laws and sovereignty disappeared.

⁶ Human nature is social. However, this does not mean that people desire sociality. Because wanting is one thing, talent is another.

lives completely alone and does not have any contact with other people, all kinds of positive and negative consequences of this situation will only concern the person himself. However, when it comes to man, it would not be realistic to show him as a being who lives completely alone and does not come into contact with other people. For Hobbes, his discussions in this area begin from these points. According to him, if an individual comes face to face with another individual like himself, both will naturally act according to their own internal reactions. These reactions also initiate a conflict of interest between them. (HULL, 2009, p. 105-106) In the conflict of interest of both parties, the parties will either act according to their nature's reactions and move in a direction that will cause each other's detriment, or they will leave these reactions to one side and agree on a political agreement that will benefit both sides.

It seems that Hobbes is comparing two situations: a) the state of nature and b) the achievement of a political agreement. If one acts with feelings such as selfishness, then the person will put himself in danger by entering into a struggle with the other person. However, this danger is such that it can even cause death of the person. But, according to Hobbes, people will put their logical judgments instead of their emotions in this comparison and lay the foundations of a political agreement with other people. This state, which ends the state of nature, will be above all very profitable for humans. Because putting aside the struggle here, which may cause turmoil, will provide the opportunity for people to live in peace and tranquility. What about feelings like selfishness in this case?

It is no longer possible for people to still act with various emotions such as selfishness. Hobbes, who thinks that these should be suppressed or transformed in some way, argues that human nature is completely affected by this political situation with the contract made. This new situation that reveals a political nature, in my opinion, means giving up on one's own essential nature in Hobbes, and this renunciation is not a part of the natural process in Hobbes. It's all a matter of preference for people. People will either live in a world where chaos prevails by acting according to various emotions coming from their nature, or they will live in peace with a social contract that puts an end to this turmoil based on mental principles. In this situation, which expresses the conflict of mind-emotion, according to Hobbes, who is an Enlightenment, people will put the mind before the emotions as a reasonable option in order to avoid a conflict.

I divide the results of this effort into two: the results created in the external world of the individual and the results created in the inner world. If we start in order, in my opinion, Hobbes put the mind in the forefront and put forward the idea of social contract by acting pragmatically in order to ensure social peace in the outside world. This is a story of "escape" from the plight that caused the turmoil in the state of nature. However, in this escape, it should not be forgotten that man has made such a transition with his nature inclined to violence in the state of nature. However, this situation, which led to a conflict in

the inner world of the increasingly alienated individual, as he could not live this nature in the new situation, made it necessary for them to act with a nature that adapts to the emerging political conditions. Otherwise, it will not be possible for human nature, which cannot adapt, to remain a nature. Therefore, in my opinion, Hobbes thus kept human nature in a political relationship and revealed the conditions for them to have a political nature.

3. Political Violence

In Hobbes, the formation of a political nature has become a part of the natural process. However, this process has emerged as the product of a certain violence, first of all. We see that violence is handled in two ways in Hobbes. The first is individual violence in the brute sense that comes from human nature, and the other is the evolution of the situation brought about by the final result of such violence into a political violence. Individual violence is physical violence perpetrated by an individual against another individual in a state of nature. In this part of the article, I will try to focus on how such violence can turn into a political thing that has an impact on everyone, rather than giving the classic expression of violence in this sense.

Hobbes has mentioned an important detail about violence. According to him, violence is never something that arises independently of external conditions; it needs certain conditions in which social relations will prepare the ground for this. If these conditions are met, violence will spontaneously emerge as part of the natural process. And this is what makes it possible for it to emerge that the equality we talked about above is at stake. As we have mentioned, according to Hobbes, there was equality between people in the state of nature. But in an environment where this equality is in question for all, the only thing that can prevent conflict between people is a political power. According to Hobbes, this political power is basically the common power. Because “it is manifest, that during the time men live without a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called war; and such a war, as is of every man, against every man”(HOBBS, 1998, p. 84).

In such a war, everything loses its meaning. If we think of it simply, in the case of war, the sustainability of all things disappears. It is not possible for a person to be rewarded for his labor, to cultivate his land, or to reveal an art. More importantly, even the construction of a society is not possible.(HOBBS, 1998, p. 84) However, for Hobbes, these are the most important things that make people exist. According to him, if people do not achieve a certain sustainability and build a society in its simplest form, the competitiveness, insecurity and pursuit of glory of human nature, which manifests itself in the state of nature, will drag everyone into a war and destroy all their conditions of existence on earth. Hobbes sees the state as a guarantor to prevent all these “negatives” from happening.(Skinner,

2008; 181) However, what seems important here is that Hobbes, who put the state against this destructiveness of human nature, preferred the state to human nature.(BREDEKAMP, 2020b, p. 19-20)

Here, it is necessary to clarify the following questions: Hobbes “prefers” the state to human nature. So does human nature disappear? Or does it take a different form? Hobbes gives tactical answers to these questions. According to him, in such a state of war, it is impossible for people to live freely in all kinds of things as in the state of nature. Because such a behavior that puts the person in danger in front of him puts his survival in great trouble.⁷ However, if an individual wants to protect himself, the freedom to be offered to others will restrict him and he must know how to accept this restriction and be contented.(HOBBS, 1998, p. 87)

At first glance, it is possible to understand that Hobbes left human nature completely aside with this restriction. However, it seems to me that human nature is the most compelling and provocative thing even under the existence of a state. Therefore, according to Hobbes, just as an individual is forced to obey another individual in a state of nature by means of feelings such as fear, he must be suppressed under the control of a state so that a new war situation does not arise. But the two suppressions here are different from each other. In the state of nature, this is done by brute force, while under the control of a state, it is done with the help of legal sanctions to prevent a new war situation.

The end of commonwealth, particular security: the final cause, end, or design of men, (who naturally love liberty, and dominion over others,) in the introduction of that restraint upon themselves, (in which we see them live in commonwealths,) is the foresight of their own preservation, and of a more contented life thereby; that is to say, of getting themselves out from that miserable condition of war, which is necessarily consequent (as hath been shown, chapter XIII) to the natural passions of men, when there is no visible power to keep them in awe, and tie them by fear of punishment to the performance of their covenants, and observation of those laws of nature set down in the fourteenth and fifteenth chapters.(HOBBS, 1998, p. 111)

In this excerpt, we see that the purpose of the state is not to create the possibility of living in accordance with one's own nature. It is simply creating the conditions for one's survival and a better life. However, although the current state of human nature prevents such conditions from occurring, the state, as a great power, suppresses human nature. If it is not suppressed, it is not possible for a state to form, and it is not possible for the individual to survive in such a living condition after a certain point. Because, according to Hobbes's impressions, violence that people will apply to each other will be inevitable unless there is any sanction or a force that subjugates them under various physically difficult conditions.(SREEDHAR, 2010, p. 63) However, it should not be forgotten that Hobbes already had a pessimistic view of human nature from the very beginning.(BREDEKAMP, 2020a, p. 9)

Although it is thought that the pessimist framework of human nature in Hobbes will cause a problematic situation in various aspects at first glance, this situation does not draw a new direction in

⁷ This means that an individual realizes that he or she is now a member of the society, and accordingly, the benefit of himself lies in thinking about the society as well.

terms of the historical process of humanity. Because, according to Hobbes, people have in a way “sacrificed” their nature in order to survive and lead a more comfortable life. However, the sacrifice here does not mean abandoning human nature completely. First of all, “Human nature cannot be blamed, human desires and feelings are not sin in themselves”(HOBBS, 1998, p. 85). So Hobbes does not actually leave human nature to one side altogether. The conditions that enable the individual to reveal his own nature are eliminated through the political power of the state. In this sense, in my opinion, his struggle with human nature is more about the various political consequences of such emotions in the outside world, rather than internal feelings such as desires and requests.

The use of the political power of the state is done within certain rules. These rules have a concrete operation that creates itself with a certain legality among people. This concreteness, which Hobbes refers to as the Social Contract, is something that holds all individuals together with a political framework. However, although there is a general opinion accepted in the history of philosophy since Aristotle as a part of the natural process that people come together with such a framework, according to Hobbes, it is not possible for a human being to be a *Zoon Politikon* by nature.(BREDEKAMP, 2020a, p. 55-56) Because although many thinkers pretend that people have no other choice but to consent to certain legal conditions and contract conditions, people do not accept to enter into a contract by nature, they only try to satisfy a mutual need.(HOBBS, 2003, p. 22-24)

4. Contract

The contract has legal obligations. Undoubtedly, these obligations draw a limit on the rights of the person. However, it is up to the individual whether to comply with these limits or not. If the person wishes, he can go beyond the limits drawn by the contract by following his various natural desires. However, if a person is caught in these desires and does not fulfill the obligations of the contract, he is subject to a sanction by the political power, and as a result of this sanction, he is provided to comply with the contract. On the other hand, if people are expected to voluntarily comply with the contract, the violent nature of human beings prevents them from voluntarily submitting to the contract. Because, according to Hobbes, human nature is selfish as we mentioned above, and because of this selfishness, he does not want to share anything that he sees as his own with other individuals. However, by making a certain logical reasoning, people have observed that it is not possible for them to survive when they act according to these emotions required by their nature in the current process.

Hobbes argues that human survival is possible only through compromise. This reconciliation cannot be achieved with a verbal commitment between people; There is no guarantee that any promise made will be fulfilled in practice, unless there is a legal force with sanctioning power. Undoubtedly, it is important for Hobbes that the power here is based on legal principles. Because legal power is both separated from brute force as in the state of nature, and although it is a force based on sanction here, it provides individuals to continue their lives in peace by establishing an environment of peace, which is the main purpose.(LLOYD, 2020, p. 56-57) But the important thing here is where human nature stands. Hobbes thinks that man with all his nature cannot be included in such a field; The “problem” stems from the destructive effects of human nature; Human nature cannot exist in the contract with all its naturalness, the tendencies that come from the nature of the person must be either suppressed or eliminated with the contract. Otherwise, these tendencies will endanger the entire existence of people by laying the groundwork for the creation of an atmosphere of turmoil. In this sense, the tendencies that come from the nature of the individual can only exist under the conditions required by the contract, and these conditions constitute the main transition point of the politicization of human nature in Hobbes.

With the Contract, many rights that people have are limited. In particular, there are some inherent rights that have been transferred to political structures, which we accept as a general will, with the construction of a contract. However, the point we emphasize here is whether people waive all their inherent rights in the contract or whether they will use these rights under what conditions. For example, if someone wants to kill you, do you have the right to kill him as in the state of nature?

Hobbes has the following important quote on this subject: “...a man cannot lay down the right of resisting them, that assault him by force, to take away his life; because he cannot be understood to aim thereby, at any good to himself.”(1998, p. 88)

In this excerpt, we see that although Hobbes argues that, together with the contract, human beings leave aside various impulses from their nature, as we see in the state of nature, when it comes to human nature, these impulses continue to exist both in the state of nature and in the contract. For, as in the state of nature, it was only man's struggle for survival that enabled man to make a contract. One has to wage such a struggle, even in the case of the establishment of a contract. Because Hobbes considers the contract as a concrete and abstract sequence that determines the relationship between individuals without the sanction of a political power, instead of seeing the contract only as a set of written rules between the state and the individual. The best example of this is seen in the contract made in the case of “fear”. According to Hobbes, even if there is no political situation, a person can make a contract with another person under certain conditions. For example, if a person is at risk of being killed and that person has to pay a ransom to save his life, the person must keep his word and make a contract in return for his

life being spared, and he must honor this contract honestly. If we recall his reasoning that made it necessary for people to switch from the state of nature to the contract, various inclinations coming from the nature of the people caused a disturbance in the state of nature, jeopardizing the conditions that ensured their survival. Therefore, although the existence of a state is needed to eliminate such problems, sometimes there are situations that the state cannot reach. And in such cases, he can even give a ransom to the other person when necessary to survive. Because the aim here is only the struggle of the person to survive, as in the state of nature.(HOBBS, 1998, p. 92-93)

All one has to do in this struggle is to fully adhere to the contract. In fact, Hobbes does not leave this commitment to one's own will. Because, according to him, on the contrary, no one can promise not to resist violence in any contract. Although it is claimed that this is due to the contrast between human nature and contract, I think there is actually a strong connection between human nature and contract. The first thing that provides this bond is fear and the other is glory and fame. Fear is quite noticeable here. As it is known, people always live in fear due to the turmoil environment in the state of nature. Although it is thought that tranquility takes the place of fear with the contract, the fear experienced by the person in the state of nature appears in another guise with the contract. Fear here is something created by not keeping one's word. In other words, if one of the parties does not keep their word in the contract, the current peace environment will be disrupted. This will ensure that fear, as a state of not keeping the promise, will show itself in the state of nature as well as in the case of contract. Likewise, it is possible to evaluate the glory and fame in this way. As we mentioned above, fame is one of the important elements of human nature according to Hobbes. Depending on these elements, even in the case of a contract, "those are a glory, or pride in appearing not to need to break it"(HOBBS, 1998, p. 94). The person actually continued to maintain these elements by adhering to the contract.

Conclusion

When we look at the history of philosophy, where human nature stands in political developments has always been an important topic of discussion. Hobbes's greatest contribution to these debates was that he dealt with human beings with a nature prone to violence. In this approach, Hobbes, of course, rather than making a naive determination, showed us how parallel such a tendency of human nature operates with the political situation. On the other hand, if human nature does not progress in parallel with the political situation, then a fierce conflict will begin between human nature and the political situation. However, Hobbes, who was a staunch defender of the monarchies that existed in the lands he lived in at that time, tried to justify that political structures are a necessary result of human nature, within the framework of a historical process, taking into account the consequences of such a conflict.

Hobbes deals with the historical process through two stages: the state of nature and the process of civilization. Like many thinkers about the state of nature, Hobbes was a period when people lived entirely according to the conditions of nature, there was no political ground and people acted only according to their natural impulses. However, the difference of Hobbes was that he set aside the various differences of people in the state of nature and claimed that they were basically equal, and created a necessary way for people to pass from this equality to the political field. At this point, the thing that breaks the equality is the main discussion of our article.

The equality that Hobbes talks about is broken due to the problems arising from human nature in the state of nature. Because in an environment where all people are equal, it is possible for everyone to claim rights on everything. These rights cause them to enter into a relentless struggle among themselves due to the qualities in human nature that we have mentioned above. This situation, which caused a great chaos, led Hobbes to the discussion of how to ensure that people live in a peaceful environment with its nature. My most important claim here is that Hobbes dealt with human nature by rasing it with the transition to the civilization process. The way to achieve this, in my opinion, was to suppress the violent aspect of human nature on the grounds of political benefit, along with civilization. Therefore, with this transition, it is now possible to talk about a political nature rather than a pure human nature. Because, for example, people now prefer to act with a political motive that will benefit everyone, rather than their inherent competitiveness. However, although this transition means a change and transformation in human nature, Hobbes considers the state of nature only as an assumption. Therefore, although these discussions about human nature are based on the human in the state of nature, in my opinion, all the determinations in Hobbes' analysis are actually about the person whose desires have been civilized. These conditions not only change the social status of the person, but also pave the way for the nature of that person to become a new fundamental determinant that changes and transforms everything in the entire social and political shaping.

Bibliography

- BREDEKAMP, H. *Leviathan Body Politic as Visual Strategy in the Work of Thomas Hobbes*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020a.
- BREDEKAMP, H. *Thomas Hobbes der Leviathan Das Urbild des modernen Staates und seine Gegenbilder 1651–2001*. Funfte korrigierte Auflage, Berlin: De Gruyter Press, 2020b.
- CURRAN, E. *The Strength and Significance of Subjects' Rights in Leviathan, A Companion to Hobbes*. Marcus P. Adams(Ed.), Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell Press, 2021, p. 221-235.
- HAMPTON, J. *Hobbes and the Social Contract Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1995.
- HOBBS, T. *Leviathan*. J. C. A. Gaskin(ed.), Oxford: Oxford University, 1998.
- HOBBS, T. *The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*. London: Frank Cass, 1984.
- HOBBS, T. *The Citizen*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2003.
- HOEKSTRA, K. *Hobbesian Equality in Hobbes Today Insights for the 21st Century*. S.S. Lloyd(ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013, p. 76-112.
- HULL, G. *Hobbes and the Making of Modern Political Thought*. London: Continuum, 2009.
- HÜTTEMANN, A. *Naturzustand und Staatsvertrag bei Hobbes Zeitschrift für Philosophische Forschung*. Jan. - Mar. Bd. 58, H. 1, 2004, p. 29-53.
- Letter to Hobbes of 18/28 August 1656. in *The Correspondence of Thomas Hobbes*. Noel Malcolm(ed.), Volume VII, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- LLOYD, S. A. All the Mind's Pleasure: Glory, Self-Admiration, and Moral Motivation in *On the Citizen and Leviathan, Hobbes's On the Citizen A Critical Guide*. Robin Douglass and Johan Olsthoorn(Ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020, p. 51-70.
- LLOYD, S. A. *Morality in the Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes, Cases in the Law of Nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2013.
- LOCKE, L. *Zweite Abhandlung über die Regierung: Über den wahren Ursprung, die Reichweite und den Zweck der staatlichen Regierung*. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2008.
- LOUGHLIN, M. The Political Jurisprudence of Thomas Hobbes, *Hobbes and the Law*. David Dyzenhaus and Thomas Poole(ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, p. 5-21.
- MACPHERSON, C. B. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism Hobbes to Locke*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2011.
- PALLADINI, F. Pufendorf Disciple of Hobbes: The Nature of Man and the State of Nature: The Doctrine of Socialitas, *History of European Ideas*. 34:1, 2008, p. 26-60.

ROUSSEAU, J. J. *Abhandlung von dem Ursprunge der Ungleichheit unter den Menschen*. Hermann Bohlaus Nachfolger Weimar, 2000.

SKINNER, Q. *Vision of Politics, Volume 3: Hobbes and Civil Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004.

SKINNER, Q. *Hobbes and Republican Liberty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2008.

STRAUSS, L. *Hobbes'politische Wissenschaft und zugehörige Schriften-Briefe*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 2001.

SREEDHAR, S. *Hobbes on Resistance Defying the Leviathan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2010.



ÇAĞMAR, Mehmet Şirin . HUMAN NATURE, EQUALITY AND VIOLENCE: HOBBS A POLITICAL REVIEW. *Kalagatos*, Fortaleza, vol.21, n.1, 2024, eK24002, p. 01-16.

Received: 02/2022

Approved: 03/2022