JYVÄSKYLÄ STUDIES IN EDUCATION, PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIAL RESEARCH
466

Mikko Jakonen

Multitude in Motion

Re-Readings on the Political Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

JYVÄSKYLÄ STUDIES IN EDUCATION, PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIAL RESEARCH 466

Mikko Jakonen

Multitude in Motion

Re-Readings on the Political Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes

Esitetään Jyväskylän yliopiston yhteiskuntatieteellisen tiedekunnan suostumuksella
julkisesti tarkastettavaksi yliopiston vanhassa juhlasalissa (S212)
huhtikuun 27. päivänä 2013 kello 12.

Academic dissertation to be publicly discussed, by permission of
the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Jyväskylä,
in the building Seminarium, auditorium S212, on April 27, 2013 at 12 o'clock noon.

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 2013

Multitude in Motion

Re-Readings on the Political Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes

JYVÄSKYLÄ STUDIES IN EDUCATION, PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIAL RESEARCH 466

Mikko Jakonen

Multitude in Motion

Re-Readings on the Political Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 2013

Editors
Jussi Kotkavirta
Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä
Pekka Olsbo, Harri Hirvi
Publishing Unit, University Library of Jyväskylä

URN:ISBN:978-951-39-5164-1
ISBN 978-951-39-5164-1 (PDF)

ISBN 978-951-39-5163-4 (nid.)
ISSN 0075-4625

Jyväskylä University Printing House, Jyväskylä 2013

Consideranda imprimis est ipsa hominum, coeuntium in unam civitatem suo ipsorum arbitrio, multitudo quod sit;

The first and crucial question is this: what actually is a multitude of men (who unite by their own decision in a single commonwealth)?

Thomas Hobbes 1642, *De Cive*, VI, 1.

ABSTRACT

Jakonen, Mikko
Multitude in Motion: Re-Readings on the Political Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes
Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2013, 214 p.
(Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research
ISSN 0075-4625; 466)
ISBN 978-951-39-5163-4 (nid.)
ISBN 978-951-39-5164-1 (PDF)

The present study examines the fundamentally intertwined relation of the concepts of motion and multitude in Thomas Hobbes's political philosophy. The concept of motion was, as it has been widely recognized in previous research, a basis for Hobbes's philosophy. Yet, its political nature has not been fully examined before. Furthermore, in recent decades the emphasis given to motion as a central concept in his political philosophy has diminished. On the other hand, the concept of multitude, which is usually understood as an apolitical concept, has been almost totally neglected in Hobbes scholarship. The aim of this research is to bring together these two concepts and show how the structure of Hobbes's political philosophy depends on the interplay of these two. Thus, we claim that the most crucial problem that structured Hobbes's political philosophy was the problem of multitude in motion.

Hobbes saw that multitude, that is, the unorganized, incoherent, anarchic, and constantly moving and changing mass of human beings was the greatest obstacle for the peaceful and organized political life in the commonwealth. The political problem of the unpredictable behaviour of crowds was already familiar to classical philosophers. Hobbes was, however, dissatisfied with the solutions offered to this fundamental question. In his philosophy he proposed a totally new way of understanding the action of human masses based on the analysis on motion and geometrical method. Hence, to understand how Hobbes applied the new theory of motion introduced by the scientific revolution to his political philosophy, we must see how Hobbes analysed and used the concept of multitude.

Through the analysis of Hobbes's conception of multitude we enable critical re-readings of Hobbes's political thought. We are interested in his conception of fear and its relation to the government of the state, in Hobbes's contradictory relationship to democracy, in his distaste for revolution and finally in his vision of international relations. In general, the present research opens new ways of reading Hobbes's political philosophy as a philosophy of motion.

Keywords: political theory, political philosophy, conceptual history, multitude, motion, Thomas Hobbes, emotions, fear, revolution, democracy, international relations

Author

Mikko Jakonen
P.O. Box 35
Ylistönmäentie 33
Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy
FI-40014, University of Jyväskylä
mikko.p.jakonen@jyu.fi

Supervisors

Professor Pekka Korhonen
Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy
University of Jyväskylä

Professor Mika Ojakangas
Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy
University of Jyväskylä

Docent Tuija Parvikko
Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy
University of Jyväskylä

Reviewers

Research Professor Sakari Hänninen
National Institute for Health and Welfare

Senior Lecturer Gabriella Slomp
University of St. Andrews

Opponent

Assistant Professor of Philosophy Gordon Hull
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is a product of research that I have been conducting over many years under many different titles and many different influences. In the economic sense my honest gratitude goes to those many instances that have financed my research and thus enabled me to concentrate more or less full time on my research. Right after having graduated in 2006 I received several scholarly grants for starting my Ph.D. project from the University of Jyväskylä, the Headmaster of the University of Jyväskylä and the Ellen and Artturi Nyyssönen Foundation. I have also received longer grants (one year each) from the Finnish Cultural Foundation (Eino Niinisen rahasto) and Finnish Cultural Foundation of Central Finland (Keski-Suomen rahasto). Without these grants my Ph.D. work would not have been possible. At the beginning of my career as a researcher I also received a short-term position as a researcher candidate at graduate school SOVAKO in the program of "Cultures of Power and Governmentality", which helped me considerably at the early stages of research.

During my research I have also been honoured to take part in academic teaching. An enlightening window to the academic world was my one year position as a junior lecturer in political science in 2007-2008 at the University of Jyväskylä. Teaching and guiding students in their studies gave me a good experience in academic practice. Ever since my period as a junior lecturer I have been entitled to teach annual courses on the classics of political theory and philosophy along with other courses of my own interest. These courses have been significant for me in many ways and thus I would also like to thank all my students during the past years in lecture series, reading circles and seminars. I would also like to thank all those people who have worked with me in various lecture series and other courses.

Along with the aforementioned sources of funding I have been privileged to take part in the project "The Concept of World Politics", led by professor of World Politics Pekka Korhonen and funded by The Academy of Finland in 2009-2012. Taking part in this project gave me the possibility to concentrate solely on my studies on Hobbes for two full years and most of the text for this Ph.D. was produced during this period. I am greatly indebted to professor Korhonen who has helped me in every possible way during my research and has always been open to my suggestions and questions. After the Academy project, I have had a chance to finish my Ph.D. as a University Teacher at the Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy. In autumn 2012 I was also offered the possibility to work as a Lecturer of Cultural Policy for six months. I am very grateful to professor of Cultural Policy Anita Kangas for this opportunity, which opened for me various new insights to the academic life and social sciences in general.

In the process of doing my Ph.D. research I have been able to travel a lot: I have participated in seminars, conferences and spent several periods as a

visiting scholar in different universities. I have been fortunate to get funding from the Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, and also from POLITU (the graduate school of political scientists), of which I am more that grateful. Of course, I have also received funding for research abroad from the Academy project "The Concept of World Politics". The several grants and other support have enabled me to spend time as a visiting scholar at the laboratoire SOPHIAPOL in Université Paris Ouest et Nanterre (Paris X) in 2008, at UFR de Philosophie in Université de Rennes 1 in 2010 and two periods at the Department of Sociology, Goldsmiths College, University of London in 2010 and 2011. During my visits to these universities in France and the United Kingdom I have always received the best possible help and guidance from other scholars, university staff and professors. I would like to thank especially professors Christian Lazzeri (director of SOPHIAPOL), professor Alain Juranville (Université de Rennes 1) and professor, head of department Beverley Skeggs (Goldsmiths College) for kindly inviting me to their universities. The facilities, interesting seminars and opportunities to give lectures on my own research topics have been an invaluable experience to me as an academic. Especially I would like to thank François Calori in Rennes 1 for kindly letting me take part in his preparatory course for *agrégation* in philosophy, where the topic was Hobbes's first political text, *The Elements of Law*.

I would like to thank one more institution without which it would be impossible to ever imagine conducting research and producing new scientific understanding, that is, libraries. As a student of political science and philosophy I have loved to sit and read in libraries, search the shelves for books previously unknown to me, and nowadays search the huge amounts of knowledge stored and organised in different kinds of databases. I am particularly indebted to all the library staff who are always ready to lend their helping hand in finding some lost article or copying some rare material. Since most of this Ph.D. was written in libraries I would like to pay regards to my "home" library, the Central Library of University of Jyväskylä, the library of social sciences at Mattilanniemi, Jyväskylä and all the municipal libraries in Jyväskylä (especially Kuokkala, Palokka and Huhtaharju) as well as libraries all over Finland where I have found peaceful places to read and write when needed. I have also spent lots of time searching out many important pieces of information for my work from the bibliothèque of Université Paris Ouest et Nanterre (Paris X), Bibliothèque de Cité Universitaire Paris, Bibliothèque municipale Georges Brassens at Montparnasse, Bibliothèque de Université Rennes, the Library of the Goldsmiths College and last, but not least, The British Library.

Among the aforementioned people I would like to thank especially my supervisors professor Pekka Korhonen, professor Mika Ojakangas and docent Tuija Parvikko. In addition to the supervision of Pekka Korhonen, in the last couple of years I have received supervision also from professor Mika Ojakangas. Being an opponent of my Licentiate thesis with docent Kari Saastamoinen, Mika led me to new tracks with my Hobbes research. His interest in the concept of multitude has been one of the important sources of

support for me delving into this perplexed topic. Just like Pekka, Mika has offered his good experience in reading academic texts and his comments to my manuscript have always been constructive, yet critical when needed. I am also very grateful to docent Tuija Parvikko. I have been priviledged to enjoy her intelligent, warm, and always supportive guidance during the last seven years. Tuija's comments concerning Hobbes and other classical theorists have always been right and needed. The mix of these three professionals has provided me a good supervision all the way through from the very start to the final manuscript. In this context I would also like to thank the two diligent and erudite reviewers of my Ph.D. manuscript, lecturer Gabriella Slomp and research professor Sakari Hänninen for giving me encouraging, profound and useful comments. I tried to make use of as many comments as possible in my published work, but I know there is so much more that I can use in my future publications concerning Hobbes. I want to give my best regards to assistant professor Gordon Hull who kindly agreed to travel to Finland and work as the opponent for this thesis.

During my research on Hobbes I have participated in many different seminars, conferences and other events, where I have always received good and competent comments on my work. I would like to thank the following people, among many others, for commenting my work: Adrian Blau, Johan Olsthoorn, Noel Boulting, Andy Knott, Juhana Lemetti, Dirk Brantl, Kari Saastamoinen, Martin Jay, Paul-Erik Korvela and Stuart Woolf. I would also like to thank several colleagues who have been important during my Ph.D. studies. My gratitude goes especially to a colleague and friend Paul-Erik Korvela who originally encouraged me to continue with Hobbes after my master thesis. Further gratitude goes to my friend, co-writer of articles and co-editor of *Yhteinen yliopisto* and co-organizer of many courses, workhops and conferences Jouni Tilli and to my roommate and partner in the Academy project, Evgeny Roschin. I am greatly indebted to Tuomas Parsio, who helped me with Greek and Latin terms. I would also like to thank all those people who have supported and encouraged me during many years such as professor Kari Palonen, professor Eeva Jokinen, professor Risto Heiskala, professor Mikko Yrjönsuuri, University Lecturer Jussi Vähämäki, Academy of Finland Fellow Petri Koikkalainen and professor Marja Keränen. I would equally pay respect to all the administrative staff at the Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy and especially to Ainoriitta Pöllänen. I am also indebted to Susanne Kalejaiye who checked English for this dissertation.

I am also truly obliged to all academic friends, fellow workers and people I have worked with concerning Hobbes, or other themes such as precarization, political theory and philosophy. Among these I would especially like to thank Akseli Virtanen, my dear friend and tireless organizer Jukka Peltokoski; and my good friends Panu Väänänen, Tero Toivanen and Joel Kaitila. I would also like to thank my "second university", that is, all the members of the past Webmagazine *Megafoni* collective with whom I have had a pleasure to cooperate and work for several years in the most fascinating atmosphere. I would equally like to thank the publishing house Tutkijaliitto and all the

members of the publishing board and also the organizers and participants of the annual Summer School of Tutkijaliitto. Similar thankfulness goes naturally to all the other magazines, newspapers and journals that I have had a pleasure to co-operate and publish with. However, life is not only words on paper. In this occasion I want to praise all the co-players in our football and futsal -team Vellamo (now Kady-Vellamo). You have saved me from many moments of frustration with your cheerful companionship.

There are still some people who have been most crucial not only for my research, but also for my academic career and life in general. First of all, I want to thank MA Akseli Linnanen, my long time precious friend and the person who first suggested to me to become a student of social sciences. This advice given to me sometime in the end of 1990s at some bar in Iso-Roobertinkatu in Helsinki turned out to be crucial for my life.

Secondly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all the family that I have become to know through my relationship with Anna Helle. I am glad about the nice and warm relations with the family and thankful about the support that you have showed me during the last 16 years Anna and I have been living together.

Thirdly, the support that I have always gained for all my antics in my life from my dear parents Arto and Tanja Jakonen is invaluable. Whether I have chosen to be a carpenter or an academic, whether I have wanted to play guitar, football or ice-hockey, or to skateboard or run, they have always supported me in every possible way. I also guess that I have inherited from my parents a trust in hard work and big plans. I have never feared starting up with new things since I know that whatever problems I might face, my parents will always support me. The same applies to my dear little sister Mari.

Now, last but definitely not least, there are three persons in my life who are more dear to me than anyone else. The importance of my partner Anna is beyond description and I cannot thank you enough for all the love and support you have given to me through many years. With Anna we have been lucky to have two incredible children, Verna and Mitja. The everyday life with these two intelligent, smart and kind children has made my life full and rich. I know that both of you have heard more than enough about the great and not so great philosophers, but I want to dedicate this dissertation to the two of you.

Jyväskylä 27.3.2013

Mikko Jakonen

NOTES ON THE TEXT

Classical names: I use standard English names for classical authors and their works i.e. I refer for example to Plato's *Republic* and not to his Πολιτεία. I use standard transliterations.

Non-English book titles: I have decided to refer to book titles by first giving the original name and then the English translation in brackets.

Gender: I have tried to use gender-neutral language as far as possible. Yet sometimes it is better to highlight the fact that authors are clearly considering rather male than female sex. In such cases I have used "he" instead of "she".

References: I refer to all literature, other than Hobbes, in standard author-date system by putting first the author, secondly the year of publication of the present volume used and then lastly the page number of the volume used. With classical texts, I use Stephanus numbers when available; otherwise I indicate the point of reference by putting first the book, secondly the chapter and thirdly the paragraph. All literature can be found at the end of this dissertation under the title "BIBLIOGRAPHY". Anonymous works are referred with the title of the book / article instead of the author's name.

With references to Hobbes's works I use abbreviations designated under the title "ABBREVIATIONS". The complete list of Hobbes's works used with proper bibliographical information can be found at the end of the dissertation under the title "WORKS OF HOBBES". In citations I usually use available English translations of Hobbes's Latin texts, but indicate as well the details for the Latin version, except in cases where I have wanted to emphasize the original Latin formulation instead of the English translation. In these cases the English translation is available in text or footnote. While referring to Hobbes's texts I first provide Hobbes's name, then the abbreviation, then the chapter with Roman numbers (I, II, etc.) and second the paragraph is given (when available) with Arabian numbers (1, 2. etc.). I also provide page numbers in a standard way to the editions I have used. I have always marked page numbers for both English and Latin editions when possible.

Citations: In this text some of the citations are used more than once. This follows from the different aspects and questions posed to certain fragments of texts. In longer citations I have also provided the Greek, Latin or other originals for certain words and sentences when needed.

Translations: I always use existing translations when possible. The citations from *De Homine* are translated by myself with the help of a French edition of the text. In these cases I have provided both the Latin and French sources and page

numbers. I have not translated citations that appear in footnotes, excluding a few instances. With classical texts I have consulted mainly the original texts with English translations published in the Loeb Classical Library. In the case of Aristotle I have used the new Oxford translation but consulted for original text from the Loeb Classical Library. With Machiavelli I have used Italian works printed in *Opere* in 1833 and modern translations.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABB	*An Answer to a Book Published by Dr. Bramhall, Late Bishop of Derry; Called the "Catching of the Leviathan."*
B	*Behemoth*
CRLMR	*Considerations upon the Reputation, Loyalty, Manners, and Religion of Thomas Hobbes, of Malmesbury, Written by Himself, by way of Letter to a Learned Person (John Wallis, D.D.)*
CTH	*The Correspondence of Thomas Hobbes, Volumes I-II*
DC	*De Cive*
DCE	*De Cive (On the Citizen) in English*
DCLE	*A Dialogue Between Philosopher and a Student of the Common Laws of England*
DCO	*Elementorum philosophiæ sectio prima de corpore*
DCOE	*English De Corpore*
DH	*De Homine*
DM	*Critique du De Mundo de Thomas White (Thomae Albi Tres Dialogi de Mundo A Thoma Hobbio Malmesburiensi Examinati)*, also known as *De Motu*
DMSAT	*De Motibus Solis, Aetheris & Telluris*
DP	*Decameron Physiologicum*
DPNA	*Dialogus physicus de natura aeris*
EL	*The Elements of Law i.e. Human Nature and De Corpore Politico*
HST	*Horae Subsecivae: A Discourse Upon the Beginning of Tacitus*
HSR	*Horae Subsecivae: A Discourse of Rome*
HSL	*Horae Subsecivae: A Discourse of Laws*
HNHP	*An Historical Narration concerning Heresy, and the Punishment thereof*
L	*Leviathan*
LF	*Leviathan in Finnish*
LL	*Latin Leviathan*
LLE	*Latin Leviathan English Translations*
LN	*Of Liberty and Necessity*
PL	*Prose Life*
PP	*Problemata Physica*
QCLNC	*The Questions Concerning Liberty, Necessity and Chance, Clearly Stated and Debated between Dr. Bramhall, Bishop of Derry and Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury*
SL	*Six Lessons for the Professors of Mathematics, one of Geometry, other of Astronomy, in the chairs set up by the noble and learned Sir Henry Savile, in the University of Oxford*

SPP	*Seven Philosophical Problems and Two Propositions of Geometry. By Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury. With an Apology For Himself and His Writings. Dedicated to the King in the year 1662.*
ST	*A Short Tract on First Principles*
THU	*Of the Life and History of Thucydides*
THUPW	*Eight Books of the Peloponnesian War Written by Thucydides, the Son of Olorus, Interpreted with Faith and Diligence Immediately out of the Greek by Thomas Hobbes. Secretary to the late Earl of Devonshire.*
V	*Vita (Prose Life)*

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

This study examines the fundamentally intertwined relation of the concepts of motion and multitude in Thomas Hobbes's political philosophy. The concept of motion was, as it has been widely recognized in previous research, a basis for Hobbes's philosophy. Yet, its political nature has not been fully examined. Our study starts from the political problem of motion. We do not, however, proceed in a conventional way. Rather than investigating Hobbes's theory of physics and metaphysics, we commence from the middle of political strife: from the chaotic and disturbed crowd of human beings, the multitude. By analysing Hobbes's definitions and uses of the concept of multitude it is possible to understand how Hobbes introduced the fundamental question and problem of motion to his political philosophy via his conception of multitude. In other words, we claim that the element of motion, which played a constitutive role in his philosophy in general, is best manifested in Hobbes's political philosophy in his description concerning the dynamics of multitude and its relations to sovereign political power. By analysing Hobbes's conception of the constantly moving and changing multitude we enable critical re-readings of Hobbes's political thought. In our re-readings we are especially interested in his conception of fear and its relation to the government of the state, Hobbes's contradictory relationship to democracy, his ambiguous understanding of revolution and finally his vision of international relations. By studying these different aspects of Hobbes's political thought through the concept of multitude we get a more focused picture of Hobbes as a political theorist of motion. Thus, our aim is to show how the political nature of the concept of multitude is important for Hobbes's conceptual architecture of political philosophy.

1.1 The Problem of Motion and Multitude in Hobbes's Political Philosophy

In Hobbes's philosophy everything is about motion. Whether it is about the motion of the sun, circulation of the planets, gravity, diurnal changes, flatfishes swimming in the sea, the turn of the tides, heat and cold, the fermentation of wine, burning wood, the generation of living creatures from the earth, optics or digestion and other bodily processes: everything can be understood and explained with the concept of motion.[1]

With his emphasis on the principle of motion as the basis of all natural phenomena Hobbes does not differ much from his earlier colleagues: pre-Socratics such as Thales or Heraclites were convinced that nature is conceived best by understanding the special character of motion.[2] *Φύσις* (*physis),* nature*,* was for them the principle of motion and rest, which manifested in every particular being.[3] Plato and Aristotle wrote long analyses concerning the concept of motion in their discourses on physics and metaphysics. For both of them, the concept of motion was the foundation for explaining the phenomena of nature.[4]

Again, almost two thousand years later, the advent of the so-called "scientific revolution" was centred around the redefinition of the concept of motion. Whether it was the early metaphysical ideas of Nicolas of Cusa (1401-1461) concerning the impossibility of absolute motion and rest in the realm of physics, or later influential reconsiderations of planetary and other motion depicted by Nikolaus Copernicus (1473-1543), Tycho Brahe (1546-1601), Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), and most importantly Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), all new astronomy and physics was interested in the phenomena and redefinition of the concept of motion. The mechanical view of motion, which cast away the old Aristotelian physics and metaphysics as well the Ptolemaic picture of the cosmos, was at the centre of the new revolutionary natural philosophy and science in the early modern Europe. Again, the redefinition and

---

1 See for example Hobbes DM, XVI, 209-214; XVII, 215-225; XXIV, 288-304; Hobbes DCO, XXVI-XXVII, 334-379; Hobbes SPP, I-II, 7-17; IV, 25-32; VI, 40-50; Hobbes PP, II, 313-317; Hobbes DP, IV, 95-108; V; 108-117; VI, 117-128; X, 169-177; Hobbes DH, I, 2, pp. 2-5; II-VIII, 7-76. Hobbes even wrote a poem concerning the motion of the Earth named as *De Motibus Solis, Aetheris & Telluris*. See Hobbes DMSAT, 441-447.

2 This is manifested in the fragments of Heraclites, where the problem and principle of motion and change is constantly considered and reconsidered. See Heraclites 2004, 239, DK B30 / M51; 241, DK B90 / M 54; 207, 13 & 14; 211, 17, DK B91. The problem of motion was also of utmost importance to such skeptics as Zeno of Elea, who stated that all motion is ephemeral. See Koyré 1981, 9–35.

3 See Aristotle's *Physics* (Aristotle 1995a, 188a, pp. 15-30). See also Hussey 1986, 12-14; Pellegrin 2002, 12–13.

4 See Plato's *Timaeus,* particularly Plato 1961, 56c–58c. Aristotle states in *Physics* that: "Since Nature is the principle of movement and change, and it is Nature that we are studying, we must understand what 'movement' is; for, if we do not know this, neither do we understand what Nature is." (Aristotle 1995a, 200b12-15.) On Aristotle's basic categorization of motion see Aristotle 1995a, 200b15–201a15 and Aristotle 1995b, 1068a10–1069a10.

analysis of the concept of motion was extremely important for the true founder of the new philosophy, René Descartes. Descartes, like Galileo and Hobbes, ascribed to the new theory of law of inertia and explained bodily and mental processes with motion.[5]

Like Descartes, Hobbes sees that it is not only the external objects that can be analysed with a mechanical conception of motion.[6] Our own senses are nothing more than motion, caused at the interplay of "internal parts of the man" (Hobbes L, II, 5. p. 12-13) i.e. brain with external objects.[7] Sensing is a rather complicated process where the true nature of the sense can be understood by conflating the concept of motion in its various forms to the one who senses and to the perceived phenomena. Hence, sense and sense experience are reduced to motion. In general Hobbes's psychology and his theory of mental processes such as speech are thoroughly marked by his conception of motion.[8] This is not, once more, a totally new theory: Aristotle's *De Anima*[9] underlines the meaning of the motion as does Plato's theory of

---

5 The first law of nature defined in Descartes's *The Principles of Philosophy* follows a modified law of inertia: "each and every thing, in so far as it can, always continues in the same state; and thus what is once in motion always continues to move." (Descartes 1985a, 240-241.) On the law of inertia see also Descartes 1985b, 241-242. Concerning the human body, Descartes believed that the heart is a sort of motor that produces heat, which further moves all the limbs (Descartes 1985b, 316-319; Descartes 1985c, 331).

6 Hobbes saw that motion is the basic category of all sense experience. Different motions differ from each other and make our perceptions: "But effects and the *appearances* of things to sense, are faculties of powers of bodies, which make us distinguish them from one another; that is to say, conceive one body to be equal or unequal, like or unlike to another body; as in the example above, when by coming near enough to any body, we perceive the motion and going of the same, we distinguish it thereby from a tree, a column, and other fixed bodies; and so that motion or going is the *property* thereof, as being proper to living creatures, and a faculty by which they make us distinguish them from other bodies." (Hobbes DCOE, I, 4. pp. 5-6; p. lat. 5.)

7 The indefatigable interest in motion and human senses was the origin of Hobbes's great interest in natural philosophy. In his *Prose Life* Hobbes writes that: "When he was staying in Paris, he began to investigate the principles of natural science. When he became aware of the variety of movement contained in the natural world, he first inquired as to the nature of these motions, to determine the ways in which they might effect to senses, the intellect, the imagination, together with the other natural properties." (Hobbes PL, 47; p. lat. xiv.) For Hobbes, motion is not only a basic feature of all bodies ["…MOTION and MAGNITUDE, which are the most common accidents of all bodies" (Hobbes DCOE XV, 1, p. 203; p. lat. 175.)], but the sense itself is a motion: "Sense, therefore, in the sentient, can be nothing else but motion in some internal parts of the sentient; and the parts so moved are part of the organs of sense. For the parts of our body, by which we perceive any thing, are those we commonly call the organs of sense. And so we find what is the subject of our sense, namely, that in which are the phantasms; and partly also we have discovered the nature of sense, namely, that it is some internal motion of the sentient." (Hobbes DCOE, XXV, 2. p. eng. 390; pp. lat. 317-318.)

8 See for example Hobbes EL II, 7. pp. 5-6; III, 1. p. 9; IV, 2 p. 15; V, 14, p. 25. Similar aspects and formulations are repeated in full in *Leviathan*, Part I.

9 In *De Anima* motion is considered especially in book III, paragraphs 9-11 (Aristotle 1995c, 432a15-434a20 pp. 687-690) and the action of the senses is defined in relation to motion in two places, in book II, 5 (Aristotle 1995c, 416b30-418a5, pp. 663-665) and III, 2 (Aristotle 1995c, 425b12-427a16, pp. 677-679). All acts of sensing are explainable with motion. Anger, for example, is the certain mode of motion. He continues: "That

human psyche in *Timaios*.[10] Still, what is new with Hobbes is his systematic emphasis on mechanical motion. In the end, even Hobbes's basic categories of *philosophia prima*[11], epistemology[12] and his scientific method[13] are defined with the concept of motion.

Following from his reconsiderations on motion Hobbes concluded that it is impossible to find true rest from the world or from human mind: "But that when a thing is in motion, it will eternally be in motion, unless somewhat else stay it…" (Hobbes L, II, 1. pp. 10-12). According to this application of Galileo's preliminary theory of the law of inertia, world, as it appears to us, is made out of matter in motion, which is at a constant state of change: motion causes motion and absolute rest can exist only beyond existence, in the case of an individual, at the death.[14] This peculiar idea opposes the Aristotelian physics, which operates with contrary opposites, motion and rest.[15] Aristotle sees, of course, how things in the realm of nature (*physis*) need causes to move, so that their potentiality might be actualized. Nevertheless, he postulates an idea of the primary, one, unmoved mover that is the origin of all the motion in the world.[16] Later scholastic philosophy combined Aristotle's idea of an unmoved mover to the Christian God[17]: God is the unchangeable and eternal source of all that lives, moves and changes.[18]

---

is precisely why the study of the soul – either every soul or souls of this sort – must fall within the science of nature." (Aristotle 1995c, 403a25-30. p. 643.) Yet in his study Aristotle tries to combine and surpass the classical theories that concern only matter in motion (e.g. Democritus) and those dialecticians (such as Plato) whose concern is only the formal explanation. On the relation between Aristotelian and Hobbesian theory of sense experience, see Leijenhorst 2007.

10 On the motion of the soul see Plato 1961, 69c–92d.

11 See Hobbes DCO, II. pp. lat. 81-174; Time for example is defined in the following way: "TIME *is the phantasm of before and after in motion*;" (Hobbes DCOE, VII, 3. p. 95; p. lat. 84.)

12 See Hobbes EL, II-VI. pp. 3-30; Hobbes L, I-V. pp. 9-32; Hobbes DCO, XXV, pp. lat. 315-334.

13 See Hobbes DCO. VI. pp. lat. 58-80; Hobbes DP, II. pp. 82-88.

14 See for example Hobbes L, II, 1. p. 11.

15 Opposites are crucial for Aristotle's analysis and they are generally treated in *Categories* (Aristotle 1995d, 11b15-14a25, pp. 18-22). In *Metaphysics* Aristotle uses opposite categories of potentiality (*dunamis*) and actuality (*energeia*) or fulfillment (*entelecheia)* to describe change and motion (Aristotle 1995b, book IX, especially 1045b27-1046a35. pp. 1651-1652).

16 Aristotle states: "…it is evident that that which primarily imparts motion is unmoved: for, whether that which is in motion but moved by something leads straight to the first unmoved, or whether it leads to what is on motion but moves itself and stops its own motion, on both suppositions we have the result that in all cases of things being in motion that which primarily imparts motion is unmoved." (Aristotle 1995a, 258b4-9, p. 431.) Generally on unmoved mover see Aristotle 1995a, Book VIII and Aristotle 1995b Book XII.

17 In Latin *Leviathan* Hobbes criticizes *The Bible* and states that it sees the earth as immobile, although several scholars have proved that earth moves. According to Hobbes, this is due to the fact that *The Bible* was written by apostles, not by philosophers. (Hobbes LL, VIII, 64.)

18 The scholastic idea derives directly from Aristotle's texts where he explicitly states that there is only one unmoved mover and this one is eternal and unchangeable. (Aristotle 1995a, 259b32-260a11. pp. 434; Aristotle 1995b 1072a 24-26, p. 1694.) See Aquinas's commentary on Aristotle's first, unmoved mover in Aquinas 1963, 530-539.

According to Hobbes, Aristotle and the Scholastics are fundamentally wrong with their conception of motion and rest: unlike Aristotle, Hobbes states that: "…it is not intelligible that anything can depart either from rest, or from the motion it has, except by motion." (Hobbes DCO, VI, 5. p. 70; p. lat. 62).[19] The source of motion in a particular body is always the cause of an external, moving body affecting it. Following Galileo[20], motion is mechanical for Hobbes: in other words, motion is always mediated by some substance in direct connection to the body.[21] For this reason there is no vacuum in the world either.[22] Resulting from this, the concept of motion is defined by Hobbes in a most simple way in *De Motu*: "[motion is] the continuous quitting of one place and the acquiring of another." (Hobbes DM, XXXX, 2, p. eng. 493; lat. p. 434.)[23]

For Hobbes the real cause and origin of motion is hidden: this suggests that there might be a principal mover or God, but the limits of our knowledge and understanding hinder us from saying anything certain about these things: we must only trust and believe in God but we cannot say anything truthful about God on the basis of our sense experience.[24] Yet, even though we do not know what causes the motion in the world, the only way to understand the phenomena of the world and things occurring in our minds is to analyse all the phenomena, mental and physical, systematically with the concept of motion. Thus the emphasis put on the concept of motion is extraordinarily strong and radical in Hobbes's philosophy, which is manifested in several, crucial texts concerning motion such as *Thomae Albi Tres Dialogi de mundo a Thoma Hobbio Malmesburiensi examinati* (*De Motu*) (1643), *De Corpore* (1655), *De Homine* (1658) and *Decameron Physiologicum* (1678). In a statement, which resembles statements by Aristotle and other classic authors, Hobbes claims that the right conception of motion is of highest important since "if a knowledge of motion is lacking, nothing certain can be laid down about motion, and hence (because whatever is done by nature is done through motion) about nature." (Hobbes DM, XIV, 1. pp. eng. 158; pp. lat. 202.)[25]

---

19 Hobbes criticizes the Aristotelian understanding of motion already in *De Motu* by describing it as: "Motion is the act of *ens* in potential, so long as it is in potential." (Hobbes DM, XXXX, 2. p. 492; p. lat. 434.) In *De Corpore* he states following Galileo that "…motion, indeed, is not resisted by rest, but by contrary motion." (Hobbes DCOE, IX, 7. p. 125; p. lat. 111.)

20 Hobbes knew Galileo's texts very early on, as his letter to William Cavendish 26.1.1634 shows. Hobbes was in London seeking for Galileo's dialogues. He also knew the political outcomes of Galileo's book in Italy, when he compares it to the books written by Luther and Calvin. (Hobbes CTH, Letter 10. p. 19.)

21 See for example Hobbes DCO, XV; XXII.

22 Hobbes DCO, II, VIII, 8. pp. 96-97.

23 In *De Corpore* the same thing is formulated in the following way: "… *motion* is defined to be the *continual privation of one place, and acquisition of another*." (Hobbes DCOE, XV, 1. p. 204; p. lat. 177.)

24 See Hobbes DCO, XXVI, 1. pp. 334-339. Hobbes also criticizes the Holy Scripture from the basis of his theory of motion, see Hobbes L, XXXIV, 5. p. 262.

25 In *Leviathan* Hobbes, emphasising the importance of geometry, states: "For nature worketh by motion; the ways and degrees whereof cannot be known, without the knowledge of the properties of lines, and figures." (Hobbes L, XXXXVI, 11. pp. 444-445.)

What interests us especially in our research is how Hobbes himself thought that his philosophy concerning nature and motion was the basis of his moral philosophy as well:

> After *physics* we must come to moral philosophy; in which we are to consider the motions of the mind, namely, appetite, aversion, love, benevolence, hope, fear, anger, emulation, envy &c.; what causes they have, and of what they be causes. And the reason why these are to be considered after *physics* is, that they have their causes in sense and imagination, which are the subject to physical contemplation. (Hobbes DCOE, VI, 6. pp. 72-73; p. lat. 64.)

According to Hobbes the reduction to physics applies to politics as well:

> …the principles of the politics consist in the knowledge of the motions of the mind, and the knowledge of these motions from the knowledge of sense and imagination. (Hobbes DCOE, VI, 7. p. 74; p. lat. 65.)

It is perhaps for this reason we have a significant amount of studies that consider how Hobbes's *scientific* thought was the basis and the starting point of his *political* thought. However, it is slightly controversial to claim that Hobbes's political philosophy derives *directly* from his natural philosophy.[26] First of all, Hobbes thought that the principles of civil philosophy[27] belong more to the realm of deductive (ratiocination) method, not only to the inductive

---

[26] Some scholars, Watkins (1965) and Spragens (1973) among others, have insisted that there is a notable link between Hobbes's natural philosophy and his political philosophy. However, even they do not see that Hobbes's political theory is totally a direct application of his natural philosophy, as Spragens writes at the introduction of his *Politics of Motion:* "…I hope to contribute to the understanding of the relationship between Hobbes's natural philosophy and his civil philosophy. I argue that Hobbes's political ideas were in fact significantly influenced by his cosmological perceptions, although they were not, and could not have been, completely derived from that source." (Spragens 1973, 7.) Yet, as Spragens continues, he sees that "…conceptual patterns and models developed to deal with natural phenomena became prisms through which he perceived human and political phenomena." (Spragens 1973, 7.) In this study we see that there is a crucial connection between Hobbes's natural and civil philosophy, they are indeed parts of the same system, but we do not, however, consider that natural philosophy and its models were primary for Hobbes's developments and conceptualisations on his political philosophy. Instead we see that one of the main motivations for Hobbes to study and conceptualize the natural motion was political as it is explained later in the text. Thus, his natural philosophy was developed side by side with his political philosophy. This means that we do not either pledge to the views of the "other camp" of the debate such as Strauss (1936/1984) or Warrender (1955/2000) who claim that Hobbes's political philosophy has little or nothing to do with his natural philosophy. As Strauss claims in his book *The Political Philosophy of Hobbes*, Hobbes himself knew that natural and political philosophy are fundamentally different in both material and method. From this follows, according to Strauss, that "On this awareness is based his conviction that political philosophy is essentially independent of natural science." (Strauss 1984, 6.) We see this position as too extreme as well. In our perspective, the problem of motion was a natural *and* political question for Hobbes. In our study we thus depart from both of these extreme positions and try to emphasise the problem of motion as the common ground for Hobbes's natural and political philosophy. For a comprehensive list of Hobbes studies concerning natural philosophy etc., see chapter 2.1 of this study.

[27] Hobbes claimed boldly that the civil philosophy was no older than his *De Cive*. (Hobbes DC, Epistola Dedicatoria.)

(experience) method that characterizes physics. In fact, in his "map of sciences" in *Leviathan*, natural and civil philosophy are two distinct branches of science: civil philosophy does not derive self-evidently from natural philosophy. (Hobbes L, IX, 3, pp. 56-57.) However, in the Epistle Dedicatory of *Six Lessons* Hobbes states that geometry and civil philosophy are both demonstrable, since human beings are the ones who make figures and commonwealths. Yet, since the natural bodies are beyond our art, we can only seek to understand what they are through experience. (Hobbes SL, Epistle Dedicatory. p. 184.)

Secondly, even though we would accept that physics plays a significant and fundamental role as the basis of Hobbes's political philosophy as Hobbes leads us to comprehend in *De Corpore,* and even though according to *De Corpore* the truths of civil philosophy can be found by both the analytical and the synthetic method (Hobbes DCO, VI, 7. pp. lat. 65-66; pp. eng. 73-74), his political doctrine is still not incontestably grounded on his theory of science and motion, since his political philosophy is first and foremost constructed on the basis of conceptual and linguistic practice. What is even more important is that Hobbes's moral and political philosophy, which he usually conceived to be "scientific" is highly political. It seems that in certain respect, Hobbes admitted this himself for he states in the preface of *De Cive* that "…Monarchy has more advantages than other forms of commonwealth (the only thing in this book which I admit is not demonstrated but put with probability)" (Hobbes DCE, Preface to the readers, p. 14; p. lat. 153.).

All these doubts concerning the scientific nature of Hobbes's political philosophy has made some scholars in recent decades emphasize Hobbes's humanistic, instead of scientific, grounds in his political philosophy[28], as Quentin Skinner states in his *Reason and Rhetoric*: "Although this view of Hobbes as 'formed' by the scientific revolution is widely shared, it is part of my purpose to suggest that there is something misleading about it." (Skinner 1996, 216.) Even though Skinner, for example, acknowledges the impact of the concept of motion in Hobbes's philosophy (Skinner 1996, 253-258), what follows from this humanistic position is that the importance of the concept of motion as the most crucial concept of Hobbes's philosophy is radically lost. Sometimes the problem of motion is implicitly referred to through such interesting questions as language's capability to move people, but in the end, there is no special interest in the theme. The same goes with Hobbes's relation to natural philosophy and geometrical method. These questions are simply not that interesting for the rhetorical and contextual approach[29], partly because this approach stands against the earlier interpretation of Hobbes as a forerunner of scientific politics, partly because these questions are rather distant to the question of language, although according to Hobbes language has a

---

28 Generally on this theme, see chapter 2.1. of the present study. The debate of Hobbes's humanistic origins commenced already in the 1930s with Strauss' comments on Hobbes's profoundly humanistic character. (Strauss 1984.)

29 Yet, it is useful to acknowledge that Hobbes's idea of science and his materialist metaphysics are also concerned, yet critically, in Johnston's *The Rhetoric of Leviathan* for example. (See Johnston 1986, 26-65.)

tremendous power to move people's mind and thus, affect people politically as we will see later on.[30] In this kind of research Hobbes is conceived mainly as a political actor and an intellectual, not a Scientist. The questions pertaining to Hobbes's method and natural philosophy are treated by considering his changing attitude between natural philosophy and humanism.[31] In the end this approach sees that Hobbes could not have evolved his philosophy without eloquence, a thing that Hobbes admitted himself in *Leviathan*.[32] Notwithstanding, there appear to be no studies concerning the rhetorical uses of the concept of motion in Hobbes's philosophy.

In our study we see that even though Hobbes's political philosophy does not stand thoroughly, and sometimes not even convincingly, at the basis of his scientific method and physical conception of motion, his political theory is still deeply inspired, rooted and related to the concept of motion. We comprehend that the problem of human motion – especially the unorganized, violent and chaotic motion in the multitude – was the starting point of Hobbes's process of political resolution, that is, the analysis concerning the fundamental elements of politics. Despite the fact that the concept of motion is not widely used in Hobbes's political texts and links to his detailed theory of motion are rare, the vocabulary and imagination connected to motion is always present. Indeed, we find motion at the centre of the most crucial arguments concerning the commonwealth designed by Hobbes. First of all, sovereign power is the soul giving motion to its members.[33] In other words, it is the principle of ordered and structured motion of the citizens that the sovereign manifests. Secondly, the civil laws are something that ought to keep people in the right kind of motion in which they do not hurt themselves or others.[34] Thirdly, some of the most crucial political questions in Hobbes's political philosophy, such as the question of liberty[35] and the resemblance between the individual and political body[36] find their motivation from the question and conception of motion.

In our understanding the motivation and need to solve the problem of motion was a political question for Hobbes. We claim that it was the political problematic of motion that inspired Hobbes's philosophical project in the first place. To avoid misunderstandings, we must further define our starting point. For us, the question of motion is a multilevel political problem for Hobbes. First of all, it refers to a confusion that prevailed in the metaphysical and physical

---

30 This fact is, naturally, emphasized by Skinner 1996 throughout his book.

31 This is especially the framework provided by Quentin Skinner in his *Reason and Rhetoric in The Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes* (Skinner 1996).

32 Hobbes, first of all, acknowledged that "Eloquence is power, because it is seeming prudence." (Hobbes L, X, 10. p. 58.) Secondly, he admits that reason is not always enough for the best solutions to succeed: "So also reason, and eloquence, (though not perhaps in the natural sciences, yet in the moral) may stand very well together." (Hobbes L, A Review, and Conclusion. pp. 467-468.)

33 Hobbes L, Introduction pp. 7-8; XXI, 22. p. 147; XXIX, 20-23. pp. 220-221.

34 Hobbes states that laws are actually like fences that guide citizens' motion. Hobbes L, XXX, 21. pp. 230-231.

35 See Hobbes DC, IX, 9. pp. lat. 258-260; pp. eng. 111-112; Hobbes L, XXI, 1-2. pp. 139-140; XXVIII, 20. p. 209; XXIX, 15. pp. 217-219.

36 See Hobbes DC, XII, 1. pp. lat. 284-286; pp. 131-132; Hobbes L, XXIV, 13. p. 168.

theories of scholastic philosophy. Hobbes strongly opposed the classical metaphysics and physics precisely due to their misconception of motion. This was not, however, only a philosophical question: as we will see in our study, the confusion in the realm of metaphysics and physics affected political questions as well. In short, the question of science and knowledge was a question of politics for Hobbes.[37] He saw that the prevailing *episteme* produced by the scholastic philosophy and universities was an indirect, yet crucial cause of the Civil Wars.[38] For this reason, even though his work on the geometrical method and natural philosophy is sincere, we must keep in mind how it was both philosophically and politically opposed to the scholastic philosophy. As such, his whole philosophical project, including metaphysics, has a political nature.[39]

Secondly, following from what has been stated above, Hobbes saw that the questions pertaining to the natural philosophy had always been part of the political power structure: expert elites on the questions of cosmology and natural philosophy were tightly entangled with the dominant political power.[40] Again, the question of who possesses and produces knowledge and the dominant beliefs concerning the "world" is a major political question for Hobbes.

Thirdly, and most importantly for our present study, the question of the right order of the everyday action and motion of the people, both physical and mental, was a crucial political question for Hobbes. The reason why Hobbes was so interested in human nature and psychology derives exactly from his motivation of finally inventing the way to guide and control the natural motion and everyday action of the common people. As stated above, this concerned both physical and mental motions, although it is good to emphasize that Hobbes believed in the power of education more than in the power of the sword pertaining long term political change.[41] Hobbes thought it would eventually be possible to change the behaviour of human beings. Hobbes sees that egoistic and even violent action of individuals "are indeed great difficulties, but not impossibilities: for by education, and discipline, they may be, and are sometimes reconciled." (Hobbes L, A Review, and Conclusion. p. 467.)

---

37 See Willms 1992; Jakonen 2010. For a detailed study on the relationship of Hobbes's metaphysics and politics, see Zarka 1999.

38 See chapter 6.2.4 of our present study.

39 Johnston describes Hobbes's attack against scholastics in the following way: "His attacks upon scholasticism in *Leviathan* constitute merely one variation upon a consistent and much larger theme. That theme is the contrast between ignorance, superstition, and magic on the one hand and knowledge, reason, and science on the other." (Johnston 1986, 104.) According to Johnston, Hobbes also attacked religion and superstition with his conception of motion. (Johnston 1986, 176, 182.) See also Leijenhorst 2002, who shows how Hobbes used his theory of sense perception against the Scholastics. (Leijenhorst 2002, 98-102.)

40 It seems that this question interested Hobbes especially during the 1660s and 1670s. He refers to the power of priests, druids, philosophers etc. and connects the natural philosophy of the schools to the power elites in England in *Behemoth* (Hobbes B, 90-96) and *Decameron Physiologicum* (Hobbes DP, II. pp. 71-81).

41 On Hobbes's relation to education, see Vaughan's (2002) *Behemoth Teaches Leviathan* and S.A. Lloyd's (2003) *Ideals and Interests in Hobbes's* Leviathan.

In its very basic form, the political problem of motion is condensed to the question of liberty:

> LIBERTY (to define it) is simply the absence of obstacles to motion; as water contained in a vessel is not free, because the vessel is an obstacle to its flowing away, and it is freed by breaking the vessel. Every man has more or less liberty as he has more or less space in which to move; so that a man kept in a large jail has more liberty than a man kept in a small jail. And a man may be free in one direction but not in the other, as a traveller is prevented by hedges and walls from trampling on the vines and crops adjacent to the road. Obstacles of this kind are external and absolute; in this sense all slaves and subjects are free who are not in bonds or in prison. Other obstacles are discretionary; they do not prevent motion absolutely but incidentally, i.e. by our own choice, as a man on a ship is not prevented from throwing himself into sea, if he can will to do so. Here too the more ways one can move, the more liberty one has. And this is what civil liberty consists in; (Hobbes DCE, IX, 9. p. 111; p. lat. 259.)

For Hobbes the absolute liberty of the individual means the absolute freedom to move in any way a person wants to. This is the case in the famous state of nature, where absolute freedom is possible. It is this very problem of absolutely free motion, which poses for Hobbes the most crucial political question: can we cope with the absolute, limitless liberty and what are the outcomes of this liberty? Do we have to somehow restrict our inbuilt drive for endless motion (endeavour, appetite) to build up an order, which secures the existence of the individual, but at the same time, limits our freedom? And how could this be done? These are the central questions that Hobbes deals in his political philosophy and they are implicitly and explicitly connected to the concept of motion.

Traditionally in Hobbes literature these questions are dealt within the framework of the state of nature and social contract.[42] The bulk of Hobbes literature has been dedicated to echoing a story told by Hobbes of the state's victory over the state of nature: the negative state of nature is conquered by instituting a sovereign power by the contract of every man with every man. This view conceives the state of nature as an apolitical state, a state of individuals, where politics does not exist. The outcome of the contract, the state, is instead seen as the proper place and sphere of politics. In this vision, politics takes place only inside the state. Thus the ordinary view in literature on Hobbes is that the Hobbesian politics is understood to be more or less the same thing as the government of the people.

This dissertation focuses on slightly different questions. We seek to approach Hobbes's vision of politics by following the path that the analysis of the concept of the multitude opens. Multitude is, in our understanding, the key that opens up the question of motion as a particularly political problem that Hobbes was about to solve in his civil philosophy. Hence, we see that analysing

---

42 Even though Hobbes did not use the term 'social contract' but instead preferred the terms 'contract' and 'covenant' and sometimes even a 'pact' (although these terms refer to different kinds of contract) in this text we use the term 'social contract' for the sake of clarity, since the use of the term is an established practice in contemporary literature on political philosophy.

the concept of multitude means the analysis of the political problem of motion in Hobbes's philosophy.

Like the concept of motion in natural philosophy, the concept of multitude has a long history in the political thought before Hobbes. In the classical period authors like Plato, Aristotle and Thucydides used the concepts of πλῆθος (*plethos*), οἱ πολλοί (*oi polloi)* and ὄχλος (*ochlos*), which all most often refer to a common people or plebs. Later in the Roman political thought, *multitudo* was a concept that had a somewhat similar content: plebs, common people and underclass were typical synonyms for *multitudo*. In the Renaissance, Machiavelli especially used the term: for him *moltitudine* was not only a group of common people. Instead he uses the concept to also refer to a violent mob and confused crowd, which are attributes that had already been used by Plato and Aristotle.

In Hobbes's time the word 'multitude' was widely used to refer to a poor, confused, rebellious and sometimes violent crowd consisting of the common people. In the medieval times it was also used in the meaning of "population".[43] It was a rather common word in the religious and political language, with a loose reference.[44] Although Hobbes must have known both the classical meaning and his contemporary use of the word, he also elaborated and redefined the concept, as he did with most of the political concepts he used. Our study is especially interested in this conceptual redefinition, in the finding of new definitions, connections and new ways of using the 'old' concepts such as multitude and motion in Hobbes.

It is important to note, that in Hobbes's use the multitude does not only refer to the common people and plebs, but instead to every person or group of people living without the sovereign power or against the orders of the sovereign power. Furthermore, we must also clarify that multitude does not either point to a certain group of people with certain history, quality, ethnicity or background. Instead anyone; rich or poor, good or evil, young or old may belong to the multitude or to be even more precise, these definitions do not play any role in multitude. Multitude is a name for a disorganized, confused, headless, anarchical and powerless collection of human beings without any specific form, shape or essence. Multitude is human matter that is always in motion: multitude changes and goes through constant metamorphoses. Yet, on the other hand multitude is an absolutely stagnant and powerless mass of human beings: it is more potentiality than actuality. It is difficult to understand multitude's undertakings; there is no other common denominator for their actions than that they are the actions of the multitude. Multitude is a monster, half a man, half an animal. It is a mythical, Biblical violent beast, the Behemoth

---

43 See Peter Biller (2000): *The Measure of Multitude: Population in Medieval Thought.*

44 Unfortunately, it is not possible in the confines of this study to seek out the proper uses of multitude from the political pamphlets and sermons of Hobbes's contemporaries. An idea of the uses of the multitude might be grasped from Christopher Hill's book *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (Hill 1975). See also Evans 2000, who tells about the poor (multitude) in early modern Exeter and Patrides (1965) who analyses the negative uses of the multitude in the Renaissance.

which Hobbes describes for us in his *History of English Civil Wars*. Multitude is something that opposes the king of pride, Leviathan, the principle of political order.[45] We must try to comprehend how in the end the multitude is, in fact, more a *logic* that defines the motion and confusion of human crowds than an ostensive term. As a matter in motion, multitude is the political problem that calls for a definitive, geometric answer in Hobbes's philosophy. However, we must realize that the problem of multitude is "unsolvable", since even after the social contract the logic of multitude haunts the organized political community. The question of multitude is something that political government must constantly think about and in his philosophy Hobbes offers elementary tools for this.

In this dissertation we claim that it is especially with the concept of multitude that Hobbes introduces the political problem of the motion to his political philosophy. In fact, multitude is, more or less, the very problem of motion. It is the problem of the disorganized, moving, changing and rioting human crowd that Hobbes aimed to solve with his political philosophy. Hence, as a crucial political problem we conceive multitude to be the starting point of Hobbes's political philosophy. By the juxtaposition of the logic of multitude with the logic of sovereign power, Hobbes manages to pinpoint the problem that is fundamentally political: the contrast and border between chaos and order, disobedience and obedience, apolitics and politics.

The analysis of multitude also shifts our interest from the question of an essentially egoistic individual to a social process that produces egoistic individuals. In this sense our understanding of the problem of individual and human nature departs from the standard interpretation: the lonely, hostile, egoistic and even violent individual living in the state of nature. According to our interpretation, the individual within the multitude is not lonely and hostile due to some sort of essential human nature that cannot ever be changed. Instead, it is the logic of multitude, the ensemble of anarchical and confused social and political relations, which make people turn into a mere collective beast.[46] With right political governance, right political philosophy and right education it is possible to reorganize and turn inbuilt human endeavour and motion to right tracks. What is needed, however, is the difficult task of eliminating the logic of the multitude from the human community, while simultaneously harnessing the powers of the multitude, the everlasting motion of human crowds, as a driving force of the commonwealth.

Consequently, at the focus of our research we have two classical concepts, motion and multitude, that seem to flow together in a fruitful way in Hobbes's political philosophy. From this basis we claim that it is essential to study how the problem and the concept of multitude is constructed and manifested in Hobbes's political philosophy.

---

45 Concerning the mythical etymology of the Behemoth and Leviathan, see Tralau 2007, 61-81 and Schmitt 2002, 73-80.

46 Hobbes refers several times in his texts to classical beasts such as Centaurs or Hydra. These examples are always connected to the logic of multitude. See for example Hobbes DC, Præfatio ad lectores, p. lat. 144; p. eng. 9.

1.2 Composition of the Study

This study is composed of five chapters that study Hobbes's conception of multitude from different aspects. We begin our re-reading on Hobbes's philosophy in chapter two entitled *Multitude in Motion* by introducing the intertwined relationship between the concepts of motion and multitude. In general, we ask what kind of concept is multitude for Hobbes: how he defines it and how he uses it. Our special interest is in the question of how Hobbes displays his most crucial political and philosophical problem through his uses of the concept of multitude: the problem of a mob or crowd composed of egoistic individuals. Yet, we depart from the traditional interpretation that sees individuals as the starting point of Hobbes's political philosophy. We argue, instead, that the real problem and logical starting point for Hobbes is not individuals, but multitude. It is the sense experience concerning the body of multitude that makes individual beings act in the most egoistic, haphazard and irrational ways. As we will see, the body of multitude affects human beings in the most immoral ways: it makes them doubt every motive of their companions and lose their trust towards each other.

Hence, it is through the analysis of the concept of multitude that we can state how the individual is not the starting point, but an *answer* to the political problem of multitude expressed by Hobbes. What Hobbes wanted to avoid was the formation of large mobs, throngs and crowds that denude humanness from human beings and deprive their closest relationships to family and relatives. Yet, he does not plead for social formations such as families or religious and political sections to build up a new political order. Instead, he speaks to those lonely, fearful, disappointed and betrayed individuals that are an outcome of the confusion of the multitude. In short, it is the multitude that produces lonely, egoistic yet uncertain individuals. It is the lonely, but pacified individuals who are the fundamental building blocks of the commonwealth. For Hobbes only an individual whose ties to his family, relatives, hometown, corporation or section have been disentangled, is able to create and serve the great Leviathan. Thus, we are interested in the complicated logic that on a one hand produces egoistic yet fearful individuals and on the other hand offers a sanctuary for these same individuals.

For Hobbes it is of utmost importance that we do not attach any political subjectivity to the multitude, like previous philosophers and Antiquity did. It seems that one of the most important fractures between classical and Hobbesian idea of the people is that, according to Hobbes, the people must be artificially created, so it can become a political subject. The classical thought instead always found the people as a natural political subject already existing. Usually this political subject was called *oi polloi*, *plebs* or *moltitudine*. Hobbes, instead, does not attach any political subjectivity to the mass. What is evident is that according to Hobbes, the multitude is totally incapable of reigning itself. Hence, by investigating the concept of multitude we are examining the border of

politics displayed by Hobbes: what belongs and what does not belong to the political order and most of all, what are the prerequisites of the political in Hobbes's philosophy.

While the second chapter introduces the basic problematic of the constantly moving multitude and thus the political problem of motion, in the third chapter *Fear, Multitude and Motion* we delve more deeply on the question of how the body of the multitude affects human beings. In our understanding Hobbes's political theory is deeply related to his theory of sense experience or *aisthesis*. Individual mistrust, actions, reactions and decisions are all related to the way in which an individual perceives the world outside her. Thus, combining Hobbes's philosophy of mind to his definitions and uses of multitude, we are able to understand how it is the very elementary sense experience pertaining the actions and motions of others that causes most of the psychological confusion that Hobbes finds existing in the multitude.

Along with *aisthesis*, we are equally interested in Hobbes's conception of *mimesis*: it is a concept that practically explains how the dynamics of motion in the human community work, especially in multitude. It is noteworthy that imitation is something that Hobbes wants to exclude from the commonwealth. Instead, as Hobbes explains, citizens should act and behave according to the confines of civil law and honour sovereign power by regulating their own action and motion. Thus, we see how two different bodies, the disorganized body of multitude and the organized body politic (state), affect human beings in different ways. From this basis we also come to understand how it is the organization of the motion of individuals that is at the core of Hobbes's politics: the inbuilt individual endeavour must be guided and directed to the construction, not demolition of the body politic.

The fourth chapter entitled *Democracy and Multitude* moves us to the question concerning the forms of government in Hobbes's philosophy. In this chapter we are especially interested in Hobbes's relationship to democracy, which he generally despised as a form of government. In our analysis we claim that Hobbes's attitude towards democracy was heavily influenced by his reading of classical political philosophy: Plato, Aristotle and Thucydides among others. He reflected the democratic and republican movements of his own time in the mirror of ancient experiences from Greece and Rome. In general, Hobbes's attitude towards democratic government was especially negative since Hobbes saw that democratic government is always on the brink of collapsing to the reign of multitude. This was, as we will demonstrate, also the viewpoint of classical writers: multitude was something that threatened the *polis,* which was based on a proper constitution and rule of law. This was a viewpoint that Hobbes shared with classical writers. The wrong use of eloquence and demagogy described by classical writers was something that Hobbes encountered in his own time as well. All this threatened the order of commonwealth and mobilized citizens to act against sovereign power. For this reason, democracy as a mode of government was too risky for Hobbes.

In spite of this, Hobbes's theory of sovereign power was based on democracy: the social contract is an essentially democratic covenant made by

every man with every man in the multitude. In the social contract is formed a majority, which rules over the minorities with omnipotent power. Now, the really interesting question concerning the concept of democracy in Hobbes's philosophy does not concern Hobbes's personal political interests and motives, but instead it is about his theoretical decision: Why did Hobbes carry the concept of democracy within his political theory, while simultaneously he always contested the reasonableness of democratic government? The reason for this, it is argued, is that Hobbes had to construct the legitimacy of the sovereign power on the basis of the moving multitude, not on God or nature for example. The starting point of the social contract is the violent 'dead end' faced by the lonely individual living in the multitude. As an outcome of the social contract the naturally problematic multitude becomes an object of governance for Hobbes: it is by the *scientia civilis* that it is possible to govern the cruel nature of the human community. Consequently, it is this curious movement, a metamorphosis of the multitude to a people that interests us in this chapter.

The question of democracy, the best form of government and contract are tightly connected to the question of the generation and corruption of the commonwealth. In the fifth chapter *Revolution and Multitude* we delve on Hobbes's conception of revolution. After the *Leviathan* was published in 1651, Hobbes was accused of being a 'rebellious' writer who allegedly sided with the Cromwellians. This interpretation has gained some success in recent Hobbes research as well. In this chapter we aim to show that Hobbes opposed "revolutionary" action and thought that rebellion will only lead to the dissolution and destruction of the state, not to any new cycle or form of the state. Hobbes's position is constructed in opposition to the classical understanding of the regime change. These explanations of the regime change included cyclical or cosmological, mythical and religious explanations. According to them, one political regime followed the other in a somewhat predetermined historical course. Another, practical reason for the regime change was the corruption of certain important actors in the society: the rule of the king for example encouraged tyrannical people to seek power and democracy instead invited the populist leaders to corrupt the lawful system into the reign of multitude, which was easily harnessed as a rule of the demagogues.

Hobbes opposed these explanations and believed that the political system, a sovereign power, is first of all a created by the human beings by their mutual contract, and secondly that this social contract is sustained only by the everyday performance of that very contract. The social contract was for Hobbes, primarily an ongoing practice or action between citizens and the representative of the sovereign power and it was designed to keep the moving multitude in control. The change from the democratic mode of government to the monarchy, for example, was as well an outcome of the contract between people and monarch. Following from this, Hobbes thought that the idea of some sort of cycle between political regimes was dangerous to the political constitution. His aim was to create a political order that might last as long as human beings

would be willing to uphold it by their action, that is, oppose the spread of the logic of multitude.

However, Hobbes feared that human beings might destroy the commonwealth by their own action. The outcome of the dissolution of the state would be the return of the reign of multitude. Hence, all rebellious action in the commonwealth exposed a body politic to dissolution, Hobbes thought. For this reason, Hobbes did not endorse any kind of 'revolutionary action' and he opposed the idea of regime change. As we find out in the fifth chapter, Hobbes's use of the word revolution was extremely rare in his texts. This is not, however, because the word revolution did not yet have a modern kind of political meaning in Hobbes's time. The word revolution was known in its political meaning and it was connected to rather radical, republican and democratic upheavals. Notwithstanding, apparently Hobbes was not interested in it.

Thus, by examining the use, or to be precise, the non-use of the concept of revolution, which is one of the most important modern political concepts reflecting the idea of motion, in Hobbes's political texts we sketch Hobbes's understanding of the state as a pure creation of human beings that exists and sustains itself only through right action, as well as through the motion of the citizens and the representative of the sovereign power. In a temporal perspective, the multitude is something that precedes and follows the state and for this reason the concept of revolution was perhaps something that confused Hobbes and made him avoid this vague concept. Revolutionary action spreads logic of multitude in commonwealth and thus threats to collapse the whole commonwealth.

In our last chapter entitled *Multitude of States or International Multitude* we move to examine the limits of the Hobbesian state in the spatial dimension by offering two interpretations of Hobbes's view of international relations: normative and descriptive. If multitude is something that confines the state in the temporal dimension, the case is somewhat different in the relations between the states. While the multitude of individuals causes anxiety, egoism and violence, the multitude of states means instead a rather peaceful coexistence according to Hobbes. States are in a disposition of war towards each other, but they do not actively seek their own benefit in the international field by waging war with others. Instead, in Hobbes's normative vision states live according to their own constitution by investing in hard work, agricultural, industrial and economic growth, we find out. They are also engaged with each other by different trade relationships. Hence, in Hobbes's design of the "anarchic" international field states do not decline to the similar state of nature as individuals. Instead, states uphold the initiative of the citizens in their everyday action. Thus, another kind of co-existence between the states is fabricated. This multitude is rather peaceful, since it is not haunted by the egoistic and negative logic of multitude.

However, we can also find another kind of description of the international relations from Hobbes's texts. While Hobbes's plan for the relatively peaceful coexistence of the independent states was his *normative* and *political aim*, the international *reality* of his age was rather different. The international field was

divided by several international struggles on power and resources. Especially the Catholic Church and Catholic countries like Spain played a huge role in a world, where traditional boundaries were constantly changing and transforming. Hobbes accuses the Catholic Church of entangling the lives of individual states: it defined how religion should be conducted, how people should carry on their daily chores and especially how people were educated in the universities and consequently at the lower levels of education as well. Along with the Catholic Church there were also other international actors such as the Presbyterian Church, economic corporations, power hungry cities, mercenary armies etc. All these form an ensemble that we call here the international multitude.

The independence of the states from external powers and their absolute right to self-determination and sovereignty was of utmost importance for Hobbes. Again we see how Hobbes wants to break the negative logic of multitude in the international field. Yet, he is not willing to engage to the idea of the "global Leviathan", an international sovereign over sovereigns, but wants instead to reserve the widest possible liberty for the sovereign power. As we see in this chapter, this liberty is absolute only in theory: in practice it is limited by the demand that Hobbes states in his rephrased Ciceronian principle, *Salus populi suprema lex* – the safety and well-being of the people is the highest law. Moral laws (dictated ultimately by God and natural reason) oblige the sovereign in their conscience and in relation to their people as well, although there are no binding moral obligations between the independent states.

Our re-reading of Hobbes's political philosophy proceeds from the definition and analysis of the concept of multitude to the particular re-readings defined above. In our research we are also discussing with previous Hobbes's scholarship. This helps the readers to orient themselves to the specific questions at hand and points out how the analysis done on the basis of multitude enables us not only to say something new, but also to understand better what has already been stated.

2 MULTITUDE IN MOTION

This chapter is a study on Hobbes's concept of multitude, its definitions and uses in Hobbes's texts. In Hobbes's use, the word multitude refers, first of all, to a large number of people as a chaotic and disordered force, which has no clear structure or form. Secondly, Hobbes's concept of multitude includes a metaphysical meaning: multitude is something that exists in spite of the historical situation and contexts. Multitude is something that exists before and after a state designed by Hobbes[47] and multitude also exists, outside of the state, while the state exists. Following this, multitude can also be conceived in the international field where different actors act in a "state of nature" as Hobbes himself suggested.[48] Thirdly, multitude usually means a lack of proper sovereign power, a situation where different heterogeneous sects, interest groups or political parties seek their own benefit in the cost of others. Thus it can mean a "mob", "throng" or "faction"[49] that aims to subvert the existing power or just cause chaos and disorder in the ordered society. Hence, multitude might exist inside the commonwealth and it is a constant danger that people (political subject) becomes a multitude. In this sense, multitude means simply a heterogeneity, which Hobbes conceives as dangerous and as a reason that will expedite the destruction of the commonwealth. No one has more power in the multitude than any other and it is this very lack of power, anarchy as Hobbes describes it, which is typical of the multitude. Lastly, multitude can also refer to the object of governance, a population, which is governed by sovereign power after the social contract is made. We note that Hobbes uses the concept of multitude in different meanings and sometimes in an intricate way, but the

---

47 Multitude stands outside of the commonwealth and every state-form is in danger of collapsing back to the multitude, as Hobbes warns in *Leviathan*: "And therefore, they that are subjects to a monarch, cannot without his leave cast off monarchy, and return to the confusion of a disunited *multitude*;" (Hobbes L, XVIII, 1. p. 115.) See also chapter 5 of this present study.

48 See chapter 6 of the present study.

49 On factions, see Hobbes DC XIII, 13. p. eng. 149; p. lat. 306. For Hobbes the faction is a commonwealth within the commonwealth.

basis of his understanding of multitude lies in his complex comprehension of the action and motion of unorganized crowds.

For us, multitude is the key term that defines the ongoing confusion and tumult in human community. Along with this, it also defines the stagnation, hopelessness and lack of future perspective deriving from the lack of political order. Yet, multitude is not only a synonym for a state of nature. Instead, we conceive the multitude as a *logic* of anarchy, which is to say as a lack of power as Hobbes describes it, and confusion, so that multitude refers to the unguided, aimless and disorganized motion of human beings. This becomes obvious while we search through the uses of multitude in Hobbes's philosophy. Multitude is a concept that marks the borderline between apolitics and politics, chaos and order, irrationality and rationality. It is an exciting term that is both included and excluded from the Hobbesian political sphere. As such we conceive it to present the fundamental, yet paradoxical political problem of motion for Hobbes.

2.1 Motion and Multitude in Hobbes Studies

Hobbes emphasized, perhaps more than anything else, the role of the proper understanding of motion in his philosophy. Still the amount of studies concentrating especially on Hobbes's political conception of motion is rather small. Actually only one monograph, Thomas A. Spragen's *The Politics of Motion: World of Thomas,* published in 1973, is dedicated to this theme. The number of studies that concentrate more generally on the concept of motion is not that wide either. There is only one unpublished Ph.D. thesis concerning this matter: Wladimir Barreto Lisboa's *Mouvement, nécessité et système selon Thomas Hobbes,* which was defended at the University of Paris I, Sorbonne in 2006.

Regarding the titles of scientific articles published in journals, only one carries the word 'motion' in its title. Yet, Jean Bernhardt's *Hobbes et le mouvement de la lumiére* from 1977 concerns Hobbes's optics alone and has no political analysis in it. Regarding the shorter texts, we find two articles. The most recent of these is Gabriella Slomp's (2011) article "The Politics of Motion and the Motion of Politics", in *International Political Theory After Hobbes*. Slomp provides a short overview on the importance of the motion particularly in Hobbes's political philosophy, which is based on her previous research emphasizing the concept of motion in her book *Thomas Hobbes and The Political Philosophy of Glory* (2000). There is also a chapter called "Hobbes and Motion" in Leslie Dale Feldman's book *Freedom as Motion*, published 2001. Feldman's analysis of Hobbes concentrates on Hobbes's theory of liberty and its relation to development of capitalism.

Although the references to the concept of motion in the titles of books and journal articles are rather scarce[50], one must acknowledge that the theme of physical motion, and sometimes its relationship to social and political questions is clearly fundamental for Hobbes's philosophy. Hence, it is more than obvious that tens, hundreds and thousands of readers of Hobbes over the centuries have noticed this fact. Following this, when looking at the literature on Hobbes we find that most of the scholars have emphasized how the concept of motion is the basis of Hobbes's philosophy.[51]

Historically there are a few treatises of the utmost importance on this matter. Frithiof Brandt's dissertation *Den mekaniske Naturopfattelse hos Thomas Hobbes*, published in Danish in 1921 and in English (*Thomas Hobbes' Mechanical Conception of Nature)*, at 1928. Brandt's work, although containing some clear mistakes and misunderstandings[52], is still very impressive in its depth and

---

50 *A Hobbes Dictionary* by A.P. Martinich has an entry for the word motion. Here motion is dealt by its metaphysical and physical aspects, but no comment or analysis of its political uses are given. Martinich points out, for example, that Hobbes refutes the Aristotelian tripartite idea of motion (change in quality, quantity and place) and says that all motion is change of bodies from one place to another. According to Martinich, Hobbes also criticized Aristotle's ideas of four causes: the formal, final, efficient and material cause. Hobbes's main critique here is that all causes must temporarily precede the effect. (Martinich 1998, 213-216.) Also Lemetti (2012, 223-225) briefly defines motion in his *Historical Dictionary of Hobbes*, yet he does not connect motion to politics at all. However, some dictionaries and vocabularies on Hobbes do not even recognize the concept of motion. For example, in the French *Hobbes et son vocabulaire*, edited by Yves Charles Zarka, there is no separate entry for motion. Motion is discussed as a part of the concepts of "space", "*conatus*" and "passion" (Schuhmann 1992, Barnouw 1992 and Tricaud 1992). Here the concept of motion is not linked with political concepts such as "power", "contract" or "dissolution of the state" (see Borot 1992, Goyard-Fabre 1992 and Nicastro 1992). The same is the case in *Le vocabulaire de Hobbes* by Jean Terrel. Here only animal and vital motions are analyzed briefly, without any relation to political ideas. (Terrel 2003, 46-49.)

51 However, most of the general introductions and overall studies on Hobbes's philosophy suffice to present, uncritically, only the most general and basic viewpoints of Hobbes's conception of motion by paraphrasing Hobbes's own words. See Moreau 1989, 18-67; Hampsher-Monk 1992 and Béal 2010 among others. Some introductory texts instead disdain the connection between motion and politics (see for example Sorell 1996a, 56-57). Concerning political studies that take motion as an important concept in Hobbes's philosophy, see for example Avgoulvent 1992, 59-69 and Slomp 2000, 11-21.

52 Regarding modern Hobbes scholarship the most serious problem is how Brandt reads *Short Tract of the First Principles* as Hobbes's own work and emphasizes the analysis of this work. Brandt's book is a sort of chronological history of Hobbes's natural philosophy and its development, and the first chapter on "Little Treatise" takes 77 pages of the 383 pages. The shadow of the "Short Tract" has haunted modern Hobbes scholarship. At least two schools concerning this question can be distinguished. The first is the tradition starting with Ferdinand Tönnies and reaching to contemporary, particularly French, Hobbes scholarship, which puts a strong emphasis on *Short Tract* at Hobbes's intellectual and scientific development. The earliest of these, after Tönnies, was Brandt (1928) who thought that *Short Tract* was significantly important text that not only explained Hobbes's development, but also the development of modernity as well. Brandt is very sure about the text's origin: "the treatise, as mentioned above, is the first essay on natural philosophy extant by the hand of Hobbes." (Brandt 1928, 47.) In 1960s Arrigo Pacchi used *A Short Tract* as Hobbes's manuscript (Pacchi 1965, 219). Pierre Zagorin (1993) also defends Hobbes as the writer *Short Tract* and gives emphasis to it as an important text in Hobbes's

preciseness of analysis. It has served as a basis for the 20th century interpretation of Hobbes as an important natural philosopher, the developer of the materialist and mechanical view of nature. Another study of Hobbes as a natural philosopher is Arrigo Pacchi's *Convenzione e ipotesi nella formazione della filosofia naturale di Thomas Hobbes* (*Convention and hypothesis in the formation of Thomas Hobbes's Natural Philosophy)*, published in 1965.[53]

In the course of time the emphasis given to motion changes, too. In the past decades we have seen a considerable shift from philosophical studies emphasizing Hobbes's natural philosophy to the historical and contextual studies that emphasize Hobbes's humanistic and political texts. In a sense, we have seen a change from a systematic approach to a contextual approach and in this change the importance given to the concept of motion has decreased.

To understand better the position of the concept of motion in Hobbes research (especially concerning his political philosophy), we can distinguish at least four general approaches: 1) ontological and epistemological 2) systematic, cosmological and mechanical 3) psychological and anthropological and 4) linguistic approach.

The first one of these, the ontological and epistemological, argues that the real novelty and defining point of Hobbes's political philosophy should be found in his "metaphysics" (*philosophia prima*).[54] These studies concern mostly

---

early development. Robert Gray (1978), who criticizes Brandt claims that there is no definitive system, not at least mechanical, in Hobbes's philosophy. He refers to a "little treatise" that Brandt mentions in his study, but it seems that Gray did not have the actual text available, only second hand information given by Brandt. Grey might have been influenced also by Watkins, who attacks Strauss and says that one should really concentrate on studying "Tract" carefully, if one wants to understand Hobbes's political thought. (Watkins 1965, 40-46.) The strongest contemporary for-speaker of *A Short Tract* is certainly Jean Bernhardt who, in his long commentary essay on *Short Tract*, manifests that it is an exceptional opening to the modernity. (Bernhardt 1988, 197.) Among particular Hobbes studies, a few general introductions also mention *Short Tract* as an important work of Hobbes. In a text by Charles-Yves Zarka, published in French at *Dictionaire des Philosophes*, he says that: "Le *Short tract* est un texte important parce qu'il marque un transition. On y trouve en effet une tentative pour expliquer tous les phénomènes de la nature par le mouvement et l'identification implicite de la substance au corps." (Zarka 1984, 1229.) However, many have also contested the originality, and following this, the special meaning of *Short Tract* for Hobbes's philosophical development. Richard Tuck questions the meaning of *Short Tract* in his article *Hobbes and Descartes.* (Tuck 1988). Noel Malcolm proves in his long article "Robert Payne, The Hobbes Manuscripts, and the 'Short Tract'" that *Short Tract* is not Hobbes's handwriting but belongs to his friend, Robert Payne. (Malcolm 2004, 80-145.) The same view is offered by Timothy Raylor (2001), who suggests that the text was written by Payne, but it was partly based on Hobbes's ideas of light that he presented in the Welbeck Abbey circle.

53 One should also note that the groundwork done by Ferdinand Tönnies in his *Thomas Hobbes: Leben und Lehre*, originally published in 1925, plays a very important role in the kind of Hobbes studies, which sees Hobbes's system as based on his epistemology, ontology and theory of physics. (See Tönnies 1971.)

54 Hobbes called the first philosophy with the Latin word *philosophia prima* to avoid the term metaphysics. For him, metaphysics was a problematic concept, loaded with the burden of scholastics and misunderstandings of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. Hobbes saw that Aristotle's *Metaphysics* meant the book that was written or placed after his books on natural philosophy (*Physics*). The schools interpreted this, wrongly according to Hobbes, to mean a supernatural philosophy. (Hobbes L, XXXXVI, 14-16, pp. 446-447.)

the overall structure of Hobbes's philosophy and claim that the political challenge Hobbes gave was based on his philosophical system, epistemology and metaphysics.[55] This approach has also been very interested in Hobbes's theory of science, his geometrical method and mathematical ideas. Generally, the approach is very philosophical and continental. The best example of this paradigm is the French researcher Charles Yves-Zarka with his *La Decision métaphysique de Hobbes.* Besides Zarka, several other French and Italian researchers have followed this line of reasoning.[56]

The second approach, systematic, cosmological and mechanical, is more Anglo-American in its orientation, but it equally concentrates on analysing Hobbes's political theory from the basis of his scientific theory.[57] Yet, while the continental and especially French approach to Hobbes's political thought emphasized the metaphysics, the Anglo-American tradition has put more weight on Hobbes's "cosmology" and mechanical ideas concerning motion.[58]

Philosophia prima should concern such things that are necessary to all other philosophy or science, that is, "in right limiting of the significations of such appellations, or names, as are of all others most universal; which limitations serve to avoid ambiguity and equivocation in reasoning; and are commonly called definitions: such as are the definitions of body, time, place, matter, form, essence, subject, substance, accident, power, act, finite, infinite, quantity, quality, motion, action, passion and divers others, necessary to the explaining of a man's conceptions concerning the nature and generation of bodies." (Hobbes L, XXXXVI, 14, p. 446.) Concerning the relation of the terms of metaphysics and *philosophia prima*, see Magnard (1990): "Philosophie première ou la métaphysique". For Magnard, as for Zarka (1999, 27-58) as well, the question and problem of the Hobbesian metaphysics is in fact a question of epistemology, not of ontology, since Hobbes's nominalism leads to the principle of the annihilation of the world (*annihiliatio mundi*) as the starting point of metaphysics.

55 Bernard Willms has, for example, concluded that Hobbes's *philosophia prima* is politics: "sa philosophie première est la politique. La politique non pas dans le sens d'une stratégie appliquée, mais dans la signification d'arche veritable au sens classique." (Willms 1990, 94.)

56 This sort of approach seems to have been popular amongst continental Hobbes scholars especially during the 1980s. There are three major edited books that present several authors who find their orientation more or less from this perspective: Zarka & Bernhardt (eds.) (1990) *Thomas Hobbes: philosophie première, théorie de la science et politique,* Bertman and Malherbe (eds.) (1989) *Thomas Hobbes. De la métaphysique a la politique* and Bostrenghi (ed.) (1992) *Hobbes e Spinoza, Scienza e politica.*

57 It is good to remember that there are some authors, such as Finn (2006), who argue that Hobbes's political philosophy should be understood primarily in relation to his natural philosophy. Thus, according to Finn, Hobbes's natural philosophy is a development of his political philosophy. The orientation of Finn's book is thus simply to "prove" that natural philosophy is not the basis of Hobbes's political philosophy, which Finn sees to be a dominant interpretation.

58 There are, however, similar interpretations in the French approach as well. Jean Terrel (1994) for example emphasizes that it is especially the idea of mechanism that enables the comparison of a natural body with an artificial body. Thus, by analysing the motion of the natural body it is possible to find out the laws of the motion that the artificial body should also share and imitate. According to Terrel motion plays a very crucial role in Hobbes's political thought, because both human and the state (*cité*) are automates "qui contiennent en eux-mêmes le principe permettant au mouvement de se perpétuer." (Terrel 1994, 278; 269-285.) Again, Stéphane Gillioz treats mechanisms as a metaphor in the general contexts of his analysis of *Leviathan* as a work of political theology. Gillioz finds a very complex system of resemblance between human body and artificial political body, the "mechanic of living", and from

Sometimes this approach sees the political system resembling the cosmological structures, but most often the argumentation goes from the analysis of general laws of motion towards politics.[59] This approach highlights the new theory of motion, which derives from such philosophers as Galileo and Gassendi and was later adapted and developed by Hobbes in his own works.

In this tradition Hobbes's theory of motion is understood as a scientific and mathematical basis and as a starting point, which leads to a totally new interpretation of the universe. The structure and the mechanics of the universe are understood to be reflected in the political structure that Hobbes was after.[60] Thus, the new scientific method and theory of cosmos offers Hobbes new possibilities to attack scholastic philosophy and Aristotelian thought. However, as some Hobbes scholars, most importantly Cees Leijenhoorst in his book *Mechanization of Aristotelianism* (2002), have proved Hobbes's orientation in natural philosophy is not that far from the Aristotelian one.[61]

Like the first approach, the second approach is equally rather abstract and theoretical and it requires good knowledge of the intellectual history of the early modern natural philosophy. This approach also emphasizes how Hobbes's philosophy is formed as an all-encompassing system.[62] Concerning

---

this basis draws a map of moral and political concepts in Hobbes's thought. (Gillioz 1990, 61-93.)

59 See the article by Lisa T. Sarasohn (1985): *Motion and Morality : Pierre Gassendi, Thomas Hobbes and Mechanical World-View*. Sarasohn writes: "Thus, for Hobbes, the 'root-paradigm' of inertial motion analogically penetrated and transformed his understanding of both psychological behavior and political activity, and gave his social theories the status of cosmological realities." (Sarasohn 1985, 363.)

60 Some scholars have, however, emphasized the point that although mechanical motion gives a context to Hobbes's political philosophy, it does not explain it. See especially Arp 2002.

61 While discussing the principal concepts of *A Short Tract* Brandt states: "Thus Hobbes takes the Aristotelian conceptions, accident and substance, and consistently maintains them." (Brandt 1928, 17.) Later several authors have emphasized the fact that at least with one foot, as Strauss says, Hobbes stands in the Aristotelian tradition (Strauss 1984, 30-43). Thus, it is true that Hobbes knew and elaborated scholastic conceptions, but he also "emancipated himself from scholasticism through criticism" as Brandt (1928, 85) states. Concerning the debt of Hobbes's natural philosophy to Aristotle, see Spragens 1973 and especially Leijenhoorst 2002.

62 Several examples of this approach could be given. Many of them are from the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. The system approach is particularly strong in J.W.N. Watking's book *Hobbes's System of Ideas*. As its subtitle indicates, it is "A Study in the Political Significance of Philosophical Theories". In his preface Watkins says that "The question it answers is, how much of Hobbes's *political* theory is implied by his *philosophical* ideas? The conclusion it reaches is that the essentials of his political theory are so implied." (Watkins 1965, 9.) Watkins's approach is Popperian and he attacks such scholars as Leo Strauss and Howard Warrender. His book concerns most of the fields of Hobbes's philosophy, but predominantly he emphasizes his philosophical system, including his theory of language (Watkins 1965). Like Watkins, M.M. Goldsmith goes in his *Hobbes's Science of Politics* through the logical structure of Hobbes's philosophy, starting from the definition of philosophy, then moving to natural philosophy, human nature, the natural condition of mankind, the construction of social order and finally to the definition of sovereignty. His aim is to find out whether Hobbes's philosophy is a system, where the nature of political philosophy is best understood by understanding his natural philosophy. He asks: "did Hobbes have any reasonable or legitimate ground for his claim that his political theory was scientific?" (Goldsmith 1965, 229.) His answer is yes, but he also notes

the political philosophy, the best example of this approach is definitely the aforementioned Spragens's (1973) *The Politics of Motion: World of Thomas Hobbes*.

The third approach can be described as "psychological" and "anthropological". The interest in Hobbes's philosophy of mind has remained somewhat stable ever since the beginning of proper Hobbes studies.[63] This is no wonder, since Hobbes's psychology offers a truly special view of the human mind in the context of the early modern period. Here the question of the mechanical theory of motion and thus, the mechanical idea of the human mind, has played a crucial role in the debate.[64] The question of the mechanical view of the mind is easily connected to the questions of Hobbes's alleged psychological egoism: if the mind works according to Hobbes as a mechanical 'clock', then egoism is something that prevails as an essential character of the human mind both in the state of nature and in society.[65] Thus, regarding politics, the question is: can one conceive Hobbes's political philosophy from the basis of his mechanical conception of the human psyche and egoism?[66]

---

that in strictly scientific sense Hobbes failed, since it was impossible to test Hobbes's political system (Goldsmith 1965, 242.) Weiß (1980) also studies Hobbes as a theorist of a system, yet connecting Hobbes's theology to the German studies of "political theology". According to Weiß Hobbes sees the world as a machine and thus, his politics and theology must be understood through his mechanical philosophy. McNeilly presents Hobbes's political theory as well as a part of a system (McNeilly 1968.) Against these systemic interpretations of the 1950s and 1960s Ashcroft offers an idea that what should interest us are the political uses of science in Hobbes's philosophy (Ashcraft 1978, 33). Several other examples of systematic, and thus not very practical approach's to Hobbes's political philosophy could be named. Two good examples are David Gauthier's *The Logic of Leviathan* (1969) and Gregory S. Kavka's *Hobbesian Moral and Political Theory* (1986).

63 One early example of the research done on the questions of Hobbes's psychology is V.F. Moore's article "The Psychology of Hobbes and Its Sources" from 1899. Here Moore suggests that Hobbes might even be the founder of English Psychology (p. 49.) The first part of Moore's analysis is descriptive, and thus he emphasizes the meaning of mechanical motion for Hobbes's psychology (pp. 49-56). In a second part of his analysis, Moore states that it was particularly Francis Bacon and René Descartes who influenced the development of Hobbes's psychology. However, he also states that several promoters of scientific revolution, such as Kepler, Galileo and Mersenne were important to Hobbes (p. 56-66). See also Brandt 1928. Even though Brandt's book concerns mostly physical phenomena, he also refers several times to Hobbes's mechanical psychological theory as well. (See for example Brandt 1928, 125-127, and passim.)

64 On Hobbes's mechanical philosophy in general, see Jesseph (1996). On Hobbes's psychology in general, see Gert 1996. Recent studies on Hobbes's psychology do not emphasize that much the mechanistic conception of Hobbes's mind, although they see the concept of motion as crucial. See for example Pettit 2008, 9-23 and Lemetti 2006, particularly 85-89. It is perhaps good to remember what McNeilly had to say concerning Hobbes's psychology: "The fact is that it is hopeless to try to reconstruct some single doctrine of Hobbesian psychology. Hobbes developed at least two distinct views." (McNeilly 1968, 196.)

65 On Hobbes's alleged psychological egoism see the debate between Gert (1965) and McNeilly (1968) from the 1960s. Both of them accept, in some respects, that Hobbes cannot be seen, at least totally as a supporter of psychological egoism. See also Kavka's conclusive analysis on this question (Kavka 1986, 35-82.) Recently Lemetti (2012, 116-117) has suggested that Hobbes's psychology is egoistic, but only as a descriptive theory of motivation, not as normative ethical theory.

66 See McNeilly 1967; Sorrell 1996a, 56-57.

This leads us out from a purely philosophical interest in the mind to a wider anthropological approach, which emphasizes the fact that the constant motion and restlessness, which Hobbes attaches to a human being, causes certain political implications.[67] The explanation of "bellum omnium contra omnes" is a typical starting point for this approach: human wickedness and the natural strife for power, namely egoism, produces a lasting appetite and search for a better life. Here the interest in motion derives mainly from the capacities of the human psyche to endeavour (*conatus*), and the important difference between vital and animal (voluntary) motions. Politics is understood as a way of controlling this natural impulse, appetite or desire, which describes "natural man".

Quite close to the anthropological approach is the last, fourth approach concentrating on the meaning of language in Hobbes's philosophy. As language occupies such an important place in Hobbes's philosophy, many see that one should seek the answers to the political questions from it as well.[68] Here the impact of motion is not as strong as it is in the case of the philosophy of the mind and in the anthropological approach. According to Hobbes, the language has a double potentiality: with the use of language, men can become almost as Gods and the makers of their own destiny, but it is also and especially language, which causes the famous war of everyone against everyone (Hobbes 2003, V, 5. pp. 71-72.) In *De Homine* Hobbes states:

> …the thing that we should be able to order and of which we should be able to understand is different kinds of the right usage of language, which is of utmost importance. Since, without language there is no human society, no peace, and therefore no discipline; instead the savagery and consequently solitude nest in our homes. (Hobbes 2012 DH, X, 3. p. 91.)[69]

Thus, language is not only a media, but language makes it possible to affect, move and organize people as well.[70] To put it shortly: without language, there is no politics.

Given the importance of language, many scholars, such as David Johnston in his *The Rhetoric of Leviathan*, Quentin Skinner in his *Reason and Rhetoric in the*

---

67 See for example McNeilly 1968, 95-136 and MacPherson 1975, 29-46.

68 Philosophical studies on Hobbes have emphasized equally the scientific, methodological and language approach. For example, in his *The Anatomy of Leviathan* McNeilly explores Hobbes's method, his theory of science and theory of language to understand Hobbes's political philosophy, *Leviathan* particularly. (McNeilly 1968, on language and logic pp. 29-58.)

69 The Latin origin reads as follows: "quod imperare et imperata intelligire possimus, beneficium sermonis est, et quidem maximum. Nam sine eo nulla esset inter homines societas, nulla pax, et consequenter nulla disciplina ; sed feritas primo, et deinde solitudo, et pro domiciliis laibula." (Hobbes DH, X, 3. p. 91). Paul-Marie Maurin translates this passage into French : "…le fait que nous puissions ordonner, et comprendre les orders est un bienfait du langage, et sans doute plus grand. Car, sans lui, il n'y aurait nulle société humaine, nulle paix, et, partant, nulle organization politique; mais d'abord, la sauvagerie, ensuite la solitude, et pour demeures des repaires." (Hobbes 1974, X, 3, p. 145.)

70 In *The Elements of Law* Hobbes dedicates a whole chapter (XIII) to this theme (Hobbes EL, XIII, pp. 73-77).

Philosophy of Hobbes and Philipp Pettit in his *Made with Words* have started to (re)consider the role of language and rhetoric in Hobbes's philosophy. It seems that Hobbes knew quite well the classical theory of rhetoric, which stated clearly that with linguistic action it is possible to move people to take certain opinions and positions in a political realm.[71] Skinner sees that Hobbes's "attack" against classical humanism included an attack against rhetoric precisely because he thought that the rhetoric is involved in an endeavour to move people's mind. Against this, Hobbes placed his "scientific" theory that aims not to move emotions, but to know the certainty. (Skinner 1996, 262-263; 268-271.) However, even though there are several studies on Hobbes's rhetoric, the special emphasis on political motion and movement caused by the language and rhetoric has remained a mere curiosity: only Skinner devotes more than few pages to this question.[72] This might follow from the fact that it is impossible to comprehend language in a similar mechanical way as Hobbes's mental philosophy. However, given the fact that the concept of motion was central to Hobbes's philosophy and that it also was embedded in the philosophical debates and concrete political questions (migrations caused by religious wars, reconstruction of the political sphere, new political and religious movements etc.) of Hobbes's time, it seems that historians and contextualists have chosen deliberatively to omit this crucial concept in favour of other emphasis. One reason for this might have been that the humanistic approach proposed by contextualists is in contrast to the former systematic and scientific approach that emphasized the role of motion.

As we see from what has been stated above, Hobbes scholarship has always given, naturally, an important role for the analysis of the motion. Yet, concerning political philosophy, the emphasis on motion has been rather shallow, excluding Thomas A. Spragens' work. Motion is generally seen as the basis of Hobbes's philosophical system and thus, its effects on politics are considered principally concerning the questions of human nature. Especially in the recent decades the emphasis on motion has diminished, except for a few interesting articles, and so far there are no studies on the question concerning the motion of human masses or multitude. In our present study we emphasize the importance of the concept of multitude while understanding the political nature and role of motion in Hobbes's philosophy. Our aim is to revitalize the meaning of the concept of motion in Hobbes studies, yet we do not engage in either the systematic or contextualist approach. We gather inspiration from different sources, but we do not blindly follow paths set by the previous research. Thus, we do not completely endorse for example Thomas Spragens' idea of politics as an extension of Hobbes's natural philosophy of motion. There is no need either to underscore too much the system nature of Hobbes's philosophy, although this study concentrates mainly on scrutinizing the uses of

---

71 Skinner states that Hobbes must have known most of the classical rhetoricians (Skinner 1996, 232-233).

72 Johnston touches on this theme but does not actually treat the capability of language to move people except only in some passing comments (for example Johnston 1986, 63-65).

the concepts in Hobbes's political texts. However, we want to emphasise how the idea of motion, even though it is not always reducible to his natural philosophy, is fundamental to his political imagination.

Moving from the concept of motion to the concept of multitude, we note how the concept has not played any significant role in Hobbes studies before. There might be several reasons for this, but it is obvious that the concept has suffered from its reputation as an "apolitical" concept. Seemingly multitude is understood mainly as a negative concept and thus connected to an alleged "pre-political world" or "state of nature". In this sense, several classical studies on Hobbes have followed the storylines told by Hobbes himself, where the anarchical state of nature precedes the social contract and the formation of sovereign power. Both of these concepts, state of nature and anarchy, have also been studied quite widely among Hobbes scholars. The multitude, however, remains almost intact. One of the most important premises of this study is that multitude is not comprehended as a pre-political concept. Instead, multitude names the very political problem. Following from this, we see that the concept of multitude cannot be reduced to the concept of state of nature either, even though these concepts have certain points of overlap and resemblance to each other.

The start of the new, vivid and radical debate on the concept of multitude in political and social theory can be traced to the publication of *Empire* by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri in 2000. This book launched a new interpretation of several classical political concepts in the framework of globalized political and economic power. Hardt and Negri argue that the classical political concepts do not suffice in the globalized politics, where the world has lost its "centre" and has become instead a multilayered and multidimensional "Empire".[73] One should not however mix Empire with imperialism, since according to Hardt and Negri, there is no hegemonic leader in the world anymore.[74]

In their theory concerning the emergence of the Empire, Hardt and Negri dwell on the long history of political thought. This is done especially in chapter two of *Empire*, "Passages of Sovereignty" in which they describe two Europes. The first one is the victorious Europe, which is organized around the concept of absolute sovereignty, and the other is Europe that has lost the battle, since it supported the concept of multitude.

Thomas Hobbes's political theory plays a significant role in this description. Negri and Hardt state: "Thomas Hobbes's proposition of an ultimate and absolute sovereign ruler, a 'God on earth,' plays a foundational role in the modern construction of a transcendent political apparatus." (Hardt & Negri 2001, 83.) Thus, Hardt and Negri understand Hobbes's sovereignty as a

---

73 A detailed reconsideration concerning the modern political vocabulary is given in Negri's book *Fabrique du Porcelaine* (Negri 2006).

74 For a critique of Hardt and Negri's theory, see the Ph.D. dissertation of Andy Knott (2011) *Multitude and Hegemony*. In his research Knott treats authors such as Marsilius of Padua, Niccolò Machiavelli and Baruch Spinoza, but does not get into Hobbes's theory of multitude.

transcendent political ruler, which is opposed to the immanent political subjectivity, the multitude. In their narrative, they juxtapose the development of a radical, immanent idea of democracy and its true subjectivity, starting from Dante and Duns Scotus and ending with the philosophy of Spinoza, with the transcendent vein of political authority, which they connect to such writers as Jean Bodin, Thomas Hobbes, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and G.W.F. Hegel. (Hardt & Negri 2001.)

According to Hardt and Negri the principle of sovereignty is opposed to the principle of multitude. For them the multitude means all free, communist and democratic tendencies that are captured by the capitalist state-machine, the transcendent sovereignty. For Hardt and Negri, the concept of people, as endorsed by Hobbes, represents the homogenous unity, whereas the multitude represents heterogenic multiplicity of "singularities" that act on the "plane of immanence"[75], which is not captured by sovereign power. (Hardt & Negri 2001, 73; 87.)

According to Hardt and Negri, the concept of the people is closely attached to the principle of sovereignty:

> We should note that the concept of the people is very different from that one of the multitude. […] The multitude is a multiplicity, a plane of singularities, an open set of relations, which is not homogenous or identical with itself and bears an indistinct, inclusive relation to those outside of it. The People, in contrast, tends towards identity and homogeneity internally while posing its difference, from and excluding what remains outside of it. Whereas the multitude is an inconclusive constituent relation, the people is constituted synthesis that is prepared for sovereignty. The people provides a single will and action that is independent of and often in conflict with the various wills and actions of the multitude. Every nation must make the multitude into a people. (Hardt & Negri 2001, 103.)[76]

In this citation people and multitude are drastically opposed and this opposition seems to follow the Hobbesian way of distinguishing between multitude and people. Like Hardt and Negri, Paolo Virno traces this opposition back to Hobbes and to his distaste for the multitude in his *Grammatica della moltitudine* (*Grammar of Multitude*) where he states:

> Hobbes *detests* — and I am using here, after due consideration, a passionate, not very scientific word — the multitude; he rages against it. In the social and political existence of the many, seen as being many, in the plurality which does not converge into a synthetic unity, he sees the greatest danger of a "supreme empire"; that is to say, for that monopoly of *political decision-making* which is the State. The best way to understand the significance of a concept — multitude, in this case — is to examine it with the eyes of one who has fought it tenaciously. The person who grasps all the

---

75 The vocabulary and theory of Hardt and Negri is influenced by the philosophy of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. For Deleuze and Guattari, the plane of immanence is something that is fundamentally opposed to the transcendence. The plane of immanence is like Spinoza's substance, a substance that is immanent to itself and has its own principles of organization. On the concept of plane of immanence, see Deleuze & Guattari 1991. The plane of immanence can be compared to the plane of consistency. See Deleuze & Guattari 2001, 318-332; 632-634.

76 For similar analysis of multitude, see Hardt & Negri 2004, 99, and Hardt & Negri 2009, 42.

> implications and the nuances of a concept is precisely the one who wishes to expunge it from the theoretical and practical horizon. (Virno 2004, 22.)

As Negri and Hardt, Virno sees that Hobbes shuns the very heterogeneity of multitude. They see that for Hobbes the multitude represents chaotic forces, which must be controlled in order to build up political order. But for them this governance of the multitude means its suppression, whereas Hobbes sees this as a freeing of human beings from their negative, natural confines.

Let us see one more interpretation of Hobbes's concepts of multitude and people that clarifies the picture that these studies have drawn on Hobbes. This citation can be found from Filippo del Lucchese's book *Conflict, Power, and Multitude in Machiavelli and Spinoza*:

> The argument used by Hobbes to criticize the multitude is not much different [*i.e. from neo-stoics such as Justus Lipsius*]. Indeed, it is with the English philosopher that the category of the *multitude* becomes a definitive polemical target of modern philosophy. The multitude is now set against the people to indicate forms of political existence of the many qua many, of a plurality that resists the idea of representation. For Hobbes, the multitude is opposed to the people as much as the latter is a subject that has achieved unity through the alienation of natural rights and the constitution of the political space through the social contract, translating, therefore, into an exclusively representational space. Only through the representation of the sovereign can the political problem of the state of nature be resolved. The multitude is turned toward the past and the state toward a future of peace and stability, as in the frontispiece of the first 1651 edition of *Leviathan*, where they are turned unanimously toward the face of the sovereign. The multitude is denied any will. It is emptied of any subjectivity, forming the bust of the *Leviathan* through a connection without relationship, in which *multitudo* recalls *solitudo* and in which the original meaning of the *cum-munus*, is overturned in the autonomization of the *munus* and in the suppression of the *cum*. (Lucchese 2009, 118.)

What Lucchese points out here is that for Hobbes the multitude lives in the past, whereas state is constructed to create the horizon of the future and development. Multitude opposes representative politics, which is the main reason why these writers want to create a counter history for the concept of multitude. In other words they want to reveal a different interpretation of multitude, which would not be confined by the Hobbesian suspicion against its potentiality.

As an opponent of Hobbes's negative theory of the multitude, the above mentioned philosophers have suggested that we should seek the proper democratic understanding of the multitude from the philosophy of Hobbes's follower, Baruch Spinoza.[77] Since Negri and Hardt, a number of studies have emerged that concentrate on the Spinozian theory of multitude.[78] Some of these

---

77 According to Spinoza, the more there are people gathered together, the more power and hence, more right they have (Spinoza 2002, II.13. p.126.) For this reason, a multitude has more right than a King and thus a multitude limits the power of the King. (Spinoza 2002, III, 2. p. 138.)

78 Generally, this line of thought derives from their interpretation on Spinoza based on Deleuze's influential *habilitation Spinoza et le problème de l'expression* (*Spinoza and the Problem of Expression,* 2004) and his little book *Spinoza: Philosophie pratique* (*Spinoza: Practical Philosophy,* 2003). Perhaps even more important is Antonio Negri's book on *Spinoza, L'anomalia selvaggia* (*Spinoza: Savage Anomaly,* 1999).

studies are more political in their nature, while others have a more traditional and philosophical standpoint.[79] In these studies Hobbes is conceived as the "bad" opponent of the Spinozian theory of the radical democratic theory of multitude. According to this discourse, Hobbes wanted to exclude the multitude from the state in any possible way, while Spinoza celebrates the free co-existence of the plurality of "singularities" in a democratic state. Thus, Spinoza is seen as a true advocate of democracy while Hobbes is understood as believer of monarchy and authoritarian state.

However, even though these interpretations and discussions are politically interesting, they are not necessarily very informative regarding the way Hobbes really used the concept of multitude in his philosophy. The weak point of these studies is that they say much about Spinoza's conception of the multitude, and even more about Deleuze's and Negri's interpretation on Spinoza, but very little about Hobbes. As so many times before in the history of political theory, Hobbes is used as a mere straw-man: we really do not get any useful or new information of Hobbes by reading these interpretations on multitude, since they are more interested in building up a positive concept of multitude as a political subjectivity for the uses of the contemporary political practice than doing research on Hobbes's concept of multitude. This is of course understandable and respectable, but not that interesting while we try to understand what Hobbes thought about multitude and how he used the concept.

Now, moving back to more traditional Hobbes research, we find, as already mentioned, that some themes that concern multitude have been previously studied under the concept of "state of nature". We do not exaggerate if we claim that the state of nature is a sort of cornerstone in the traditional Hobbes research. The metaphor of the state of nature where all human development is suspended and the war of all against all reigns has inspired hundreds of authors throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. Several of Hobbes's most famous slogans find their source in Hobbes's description of the state of nature. Anyone who becomes acquainted with Hobbes soon knows what the concept of state of nature means. One aim of this study is to unravel the grand narrative related to the concept of state of nature and reveal the importance of the concept of multitude.

Thus, the state of nature has been a sort of metanarrative in Hobbes studies. The movement from the state of nature to the state has been seen as

---

79 See for example the aforementioned Filippo del Lucchese's (2009) philosophical work (that uses Deleuze, Nancy, Balibar, Negri etc.) *Conflict, Power, and Multitude in Machiavelli and Spinoza*. Here, following the ideas of Negri, Lucchese argues that Spinoza uses the Machiavellian ideas on the power of the *populo* over the Prince. He also finds other similarities with these two writers. Usually Lucchese puts Machiavelli and Spinoza in opposition to Hobbes's doctrines. He states for example that Hobbes's theory was "abstract" and separated from the peoples historical reality (p. 67) and that Hobbes's demand of absolute obedience towards the sovereign is very different from Spinoza's ideas of democracy (p. 33, 77). Lucchese also argues that Hobbes's influence on Spinoza should not be considered too meaningful (p. 108).

decisive. Still, even though the "ghost" of this narrative, that is, the idea of some pre-political state, haunts modern political thought, Hobbes's story has been contested by several Hobbes scholars. In his classical study C.B. MacPherson for example states that the state of nature should be understood as a negative reflection of the English Civil Wars and as a logical hypothesis, not as a historical description (MacPherson 1975, 19-29).[80] Nowadays all scholars acknowledge that the state of nature is fiction, a concept that is designed for Hobbes's purposes to build a negative opponent for the sovereign and political order.[81]

One comprehensive study on the concepts of nature and state of nature in Hobbes's philosophy is Anne-Laure Angoulvent's *Hobbes ou la crise de l'État baroque*. However, Angoulvent does not connect the state of nature to the concept of multitude at all. In fact, she tries to show that the state of nature should be in fact understood as a civil society (*l'état civil*). (Angoulvent 1992, 150; 150-159.) Another, much more profound study on the concept of the state of nature is Helen Thornton's *State of Nature or Eden?* (2005), which presents aspects of Hobbes and his contemporaries on the state of nature. Like Angoulvent, Thornton does not analyse the relationship between the concepts of the state of nature and multitude. In fact, she does not mention multitude at all in her book.

In short, the concept of multitude is not conceived as important in the studies that concentrate on the state of nature, even though this would have been a rather obvious and logical (but in our interpretation, not sufficient) connection. If we manage to find links between the state of nature and multitude, they are most often unintentional in that the use of the concept of multitude is not especially reflected.[82]

The same understating of the concept of multitude can be observed in dictionaries that concern Hobbes's philosophy. For example, in A.P. Martinich's *A Hobbes Dictionary* there is no entry for multitude, and in addition, the book

---

80 Later the same idea is given by Ninon Grangé who states that: "Il est connu que l'émergence de l'état de nature en philosophie est liée aux guerres civiles, et plus généralement européennes – s'en font l'écho Bodin, La Boétie, Montaigne, Grotius, Hobbes, Spinoza, Pufendorf, Locke mais aussi Vico, qui vivent tous en des temps troubles." (Grangé 2009, 132; 133.) Richard Ashcraft points out as well that Hobbes's conception of the state of nature cannot be understood in an analytical way. According to him, it is not right to remove all the historical connections and study it as a timeless and unhistorical concept. (Ashcraft 1978, 29-30.) Here Ashcraft is in the lines of MacPherson (1962).

81 Some scholars connect the concept of the state of nature to the story of the Adam's fall and in *Genesis* (See for example Thornton 2005, 4-5). Some have also pointed out that Hobbes found the inspiration for the state of nature from Thucydides's description of the early Greece. (See Klosko and Rice, "Thucydides and Hobbes's State of Nature", 405-409. Reference by Rahe 2008, 283.)

82 An exception to this is Gordon Hull's lucid chapter on the concept of the state of nature (pp. 87-117) in his book *Hobbes and The Making of Modern Political Thought*, where the concept of multitude is used several times in insightful way at the context of state of nature. (Hull 2009, 89; 109; 112; 117.)

does not analyze the concept of multitude at all. This is the case also with the French *Hobbes et son vocabulaire*, edited by Yves Charles Zarka and *Le vocabulaire de Hobbes* by Jean Terrel. Terrel mentions the multitude only briefly (p. 37.) but he does not say much about it, since he concentrates on the problem of representation and artificial person. The most recent Hobbes dictionary by Juhana Lemetti (Lemetti 2012, 225-226) recognizes the concept of multitude. Yet, Lemetti's description of the word is very narrow and limited only to *De Cive*, echoing the problematic translation made by Silverthorne and Tuck in their new translation of *De Cive* (*On the Citizen*, 2003), where they translate multitude as crowd.

In fact this interpretation concerning Hobbes's concept of multitude reveals quite a lot about the views of contemporary scholars. In their translation, the concept of *multitudo* is systematically translated with the word "crowd". Their explanation for this choice is worth citing in full:

> No modern English word seems to be an adequate substitute for the archaic "multitude" (which is Hobbes own equivalent in both *Elements of Law* and *Leviathan*). *Multitudo* is the key word of plurality, but it is more than numerical. A *multitudo* becomes *unus* by effecting an *unio* (V.I-II, especially 9); and in this contrast with *unus* and *unio*, *multitudo* carries an implication of disorder (made explicit in some contexts by the phrase *dissoluta multitudo*, e.g. VII.5). We have felt therefore that merely to stress the plurality of *multitudo* by using some such phrase as 'a number of men' was inadequate, and we have attempted to convey the other connotations of the word by using 'crowd' (ch.VI.I and note). (Silverthorne and Tuck 2003, xl-xli.)

This decision considerably affects the reading of the new translation of the *De Cive*. As the concept of multitude plays a very important role in that book, the reader is led to almost totally forget the importance and multidimensional use of the word. With this decision, the multitude is also dispatched from the ancient uses, and as well of Hobbes's own uses of the concept in his other texts. Now the reader gets a rather limited interpretation of the concept of multitude, when it is reduced to meaning the 'crowd'.[83]

From the analysis above we notice that the concept of multitude has not been at the centre, or even of moderate interest in Hobbes scholarship. In general, references to multitude are promiscuous and there is no proper analysis concerning this concept. However, there are three proper scientific texts that concern the very concept particularly in Hobbes's philosophy.[84]

The two most important of these are Omar Astorga's article "Hobbes's Concept of Multitude" published in *Hobbes's Studies* 24 (2011) and a chapter 'Constructing Politics' in Gordon Hull's book *Hobbes and the Making of Modern Political Thought* (2009). Both Astorga's and Hull's articles are valuable, since they concentrate exactly on the critical question of Hobbes's concept of

---

83 Even though the translation is limited, this does not mean that the term 'crowd' could be avoided while writing about multitude. In our text we use the term crowd in several places. The most important thing is that multitude does not equal crowd.

84 However, the term multitude is naturally used in several texts and articles concerning Hobbes's political thought. For example Skinner (1997) uses the term multitude widely in his article "Hobbes and the Purely Artificial Person of the State".

multitude in his theory of sovereignty and representation: the difference between multitude and people. Astorga states the aspect that can be seen as the culmination point of Hobbes's political theory: multitude is not a people and multitude must be turned into a people if sovereign power is to be established. Yet, although Astorga's article summarizes the main points of this in *De Cive* and shows its importance in the theory of representation in *Leviathan*, the article contends to outline the obvious character of the concept of multitude while also repeating the views defined by Hardt and Negri. Hull's chapter concerning the difference between multitude and people, which is closely related to the principle of representation, gives instead a much deeper philosophical understanding of the nature of social contract and sovereignty. He also connects the question of the multitude to a longer context of history of ideas. (Astorga 2011; Hull 2009, 118-136.)

The same idea of the difference between people and multitude is also treated in Malcolm Bull's article "The Limits of Multitude", published in *New Left Review* 2005. While Astorga's motivation for writing an article on Hobbes's concept of multitude is only partly inspired by the huge interest on the topic among the aforementioned political theorists, Bull's article is motivated solely on this basis. Thus, Bull tries to give a critical answer to Negri, Hardt, Virno and others who use Hobbes's conception of multitude in their political theory. (Bull 2005.) Like Astorga and Hull, Bull also concentrates on the difference between multitude and people. Yet unlike Astorga, Bull sees the connection between the concepts of multitude and people as much more complicated. He states that "the distinction is trickier than it might appear, for the people and the multitude are not distinct or opposing forces; they are actually the same individuals" (Bull 2005, 23).

According to Bull, the multitude exists in three distinct moments: first before the contract; second, in the contract when multitude becomes a people; and third after the contract "when a proxy has been designated, and the designated proxy is not the people, and multitude itself just a multitude once more." (Bull 2005, 24). Bull also states that:

> It is wrong to claim that Hobbes's multitude shuns political unity, resists authority, or does not enter into lasting agreements. According to Hobbes, it is the multitude who enters into lasting agreements (with one another as individuals) to create the people. (Bull 2005, 24.)

Hence, according to Bull, Hobbes is not in fact opposed to multitude, but instead he is against every faction, which acts as a people, that is, tries to possess a sovereign power.

What both Astroga and Bull seem to forget is the very important aspect, which is brought up by Charles Yves Zarka in the last page of his *L'autre voie de subjectivité*, which is one of the rare places that we can find term multitude in Zarka's texts, where he states that Hobbes's concept of multitude stands in opposition to the classical, organic conception of the people. With the help of the concept of multitude Hobbes abandons the old idea of the political

subjectivity attached to the *plebs*, *populo* or multitude. In contrast, a people has a political subjectivity only because it has one common will. (Zarka 2000, 132.)

To summarize, when scholars of political theory write about Hobbes's relation to the concept of multitude, Hobbes is usually conceived as a political theorist who radically opposed the concept of multitude.[85] Virno states that for Hobbes the difference between the two is fundamental: when there is a state, there is a people, and when there is no state, there is a multitude (Virno 2004, 22-23). The articles by Astorga and Bull follow and repeat this line of thought, even though they give light criticism of it. Most strongly these ideas are manifested in the political theory of Hardt and Negri. According to them, the crucial difference between the two concepts can be found from the centre of the social contract. Thus, this debate is mainly concerned with the question of political subjectivity. They argue that in the contemporary, globalized world people cannot be a political subject and this is why we must create a new political subjectivity. The radical understanding of the concept of multitude provides the new subjectivity for them. Yet, this was not Hobbes's intention as Zarka and Hull partly point out and as we will see later in our study. It is true that Hobbes does not recognize the political subjectivity of the multitude. Yet, they do not make any effort to understand this denial. This follows, it seems, from the fact that they totally abandon the closer research concerning the dynamical relationship between Hobbes's concepts of multitude and motion in their debates. The political problem of motion that the multitude expresses is not covered in these debates.

2.2 Multitude in Classical and Early Modern Philosophy

The idea of multitude was not unknown to classical philosophers and writers such as Plato, Aristotle, Thucydides, Polybius and Cicero or for such writers of the early modern period as Niccolò Machiavelli. In the Greek philosophy three terms, οἱ πολλοί (*oi polloi),* πλῆθος (*plethos*) and ὄχλος (*ochlos*) occupy the same

---

85 There are also some books that concern the questions related to the multitude from rather different angles. Gerard Mairet, for example, deals with the question of multitude in his book *Le Maître et la Multitude*. However, even though the book has a frontispiece of Hobbes's *Leviathan* in its first page, this book does not dwell on Hobbes's conception of multitude, but treats instead such authors as Marsilius of Padua, Jean Bodin, Adam Smith, J-J. Rousseau and Karl Marx. According to Mairet the principle of sovereign means that "infinite multitude of little Hamlets" has refuged themselves to an internal monologue. The logic of sovereignty that operates in state, but also in political parties, means the idea that all the people of the state speak the same language and debate about the same problems. In a modern state, everybody is like each other. The change that Mairet is interested in concerns the fact that in the postmodern era, it is the individual, the little Hamlet, who wants to become a sovereign. If the subjectivation of the Hamlets to a sovereign power was a part of the birth of the modern state, the birth of the postmodern state means the emancipation of the individual from the sovereign's rule. (Mairet 1991, 51.)

place as *multitudo*[86], *plebs* and *turba* later in the Latin tradition. When translated into English these three terms usually get the form multitude, which is evident from Hobbes's own translation of Thucydides' *Peloponnesian War*. As *oi polloi* and *plethos* are widely used in the classical philosophy, the term *multitudo* is typical for the Latin political language. *Ochlos* and *ochlocratia* are instead connected especially to Polybius and also to biblical language.[87] Again, the way that Niccoló Machiavelli uses the term *moltitudine* (multitude) reminds us of the classical *oi polloi*, *plethos* and *ochlos* as well of Latin *multitudo*, *plebs*[88] and *turba*[89]. The crucial political problem connected to these terms is the relation between the political rule and the power of many[90], which is present in all classical and

---

86 The Latin word *multitudo*, depending on the context, derives from *multus*, which is equal with the Greek word μάλα (*mala*). (Ernout & Meillet 1985, 419-420.) However, substantially *multitudo* has much more to do with *oi polloi* and *plethos*, than with *mala*. Traditionally, *oi polloi* has been understood as a *great number of people*, *a crowd*, *plebs*, *multitude* and *common people*. The same goes with *plethos*, since it has the meanings of *a great number*, *multitude*, *the mass*, *main body*, *majority*, *people*, *population*, *populace* or *commons*. More abstractly, it can also mean *quantity*, *magnitude*, *size* or *plurality*.

87 Polybius is usually mentioned as the inventor of the term ὀχλοκρατία (*ochlocratia*). Unlike with Plato who sees democracy to have good and bad forms, Polybius instead names bad democracy as the "rule of the mob", that is, ochlocratia. In short, ochlocratia is an outcome of the degenerated democracy in the cycle of states. (Polybius 1968-76, 6.4.) In the *Bible* the term *ochlos* is usually translated with the term multitude. (See for example Matthew 4:25; 5:1; 8:18: 9:36; Luke 3:7; 5:15 etc.)

88 *Plebs* means literally *common people*, the *commons* or *commonalty*, that is, the plebeians. *Plebs* are something that is opposed to patricians, senators, and knights, they are the underclass or working class. In this sense *plebs* also differ from the word *populus*, which signifies the *collective people*, including, therefore, the Senate. *Plebs* can also mean more generally *a great mass*, *a multitude* or simply *a mass*. Hence, the word *plebs* connects the word *multitudo* more closely to practical politics, where *plebs* are opposed to the upper classes. Translated to English and French, the word *plebs* can mean a "multitude". The closest word in Greek is the word πλῆθος (*plethos*). (Ernaut & Meillet 1985, 513-514; Lewis 1989, 1386.)

89 The meaning of *turba* becomes intelligible when we understand the Sanskrit origin of the word *turâmi*, which means *to hasten*. Thus, *turba* has a connection to speed but also to a vortex and a spiral. From the same word derives such modern words as *turbo, turban, turbine* and *turbulence*. *Turba* leads also to the Greek term τὐρβη, which means "confusion, tumulte" and also *noise, commution* and *confusion*. *Turba* can also be close to the word *turma*, which is instead comparable to such Indo-European rooted words as the old Irish words *pruma*, *prymr*, "noise, racket", or the old English *drymm*, "troop, crowd". Yet, *turba* has also another, more political meaning. It can mean a *turmoil*, *hubbub*, *uproar*, *disorder*, *riot*, *tumult*, *commotion* and *disturbance* of a crowd of people. More concretely it can mean a *crowd*, *throng*, *multitude*, *mob* or a *band*, *train* or *troop*. It can also simply mean a *great number* or a *multitude*. According to the French etymology of the Latin language, *turba* can also mean "foule nombreuse et mêlée, le commun" or "foule en mouvement ou en désordre, cohue". It also means "querelle, dispute". From *turba* derives the word *turbo,* meaning "troubler, mettre en désordre, agiter". In addition the word *disturbo*, meaning "démolir, renverser" derives from same source (and eventually the English word "disturb"). The word *turbidus* meaning "trouble (se dit souvent du temps, de l'eau; sens physique et moral)" also finds its source here. (Ernout & Meillet 1985, 707-708; Lewis 1989, 1916; Glare 1994, 1990; Sofroniew 2006, 30-34; Vaan 2008, 634.)

90 In the context of human beings the Latin word *multitudo* most often gets a simple, general meaning of *a people*, *common people* or *a crowd*. *Multitudo* can also get a more definitive meaning of *a throng* or *a host*. *Multitudo* also refers to a large *number of people* or *masses*, quite similarly as the term *crowd* lets us understand. This reminds us of another meaning of a *multitudo*, which is not necessarily connected to humans, but simply means a large amount of something. In this sense, the word *multitudo* gets the

early modern philosophy and it is this very question which Hobbes deals with in his own philosophy as well.

Looking for the different connotations and uses of the concept before Hobbes, we have to consider how these terms were used in classical and early modern political literature. Studying aforementioned writers clarifies the use of the multitude and related concepts in classical thought. This gives us a possibility to reflect upon the idea of multitude and related terms in classical political thought in contrast to Hobbes's own formulation of the concept at next subchapter.

The first thing that we find from the classical writers about the uses of multitude is that the they always use the term (be it *plethos*, *oi polloi*, *ochlos*, *multitudine*, *multitudo, moltitudine* etc.) to describe a large amount or large number of things. The term is especially used while discussing a large number of people, soldiers for example. Thus, multitude is simply a mass of people without any special characteristics except the fact that they are uncounted. (See for example Thucydides 1969-77, I.81; I.94; I.1129; II.88; II.100; III.1.; III.10; IV.34; VI.20; VIII.105; Cicero 1959, I.15; I.16; I, 18; II.14; III.7; Machiavelli 1833/1989, 2.23: 2.41; 3.8.)

A more detailed description of the multitude grasps its special nature as a human crowd, gathered together for some, usually political, reason. Several times multitude is simply understood as a potential political actor and also as a source of political power, which must be convinced of some political manoeuvre. Thus, multitude is an object of rhetoric; it is the crowd that hears the speech of the politicians. This fact is emphasized, naturally, in the context of classical democracy. In Thucydides' *History of Peloponnesian Wars* it is mentioned several times how the politicians or demagogues like Pericles, Alcibiad or Brasidas must give their speech in front of the multitude (*plethos*). (Thucydides 1969-1977, II.34; IV.84.)

Hence, dealing with the multitude asks special skills from a politician. First of all, the politician must be a good orator since the only way to win the multitude to one's side is to please it with right words, gestures and arguments. In Cicero's *De Oratore* (*On the Orator*) Crassus gives an example of how the rhetorician is understood to lead the multitude and how the rhetoric is related here to the "quiet and peaceful communities":

> …there is to my mind no more excellent thing than power, by means of oratory, to get hold on assemblies of men, win their good will, direct their inclinations wherever the speaker wishes. In every free nation, and most of all in communities which have attained the enjoyment of peace and tranquillity, this one art has always flourished above the rest and ever reigned supreme. For what is so marvellous as that, out of the innumerable company of mankind [*infinita multitudine*], a single being should arise, who either alone or with a few others can make effective a faculty bestowed by nature upon every man? (Cicero 1959, I.30-I.31.)

---

definitions a *great number of something*, *numerousness*, a *large quantity of something* or simply a *plurality of things*. Yet, in the political meaning the word can also mean *population* in the sense of a *large body of people* or *populace*. (Lewis 1989, 1172; Glare 1994, 1143.)

Cicero relates here political movement and motions of the mind with rhetoric. It is the power of rhetoric and speech that enables a politician to move people politically from one opinion to another. One man may lead the whole crowd with his speech, if he knows how to do it. However, to move the mind of the multitude is not purely based on the best rational arguments, but instead, the trick is to move people's emotions with speech. In Cicero's example, Antonius says that the speech should be adapted to the ears of the crowd (*multitudinis*) so that the speech pleases the hearers and makes it possible to stir their emotions. Creating passions in the multitude makes it possible to control and lead them politically.[91] (Cicero 1959, II.157-160.)

However, multitude is not an easy object for a rhetorician to work upon, since multitude is contingent and changes its opinion all the time. This sets demands for the orator, since the orator has to be able to change his speech according to the mentality of the multitude. The public meeting, distinguished for example from the senate, is defined as an "orator's greatest stage" with a very vivid metaphor:

> But as the orator's chief stage seems to be the platform at a public meeting, it naturally results that we are stimulated to employ the more ornate kind of oratory; for the effect produced by numbers [*multitudo*] is of such a kind that a speaker can no more be eloquent without large audience [*multitudine*] than a flute-player can perform without a flute. (Cicero 1959, II.337-II.340.)

What should be avoided are the hostile reactions of the multitude that might be flared because of a mistake in the speech. Cicero lists four kinds of mistakes, such as arrogance or harshness. However, one can "amend" these mistakes with different techniques and thus, it is a question of controlling the multitude with various ways of speech, which Cicero especially addresses here. (Cicero 1959, 2.337 – 2.340.)

The problem of changing the mind of the multitude was known already in classical Athens. Thucydides describes how some political questions are better kept secret from the multitude, that is, from the democratic concert, since the danger of the rioting multitude is too big. This is the case with Cleon and Lacedaemoians (Thucydides 1969-77, IV.22) and the same problem is expressed when Alcibiades makes a plot to come to power despite of the opinions of the multitude. Certain men speaking about certain things in front of the multitude might move the whole multitude (*plethos*) to another opinion (Thucydides 1977, V.45). Melians for example dared not bring the Athenian ambassadors to the agora, since they fear the reaction of the multitude (*plethos*) (Thucydides 1969-77, V.84; V.85). Plato states in *Republic* as well that some things are important to keep secreted from a multitude. (Plato 1963, 564e.) Again, according to Machiavelli it is almost too easy to persuade a multitude to various actions. This might take time, but in the end Machiavelli seems to think that the

---

91 In *De Oratore* Cicero also uses the term *multitudo* to refer to people of simple kind in their artistic knowledge and education. However, he tells us two times that even the multitude shows its displeasure and hoots off the stage such artists, singers in this case, who sing out of tune and have ugly voices. (Cicero 1959, 3.98.)

multitude is rather easy to win over on whatever side. People can also be made to act against their own proper good by offering them short term goods. Demagogy flourishes whenever multitude is gathered together.[92] (Machiavelli 1833/1950a, LIII.)

Thus, dealing with a multitude is not a simple task for a politician. The multitude might show its rage against the speaker or against the existing political order. In other words, there is a monster hidden in the human crowd, as Plato conceived it. For Plato, in *Republic* and in *Gorgias* as well, sophistry and rhetoric is like dealing with a "beast".[93] A beast, a multitude (*oi polloi*, *plethos*), does not want to hear what is really right or wrong. Instead of a reasonable deliberation, the beast of a "motley multitude" is ready to rip apart all the opinions and ideas, however true they are, if they do not please it.[94] Right and wrong, just and unjust is decided according to the opinion of a multitude, not according to the philosophical and legal true inquiry, which is problematic for Plato. (Plato 1963, 493a-b; Plato 1967, 452e, 456c, 457a, 459e.)[95] However, understanding this madness of the multitude (*oi polloi*) is important if one wants to become a philosopher and especially, a philosopher-king, since a politician has to be able to deal with the multitude. (Plato 1963, 496c.)

Ruling over the many, that is, controlling and commanding the multitude with speech is a dangerous occupation, which asks for special skills. In *De re publica* (*On the Commonwealth*), Cicero states that people generally believe that it is dangerous to be a politician, especially when the politician has "strirred up the mob (*multitudine*)". Thus, people think that being a politician is not a good occupation for a wise man, since the wise men cannot deal with the uncontrollable rush of the crowd. (Cicero 1998a, I.9.)

The problem of monstrous multitude (i.e. people turning to a unrestrained monster) is especially connected to the democratic governments. This fact is highlighted by Polybius who, unlike Plato who sees democracy as having good and bad forms, names bad democracy as the "rule of the mob", that is, *ochlocratia*. In short, for Polybius *ochlocratia* is an outcome of the degenerated

---

92 Machiavelli's idea might be influenced by Polybius' *Histories,* which combines several times the bad, democratic government, *ochlocratia* and demagogy. See Polybius 1968-1976, book VI and Champion 2004, 199-203.

93 Machiavelli illustrates very vividly the frightening noise the multitude makes. Like Plato, Machiavelli states that the noise of the multitude is not human, but instead something dangerously animal. In front of this noise, the leaders of the city are moved more by fear than by any other motive. (Machiavelli 1833 / 1989, 3.15.)

94 According to Plato, the soul is divided in two parts, good and bad. The good part is the smaller one and the bad part is the larger one. Here Plato uses the term *oi polloi* to refer to the larger part, which reminds us about the different social classes and Plato's attitude towards listening to the opinions of the multitude: one should not lead one's soul, or a *polis*, according to the larger and worse part, that is, according to the multitude. One ought to count on the good and qualitative few, who can decide what is good for the whole *polis*. (Plato 1963, 431a-d.)

95 For a similar example where Plato refers to winning the opinion of the multitude to one's side, see Plato 1963, 605a. In book two of *Republic* Plato notes that "many" (*oi polloi*) think differently about justice, since multitude conceives it as a troublesome thing that is done only for the sake of rewards. Plato instead suggests that justice ought to be done for its own sake and not for the benefits it brings with it. See Plato 1963, 358a.

democracy in the cycle of states and it is always connected to troublesome political regimes in his *Histories.* (Polybius 1968-76, VI.4; see also I.11; III.1; III.9 and X.2.) Cicero also reminds his readers of what happened in Athenian democracy. There the democratic power was "transformed in to the mad and irresponsible caprice of the mob [*multitudinis*]…" (Cicero 1998a, I.44). Unfortunately the text ends here and the missing pages have been lost. It is clear however that Cicero warns about the negative, monstrous side of the multitude.[96] Democracy is always in danger of collapsing to a mere multitude.

The dangerous and monstrous sides of the multitude are brought up most clearly by Niccolò Machiavelli in his *Istorie fiorentine* (*History of Florence*). For him the power given to the multitude is always a threat for a state (Machiavelli 1833/1989, 2.32). According to Machiavelli the multitude can only act as a violent mob, robbing and burning everything down, or as a scrupling crowd, which will not act since it fears the outcomes of its own action (Machiavelli 1950a, XVII). The fear towards the powers of multitude is understandable, since several examples given by Machiavelli explain how the multitude is really more like a monster that rages in the city than a group of citizens who have just taken the law in their own hands (Machiavelli 1833/1989 2.37; 3.14; 3.16). Hence, Machiavelli states explicitly, "The multitude is always slow in being moved to evil, but, once so disposed, the slightest accident will start them to violence." (Machiavelli 1833/1989, 6.24).

The problematic nature of multitude is present especially when the power of the state is attached only to one source, especially when the power is given only to the people. A Ciceronian example states that the power of the multitude is the dangerous outcome of democracy, in quite similar way that Aristotle explains in *Politics* (Cicero 1998a, 1.65 -1.66). In fact, Cicero states that there is a "principle which should always be observed in politics, namely that the greatest power should not rest with the greatest number" (Cicero 1998a, 1.39). Cicero thinks the name of the republic is difficult to consider for a democracy. The problem is that in democracy, masses (*multitudo*) punish whoever they like to and act only according to their own will and liberty. When everything belongs only to a public one has to, (paradoxically, since the very definition of the republic is the "property of the people"), consider whether the name of the republic is proper for a mob like this. The state should not be enslaved by the mob (*multitudo*) (Cicero 1998a, 1.45-46).

The Athenian democracy as a rule of a multitude is problematic for Thucydides as well. According to the translation of Hobbes, the government of Athens is called a democracy since it relies on the multitude (*plethos*) (*THUPW*; Thucydides 1969-77, II.37).[97] When multitude has a power in a *polis* the whole

---

96 We must also remember, as Hull points out, that in the *Bible* (Job 11:2, among others) multitude refers also to excessive, meaningless speech. Thus multitude does not only refer to the monstrosity of many different voices but also to *hubris* of a person who speaks too much. (Hull 2009, 122.)

97 Alcibiades also speaks to the Lacedaemoians and states that the Athenians have always opposed tyranny. And what is opposite to tyranny, is democracy. Hence, says Alcibiades, Athens has always kept with the multitude (*plethos*). (Thucydides 1969-77, VI.89.)

future of the *polis* lies on the opinions of the multitude. For example, as the Peloponnesian War rages on, Pericles's position keeps shifting all the time because of the constant alteration of opinions and attitudes towards the leaders "as is the way with the multitude" (Thucydides 1969-77, II.65).[98] However it is also noted that Pericles was not that much at the mercy of the multitude: "…Pericles, who owed his influence to his recognized standing and ability, and had proved himself clearly incorruptible in the highest degree, restrained the multitude while respecting their liberties, and led them rather than was led by them…" (Thucydides 1969-77, II.65.)

It seems that in the Athenian democracy the power of the multitude (*oi polloi*, *plethos*) means the power of the common people. Common people, the many, are gathered together to decide about the political actions and judge concerning the good and the bad. The speech of Athenagoras for the Syracusians reveals that in a democracy the multitude (*oi polloi*) is the judge, which Athenagoras finds reasonable. In a democracy wise men counsel the crowd and having heard them it is the multitude that judges. In oligarchy, on the contrary, the multitude is made to bear risks for the few, but the profits are never shared with the multitude. This makes the oligarchy an unjust system and in the end, it leads the multitude to riots.[99] (Thucydides 1969-77, VI.39.)

However, one cannot avoid the impression that the sole rule of the multitude seems to be very dangerous for all classical writers. Letting only a multitude rule in a *polis* is a risk, which can end in a total collapse of the *polis*, since multitude is disposed to demagogues and rhetoricians who seek only their own interest, not the common good. As Athenagoras warns in Thucydides' *Peloponnesian War*, people should not try to rule their city by themselves, as a multitude (*plethos*). With the rule of the multitude the city would never be quiet, but instead there would be an ongoing debate. There would be constant sedition and contention, which harms more the city itself than the enemy. Tyranny and usurpation are a constant threat, if the reign of multitude is accepted. (Thucydides 1969-77, VI.38.)

According to Aristotle's *Politics* one way of preventing the negative reign of the multitude is to advance the differences and heterogeneity inside the ruling political subject. Aristotle thinks that if there should be the rule of the multitude, then the multitude itself should be heterogeneous and include the variety of differences and general pluralism in itself. For this reason the multitude (*plethos*, *oi polloi*) is not a homogenous mass of people for Aristotle, or a "beast" of Plato. In other words, if there is too much unity in the *polis*, the city will be reduced to a mere family and the family will be reduced to a mere individual. In this case the danger is that the whole *polis* is reduced to *oikos*, and

---

98 The same words are used in the case of Cleon (Thucydides 1969-77, IV.28).

99 Plato points out that if the poor of the commonwealth are treated badly and excluded from the governance of the *polis*, it is very dangerous to arm this multitude (*plethos*) in the time of war. When giving arms to a multitude, leaders have to fear more this multitude, which might turn against its leaders, than the actual enemy. (Plato 1963, 551a-b.)

the leader of the state becomes a *despotos* (Aristotle 1959/1995e, 1328b6-1329a39.) The same problem is recognized by Cicero who says that in democracy, where the multitude reigns, the problem is the equality of the multitude. The multitude does not allow any degrees of merit to be built, and regarding the political governance it is indeed very difficult to govern people if they are all equal. (Cicero 1998a, I.43.)

Yet, even though most connotations given to the multitude are negative, there are some positive epithets connected to it as well. Aristotle states that the judging concert, which is formed out of many different men with the principle of multitude (*plethos*) is better and more capable to judge different things such as music or poetry, since the opinion and the intelligence of the many is better than the opinion of one. Aristotle compares the judgement of the multitude to a public dinner, which is rich since everyone contributes something to it. Multitude can concretely become one, as one personality: "and when they meet together, just as they [*plethos*] become in a manner one man, who has many feet, and hands, and senses, so too with regard to their character and thought." (Aristotle 1959/1995e, 1281b1-5.) Aristotle also compares the multitude to a stream of water: as it is in the constant motion it always stays fresh. In this sense, multitude is seen as "pure", genuine and uncorrupted.

What we have seen above are different definitions and uses of the multitude given by classical authors. First of all, multitude means usually *common people* or *populace*. It refers to the poor classes of the society, which are outnumbered and thus, easily called just multitude without any other attribute. Secondly, multitude is also a large number of people, which is difficult to determine exactly. In multitude there are instead always so many people that it is impossible to count every one of them. Multitude is a crowd of people or a mob and it is impossible to say who belongs to that crowd and who does not. Thus, thirdly, the word multitude does not only describe the people or common people: it has also a connection to general plurality of things, to masses and huge numbers. When something is called a multitude it means that there are so many parts in that plurality that it is impossible and unnecessary to count all of them. However, with classical writers, multitude was always connected to democracy, that is, to the power of the common people. Yet, what separates the multitude from the people is that the multitude is not limited and restricted by the laws. An unbridled multitude is way too excessive to control itself. In the worst case, multitude is like a raging beast or monster, a travesty of the democracy. Hence, only sovereign power can set limits to the behaviour of the multitude. Yet, for classical authors multitude is most of all a group or large number of common people, who have decided to take over the political power. Thus for classical philosophers there is a certain political subjectivity connected to the multitude and this subjectivity represents the disorganized, politically unsophisticated, usually negative, excessive and destructive spirit of the poor, common people.

2.3 The Concept of Multitude in Hobbes's Political Philosophy

As we already noted in section 2.1., the concept of multitude has not been reflected very extensively in previous Hobbes scholarship. For the most part the emphasis is given to the important difference between multitude and the people, but other uses and aspects of the concept have not been thoroughly mapped out or analyzed. Most importantly, multitude is generally conceived as an apolitical concept in Hobbes's philosophy.

What is truly different with Hobbes's conception of multitude compared to the classical authors mentioned before is that multitude is used in so many different ways and in so many contexts in Hobbes's philosophy. The reason for this lies in Hobbes's different understanding of the multitude. For him, multitude is not only a 'crowd', 'common people' or 'people'.[100] Along with these traditional and common reference points, multitude refers especially to the logic of anarchy i.e. chaotic and dissolving action prevailing in the multitude. For Hobbes the concept of multitude includes the idea of unorganized motion, a motion and action that feed illegality, mutiny and egoism. As such, multitude names the political problem of free, rampant motion of the crowds. It is this logic of multitude, not the essential character of the common people that interests us in Hobbes's political thought. It is the task of this chapter to summarize the main aspects of the complex and sometimes complicated concept of multitude in Hobbes's philosophy and thus form a general understanding on the concept and its political nature.

2.3.1 Multitude as a Political Concept – Limiting the Limitless Multitude

Starting from the origins of the concept in Hobbes's philosophy, it is clear that for Hobbes the word multitude derives linguistically from Latin and old English and conceptually from classical and renaissance political philosophy. However, in Hobbes's time the term multitude was used mainly as an ordinary word referring to the plenitude of things.[101] From this numerical aspect derives also the grammatical definition of the multitude, which Hobbes gives in the famous amendments of *De Cive*:

> Multitudo, quia vox collective est, significare intelligitur res plures, ut hominum multitudo idem fit quod multi homines. Vox eadam quia numeri est singularis, unam rem significant, nempe unam multitudinem. (Hobbes DC, VI, 1. p. 217.)[102]

---

100 Sometimes, especially in *Leviathan*, Hobbes uses multitude when referring to the object of governance. These particular cases are studied more closely in chapters four and five of the present study.

101 For ordinary uses of the multitude in Hobbes's texts, see for example Hobbes L, VIII, 11. p. 47; Hobbes L, XXVIII, 26, p. 211; Hobbes L, XXX, 19, p. 230; Hobbes L, XXXIX, 3. p. 310-311; Hobbes L, XLII, 133. pp. 388-389.; Hobbes DCLE, 44-45.; Hobbes B, 39; 114.

102 This fragment is translated by Silverthorne and Tuck (2003) in the following way: "Because crowd is a collective word, it is understood to signify more than one object, so that a crowd of men is the same as many men. Because the word is grammatically singular, it also signifies one thing, namely a crowd." (Hobbes DCE, VI, 1. p. 76.)

What interests us in this definition is that Hobbes is clearly aware about and even attracted by the paradoxical nature of the concept. Multitude is grammatically singular, yet it signifies many men who do not have any other common denominator. Multitude is a common appellation for a mass of individuals under one name. However, as we are mostly interested in the political nature of the concept of multitude in Hobbes's philosophy, we must see how he continues his definition. Hobbes states:

> At neutron modo intelligitur multitude habere unam voluntatem a natura datam, sed alius aliam. Neque erdo attribuenda illi est una actio, quecuncue ea sit. Itaque promittere, pacisci, jus acquirere, jus transferere, facere, habere, possidere, & fimilia, multitudo non potest, nisi sigillatim sive viritim, ut sim promissa, pacta, jura, actions, tot quot sunt homines. Quapropter multitude, persona naturalis non est. Caterum eadam multitude, si viritim paciscantur, fore et unius, alicujus hominis voluntas, vel majoris partis ipsorum voluntates consentatee, pro voluntate omnium habeantur, tunc persona una fit : voluntate enim praedeta est, ideoque actiones facere potest voluntarias, quales sunt, imperare, leges condere, jus acquirere & transferre, & cetera ; & populus sepius quam multitudo dicitur. (Hobbes DC, VI, 1. p. 217.)[103]

Here Hobbes sees that since multitude refers to an unlimited number of individuals, and not to one natural or artificial person, one cannot conceive the multitude's actions as a pursuit of one will. Without one, common will, which is the outcome of the deliberation and social contract, there can be no politics and hence this kind of multitude is actually impotent or anarchical[104], thinks Hobbes. This means, according to Hobbes, that multitude cannot be one consistent political subject either.

Apparently, with this Hobbes attacks the classical understanding of the multitude. For Hobbes, multitude can never be a political subject as such: since there is no common will in the human crowd it is impossible to attach any political attributes to the multitude either. In short, the multitude does not belong to the sphere of politics designed by Hobbes. Nevertheless, multitude can become a political subject by making a contract, as Hobbes states in the latter part of the citation. Thus, multitude is truly a paradoxical entity: it is essentially apolitical, but it can transform itself into a proper, political subject

---

103 "Neither way of taking it implies that a crowd has one will given by nature, but that each man has his own will. And therefore one must not attribute to it a single action of any kind. Hence a crowd cannot make a promise or an agreement, acquire or transfer a right, do, have, possess, and so on, except separately or as individuals, so that there are as many promises, agreements, rights, and actions, as there are men. For this reason a crowd is not a natural person. But if the same crowd individually agree that the will of some one man or the consenting wills of a majority of themselves is to be taken as the will of [them] all, that number then becomes one person; for it is endowed with a will, and can therefore perform voluntary actions, such as command, make laws, acquire and transfer a right, etc., and is more often called a people than a number." (Hobbes DCE, VI, 1. pp. 76-77.)

104 In *Leviathan* Hobbes defines anarchy in the following way: "That the condition of mere nature, that is to say, of absolute liberty, such as is theirs, that neither are sovereigns, nor subjects, is *anarchy*, and the condition of war." (Hobbes L, XXXI, 1. p. 235.) In other words, anarchy means the absolutely unrestricted, free motion of the individuals and groups.

through a conceptual metamorphosis. We see how the multitude is for Hobbes a political problem *par excellence*.

Notwithstanding, we can also note that in fact the concept of multitude has a political use and meaning in Hobbes's philosophy (whenever he is not using it as an ordinary word)[105], although it sometimes, yet not always, refers to an "apolitical" mass of human beings or individuals living in the "state of nature"[106]. This gives us a reason to believe that *multitudo* / multitude was first and foremost a political concept for Hobbes, since it refers exactly to the political problem which Hobbes was about to solve in his philosophy.

Now, since this definition given by Hobbes is somewhat limited, we must see how Hobbes uses the concept of multitude in his philosophy to further prove our argument. Starting from the most universal definition of the multitude, we note that multitude is a concept that always refers to a huge number of people. According to Hobbes, a multitude might be an limitless amount of Christian men "how far so ever they be dispersed" (Hobbes L, XXXIX, 3. p. 310).[107] He also translated the *Bibliotheca historica* of Diodorus Siculus to speak of multitude of Indians (Hobbes B, 93).[108] Yet, what is most important is that multitude is a natural, not an artificial group of human beings. Yet, people are not naturally able to live politically and peacefully with each other, as Hobbes reminds us in *Leviathan*:

> For if we could suppose a great multitude of men to consent in the observation of justice, and other laws of nature, without a common power to keep them all in awe; we might as well suppose all mankind to do the same; and then there neither would be, nor need to be any civil government, or commonwealth at all; because there would be peace without subjection. (Hobbes L, XVII, 4. p. 112.)

Thus, even though Hobbes does not explicitly refer to a global multitude of men, this idea is at least implicitly present in his statements. To put it simply, speaking about the multitude without any other attributes refers to an unlimited number of human beings. In the widest sense of the word there are no borders in a multitude. Everyone can be part of the multitude and there are no proper criteria on how to count someone as belonging or not belonging to the multitude. Thus, at the very fundamental and ontological level, the definition of the multitude is all encompassing. Hobbes sees that it is impossible to attach politics to this sort of multitude.

However, the question of all the people living in the world is not an interesting question according to Hobbes. He never conceives this question

---

105 Multitude also has strong religious connections, since the word was used widely in the Latin and English *Bible*. For Hobbes the religious connotations and connections to multitude have, however, always a political nature as well. See for example *De Cive* (XVII, 20. pp. lat. 395-397; p. eng. 220.) where Hobbes talks about the pact that multitude makes with God through Christ, and thus becomes a person.

106 "Moreover, in a crowd [*multitudo*] which has not yet coalesced into one person in the way we have described, the *state of nature* persist, in which *all things belong to all men*." (Hobbes DCE, VI, 1. p. eng. 76; p. lat. 217.)

107 See also Hobbes L, XLIV, 4. p. 404 "…multitude of Christian men now living…"

108 The story of Diodorus Siculus, which Hobbes refers to, tells naturally about the people who live in India.

seriously. Nonetheless, the limitless nature of the multitude plays an important role in Hobbes's texts. Because of this limitlessness, multitude always has a political nature, not only sociological or demographic. Of course, multitude can refer demographically to a population as Hobbes shows in *The Elements of Law* where he states that the word people:

> signifieth only a number of men, distinguished by the place of their habitation; as the *people* of England, or the *people* of France, which is no more, but the multitude of those particular persons that inhabit those regions, without consideration of any contracts or covenants amongst them, by which any one of them is obliged to the rest." (Hobbes EL, II, 10. p. 145-146.)

Hence, multitude can mean population with rather harmless reference. Yet, usually Hobbes sees multitude as indefinable mob of people, which he equates with animals[109] or beast by following Plato's example.[110] Multitude means troubles, thinks Hobbes. When a crowd of people are gathered together it is impossible to say who belongs to this crowd and who does not. It is also impossible to speak with reasonable arguments, that is with dialogue favored by Hobbes himself, to a multitude, since there are always too many people in multitude (Hobbes L, XXV, 8. p. 170-171). Therefore, taking control of a multitude and governing it requires different kinds of exclusions, limits and borders. Exclusion can be very concrete as when Hobbes compares people unfit for the political community to stones that are not suitable for construction[111] or rather abstract when he states that the crucial thing pertaining to safety is not the size of the multitude but instead its capability to safeguard people from the common enemy.[112] In general, it is impossible to govern a multitude, and thus create a sphere of politics, without definitive exclusion.

The most important border for Hobbes is, self-evidently, the border between the multitude and people, or, between apolitics and politics, the state of nature and commonwealth. According to Hobbes the political order cannot operate with a limitless mass of human beings: political order is created by social contract, which is simultaneously constitutive, but exclusive as well.[113] The people, the political subject that is established in the social contract excludes all the other people and nations who remain in the state of nature and at the level of multitude compared to the people of the certain commonwealth.

---

109 See Hobbes EL, VI, 5. p. 120-121. Here Hobbes states that "irrational creatures" can live in concord whereas multitude of men cannot.

110 In his *Answer to Bishop Bramhall* Hobbes refers explicitly to Plato while writing about multitude: "*What the lawgiver commands is to be accounted good, what he forbids, bad*. This was just the garb of the Athenian sophisters, as they are described by Plato. Whatsoever pleased the great beast, the multitude, they call holy, and just, and good." (Hobbes ABB, 368.)

111 See Hobbes DC, III, 9. pp. lat. 186-187; p. eng. 48.

112 In *Leviathan* Hobbes writes that: "The multitude sufficient to confide in for our security, is not determined by any certain number, but by comparison with the enemy we fear; and is then sufficient, when the odds of the enemy is not of so visible and conspicuous moment, to determine the event of war, as to move him to attempt." (Hobbes L, XVII, 3. p. 112.)

113 The question of social contract is treated more closely at chapter five of the present study.

While the people of a certain commonwealth have a law and the system of justice, those who live in multitude stand outside of justice.

2.3.2 Equality and the Birth of Egoistic Individual

Unlike social contract and the concept of people, the concept of multitude is instead inclusive, since in multitude men do not have any special, stable place or position: there is no inside or outside in the political sense, there is no sanctuary from the chaos of the world. This is not to say that multitude would practically be one grey mass of individuals. Vice versa, multitude might also be made out of several different interest groups, religious sects and churches, families, corporations, personalities and even kingdoms that compete and act against each other.[114] Hence, multitude can refer to several different social phenomena – to anarchic collection of individuals and to an anarchic collection of interest groups – as long as these groups are driven by the logic of anarchy and multitude, that is, according to everyone's own private opinion.[115] Multitude is always described as a heterogeneous and vague group of persons or interest groups without a proper, common power (a sovereign) that keeps

---

114 In *Leviathan* Hobbes states this matter rather clearly while defining critically the "state of nature" and the "causes, generation, and definition of a commonwealth": "And in all places, where men have lived in small families, to rob and spoil one another, has been a trade, and so far from being reputed against the law of nature, that the greater spoils they gained, the greater was their honour; and men observed no other laws therein, but the laws of honour; that is, to abstain from cruelty, leaving to men their lives, and instruments of husbandry. And as small families did then; so now do cities and kingdoms which are but greater families (for their own security) enlarge their dominions, upon all pretences of danger, and fear of invasion, or assistance that may be given to invaders, and endeavour as much as they can, to subdue, or weaken their neighbours, by open force, and secret arts, for want of other caution, justly; and are remembered for it in after ages with honour." (Hobbes L, XVII, 2. p. 111-112.) In addition to this, Hobbes gives several other examples. Church should rule and represent the church only within the limits that civil law and the sovereign power allows. In his *Answer to Bishop Bramhall* he states: "I deny also that the whole clergy of a Christian kingdom or state being assembled, are the representative of that church further than the civil laws permit; or can lawfully assemble themselves, unless by the command or by the leave of the sovereign civil power." (Hobbes ABB, 337.) The briefest definition of the kingdom is given by Hobbes in *The Elements of Law* where he states that "For when one man hath dominion over the other, there is a little kingdom." (Hobbes EL, III, 1. p. 149.) It is obvious that multitude can involve several small "kingdoms", yet they do not give enough security for their subjects. The same is the case in Hobbes's historical description of great families, which are in fact, small (patrimonial) kingdoms. According to Hobbes families and lords ruled in Germany and in Netherlands fighting together before they joined together and made a greater monarchy. (Hobbes L, X, 51. p. 64.) Hobbes describes the lack of government within "savage peoples" as the reign of small families and who thus live in a "brutish manner" (Hobbes L, XIII, 11. p. 85). Hobbes also warns that private families should not establish armies, since commonwealth gives security to everybody (Hobbes L, XXII, 31. pp. 157-158). On the other hand, body politic can consist of other bodies (families, corporations etc.), as long as they are all subordinated only to that one sovereign body politic and its will (Hobbes EL, VI, 9. pp. 122-123).

115 In *The Elements of Law* he states that: "…is not that kingdom divided against itself, where the actions of everyone shall be ruled by his private opinion, or conscience, and yet those actions such as give occasion of offence and breach of peace?" (Hobbes EL VI, 4. p. 173.)

them in order. Without a sovereign power it is impossible to keep people in their places, to secure the endurance of social differences and political hierarchy, which Hobbes conceives to be remarkably important for a commonwealth.[116] In other words, without sovereign power the logic of multitude causes constant motion, chaos, confusion and political upheavals in the multitude.

The source of this constant change and motion in multitude is human nature, the inbuilt endeavor (*conatus*) which every human being possesses.[117] For this natural drive people are eager to seek more and more wealth, glory and power and when it comes to political groups, religious sects and commonwealths the case is the same. It is not only a struggle over the domination of the commonwealth that causes problems, but also the struggle over the leading positions in every sect, interest group or even in families.[118] Without sovereign power it is impossible to secure the existing political order. Roles and statuses that a commonwealth consists of play no role in multitude, since everyone is eager to question another's position. Only fighting can decide who is the strongest (Hobbes DC, I, 6. p. lat. 163; p. eng. 27).

This means that the subjectivity and identity of the human being living in the multitude is not fixed: one can be a morally good person today, but tomorrow act in the vilest manner since nothing really restricts the person's behaviour: to guard the morally righteous behaviour of the people the sword of the sovereign, contrary to the sword of the man, is needed. (Hobbes L, XVII, p. 111; XXI, 6. p. 141; XX, 14. p. 136.) One can have property, a house and family today, but lose all this suddenly with or without one's own fault. In multitude there is no place for *meum* and *tuum*, to what is mine and what is thine:

> Moreover, in a crowd [multitude] which has not yet coalesced into one person in the way we have described, the *state of nature* persists, in which *all things belong to all men.*

---

116 Hobbes sees that all men are equal in the state of nature. For this reason, inequality is the product of civil laws. (Hobbes L, XV, 23. p. 103.) According to Hobbes, a sovereign is the source of inequalities between citizens in the commonwealth, but in the face of a sovereign, everybody is equal, since a sovereign rules the multitude, where everyone is equal. (Hobbes L, XXX, 16. p. 229.) Hobbes sees that the sovereign is the one who makes the social and political differences inside the commonwealth and orders everybody their own place. Sovereign power is like a sun: "But by the law of nature […] the civil sovereign in every commonwealth, is the head, the source, the root, and the sun, from which all jurisdiction is derived. And therefore the jurisdiction of bishops, is derived from the civil government." (Hobbes L, XXXXII, 115. p. 381.) The same metaphor is used in the case where Hobbes defines the sovereign power to be above all the other nobles in a commonwealth. The sovereign is the one who actually produces lords, earls and dukes. (Hobbes L, XVIII, 19. pp. 121-122.) It is precisely due to the equality that the war of all against all continues perpetually: "Yet a war which cannot be brought to an end by victory because of the equality of the contestants is by its nature perpetual." (Hobbes L, I, 13. p. 30.)

117 Endeavour is the smallest, invisible unit of motion in man: "The small beginnings of motion, within the body of man, before they appear in walking, speaking, striking, and other visible actions, are commonly called ENDAUVOUR." (Hobbes L, VI. 1. p. 34.)

118 "Competition of riches, honour, command, or other power, inclineth to contention, enmity, and war: because the way one competitor, to the attaining of his desire, is to kill, subdue, supplant, or repel the other." (Hobbes L, XI, 3. p. 66.)

> *Mine* and *Yours* (whose names are *dominion* and *property*) have no place there, because there is as yet none of that security which we showed above was a prerequisite of the *natural laws*. (Hobbes DCE, VI, 1. p. eng. 76; pp. lat. 216-218.)[119]

Regarding the important political positions such as military leaders, priests or kings, multitude is unsecure. The authority of the king, for example, continually in danger since practically any one can contest King's power. The change of political and military leaders in multitude is more than typical: this follows from the demagogy and the importance of the popular opinion that reigns in the multitude, and characterizes the whole multitude in general. At the most fundamental level, even the very humanity seems to vanish in multitude and people turn into nothing more than violent beasts.[120]

In Hobbes's opinion this constant motion, insecurity and change of social order caused by the natural equality of people produces all crucial differences, hierarchies and dichotomies to collapse and lose their meaning. This does not mean that everyone in the multitude would be the same: instead, people are different, so that one might be physically strong, other intellectually wise (Hobbes L, XIII, 1. p. 82). Yet, no one can be sure of his extraordinary powers. Paradoxically, the fact that people realize their equality, the fact that anyone can kill anyone, is the reason why people attack each other: everybody believes that she can get what others want too (Hobbes L, XIII, 3. p. 83). Yet, even though multitude is heterogeneous, all the people living in the multitude are equally helpless and powerless in the face of the arbitrary nature of the multitude. The constant motion and change that characterizes the multitude collapses the system of differences, limits and borders, which are the source of order in a commonwealth.

What follows from this drastic collapse of permanent social and political differences is that the body of the multitude affects the individual very deeply: it destroys one's belief in higher motifs, aims and abridges ones morality to mere egoism, vain glory and pride.[121] No-rule or anarchy of the multitude feeds

---

119 "Præterea in multitudine nondum in unam personam, eo modo quo dictum est, coalita, manet ille *naturæ status*, in quo *omnia omnium* sunt; neque locum habes illud *meum* et *tuum*, quod vocatur *dominium*, et *proprietas*: propterea quod nondum exstat securitas illa, quam supra ad exercitium *legum naturalium* require ostendimus. (Hobbes DC, VI, 1. p. 218.) In a natural society even Jesus does not have that power. (Hobbes DC, XVII, 6. pp. lat. 379-381; pp. eng. 208-209.) The problem of the natural state, which here means the logic of multitude, is that eventually all the things are common and thus, the first thing that the establishment of the government does is that it orders what is yours and what is mine. (Hobbes DC, IV. 4. p. lat. 201; p. eng. 60; VI. 9. pp. lat. 221-222; pp. eng. 79-80.) Questions concerning property are decided solely by the sovereign power, this is the word of *The Bible* according to Hobbes. (Hobbes DC, XVII, 10. pp. lat. 385-387; p. eng. 213.)

120 The most famous example of this is the war of everyman against everyman (Hobbes L, XIII, 8. p. 84). According to Hobbes to follow moral laws means that one prohibits from oneself pride, ingratitude, insult, unkindness, unmercifulness, wrongs and other offences by which people hurt each other. (Hobbes DC, XVIII, 3. pp. lat. 416-417; p. eng. 236.)

121 In *De Cive* the eighth law of nature is designed against pride and arrogance (Hobbes DC, IV, 8. p. lat. 202; p. eng. 62). Vain glory is based on the flattery of others (Hobbes L, VI, 39) and people seek it to raise their own ego. Vain glory is a usual cause of

despair in the people. It disconnects every individual from their closest communities, such as families, villages and towns. When the horizon of life is reduced to mere survival, all loyalties and bonds between people collapse and people tend to lose common sense:

> For example, though the effect of folly, in them that are possessed of an opinion of being inspired, be not visible always in one man, by any very extravagant action, that proceedeth from such passion; yet, when many of them conspire together, the rage of the whole multitude is visible enough. For what argument of madness can there be greater, than to clamour, strike, and throw stones at our best friends? Yet this is somewhat less than such a multitude will do. For they will clamour, fight against, and destroy those, by whom all their lifetime before, they have been protected, and secured from injury. And if this be madness in the multitude, it is the same in every particular man. (Hobbes L, VIII, 21. pp. 49-50.)

What remains after this collective madness of the multitude is a lonely, egoistic individual, an atomized human being, who cannot trust anyone or rely on any supreme authority. Even closest persons (family, friends etc.) are attacked when violence bursts out in multitude.

In this way Hobbes turns the political problem of the multitude, which is the political problem of the many, to the concern of the individual. The political problem of the multitude is now in fact the problem of the individual, who cannot live happily in the world inhabited by other individuals. Delusions concerning the motifs of the others haunt one's mind, which is enough to cause any possible reaction to the actions of others. All this creates increasing inconsiderate motion: people desperately seek their own benefit at whatever costs. For this reason, multitude is loaded with suspicion and violence is ready to burst forth anywhere, anytime. Hence, the birth of the individual who is "free" of all relationships with others and completely unable to trust[122] her companions is explained through the logic of multitude in Hobbes's philosophy.

2.3.3 Agitating the Ignorant Multitude: From Demagogy to Monstrosity

To put the arguments that speak against the multitude in Hobbes's philosophy in another perspective, we have to remember that Hobbes did not believe in human's capability to naturally form lasting, just and peaceful commonwealths. Hobbes needed a starting point for his political philosophy and he found it from the destruction of the Aristotelian idea of the origins of natural political order.[123] Hobbes explained that biological life is not enough to safeguard human life. Human beings have naturally i.e. without political community, too

---

crime (Hobbes L, XXVII, 13. p. 196.) and it is almost like madness (Hobbes L, VIII, 18. p. 49).

122 Trust is the basic unit of all covenants. Without sovereign power people do not have any reason to trust each other and for this reason, covenants and contracts do not bind them. (Hobbes EL, II, 9. p. 90; Hobbes L, XIV, 11, 18. pp. 89-91.)

123 At the beginning of *De Cive* Hobbes attacks the Aristotelian idea of *zoon politikon* and states that people are not born fit to society, in other words, there cannot be a political order by nature. (Hobbes DC, I, 1-2. pp. lat. 157-161; pp. eng. 21-22.)

many rights: *jus naturale*, for Hobbes, means a limitless selection of different ways to protect one's own life.[124] Due to their nature, mankind is destined to a precarious and fragile position as long as it lives in the state of nature, or in fact, as long as the logic of multitude prevails in a population. Without a right political structure mankind lacks the knowledge of how to cultivate the human life on earth.[125]

Since political order creates peace, it also enables the proper development of philosophy and science. Without peace, it is impossible to improve human's natural condition by sciences and arts, which Hobbes conceives to be the most important for humankind.[126] While the multitude reigns, human intelligence does not have the possibility to flourish as Hobbes describes in this citation from *Leviathan*:

> Whatsoever therefore is the consequent to a time of war, where every man is enemy to every man; the same is consequent to the time, wherein men live without other security, than their own strength, and their own invention shall furnish them withal. In such condition, there is no place for industry; because the fruit thereof is uncertain; and consequently no culture of the earth; no navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by sea; no commodious building; 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 worst

---

124 Hobbes writes in *Leviathan* that "THE RIGHT OF NATURE, which writers commonly call *jus naturale*, is the liberty of each man hath, to use his own power, as he will himself, for the preservation of his own nature; that is to say, of his own life; and consequently, of doing any thing, which in his own judgment, and reason, he shall conceive to be the aptest means thereunto." (Hobbes L, XIV, 1. p. 86.)

125 At the very beginning of *De Corpore* Hobbes actually states, that "PHILOSOPHY seems to me to be amongst men now, in the same manner as corn and wine are said to have been in the world in ancient time. For from the beginning there were vines and ears of corn growing here and there in the fields; but no care was taken for the planting and sowing them. Men lived therefore upon acorns; or if any were so bold as to venture upon eating of those unknown and doubtful fruits, they did it with danger of health. In like manner, every man brought Philosophy, that is, Natural Reason, into world with him; for all men can reason to some degree, and concerning some things: but where there is need of a long series of reasons, there most men wander out of the way, and fall into error for want of method, as it were for want of sowing and planting, that is, of improving their reason. And from hence it comes to pass, that they who content themselves with daily experience, which may be likened to feeding upon acorns, and either reject, or not much regard philosophy, are commonly esteemed, and are, indeed, men of sounder judgment than those who, from opinions, though not vulgar, yet full of uncertainty, and carelessly received, do nothing but dispute and wrangle, like men that are not well in their wits." (Hobbes DCOE, I, 1. pp. eng. 1-2.; pp. lat. 1-2.) Hobbes sees that the want of right method, that is, geometrical method, causes disputes and wrangle, which keeps the philosophy at the "state of nature". The only solution to this is to implement the right method through universities, guided by sovereign power. Obviously, this is one part of Hobbes's attack against the Scholastics.

126 In *De Corpore* Hobbes states: "The end or scope of philosophy is, that we may make use to our benefit of effects formerly seen; or that, by application of bodies to one another, we may produce the like effects of those we conceive in our mind, as far forth as matter, strength, and industry, will permit, for the commodity of human life. […] The end of knowledge is power.[…] Now, the greatest commodities of mankind are the arts; namely, of measuring matter and motion; of moving ponderous bodies; of architecture; of navigation; of making instruments for all uses; of calculating the celestial motions, the aspects of the stars, and the parts of time; of geography, &c" (Hobbes DCOE, I, 6-7. pp. eng. 7-8.; pp. lat. 6-7.)

> of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short. (Hobbes L, XIII, 9. p. 84.)

In short, the lack of true philosophy causes a general deprivation of mankind. The way out of this general state of human abasement is obviously the cultivation of philosophy and knowledge combined with efficient government which brings and guarantees peace. Hence, it is not only the question of a lack of science and practical knowledge which is in question in these benign circumstances. In fact the problem is that the general conditions and circumstances where people live are threatened. Without proper philosophy and civil science, people will be endlessly at war with each other.[127] However, Hobbes sees that even in the multitude knowledge exists concerning both the sciences and true civil philosophy. The problem is that even though some individuals in the multitude might possess the knowledge, it is not distributed amongst the others: personal knowledge does not do any good for mankind. In *Behemoth* Hobbes enlightens this matter in the following way:

> The rules of *just* and *unjust* sufficiently demonstrated, and from principles evident to the meanest capacity, have not been wanting; and notwithstanding the obscurity of their author, have shined, not only in this, but also in foreign countries, to men of good education. But they are few, in respect of the rest of the men, whereof many cannot read; many, though they can, have no leisure; and of them that have leisure, the greatest part have their minds wholly employed and taken up by their private businesses or pleasures. So that it is impossible that the multitude should ever learn their duty, but from the pulpit and upon holidays; but then, and from thence, it is, that they learned their disobedience. And, therefore, the light of that doctrine has been hitherto covered and kept under here by a cloud of adversaries, which no private man's reputation can break through, without the authority of the Universities. But out of the Universities, came all those preachers that taught the contrary. The Universities have been to this nation, as the wooden horse was to the Trojans. (Hobbes B, 39-40.)

Thus, the lack of sovereign power that can implement the right knowledge to people by educating them in the principles of right and wrong and other central civic duties in universities will inevitably cause ignorance of the people.[128] This ignorance is an essential character of the multitude and it is produced by wrong politics, in this case by the Catholic politics that support the Pope's power, who eventually benefits from the ignorance of the people and thus, at least indirectly, stimulates the spread of the logic of multitude in the population, argues Hobbes. Hence, Hobbes does not accuse the common people of being egoistic, short-sighted and rebellious as such. Instead he points his finger at the universities and other educational institutions that spread nothing more than ignorance and disobedience. Hobbes sees that it is possible to educate the

---

127 As Hobbes states in *De Corpore*: "But the utility of moral and civil philosophy is to be estimated, not so much by the commodities we have by knowing these sciences, as by the calamites we receive from not knowing them. Now, all such calamites as may be avoided by human industry, arise from war, but chiefly from civil war; for from this proceed slaughter, solitude, and the want of all things." (Hobbes DCOE, I, 7. p. eng. 8.; p. lat. 6-7.)

128 On the ignorance of the multitude, see Hobbes B, 38-39; 41; 68; 187-188.

multitude and thus, turn them away from short-sighted and egoistic behaviour.[129]

The ignorance and immorality of the multitude, which is the outcome of the social disorder and epistemological confusion prevailing in the commonwealth (and thus, not only in the "state of nature" where the commonwealth does not exist), is easily harnessed as a driving force of unmoral political aims by skilful demagogues. [130] In fact, demagogy would be impossible if people would only know what their basic rights and duties are, and know that sovereign power will take care of the right exercise of the law. Hence, the multitude feeds demagogy: without sovereignty it is impossible to guide people to a common understanding and peace. Vice versa, it is easy to hoax the multitude to follow whatever opinion.

Arguably, here Hobbes follows the idea posed earlier by Plato and Machiavelli. Multitude is always subject to betrayal, and the more people there are together, the easier it is to hoax them all.[131] This follows from the nature of the multitude, since in a multitude the variety of opinions, (in the end, everyone has their own), turns out paradoxically to be simple Manichean opinions when they are expressed by the multitude. This derives from the fact that the multitude acts according to its passions: it moves towards something that pleases it and moves away from everything that scares it. In multitude only brutal appetites and aversions have importance. It is of no use to ask anything special from the multitude, since the only answer it will give is simple *pro* or *contra*, if it can answer at all.[132] Hence, if one (demagogue for example) wants to lead a multitude, it must happen through easily understandable orders and by

---

129 Hobbes is not, however, a true philosopher of "enlightenment" (which really took place during the 18th century) since he sees that truth is something that only few can possess, as he states in *The Elements of Law*: "for commonly truth is on the side of a few, rather than of the multitude:" (Hobbes EL, XIII, 3. p. 71.) The Hobbesian idea is that those few who know the philosophical truths should deliver them to the common people in the best possible way.

130 In *Behemoth* Hobbes states: "This Parliament, in the use of their words, when they accused any man, never regarded the signification of them, but the weight they had to aggravate their accusation to the ignorant multitude, which think all faults heinous that are expressed in heinous terms, if they hate the person accused, as they did this man not only for being of the King's party, but also for deserting the Parliament's party as an apostate." (Hobbes B, 68.)

131 In *Behemoth* Hobbes says: "I have heard often that they ought to pay what was imposed by consent of Parliaments to the use of the King, but to their own use never before. I see by this, it is easier to gull the multitude, than any one man amongst them. For what one man, that has not his natural judgment depraved by accident, could be so easily cozened in a matter that concerns his purse, had he not been passionately carried away by the rest to change of government, or rather to a liberty of every one to govern himself?" (Hobbes B, 38.)

132 In *Leviathan* Hobbes describes how the "government of a multitude" is incapable of action, as he compares it to the "mute" representative where the number of representatives is equal and thus, it is not possible to decide anything. "Or if the number be odd, as three, or more, men or assemblies; whereof every one has by a negative voice, authority to take away the effect of all the affirmative voices of the rest, this number is no representative; because by the diversity of opinions, and interests of men, it becomes oftentimes, and in cases of the greatest consequence, a mute person, and unapt, as for many things else, so for the government of a multitude, especially in time of war." (Hobbes L, XVI, 17. pp. 109-110.)

appealing to passions, not by rational discourse. Rational dialogue, which Hobbes connects to education and deliberation, has no place in a multitude:

> Secondly, that the use of exhortation and dehortation lieth only where a man is to speak to a multitude; because when the speech is addressed to one, he may interrupt him, and examine his reasons more rigorously than can be done in a multitude; which are too many to enter into dispute, and dialogue with him that speaketh indifferently to them all at once. (Hobbes L, XXV, 8. pp. 170-171.)

We see that as an audience and partner of the deliberative decision making the multitude does not pronounce clear words or sentences, but instead it makes noise that overwhelms all the reasonable arguments. The noise of the multitude exceeds the individual speech and any possible deliberation that an individual might have. And since the "truth" lies originally only in individuals and since it is necessary to have rational dialogue with people to spread that true knowledge, the multitude forms a great threat to the civilization. What is even more dangerous according to Hobbes is the combination of passionate stupidity of the multitude and eloquence of the demagogues as Hobbes states when he compares demagogues to the story of Medea.[133] The irrationality of the multitude puts the body politic in the tangible danger of falling apart.

Thus, it is no wonder why Hobbes conceives that "popular men" have a bad effect on the commonwealth, since the support of the multitude encourages demagogues to break laws and to take laws in their own hands.[134] Popular men also cause indignation in the multitude, which causes further rage against the whole sovereign system and its basic principles. For this reason those who instigate men to take the law in their own hands, must be punished. For Hobbes the law, especially a written one, is an all in all and if there is no law, there is no commonwealth, explains Hobbes. (Hobbes EL, IX, 7. p. 218; Hobbes L, XXX, 23. pp. 231-232.)

Thus, a multitude is more or less a monster, a Behemoth, which makes a terrible noise and has many, constantly changing facets.[135] Monstrosity is expressed as the very concrete problem concerning the author of the actions done by multitude:

---

133 Hobbes writes: "Thus, *stupidity* and *eloquence* unite to subvert the commonwealth; in the manner in which once upon a time (as the story goes) the daughters of *Pelias*, king of Thessaly conspired with *Medea* against their father. Wishing to restore a decrepit old man to his youth, they cut him in pieces by the advice of *Medea* and placed him in the fire to cook, in the vain hope that he would be rejuvenated. In the same manner the mob (*vulgus*) in their stupidity, like the daughters of Pelias, desiring to renew their old commonwealth and led by the *eloquence* of ambitious men as by the sorcery of *Medea*, more often split it into *factions* and waste it with the fire than reform it." (Hobbes DCE, XII, 13; pp. 140-141; lat. p. 296.) A similar example can be found from Hobbes EL, XIII, 15. p. 212.

134 Hobbes states in *Leviathan*: "And that such as have *multitude* of potent kindred; and popular men, that have gained reputation amongst the *multitude*, take courage to violate the laws, from a hope of oppressing the power, to whom it belongeth to put them in execution." (Hobbes L, XXVII, 15. p. 196.)

135 In *Behemoth* Hobbes refers to the story of Hydra when he tells about the events of the civil war and rebellious action. (Hobbes B, 72.)

> From the same also it proceedeth, that men cannot distinguish, without study and great understanding, between one action of many men, and many actions of one multitude; as for example, between one action of all the senators of Rome in killing Cataline, and the many actions of a number of senators in killing Caesar; and therefore are disposed to take for the action of the people, that which is a multitude of actions done by a multitude of men, led perhaps by the persuasion of one. (Hobbes L, XI, 17. pp. 90-91.)

The crucial distinction between one action of many men (people) and many actions of one multitude is that one action of many men is always deliberated and hence, it is organized and in Hobbes's sense political.[136] The many actions done by one multitude instead are not deliberated and thus it is impossible to understand them as actions of one will. The actions of a multitude are individual expressions of the passions and rage, and for this reason, they can be whatever. A multitude might cause tremendous destruction in the city, since individual actors choose their own targets; one loots the nearby shop while others break the windows. However, the common name for all these actions is the action of the multitude, since one cannot separate who is the author of this or that act.

2.3.4 Capturing the Moving Multitude

It is obvious on the basis of what has been said above, that in a multitude individuals oppose each other and form antagonistic relationships to each other. In a multitude the free motion of the individuals causes a charged tension. In multitude every person is a rival to each other. No one can be sure about her position, since tomorrow might change everything: social position, possessions, identity and even life can be lost through no fault of one's own. Living in a multitude means that an individual is subject to the changing mood and pure arbitrariness of the other people, to the wavering body of the multitude. One's wellbeing depends more on luck than one's capabilities. And paradoxically what is most important, the constant motion typical of a multitude causes the absolutely stagnant state of ignorance and stupidity, where things that bring wealth and prosperity to human kind cannot develop.

Ironically, the reason for this standoff is free motion of individuals. Every individual aims to better her life and safeguard her existence by doing everything she thinks necessary. This leads inevitably to a sort of hyperbole, which accelerates a tendency to fight and struggle between individuals. In a multitude there are no stable structures, no barriers or fences, either physical or

---

136 This is clear when Hobbes describes the source of sovereigns authority in *Leviathan*: "And because the *multitude* naturally is not *one,* but *many;* they cannot be understood for one; but many authors, of every thing their representative saith, or doth in their name; every man giving their common representer, authority from himself in particular; and owning all the actions the representer doth, in case they give him authority without stint: otherwise, when they limit him in what, and how far he shall represent them, none of them owneth more than they gave him commission to act." (Hobbes L, XVI, 14. p. 109.) The same kind of idea is present in Hobbes's definition of the church at *De Cive.* (See Hobbes DC XVII, 20. pp. lat. 395-397; pp. eng. 220-221.) For the definition of the *Elements of Law* on the same matter, see Hobbes EL, I, 2. p. 126.

mental, that would guide people's natural motion. In the commonwealth people's actions and motions are guided instead by physical limits, such as fences[137], as well as by civil laws.[138] In multitude the absolute liberty of the individuals creates a chaos, an overcrowded market place where one cannot move forward since others obstruct the way. In a multitude, people are packed so close together that there is no free space between them. A throng made out of individuals makes people lose their identity and become only pieces, atoms of the human mass, which acts according to its own laws. In short, a multitude is not going anywhere; it is a stagnated force that can only rip itself apart. This is the paradoxical nature of the absolutely free motion of the individuals.

The arguments for making the social contract are all derived from this paradoxical nature of the multitude. Even though people are in principle free in the state of nature, the outcome is that people more or less restrict the liberty of the others, and themselves, by their own free motion:

> And be there never so great a multitude; yet if their actions be directed according to their particular judgments, and particular appetites, they can expect thereby no defense, nor protection, neither against a common enemy, nor against the injuries of one another. For being distracted in opinions concerning the best use and application of their strength, they do not help, but hinder one another; and reduce their strength by mutual opposition to nothing: whereby they are easily, not only subdued by a very few that agree together; but also when there is no common enemy, they make war upon each other, for their particular interests. For if we could suppose a great multitude of men to consent in the observation of justice, and other laws of nature, without a common power to keep them all in awe; we might as well suppose all mankind to do the same; and then there neither would be, nor need to be any civil government, or commonwealth at all; because there would be peace without subjection. (Hobbes L, XVII, 4. p. 112.)

Thus, the very concrete problem of the multitude is that people are unable to really help each other. Although they have in principle absolute liberty to move, they cannot move, since they obstruct each other, and even though they have total freedom to voice their own opinion, they cannot hear what others say, since they all make such a noise. In a multitude there is no knowledge (philosophy) pertaining how to solve this standoff and hence, everyone is pushing her own private interests, with bad outcomes. People are bound to rely only on their own strength, which is never enough if the individual is altered by the others, that is, by the body of the multitude.

In multitude the development of the mankind is halted since individuals and their private desires, passions and interests are stemming the way. It seems that the concept of time, especially of the future, is something that cannot be

---

137 In *De Cive* Hobbes states: "And a man may be free in one direction but not in the other, as a traveller is prevented by hedges and walls from trampling on the vines and crops adjacent to the road. Obstacles of this kind are external and absolute; in this sense all slaves and subjects are free who are not in bonds in prison. Other obstacles are discretionary; they do not prevent motion absolutely but incidentally, i.e. by our own choice…" (Hobbes DCE, IX, 9. p. 111; p. lat. 259.)

138 According to Hobbes: "… the right of nature, that is, the natural liberty of man, may be by the civil law be abridged, and restrained: nay, the end of making laws, is no other, but such restraint; without which there cannot possibly be any peace." (Hobbes L, XXVI, 8. p. 178.)

conceived in a multitude. Individuals think only for themselves, of their current existence. Working for the future is vain since the fruits of the labor are unsecure. What is needed to unravel this stagnated state is the establishment of the sovereign power that can open the space for regulated and even restricted motion and development; in other words, by bringing peace, the sovereign power opens up the horizon of the future for the citizens.[139] Commonwealth means a regulated motion of the multitude, a balance of freedom and restriction of freedom as Hobbes states in *De Cive*:

> Water stagnates and corrupts when it is closed in by the banks on all sides; when it is open on all sides it spreads; and the more outlets it finds the freer it is. So with the citizens; they would be without initiative if they did nothing expect at the law's command; they would be dissipated if there were no legal restrictions, and the more things left unregulated by the laws, the more liberty they enjoy. Both extremes are faulty; for laws were invented not to extinguish human actions but to direct them; just as nature ordained banks to stop the flow of the river but to direct it. (Hobbes DCE, XIII, 15. p. 151; p. lat. 308.)[140]

Creating a sovereign power opens up the future for mankind. As for individuals, what needs to be done to open up this horizon of hope is to demolish the multitude which causes the negative "state of nature" and to establish the commonwealth.[141] This simply means a possibility for reasonable action to occur within a relatively stable social, economic and political system.

A commonwealth is established by capturing the motion and power of the multitude in a social contract and transferring those powers to a sovereign, the representative of the abstract sovereign power (sovereignty) created in the contract. For Hobbes the way to demolish the multitude is to construct a new theory of the human nature. By emphasizing human psychology and explaining the action of the individual, Hobbes is able to exemplify in a new way the logic of the multitude. He wants to harness this "negative" power as the source of a totally new kind of political power: ultimately, the absolute power of the sovereign derives from the multitude.[142]

It is not, however, possible to catch the powers of the multitude straightforwardly to work as energy of the sovereign. For this reason Hobbes

---

139 In *The Elements of Law* Hobbes notes that the ninth law of nature requires forgiveness of misbehaviour of the others for the sake of the future. (Hobbes EL, III, 9-10. p. 100.) In *De Cive*, *Answer to Bishop Bramhall* and *Liberty and Necessity* he states that civil laws are nothing more than commands concerning the future actions of the citizens. (Hobbes DC, VI, 9. pp. lat. 221-222; p. eng. 79.; Hobbes ABB, 370; Hobbes LN, 253.) Deliberation is not possible either if there is no hope, and since sovereign creates hope, it makes also possible the deliberation concerning the future. (Hobbes EL, XII, 2. p. 68.) In general, politics of the commonwealth is always directed towards future according to Hobbes. (Hobbes L, XXVII, 30. p. 201; XXVII, 20. p. 198; XXVI, 19. p. 182.)

140 See also Hobbes LN, 273-274.

141 The idea of social contract is expressed in a compact way at *Leviathan* XVII, 13. p. 114.

142 In *Dialogue of Common Laws* Hobbes states that: "but they have no reason to think he [the King] will, unless it be for his own profit; which cannot be, for he loves his own power; and what becomes of his power when his subjects are destroyed or weakened, by whose *multitude* and strength he enjoys his power, and every one of his subjects his fortune?" (Hobbes DCLE, 34.)

has to deconstruct the multitude by introducing a new idea of the individual. This individual is a product of a multitude, a timid, suspicious and lonesome individual. Building up a contract between individuals[143] who are disengaged from their families and communities, creates a new political subject, a people. Everyone individually authorizes the sovereign power and thus, their loyalty is to no one else but this abstract sovereign power. When an artificial, public person[144] is created the powers and capabilities of human kind (the inner, endogenous natural reason) that waited for their turn in multitude get a possibility to flourish. The logic of multitude is put aside and the new political logic of the people is established. Thus, Hobbes's emphasis on the new theory of human nature, and especially the human motion, is what makes it possible to subvert the logic and rule of the multitude.

As we have seen in this chapter, multitude is a concept that includes many characteristics that we might connect to politics today. Multitude is full of rivalry, competition, antagonism and struggle for survival and power. Multitude is also full of speech by different orators and demagogues, who try to convince the mob of their own superiority. As an outcome of this, the multitude is divided in different factions and sects that all struggle for power and glory. Hence, multitude is a stagnant potentiality that remains in the same state of "nature", that is, it does not involve any development.[145] On the other hand, a multitude is internally in constant motion and change: no part of a multitude stays the same forever, all identities and positions are negotiable and subject to possible change. It would not be wrong to define Hobbesian multitude with his metaphor of water, when he defines the action of the mind:

> All fancies are motions within us, relics of those made in the sense: and those motions that immediately succeeded one another in the sense, continue also together after the sense: insomuch as the former coming again to take place, and be predominant, the latter followeth, by coherence of matter moved, in such manner, as water upon a plane table is drawn which way any one part of it is guided by the finger. (Hobbes L, III, 2. p. 16.)

In other words, a multitude is a contingency *par excellence*. Uncertainty and a certain illusion of constantly new possibilities characterize the multitude. A

---

143 "A *commonwealth* is said to be *instituted,* when a *multitude* of men do agree, and *covenant, every one, with every one,* that to whatsoever *man,* or *assembly of men,* shall be given by the major part, the *right* to *present* the person of them all, that is to say, to be their *representative;* every one, as well he that *voted for it,* as he that *voted against it,* shall *authorize* all the actions and judgments, of that man, or assembly of men, in the same manner, as if they were his own, to the end, to live peaceably amongst themselves, and be protected against other men." (Hobbes L, XVIII 18, 1. p. 115.; See also Hobbes EL, VI, 8. p. 122.)

144 As Hobbes scholars have emphasised in past decades, the idea of an artificial person plays an utmost important part in Hobbes's political theory (see for example Copp 1980 and Skinner 1999). For a more detailed account on the question of an artificial person in relation to question of multitude, see chapter four of the present study.
It seems that generally Hobbes does not see nature as developing or including the principle of evolution as contemporary science does. In general, Hobbes did not write extensively about "biology". For Hobbes nature is mechanical rather than organic. Thus, even though there is constant motion and change in nature, it does not "lead" anywhere. See also Lemetti 2012, 229-230.

multitude is like a disorganized human mind that bounces from one thing to another, without any organization or discipline. Every new thing draws its attention, like the demagogue when she speaks to the multitude.

For Hobbes the multitude is not, as it is stated before, a proper political concept in his own understanding. Political subjectivity lies in the people, or in the representative of the people, King for example, not in the multitude.[146] Hence, multitude is something that must be excluded and ousted from the proper political order. Yet, multitude is not completely extinguished: in the social contract it is reconstructed as an object of governance and reformed as a population. (Hobbes DC, XII, 7. pp. eng. 137.; pp.lat. 290-291.) By this act, a multitude and its strength are included in the state, while in the political sense it is excluded. Multitude is a constantly moving, changing and transforming matter that must be organized and controlled by the sovereign power. This is the only way to capture the powers hidden in the human nature as a constantly renewing and moving energy of the commonwealth.

146 This will be studied in detail in chapter five, but it is good to remember what Hobbes says about the dangers of confusing these two, especially in democracy: "this is commonly of more danger in a popular government, than in a monarchy; because an army is of so great force, and multitude, as it may easily be made believe, they are the people." (Hobbes L, XXIX, 20. p. 220.) The most profound analysis concerning the two sides of the word people, people as a multitude and people as political subject, can be found from *The Elements of Law* (Hobbes EL, II, 11. pp. 145-146.) In *De Cive* Hobbes states that when the sovereignty is moved from the people to the king, a people becomes a *dissoluta multitudo* (disorganized crowd) since it can be a political subject only as long as sovereignty resides in it. (Hobbes DC, VII, 11. p. eng. 96; p. lat. 242.) In monarchy, king is the people. (Hobbes DC XII, 7. pp.lat. 290-291; p. eng. 137.)

3 FEAR, MOTION AND MULTITUDE

This chapter studies Hobbes's usage of the concept of fear in its various forms, and by doing this it draws a summarizing cartography of the relationship between concepts of fear, motion and multitude in his political thought. We also present how Hobbes used the concept of fear in his theory of sovereignty. Our interest lies, first of all, in the role that fear plays at the constitution of the sovereign power, and, secondly, in the ways that the sovereign power uses fear to govern its subjects. Consequently, this chapter demonstrates that fear is truly a key concept in the analysis of the Hobbesian approach to governing the people.

One of the leading ideas of this chapter is the analysis of the political *aisthesis* in the Hobbesian commonwealth. The question is how differently a subject senses the body of the multitude and body politic? What are the effects that these two different social bodies create in people's behaviour and action? Furthermore we question, why is it so important to create fear in citizens in order to rule the state efficiently? We do not argue that Hobbes's aim was to create actual everyday fear towards the sovereign in the sense of terror or horror. As the analysis in this chapter shows, fear as a political tool has a much more discreet meaning than just the pure and rude power (sword) of the sovereign. We argue that 'fear' is both rational and emotional in the state. For this reason, fear is implemented through education and sense experience of power rather than through violence and oppression.[147] It is argued that the aim of education, as understood in a wider sense of the word, is to create the kind of behaviour, which is manifested in certain respects as honourable action towards the sovereign power. As such, knowledge that is reached through education and internalizing the civil laws is not enough, but the aim is to create practical

147 This fact is also noted, although not much elaborated, by Vaughan who studies Hobbes's view of fear in relation to education in his *Behemoth Teaches Leviathan*. According to Vaughan, the state of nature is the second lesson that Hobbes has to offer for the students (that is citizens) of political education. "Our fear must not only be of the punishments of the sovereign authority, but the punishments or consequences of falling back into the state of nature", states Vaughan. (Vaughan 2002, 57.)

manners that actually perform the social contract and make it happen in everyday life. It is through manners and other little gestures of everyday life (i.e. through certain kinds of motions) that a person can sense that she lives in a commonwealth instead of a multitude.

Since the sense experience, *aisthesis*, plays such an important role in the formation of fear, we are inevitably led to the realm of the analysis of motion.[148] It is the concept of motion that explains how passions work for Hobbes. Concepts closely related to motion such as *mimesis* also offer us a possibility to scrutinize the social aspects of fear, which are important when we analyse the reasons why the uncultivated natural passions of men are so problematic for the political order. The concept of multitude plays an equally important role in this analysis, since it is indeed the problem of fear in unorganized human masses that Hobbes wants to overcome. In the end, to control human masses means to control the motions of minds and bodies.

3.1 Hobbes's Theory of Passions and His Political Theory

Generally, modern scholarship recognizes a relationship between Hobbes's political theory and his theory of passions as one of the most important developments on the subject in the early modern period.[149] However, while Hobbes's philosophy of mind has become one of the most studied aspects of his philosophy, there are not many texts dedicated especially to Hobbes's usage of the concept of fear, which is undoubtedly the most important passion for him.[150]

---

148 If *A Short Tract of First Principles* is Hobbes's original work, then we can state that Hobbes emphasized the organic relation between sense and motion ever since the end of 1620s. See for example Hobbes ST, Section 3. p. 40-56.

149 Gert 1989, 84-86;

150 Concerning Hobbes's philosophy of mind and philosophy of language and their relation to his political doctrine, see recent publications such as Lemetti 2006, Weber 2007, Skinner 2008 and Pettit 2009. Although Skinner and Pettit write about fear in their books, they do not analyze it as an organizing theme of Hobbes's political philosophy, but instead refer to it only in passing comments. One of the most important articles concerning Hobbes's idea of fear is Jan H. Blits's *Hobbesian Fear* (see Blits 1989). Blits does not, however, analyze very deeply the relationship between Hobbes's political doctrine and fear. See also two articles by Yishaiya Abosch (2006 and 2009) who uses Hobbes's conception of fear and hope in his analysis of Hobbes's political theory. The article *Politics and Anxiety in Thomas Hobbes's Leviathan* by William W. Sokoloff (2001) traces the role of anxiety, which he separates from fear, in *Leviathan*. Actually, Sokoloff sees that anxiety, not fear is the fundamental problem of *Leviathan*. In a recent article by Noel Boulting, Hobbes's conception of fear is analyzed through the philosophy of C.S. Peirce. Boulting states that Hobbes's conception of fear can be divided in three different aspects: *iconic*, *indexical* and *intellective*. For Boulting, the iconic sense of fear means the limitless capacity for fear, which is typical for the state of nature. The indexical sense of fear is instead something that makes possible to overcome this natural fear in the state. This can be superstitious religion (negative sense) or a state (positive). Boulting sees the intellectual sense of fear to be anxiety about the future. (Boulting 2011, 135-155.) In our analysis we find Boulting's suggestion useful, yet not exhaustive.

Fear is, of course, generally acknowledged as one of the most important "building blocks" of Hobbes's political thought. For example, many general presentations concerning Hobbes's philosophy (such as Zarka 1995 and Sorell 1996b, among many others), and biographies (such as Reik 1977 and Martinich 2007) emphasize the importance of fear in Hobbes's political thought.[151] This general and rather widely shared view of Hobbes's conception of fear can be described with the words of Gérard Mairet:

> The politics of Hobbes is traversed entirely by this original idea according to which fear of death is the origin of the political community. For Hobbes the fear is the primary passion of the human being. A state – which Hobbes names as "Leviathan" – is instituted to remove the violent death: it is its first and last justification. (Mairet 2009, 135; see also 136-138.)[152]

Mairet emphasizes Hobbes's idea of the passion of fear as an origin of the state, but does not elaborate the concept any further. It seems indeed that most scholars are satisfied with the fact that Hobbes understands men's *mutual* fear as a building block of the commonwealth.[153] Thus, while there is a shared understanding of mutual fear as the *source* of the commonwealth, less interest has been given to fear as the most important political *tool* of the sovereignty planned by Hobbes.[154] In other words, scholars' interest has focused more on the philosophical anthropology than on Hobbes's practical politics. They attach fear to the state of nature, but sometimes fail to see that fear has a very different nature when it is connected to a multitude and again when it is used as a tool to govern the people.[155]

---

151 Biographies also make such an easy comparison with Hobbes's interest in fear and his personal characteristics that are claimed to be fearful. Even though these arguments can get some support from Hobbes's personal statements concerning his life, these questions are not in our interest in this chapter.

152 The Original French text reads : "La politique de Hobbes est tout entière traversée par cette idée initiale que la peur de la mort est à l'origine de la commonauté politique. Pour Hobbes, la peur est la passion première des hommes. L'État – que Hobbes nomme "Leviathan" – est institué pour écarter la mort violente; c'est là sa justification premiére et derniere." (Mairet 2009, 135.)

153 Manent (2007), for example, notes that fear, and especially the fear of death, is the basis of Hobbes's idea of political order. According to Manent, it is the equality of the people in the state of nature, which makes them fear each other. However, what is most interesting is how Manent sees fear as enabling the constitution of socialibility and the social world in general. (Manent 2007, 108.)

154 Sometimes it is, however, noted that power is the tool (*moyen*) that transforms the negative sociability of the state of nature to the positive sociability in the state, where peace exists. (Manent 2007, 88). According to Menent it is the necessity, which is the key to understand the way out of the mutual fear in the state of nature to the peaceful society ("peur de la mort donne accés a la nécessité") (Manent 2007, 110). However, even though Menent considers the problem of fear he deals with it mainly through the concept of necessity. Fear as a tool of governance is totally dismissed. (Manent 2007, 94-114.)

155 However, Gabriella Slomp shows in her book *Thomas Hobbes and the Political Philosophy of Glory* that first of all Hobbes's view of fear is closely related to one of Thucydides, who sees that fear is always connected to uncertainty. Secondly Slomp shows that fear is an important part of political governance in Hobbes's thought, as she writes: "The difference is that Hobbes seems more aware than most writers both of the crucial function of fear in political associations and of the validity of his whole

Thus, it is only through practical politics that Hobbes's philosophical anthropology, or his philosophy in all its complexity, finds its *raison d'être*. As Hobbes himself claimed, only a philosophy that has practical implications is useful and worth studying:

> The end or scope of philosophy is, that we may make use to our benefit of effects formerly seen; or that, by application of bodies to one another, we may produce the like effects of those we conceive in our mind, as far forth as matter, strength, and industry, will permit, for the commodity of human life. For the inward glory and triumph of mind that a man may have for the mastering of some difficult and doubtful matter, or for the discovery of some hidden truth, is not worth so much pains as the study of Philosophy requires; nor need any man care much to teach another what he knows himself, if he think that will be the only benefit of his labour. The end of knowledge is power; and the use of theorems (which, among geometricians, serve for the finding out the properties) is for the construction of problems; and, lastly, the scope of all speculation is the performing of some action, or thing to be done. (Hobbes DCOE, I, 6.p. 7; p. lat. 6.)

Following this general guideline for philosophy, Hobbes seems to suggest it is no use to know that fear is a central element in human psychology and social behaviour if we do not know how to control and use it politically. Hence, while we are interested in the psychological side of the concept of fear and its effects on human beings in their social life, especially while they are living in a multitude, we should also be interested in how fear is used in political governance. We cannot connect fear only to the "state of nature" and to human nature as some sort of pre-political concept, but we must try to comprehend how it operates at the centre of political governance. The analysis of fear as the source of the commonwealth is not enough: we must understand that fear is a crucial part of the commonwealth and its governance in the everyday life.[156]

What kind of relation is there between passions and political theory in Hobbes's philosophy? Hobbes himself saw passions as something that called for a serious scientific analysis. In his *Vita* Hobbes describes his position in the following way:

> Prior to his [that is, Hobbes's] work, nothing had been written in ethics concerning common or vulgar feelings. But he deduced the customs and practices of men from human nature, virtues and vices from natural law, and good or malicious action from the law of states. (Hobbes PL, 251; V, xix.)

---

political theory being dependent on the assumption of fear-inspired behaviour." (Slomp 2000, 79 and 74-83.)

156 This chapter does not, however, propose, as Sim & Walker do in their book, that people would be eager to slip immediately back to the state of nature if political control is weak. Sim & Walker state that "Civil society, as Hobbes observes in his earlier statement of his political philosophy, *De Cive*, has its origin in 'the mutual fear [men] had of each other'. Even in civil society we continue to fear each other's natural drives; hence, as Hobbes notes, we arm ourselves on journeys and lock our doors at night. Our fellow human beings are never completely to be trusted, and will revert to pre-social type given the slightest opportunity to do so." (Sim & Walker 2003, 15.) Furthermore, in our present study we do not see that there is such a thing as a 'pre-social' in Hobbes's philosophy.

Even though this is an autobiographical note, the quotation shows that emotions were a first order question in Hobbes's political philosophy. As Roberto Esposito has suggested, Hobbes can be seen as a unique political philosopher of emotions in the era of scientific revolution.[157] Hobbes wanted his readers to grasp his political science (*scientia civilis*) as a systematic scientific enquiry, which was based on the facts of laws concerning material and motion. He wrote his political works as if those metaphysical principles were known and self-evident. From this metaphysical basis he built his theory of the human mind. The theory of the human mind for its part is the basis of his political theory. Hence we must recognize the crucial role that Hobbes's theory of passions plays in his philosophical architecture. Without a proper analysis of the motions of the mind it would be impossible to understand politics, Hobbes seems to argue.

The centrality of the passions in his political thought is obvious, but become more complicated when we ask why passions came to play such an important role for Hobbes. Hobbes's psychology is usually treated quite narrowly as a question of an egoistic individual.[158] And even when the analysis is done with other terms than egoism, the centrality of the individual is not questioned. We should, however, note that the solution that Hobbes offers so eagerly, that is the lonely individual as a fundamental building block of the organized commonwealth, is an answer to a political and collective problem of multitude as we already saw in the previous chapter.

Thus, while we acknowledge that Hobbes's solution to a political crisis goes through the psychology and the logic of the individual, we should also note that reducing the political order to the individual is an attack against the other logic, the logic of multitude.[159] For Hobbes the first enemy of all order in any commonwealth was the amorphous and fragmented mass of human beings. Thus, by reducing the political question to the organization of atomized individuals, separated from their connections to family, love relationships, economic, religious or political relationships and bonds, Hobbes introduced a new idea of organizing and controlling human crowds.[160] Now, the question

---

157 See Esposito 2000, 37-38. It is however worthwhile to remember how writers such as René Descartes, Nicolas Malebranche and Baruch Spinoza also wrote deep philosophical analyses concerning emotions. Hobbes does not stand alone as an inventor of the relationship between the movements of the mind – or emotions – and political philosophy, since the theme was central for all the Greek and Roman political philosophers. In the beginning of the modern age, Hobbes, however, formulated this relationship in a new way and shed light on a new kind of understanding between politics and emotions. Spinoza for example can be seen as a follower, interpreter and critique of Hobbes's political theory (see more in detail the rigorous work by Christian Lazzeri 1998).

158 See Kavka 1986, 29-82 who argues against the traditional assumption that Hobbes was a psychological egoist.

159 As Michel Foucault shows in his lectures of 1977-78 (*Securité, territoire, population*), the principle of the individual is a key to understanding the mechanisms of sovereign power, but as well disciplinary power and mechanisms of security. See Foucault 2004, 13-14.

160 In fact one could even claim that in Hobbes's vision of politics sovereign power speaks to individual citizens in the same kind of private, inner relationship as God speaks to individual human beings in Lutheran doctrine.

moves from how to organize the interests of different interest groups, to the question of how to make individual persons understand that their first obligation should be towards the sovereign power, that is, the state. In a commonwealth, an individual and the people play a dialectical game that benefits both of them. The multitude, where individuality is not properly fulfilled (or is fulfilled only in a distressing form), stands on the losing side in this game.

At one level, the problem of human passions and psychology is in fact expressed through Hobbes's negative conception of the state of nature and multitude. Describing the nature of the human mind and explaining the interconnectedness of individual minds through sensing, language and customs, Hobbes illuminates the condition of human kind without a sovereign power: a life without a sovereign power is a life without proper education and cultivation of the human mind. In other words, multitude means not only physical but also mental disorganization of the human community. Passions reign in the multitude since reason does not have proper ways i.e. political tools with which to organize passions. However, what is important is that without a collective re-organization of the human psyche it is impossible to organize individual minds either. The science of the human mind (psychology) introduced by Hobbes aims at a true political breakthrough.

Thus, Hobbes had political aims for his theory of human nature. These normative and political aims constitute an overall argument, which demonstrates how the concept of the human being as a species can be separated from the individual and citizen, that is, human nature is separate from the political subject. The political problem that Hobbes sets out is: how to become a citizen, a political subject, and not just to remain at the level of a mere human being, in the state of human abasement. The fundamental aim, i.e. changing a human being by political action, characterizes all of Hobbes's political thought.[161] (See for example Jaume 1984, 36-41; 135-180.) At the level of philosophical anthropology the re-orientation of both reason and passion are necessary to overcome this "ill condition" of the state of nature. (Hobbes L, XIII, 12-14, pp. 85-86.)

Given this obvious orientation to change the behaviour of individuals, and human collectives as well, we arrive at the problematic question pertaining to the permanence of the human nature. As many scholars have concluded, it seems that Hobbes belongs to the group of "realist" political theorists, who

---

161 This becomes evident for example from the introduction of *Leviathan*, where Hobbes writes that it is the quest of art (that is, the art of politics, art which can be found in Plato's *Statesman*) to create the almighty Leviathan: "*Art* goes yet further, imitating that rational and most excellent work of nature, *man*. It is by art that great LEVIATHAN called a Commonwealth, or STATE, (in Latin, *Civitas*) is created, which is but an artificial man." and Hobbes goes further to say that "To describe the nature of this artificial man, I will consider First, the *matter* thereof, and the *artificer*; both which is *Man*." (Hobbes L, The Introduction. p. 7). Even though Hobbes supported the idea of an unchanging human nature, which he probably adopted from Thucydides (see Schaltter 1945, 357), it is obvious that his conception of human nature was a basis for political change.

thought that human nature is something that remains unchanged through historical development. It seems totally legitimate to argue that Hobbes saw human nature as a permanent, encoded structure, which carries with it certain patterns of behaviour, usually rather egoistic and negative. According to Hobbes the human being seeks constantly more and more power to secure her own life: "I put for a general inclination of all mankind, a perpetual and restless desire of power after power, that ceaseth only in death." (Hobbes L, XI, 2. p. 66.) Due to this "fact", Hobbes did not believe in the possibility that human life on Earth and in particular societies could flourish without strong political guidance: the natural condition of human kind is worse than animals. However, at the same time we have to admit as well that the centre of Hobbes's project for scientific politics was to finally find out what are the constitutive elements of human nature and how they could be re-organized. Thus, science is a way to become acquainted with human nature, and eventually, to change that very nature, that is, build up a sort of 'second nature'. This does not mean that human nature could be changed for good: but with scientific politics it is possible to re-organize and control human behaviour in a way that most of the negative outcomes of human nature can be excluded from the social and political life. In the end, it is the education of the subjects (manners, actions etc.) that offers a possibility to a permanent political change through the change of everyday *aisthesis* of the fellow citizens.

We must also note that it is not only individuals who are corrected, but in fact, it is the behaviour of the different interest groups that is targeted with political control as well. The aim of the social contract is not only to minimize individual egoism, but to minimize the power of different interest groups and balance the power relations inside the territory and population which the sovereign governs. Thus, what people should realize is that their own, particular interests, which are eventually the outcome of unrestricted passions, only lead them into trouble, where their self-preservation is endangered. Personal and group interests should be changed to an interest of the state that can secure the life of the individual.

The problem of liberty, that is of free motion according to ones own desires and passions, is likewise connected to the question pertaining to passions. Manifesting the interest of the state properly needs the restriction of individual liberty. According to Hobbes, when people act in total liberty they very probably act according to their short-term passions and most egoistic interests. As a substitute to this Hobbes posits a rule of law, which is the same as the rule of sovereign power, that is, the rule of reason. Reason should reign in society, not individual passions and desires, or aggregates of individual passions and desires (interest groups, political parties, religious sects or any sort of wider mass hysteria). All this is done in the name of liberty or freedom of the Commonwealth. An artificial person, Hobbes's construct of the state, should have total freedom to perform basic tasks, which would offer and bring peace and security to the whole society. *Salus populi suprema lex,* the security of

the people is the highest law, as Hobbes says following the words of Cicero. (Cicero 1998b, III, 8; Hobbes L, XIX, 4. p. 124.)[162]

However, we must remember that reason is not a distinct faculty of mind according to Hobbes, but it is more or less a process where certain appetites and aversions (the sources of passions) are deliberated. Hence, although most passions work against reason, some passions still incline men to ends that reason suggests as best, that is, peace. The fear of (violent) death is the most important one of these. Thus, from the basis of fear, reason suggests the convenient articles of peace, i.e. laws of nature. (Hobbes L, XIII, 14. p. 86.) Fear is truly a different passion than other passions, since generally passions, in relation to reason, should be understood as perturbations, as they frequently obstruct the process of right reasoning. (Gert 1989.)

In addition, passions are closely related to the rhetoric and eloquence. According to Hobbes, words move people's minds. Even though Hobbes is not particularly fond of the power of false rhetoric, he is completely aware of it. Hobbes states that rhetoric has force that can be, and should be, harnessed for the uses of the commonwealth and the sovereign. He definitely tries to relate to the idea of *parresia* of antiquity, i.e. the idea of speaking frankly with reasonable arguments.[163] As one of the most important ways of ruling and ordering human passions is language, the sovereign power should limit and censor the words and the ways people talk in public.

It is clear that passions have a very complex but central role in the political theory of Hobbes. Passions pull human beings together but they also are a factor that causes problems. In a sense, passions are seen as a force of nature (which is a classical viewpoint), something that human beings cannot control without proper philosophical and political skills. Thus Hobbes's aim is to explain what passions are, how they move individuals and human communities and after this, in a logical order, he wants to show the solution to the "problem" of passions, those pointless and aimless passions that move the natural human community (the problem of multitude). Only by working with passions, learning how to manage, control and govern them, can political aims truly be reached. Hobbes saw that the classical political thought did not properly understand how the human mind works and what are the reasons for the gradual slipping towards the reign of the multitude. By understanding passions, we understand how the human community works and then the true aim of political action, peace, will prevail.

---

162 Hobbes usually translates *salus* as security. *Salus* can also mean the well-being, welfare, health and safety, which gives deeper meaning to this phrase than just plain "security".

163 On the concept of *parresia*, see Foucault 2008; 2009.

3.2 Fear in Multitude

Hobbes's model of passions begins with a basic distinction between the two motions of a human being: appetite and aversion. Appetite and aversion are generated from *endeavour* (lat. *conatus*). Endeavour means "[t]hese small beginnings of motion, within the body of man, before they appear in walking, speaking, striking, and other visible action" (Hobbes L, VI, 1. p. 34). Appetite, or desire, is a motion directed towards something that seems to be utile for the self-preservation of the individual. Aversion on the contrary is a motion away from something that seems to threaten self-preservation.

The aim of aversion and appetite is to sustain the *vital motion* of the human being. There is also another category of motion, *animal motion* or *voluntary motion*, which is linked to the vital motion. Animal motion, which Hobbes was more interested in, also operates with the principles of appetite and aversion, but is far more complex. Voluntary motions are something that can be generally called passions, whereas vital motions do not belong to the category of passions.[164] (Hobbes L, VI, 1-8. pp. 33-35; Gert 1989; Gert 1996, 159-164.)

For Hobbes the whole universe is a material body, and there exists nothing except this material body. A human being exists inside a huge material body, i.e. the universe. Perceiving the world is possible through sensory experience, which, however, constitutes a realm where the motions of the outside material body *affect* human beings. These motions can be sensed with different sense organs such as sight or hearing. There might also be several other sorts of motions, which cannot be sensed with the sensory system. Amplifiers for sensing things may also be needed. For example, to perceive the motions of the moons of Saturn calls help from a telescope. The case is the same with a microscope.[165] (Hobbes L, XXXXVI, 14-17. pp. 446-448; Hobbes DCO, XXV-XXVI. pp.eng. 387-444; pp.lat. 315-361.)

Generally, all sense experience, as well as phantasms and ideas, are an outcome of the two endeavours or motions collapsing together and causing a reaction:

> … all resistance is endeavour opposite to another endeavour, that is to say, reaction. Seeing, therefore, there is in the whole organ, by reason of its own internal natural

---

164 Unlike David Heyd (1982, 290) suggests, emotions have their source in appetite and aversion and they *also* cause appetite and aversion. Again, involuntary motions, such as vital motions, are part of appetite and aversion, not excluded from them as Heyd claims.

165 In a way the whole development of modern science is about amplifying human senses: the microscope, telescope, stethoscope etc. Hobbes writes about microscopes and telescopes for example in *De Homine.* (See Hobbes DH, IX. pp. 77-87.) This idea of technique is still at the centre of many developments of natural science. Hobbes's relation to empiricism was that he thought that there could be no conceptions in the human mind that do not have their source in sense experience. On the other hand, Hobbes's own philosophical analysis is based on the analysis of language and conceptual relationships. (See Zarka 1995; Pettit 2009.) Hence, it is worthwhile to note that Hobbes did not construct his philosophy on experiments, but on rational and linguistic calculation, and conceptual development.

> motion, some resistance or reaction against the motion which is propagated from the object to the innermost part of the organ, there is also in the same organ an endeavour opposite to the endeavour which proceeds from the object, so that when that endeavour inwards is the last action in the act of sense, then from the reaction, how little soever the duration of it be, a phantasm or idea hath its being; which, by reason that the endeavour is now outwards, doth always appear as something situate without organ. (Hobbes DCOE I, XXV, 2. p. 391; p. lat. 318.)

Thus, passions take shape originally based on sensory experience, that is, on the resistance caused by two different motions. Self-preservation determines whether these motions are perceived as positive or negative for vital motion. Consequently, it could be said that for Hobbes a passion is a second order motion that has as its original source in a motion coming from outside, an affect.[166] Passions are thus always reactions, not necessarily immediate, to some affects. He writes:

> This endeavour, when it is toward something which causes it, is called APPETITE, or DESIRE; the latter, being the general name, and the other oftentimes restrained to signify the desire of food, namely *hunger* and *thirst*. And when the endeavour is fromward something, it is generally called AVERSION. These words *appetite*, and *aversion* we have from the Latins; and the both of them signify motions, one of approaching, the other of retiring. (Hobbes L, VI, 2. p. 34.)

However, even though these two motions, appetite and aversion, are the origins of the passions, passions do not operate only in the present tense. A human being has a memory and thus passions can arise also from past experiences. Passions can be marked with different signs, like words (love, hate etc.), but for Hobbes the "best signs of passions present, are either in the countenance, motions of the body, actions, and ends, or aims, which we otherwise know the man to have." (Hobbes L, VI, 56. p. 41). Passions are part of linguistic and non-linguistic communication. Hence, even though we mark our passions with words we must remember that passions are raised as well by gestures, facial expressions etc. What we sense from other people are subtle motions, which we interpret, or misinterpret in several ways. Passions are common to everybody: they are a central part of everyday sensory experience concerning other people and their behaviour. They emerge whenever two people meet and communicate with each other, since every encounter of two bodies creates resistance, which makes perception and passions possible. The expressions of passion are perhaps the most important part of the constitution of the social fabric.

---

166 Hobbes uses the term affect a couple of times in his philosophy as a technical term related to passions, although the term is not typical for Hobbes (see Hobbes EL, VI, 9; p. 30; see also on the concept of affect in relation to the concept of speech in Hobbes L, IV, 24, p. 26). Generally affect is a term already used by scholastics to define the impact of the external body on human body and mind. Sun for example affects a human being with its warmth. Thus, affect does not have the sense of affection or emotion that we nowadays attach to it. In Hobbes, and for example in Spinoza's philosophy, affects are motions that derive from external bodies, whereas passions have their source in internal motions of the mind.

But, what kind of passion is fear for Hobbes? In *Leviathan* the definition is: "Aversion, with opinion of HURT from the object, FEAR." (Hobbes L, VI, 16. p. 36.) This basic definition clarifies how Hobbes's system of passions works. Firstly, there is an aversion, a motion away from something that threatens vital powers. Secondly, above this there is a more complex psychological process, memory and a disposition pertaining to the question what it means to be hurt. These processes are structured by the fact that fear is caused by an *opinion* of being hurt by some external *object*.

What this object is, or what Hobbes means with the concept of object, is not clarified, but it is certain that he does not only mean objects such as a knife, fist or bullet. Hobbes's definition is, of course, as straightforward as possible because its function is to describe how human nature works, but it is necessary to underline that the "object" can be a very complex set of different powers, a state for example. Fear has a certain clear object, which causes it and causes resistance in people or in a single human being.

Fear can also be a source of panic and terror. Panic and terror reign when a person or a group of persons do not understand why they fear something, or what the object is that is causing that very fear:

> *Fear*, without the apprehension of why, or what, panic terror, called so from the fables, that make Pan the author of them; whereas, in truth, there is always in him that so feareth, first, some apprehension of the cause, though the rest run away by example, every one supposing his fellow to know why. And therefore this *passion* happens to none but in a throng, or multitude of people. (Hobbes L, VI, 37. p. 38.)

Here Hobbes explains how social fear emerges in a multitude. First someone fears something knowing, or believing that she knows, what the real cause of the fear is. Accordingly, since fear causes aversion, i.e. motion, she starts to move and act in a way that reflects the fear. Other individuals who are sensing this motion, react to it and panic. In other words, they start to move because of the example of the first person. Consequently, such imitation relates very closely to fear. Panic and *mimesis* are typical only for the multitude where the object of fear seems to be obscure and where the passionate reactions of others create disorder.

Indeed, one of the key concepts in Hobbes's idea of the human community is definitely the concept of *mimesis* (lat. *imitatio*).[167] First, mimesis explains why people attack one another. Second, it offers a comprehensive explication of the

---

167 Some other authors also emphasise the fact that mimesis was an important concept for Hobbes. Usually the analysis of mimesis is, however, restricted to the process where human imitates the nature, the work of God, while he builds up the State. The reason why nature is imitated is the fact that nature imitates the art, that is, the art of God in creation. This kind of emphasis for imitation is given, for example, by Angoulvent. She states that "Physis et mimesis sont soeurs ou cousines comme, plus tard, nomos et logos seront frères ou cousins. Le règne commun du physis et de mimesis laisse peu à peu la place à celui de nomos et de logos par le jeu de la construction au deuxième degré, c'est-à-dire le "constructionisme"." (Angoulvent 1992, 240.)

interior reasons of motion in a human community. In short, mimesis explains much of what we would call sociability and social behaviour.

It is possible to distinguish two aspects of mimesis, i.e. the social and the political, although social mimesis has strong effects on political behaviour as well. This section will analyze the kind of social mimesis, while the political mimesis is analyzed in chapter 3.3.

The fundamental aspect in the social side of mimesis is the way an individual imitates the powers of life that others possess. As Hobbes states in *Leviathan*, men have a perpetual and restless desire after power. Because of this perpetual desire, people end up always inventing new desires and needs. In the ultimate situation, nothing can fulfil a person's appetite for better living and ensuring one's possessions. A person, or a sovereign power, may use whatever means to ensure the well-being it has:

> Competition of riches, honour, command, or other power, inclineth to contention, enmity, and war: because the way of one competitor, to the attaining of his desire, is to kill, subdue, supplant, and repel the other. (Hobbes L, XI, 3. p. 66.)

Hence, it is ultimately by killing and subduing others that a person makes sure of her own well-being. However, competition and stealing the powers and resources of life that others possess does not need to be this violent.

But how does one imitate the powers that others possess? Hobbes gives maybe the clearest example in the beginning of *De Cive*, where he explains why people seek their own utility and good from society. Here Hobbes criticizes the Aristotelian notion of *zoon politikon* implying the idea that human beings are born fit for society. For Hobbes the case is the exact opposite. In Hobbes's theory the main reason for "entering" society is personal good, that is, the honour or advantage, grouped with material goods that an individual seeks from society. (Hobbes DC, I, 1-2. pp. lat. 157-161; pp. eng. 21-25.)

When people come together, they immediately start to seek their own glory, not the good of the society. What generally drives people is their desire to keep alive and secure their living in the best possible way. Hobbes writes:

> And if people happen to be sitting around swapping stories, and someone produces one about himself, every one 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. (Hobbes DCE, I, 2. p. 23; p.lat. 159.)

The case is the same in the gatherings of philosophers, where everyone wants to be a master. Glory and honour that people get from their performance is something that everyone wants for themselves. This leads to imitation of gestures and behaviour. However, what is imitated is not this or that particular performance.[168] The imitation is actually directed towards the powers of life

---

168 A critic and follower of Hobbes, Jean-Jacques Rousseau wrote in his second discourse (*Discours sur l'origine et les fondaments de l'inégalité parmi les hommes*) in a similar way as Hobbes that the origin of all bad things in society was the camp fire, which made people gather together and perform for one another, singing and dancing. This is

that other persons seem to possess, to their *endeavour* or *conatus,* as Hobbes calls it.[169]

To put it briefly, a person wants to stay alive, and thus has an impulse towards self-preservation. In a multitude the fear of death pushes human beings to constantly want more resources, opportunities and anything that might secure one's own life. Imitating what other people do, and how they do it, makes one believe that her possibilities to stay alive are better than before. However, what is wanted from other persons is not only the technique, but the very power of life. Imitation is not resistance to the motions of others, but instead means to follow the motions, gestures and actions of others. In this way the one who is imitated draws the motion of others towards herself and her person.

The whole process of searching for glory and imitating others is, nevertheless, fatal for the community, for it leads to negative competition and passions such as envy, which only cause violence and death. The purpose of the commonwealth is to assign everyone to their own places in a social hierarchy and thus prevent envy, the search for glory and imitation of the others. Accordingly, Hobbes's idea is that the tasks of the sovereign include classical "statesmancraft", but on the other hand, the sovereign has to be aware of questions pertaining to changing people's behaviour, keeping the strife for glory and imitating others away from the commonwealth. The sovereign should concretely limit the motion and gestures of the subjects and prevent negative mimesis.

Fear is not just a simple passion that can be judged as essentially good or bad. Stoics for example argued that fear is a false conclusion.[170] Hobbes instead states that fear can sometimes be caused by the wrong interpretation of the senses for example when a man claims to have seen ghosts. Ghosts, however, exist only in the person's own imagination. The real reason for people seeing ghosts can be found from the false doctrines of scholastics and the pagan beliefs of people. (Hobbes L, XII, 8. pp. 73-74; XXXXVI, 19. p. 449.) The negative influence of the scholastic philosophy and its power to feed superstition becomes obvious from the following citation:

> Again, whereas motion is change of place, and incorporeal substances are not capable of place, they [*i.e scholastic philosophers*] are troubled to make it seem possible, how a soul can go hence, without the body, to heaven, hell, or purgatory; and how the *ghosts* of men, and I may add of their clothes which they appear in, can walk by night in churches, churchyards, and other places of sepulture. To which I know not what they can answer, unless they will say, they walk *definitive,* not *circumscriptive,* or *spiritually,* not *temporally:* for such egregious distinctions are equally applicable to any difficulty whatsoever. (Hobbes L, XXXXVI, 21. p. 449.)

---

something that cultivates envy in the human mind and makes them imitate the gestures of one another. (Rousseau 2003, 96-108.)

169 René Girard has extensively studied the concept of mimesis and his conception of mimesis and desire resemble Hobbes's view. Girard underlines that the principal object of the mimesis is the power of other's life. (Girard 2006, 217; see also more generally 213-248.)

170 Hobbes knew at least some of the stoic philosophy and he refers to it several times in his texts. See for example Hobbes L, XXVII, 21. p. 199; XLVI, 7. p. 443.

In contrast, scientific knowledge, optics for example, explains how different kinds of halos, reflections and folds of light create images that seem to be strange for us (see for example Hobbes DH, II-III. pp. 7-28). Scientific knowledge is thus set against scholastic philosophy, which invents obscure concepts and explains, for example, the ontology of angels.[171] It is thus no wonder that every now and then we see angels, if we practice such a false philosophy, Hobbes seems to reckon (Hobbes L, XXXIV. pp. 260-270; XXXXV, 8. pp. 428-429). Conversely, by means of the scientific method and true philosophy, people can understand what these phenomena actually are: only weird or false sensations caused by moving material. What follows politically from this is the political guidance of the soul with fear, which is something that Hobbes does not accept.

In this sense Hobbes tries to extenuate fear through his materialistic philosophy of mind. There is no need to fear all sorts of unusual phenomena, since most of them are just tricks of our senses, if we happen to be for example delirious, crapulous, in hunger etc. (Hobbes DC, III, 25. p. lat. 193; p. eng. 53.) Instead, there are real dangers, such as thunder and lightning, which should make us beware.

In sum, there are two sorts of fears. Firstly, the ones that are real, that is, whose source is outside of the human mind, which, in turn, interprets the affects that the outside objects cause accurately. Secondly, there are fears that originate from within the human mind and hence have the potential to be wrong. Reason and the capability to make judgments are important when separating our irrelevant fears from the relevant ones. *War*, for example, mixes our capability to make judgments and it makes us fear all sorts of things in a way that renders it difficult to distinguish between actual and illusory fears.

There is also another dichotomy related to the *actual* feeling of fear. Hobbes states that those who believe that fear in the state of nature is constant actual fear, or even panic, are wrong. In the amendments that he made to *De Cive* in 1647 he specifies that fear does not only mean a state of a person actually frightened. Instead, he defines fear as "any anticipation of future evil". (Hobbes DCE, I, 2. p. 25; p. lat. 161.) He gives examples of how the anticipation of future evil is manifest in the society. His examples include people locking doors when they go to bed and arming themselves against robbers while they are on a journey. Countries guard themselves with walls and frontiers, with arms and armies. Occasionally, even the strongest armies negotiate peace because they are afraid of losing the war. (Hobbes L, XIII, 12. p. 85.)

In short, fear manifests as a precaution and preparation for different kinds of risks. In this sense, fear is not a limited feeling or passion of actual dread; it is not only panic and disorder. (Hobbes DC, I, 2. p. eng. 25; p. lat. 161.; see also Hobbes L, XIII. pp. 82-86.) Fear has two temporal dimensions. Firstly, the fear of what actually happens, i.e. fear in the present tense. Secondly, and what is more

171 Scholastics were a very wide philosophical genre and many scholastics did not seriously consider the question of angels. Only some did, such as Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologiae*, see Questions 50-64. (Aquinas 1981.)

important for Hobbes, there is the fear of future misfortune, i.e. "distrust, suspicion, precaution and provision" (Hobbes DCE, I, 2. p. 25; p. lat. 161).

Then, what is the type of fear in the state of nature? Hobbes's definition of the state of nature is the "war of every man against every man" (Hobbes L, XIII, 8. p. 84). The definition of total war suggests that the state of nature is a state of constant and actual fear: the fear of violent death. This, however, might be an exaggerated view of the state of nature since, as a matter of fact, many other examples Hobbes gives are quite different. They suggest that the idea of the state of nature is conceptually linked to the idea of state as stagnation: the state of nature is a state where nothing ever develops and human efforts are vain. (Hobbes L, XIII, 9. p. 84.)

The war of every man against every man does not mean actual fighting. Rather, it refers to a disposition to fight. Consequently, two aspects of war and fear in the state of nature can be distinguished:

> 1) Actual fighting, which causes real fear and also creates a memory of fear, that is, stories and legends of something horrible. The act of fighting is a precondition for the second aspect of the state of nature.
> 2) Constant disposition of fear and suspicion towards other people. Here fear is not real in the sense that it would demand instant reactions or cause fear in the sense of panic or terror. However, this second aspect of fear can also be seen as a reason for the first aspect of the state of nature.

Hence Hobbes's definition of the state of nature is tautological and it demands a definitive solution (the birth of sovereign), since it is impossible to derive peace from either of these aspects mentioned above. Conceptualizing the state of nature with the help of these two aspects it becomes easier to understand the Hobbesian statement that mutual fear is the basis of every large and lasting society. Accordingly, he writes in *De Cive*: "One must therefore lay it down that the origin of large and lasting societies lay not in mutual human benevolence but in men's mutual fear." (Hobbes DCE, p. I, 2. p. 24; p. lat. 161.) Indeed, it would be quite awkward to suggest that creating a (imaginary) covenant between people, i.e. the social contract, would need a case of actual war. The basis of society would lie in the war, not in reason as Hobbes suggests. This would definitely mean to build a state on the idea of state of exception, taken in a very literal sense.[172] Hence, it is true that commonwealth is based on fear, but not on an actual fear or panic, but rather on suspicion that brings space to right reasoning.

Hobbes sees that the condition of distrust is not good for a society or political structures. It prevents the development of knowledge and facilitates controversies between different opinions. In such a community there are no shared ideas of the knowledge of the universe or cosmos, no shared idea of God or the role of Sovereign power. Everything that other people know or do can be

---

172 For Carl Schmitt, who described the state of exception in his *Political Theology*, the sovereign is the one who decides the state of exception. This means simply that the sovereign can hold the law in its hands and decide about police operations or war. (See Schmitt 2006.) See also Giorgio Agamben's analysis concerning Schmitt's thought (Agamben 2005, 32-40).

interpreted as being related to their own interests. And all this action is marked by fear, the fear of escalating opposite opinions into an actual conflict, where everything can and will happen.

The true condition of the multitude is the condition of fear, which also explains why violence is so easily launched in the multitude. This is really what we should understand with the concepts of the state of nature and the phrase of the "war of every man against every man". It is the human condition without the *future* since the events of the past cause anxiety in the present, as something similar might happen in the future. In the state of nature the concept of time is obscure and there is no horizon for the future. If we are allowed to use ancient concepts, in the state of nature, time is marked by *aion* and *kairos*, that is, by immeasurable mass of time and sudden flashes of change in that time. The multitude is made out of motions, but the "soul" (psyche) that could measure those changes with time is lacking. Motions without a measure (time) bring in the experience of chaos and causes the corruption of long-term plans. All this is vividly expressed in Hobbes's definition of war and time:

> For WAR consisteth not in battle only, or the act of fighting, but in a tract of time wherein the will to contend by battle is sufficiently known. And therefore, the notion of *time* is to be considered in the nature of war, as it is in the nature of weather. For as the nature of foul weather lieth not in a shower or two of rain, but in and inclination thereto of many days together, so the nature of war consisteth not in actual fighting, but in the known disposition thereto during all the time there is no assurance to the contrary. All other time is PEACE. (Hobbes L, XIII, 8. p. 84.)

What is needed to dissolve this whole (imaginary) situation is the formation of a sovereign power. Sovereign power can create a perspective for a better future. In fact, sovereign power can create a time in its chronological sense, a *kronos*. Sovereign power promises that established order will also last tomorrow. Hence, it also guarantees that individual property, meaning the labour of a human being, is secured. In the multitude everyone has the right to everything, to the fruits of labour and even to one's person. However, in a commonwealth the sovereign has the capability to create a power that can modify fear and create hope instead of depression. In other words, the sovereign power can create a dimension of the future – the proper tense of politics as Aristotle already stated in his *Rhetoric*.[173]

---

173 Aristotle connects the future to hope and deliberation. According to him, deliberative speech is much more difficult than forensic speech, because it is directed towards the future, whereas forensic is connected to the past. (Aristotle 1995f, 1417b22-1418b38.) According to Aristotle, rhetoric is very close to politics, since it opens different possibilities and is thus directed to the future: "The duty of rhetoric is to deal with such matters as we deliberate upon without arts or systems to guide us, in the hearing of a person who cannot take in at a glance a complicated argument, or follow a long chain of reasoning. The subjects of our deliberation are such as seem to present us with alternative possibilities: about thing that could not have been, and cannot now or in future be, other than they are, nobody takes them to be of this nature wastes his time in deliberation." (Aristotle 1995f, 1357a2-7.)

3.3 Fear and Political Sovereignty

Fear is a central problem also in the analysis of power. Without fear, power could not exist and operate. In the Hobbesian theory of the covenant that establishes the commonwealth by institution (social contract), the function of fear is crucial. Another possibility to acquire sovereignty is by force. Let us consider the latter case first.

When an organized assembly of persons, such as a foreign army, takes hold over a people or a multitude by force, a situation emerges where a people are coerced either to accept a foreign assembly, such as an army, as their superior power, or just simply to obey that power. If the case is the latter, there is no contract or covenant between the people and the sovereign power. The sovereign power can use brute violence to force subjects to do whatever the sovereign wants. In other words, subjects without rights in the commonwealth resemble slaves. In this case the fundamental reason why people subject themselves to a foreign power is the fear of death posed by foreign sovereign power. (Hobbes L, XX, 2-4. pp. 132-133.)

In the first and better form of sovereignty, i.e. commonwealth by institution, a commonwealth is established through a social contract assembled in order to avoid and overcome the constant state of fear and possible war of all against all. Performing the bonds of everyman with everyman constitutes the social contract. In this case, the reason for the social contract is the fear of *one another*, a *mutual* fear. (Hobbes L, XX, 4. p. 133.) Yet in the social contract, people do not fear the instance they are about to establish, the sovereignty, since there is not yet an object one could sense (a state) and hence, fear. Instead people living in the multitude fear one another, that is, the multitude. The fear of the sovereign comes only after this basic contract is made, just after the body politic comes into being, as Hobbes writes:

> For by this authority, given him by every particular man in the commonwealth, he hath the use of so much power and strength conferred on him, that by terror thereof, he is enabled to perform the wills of them all, to peace at home, and mutual aid against their enemies abroad. (Hobbes L, XVII, 13. p. 114.)

Hence, there are two kinds of fear connected to the formation of sovereignty. The first one is constructive fear, the mutual fear that drives people to organize themselves as a commonwealth against their mutual fear and also against the fear of a foreign enemy. The second one is the fear of sovereignty. When the fear of sovereignty has its source inside the commonwealth, it is the outcome of a constructive mutual fear and something that people will accept liberally as a reasonable outcome of their deliberation. When the source of the fear of sovereignty comes from the outside it happens because of subjugate power. These different types of fear organize people in different ways and affect political possibilities of commonwealths. However, the most important thesis is: innumerable political organizations derive their motivation from fear.

Even though fear is a passion, it can still be a part of public or private *deliberation*. Covenants based on fear are as valid as those based on purely rational calculation. In fact, Hobbes says that all those who claim that fear cannot be the source of a covenant between the subjects and the sovereign power are clearly manifesting that they do not understand the proper character of sovereign power. (Hobbes L, XX, 2. p. 132.) They are revealing that they do not comprehend the relationship between desire, emotions and reason, that is, the continuum from passion of fear to rational will.

What happens to the natural liberty of men when they engage themselves in the laws of a commonwealth? In the multitude, everyone is as free as possible to do whatever they desire to do, which leads the people to the state of war of every man against every man, with constant fear reigning. The social contract is a process where every single mind deliberates and finally understands how the real enemy of all peaceful living is their own absolute freedom, the free motion of human beings.

Following this conclusion, individuals have to restrict their natural freedom that allows them to do whatever they desire to do. This restriction is properly completed when everyone surrenders their natural rights to the sovereign power. In the social contract everyone cedes their natural right to hinder or otherwise encroach on the actions of others. This kind of move presumes trust, because giving up the right to oppose or even to kill another person denotes a huge risk. Hence trust is not directed towards the other persons of a multitude, but instead it is expressed towards the sovereign power. People in a commonwealth trust[174] that the sovereign power can and will act in a way that people do not have to be afraid of one another. However, trust itself is not enough to secure peace: there has to be a sovereign who is trusted upon. (Hobbes L, XIV, 18. p. 91; XVII. pp. 111-115.)

Thus, fear and liberty do not exclude each other. In a multitude human beings are in a sense afraid all the time, although this fear is more like distrust towards the future. They are, however, still free at the same time. As they enter into the commonwealth they must perform a deliberation concerning the best possible outcomes of this commitment, especially in relation to their own advantage. People do not enter the commonwealth because of a common interest, but because of a private one (Hobbes DC, I, 2. p. eng. 23; p. lat. 159-160).

Fear makes individuals see why engagement in the commonwealth is necessary for their own self-preservation. Fear does not hinder liberty in any way, claims Hobbes. While defining the process of deliberation, Hobbes in fact very clearly states that will is the last appetite or aversion in the chain of calculation concerning good and bad sides of a certain action. Deliberation ends the state of liberty, as Hobbes repeatedly underlines.[175] And even though the

---

174 Hobbes defines trust in the following way: "To believe, to trust, to rely on another, is to honour him; sign of opinion of his virtue and power. To distrust, or not believe, is to dishonour." (Hobbes L, X, 27. p. 60.)

175 Quentin Skinner points out that Hobbes misunderstood the etymology of the word deliberation. For Hobbes the word meant de-liberation that is, the end of freedom

process of deliberation is carried out under the fear of violently losing one's life, the outcome of the deliberation, i.e. the *will* is still valid. (Hobbes L, VI, 50. pp. 39-40; XXI, 3-4. p. 140; Hobbes EL, XII, 2. p. 68; see also Skinner 2008, 107-115.)

It is important to emphasize that fear does not vanish when a commonwealth is erected. When the multitude of individuals has ceded its natural right to do whatever it wants to do, the right is transferred to the sovereign. Now the sovereign has all the rights and all the legitimate reasons to do whatever is necessary to fulfil the maxim of sovereign power, i.e. the aforementioned *salus populi suprema lex*. The task of the sovereign is to create peace and security for the people against outside enemies, but also by restraining all such actions performed by citizens themselves that might be harmful, cause fear, panic etc. to other members of the commonwealth. This is the reason why the sovereign has to have the capability to create fear among the people, if necessary. Again, it is important to underline that this kind of fear is not mutual fear. Instead, it is fear of a sovereign power.

In the social contract, the total liberty to do whatever a person desires is substituted for the limitations of a sovereign arbitrator. Hobbes seems to suggest that it is to the benefit of every individual to subject their desires to the rule of the sovereign if peace and security is received in exchange. In fact, an individual can simultaneously cast aside the constant fear they experience in the multitude.

Hence, fear of the sovereign in the commonwealth is not actual fear and it is not fear of a precarious future. In a sense, in the commonwealth fear is recognizable and clear. In the state of nature, the multitude is a confusing, constantly changing and metamorphosing body of people that affects the *aisthesis* of an individual in a dreadful way. In a multitude it is indeed difficult to recognize the true source of the fear. It is from this basis that the need for the commonwealth and the great Leviathan arises. The similarity of the fear of God to the fear of the sovereign power is revealing:

> This *perpetual fear*, always accompanying mankind in the ignorance of causes, as it were in the dark, must needs have for object something. And therefore when there is nothing to be seen, there is nothing to accuse, either of their good, or evil fortune, but some *power*, or agent *invisible:* in which sense perhaps it was, that some of the old poets said, that the gods were at first created by human *fear*: (Hobbes L, XII, 6. p. 72.)

One might argue, that the sovereign power is equally created by human fear. However, unlike with God, the sovereign power is something one can sense and feel perfectly well. Sovereign power is not as impotent as God, since sovereign power can act and one can prove that certain actions are really the actions of the sovereign power. This is the reason why the power of the mortal god functions so well in a commonwealth. The sovereign causes the fear if the subject offends the rules and laws of the commonwealth.

---

whereas the right etymology refers to the scale (*libra*). (See Skinner 2008, 20-25; 32; 46.) In other words, Hobbes thought that while people deliberate they still have a freedom of movement between their appetites and aversions. The ending of the process of deliberation, that is will, end this liberty.

Thus there is definitely a change in the quality of fear. In the multitude fear is caused by mutual uncertainty, chaos and mistrust, whereas in the commonwealth fear is caused by the orders of the sovereign which are put in practice by military, administration etc. This constitutes the structure of the commonwealth. Yet this does not mean that there are no individual liberties in a commonwealth. Rather, now citizens truly have a responsibility, and a reason, to deliberate the outcomes of their actions in the framework of a civil law, which guides their actions and motions.

In a commonwealth the citizen no longer possesses the ultimate natural right to hinder the motion of others. However, this should not cause any kind of anxiety in the people since they understand, or to be more precise, they believe, that a mechanism exists that will intervene if individuals or groups should find themselves in a conflict. The principle that secures that no one acts beyond the proper limits of everyday interaction is the fear of civil law and punishments deriving from breaking these laws.[176] Hobbes sees that (written laws) manifest the reason of the state and the sovereign has all the authority to defend the commands that are given in the form of law – even with violence.

Civil law is a mechanism of restricting the motion of individuals in a commonwealth. The word civil law is derived, Hobbes claims, from the name of the commander. In the case of civil law the commander is the *persona civitatis*, the artificial person of the commonwealth. The definition of civil law is:

> CIVIL LAW, is to every subject, those rules, which the commonwealth hath commanded him, by word, writing, or other sufficient sign of the will, to make use of, for the distinction of right and wrong; that is to say, of what is contrary, and what is not contrary to the rule. (Hobbes L, XXVI, 3. p. 176.)

In other words, the laws restrict the actions of the citizens. The laws should be expressed clearly, for everything that is not restricted by law is permitted. The natural laws have real power and meaning only in the commonwealth. Natural law is always a silent part of the civil law.[177] Also, only the sovereign power can

---

176 Mediators between individuals are named as arbitrators (lat. *arbiter*) already in the list of natural laws of *De Cive*. Arbitrators are necessary for the peace and both parties have to acknowledge the same arbitrator. In a commonwealth the sovereign is the arbitrator and the principle of natural laws means simply that people have to accept that the sovereign mediates all relations between citizens if that is necessary. (Hobbes DC, III, 20-21. p. lat. 191-192; p. eng. 51-52.) It could be said that the decisions of the arbitrator or judge are in a principle arbitrary: they have no other source or cause than the sovereignty itself. However, in practice they are more or less conventional, not purely arbitrary.

177 In *Leviathan* Hobbes states: "The law of nature, and the civil law, contain each other, and are of equal extent. For the laws of nature, which consist in equity, justice, gratitude, and other moral virtues on these depending, in the condition of mere nature, as I have said before in the end of the fifteenth chapter, are not properly laws, but qualities that dispose men to peace and obedience. When a commonwealth is once settled, then are they actually laws, and not before; as being then the commands of the commonwealth; and therefore also civil laws: for it is the sovereign power that obliges men to obey them.[…] The law of nature therefore is a part of the civil law in all commonwealths of the world. Reciprocally also, the civil law is a part of the dictates of nature.[…] Civil, and natural law are not different kinds, but different

defend natural (that is divine and moral) laws and give a voice to these otherwise silent laws of reason. Voicing the law is important, since only those who can hear, read or otherwise understand the law are considered to be subject to it.[178] The ones who give a voice to the sovereign are judges and other public ministers of sovereign power. (Hobbes L, XXIII, 9. pp. 161-162.)

The fear of the civil law adds new dimensions to Hobbes's analysis of the relation between fear and power. The fear of violence, fear of losing one's independence (imprisonment, etc.) and in the end, fear of a (violent) death are the elements that uphold the civil law. The monopoly on violence is crucial to the state. Without a genuine means to instil fear in the subjects, the reason of the sovereign, or God, does not have any effective power in a commonwealth. If some other body of people instead tries to create fear in the commonwealth, this attempt is an immediate attack on the sovereign power and its monopoly on violence.

Unlike the theorists who have doomed violence as a sort of mute action, i.e. as action without words not belonging to the realm of politics, Hobbes takes a different stance.[179] He sees that violence has several faces: one face is certainly the aimless and pointless violence of the multitude (in regard of the human community), but another face is the important violence of the sovereign. The violence of the sovereign is always an outcome of an unfulfilled command; it is an attempt to suppress unpleasant action (action that is dangerous to peaceful society) with fear. In other words, if speech and commands do not work, the violence becomes a part of the rational government of the people. Observing Hobbes's theory from this standpoint, there is only a short path to von Clausewitz's idea that war is only a continuation of politics by other means.[180]

---

parts of law; whereof one part being written, is called civil, the other unwritten, natural." (Hobbes L, XXVI, 8. p. 177.)

178 This enables a humane approach towards children and madmen, since those who do not understand the message of law, are not considered as bad or good, just or unjust: "From this, that the law is a command, and a command consisteth in declaration, or manifestation of the will of him that commandeth, by *voice*, writing, or some other sufficient argument of the same, we may understand, that the command of the commonwealth is law only to those, that have means to take notice of it. Over natural fools, children, or madmen, there is no law, no more than over brute beasts; nor are they capable of the title of just, or unjust; because they had never power to make any covenant, or to understand the consequences thereof; and consequently never took upon them to authorize the actions of any sovereign, as they must do that make to themselves a commonwealth. And as those from whom nature or accident hath taken away the notice of all laws in general; so also every man, from whom any accident, not proceeding from his own default, hath taken away the means to take notice of any particular law, is excused, if he observe it not: and to speak properly, that law is no law to him. It is therefore necessary, to consider in this place, what arguments, and signs be sufficient for the knowledge of what is the law; that is to say, what is the will of the sovereign, as well in monarchies, as in other forms of government." (Hobbes L, XXVI, 12. pp. 179-180.)

179 Arendt writes in her *Vita Activa*, that the violence is mute, which is the reason why violence itself cannot ever be anything great. See Arendt 1998.

180 See von Clausewitz 2000, I, 24. pp. 101-121. See also Foucault 1997, 41-46. Foucault says that von Clausewitz's principle is in fact a turnover of a general idea of politics in the 17th century, which understood politics as a continuum of war. In Hobbes's case we can detect that he especially wants to deny the relationship between war and politics. For Hobbes politics is not a continuum of the war of everyman against

Hobbes definitely has a double articulation of fear and violence in his political theory. In one sense, war, fear and violence should be removed from the political realm: the realm of the State should guarantee peace, security and meaningful action to the citizens according to reason of state (*raison d'État*).[181] On the other hand, he immediately states that fear, violence and war should not be ousted from the toolbox of politics since without them the political sphere (State) cannot work. The sovereign needs the capacity to arouse fear whenever and wherever it is needed. For this reason, the civil law as a guideline of the right behaviour in a commonwealth is guaranteed by the threat of violence. But how should a citizen obey the sovereign in a commonwealth? How should the metaphor of the "mortal god", the Leviathan, be understood? These questions can be answered with an analysis of Hobbes's idea of civil religion.[182]

The Leviathan is an earthly God or a mortal God. Thus the behaviour of a subject should be equal towards the sovereign and towards the immortal and eternal God. Hobbes says that the fear of God, when it is publicly expressed by the citizens, is an act of honouring. In short, worshipping God means a labour that shows honour towards God.[183] The same goes with the relation to the sovereign: showing fear towards the sovereign means honouring God, whose lieutenant the sovereign is on the Earth.[184] The sovereign gives voice to God's law (that is the divine law or law of nature) on the Earth (Hobbes L, XXXI, 33-34; p. 242). In the end, the sovereign is the source of all the honour in the commonwealth, as Hobbes writes in *Leviathan*:

> And as the power, so also the honour of the sovereign, ought to be greater, than that of any, or all the subjects. For in the sovereignty is the fountain of honour. The

---

everyman. In politics, according to Hobbes, there should be no rivalry of different sections. Politics is for Hobbes the same thing as government that is, governing the people.

181 On the reason of state and Hobbes see Noel Malcolm (2010) *Reason of State, propaganda and the Thirty Years' War*, especially pp. 92-123. As Gijs Rommelse writes: "Machiavellian principles of raison d'état were increasingly applied in the formulation and conduct of inter-state relations. Thus, the doctrine of raison d'état and the ideal prince were often discussed in the 16th and 17th century. Many authors like Jean Bodin, Thomas Hobbes, Baruch de Spinoza, John Locke and others continued the theoretical debate." (Rommelse 2006, 20.)

182 In his book *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*, Jeffrey R. Collins explains that Hobbes's idea of civil religion was important for Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Hobbes's ideas of civil religion and the use of religion as an instrument of politics are derived from the humanist canon, from both Tacitus and Cicero, but also from Thucydides. (Collins 2007, 36-57).

183 For a comprehensive analysis of the concept of honour, see Hobbes L, X. pp. 58-65. Generally honour is a sign of power. Sarasohn has analyzed Hobbes's theory of honouring from the viewpoint of master and servant, that is, from the viewpoint of patronage. Sarasohn is not explicitly interested in the relationship between religious and political honouring. See Sarasohn 2000. See also Jendrysik who compares Hobbes's sovereign to God, which is, however, perhaps a too strong interpretation. While Jendrysik writes that "Like God the sovereign taught the people their duties. His actions, like those of God, were beyond question by subordinates."(Jendrysik 2002, 136.) He seems to equate sovereign and God, which was not Hobbes's idea.

184 In *Leviathan* Hobbes states: "… there is no covenant with God, but by mediation of somebody that representeth God's person; which none doth but God's lieutenant, who hath the sovereignty under God." (Hobbes L, XVIII, 3. p. 116.)

> dignities of lord, earl, duke, and prince are his creatures. As in the presence of the master, the servants are equal, and without any honour at all; so are the subjects, in the presence of the sovereign. And though they shine some more, some less, when they are out of his sight; yet in his presence, they shine no more than the *stars* in the presence of the sun. (Hobbes L, XVIII, 19. pp. 121-122.)

Thus, what are these acts of honouring and worshipping, what is this labour that shows honour toward the sovereign? Hobbes wants to eradicate the signs of vainglory, pride and similar faults from a citizen's behaviour. In a sense, for Hobbes heroism and pride are barbarous manners: they belong to myths and stories. The story of *Don Quixote*, which Hobbes knew very well,[185] clearly manifests the price of imitating the heroes of the past: the outcome is a total folly.

Hobbes, following the metaphor from the *Book of Job,* writes that the Leviathan is the king of pride. All those signs and marks of our actions that can cause despise, measuring of one against another, envy and similar emotions, is behaviour that does not reflect the proper respect towards the sovereign power and towards the aims for which it is erected, that is, peace. Sovereign power only wants moderation of manners. It hates all kinds of arrogant and presumptuous behaviour.[186] Hence Hobbes is not willing to promote any special rites for honouring the sovereign: reasonable, modest and moderate conduct in everyday life towards other people, the civil laws and the sovereign are enough.[187] One of the best examples of this is the value that Hobbes puts on work. Work is not important only because it creates value and commodities, but it also has political importance, since it keeps idleness away from the commonwealth. (Hobbes L , XXX, 19. p. 230.)

Glory exists, however, in a special function in the commonwealth. Glory should be reserved only for the sovereignty. More precisely, the labour of glory and honour should be directed towards an abstract sovereignty, towards the State-form itself and towards the laws of the State. Consequently, this kind of behaviour manifests itself in proper and objective conduct, in recognition and acknowledgement of certain rules and manners.

Mimesis (as analyzed in chapter 3.2.) offers interesting aspects when it is connected to the concepts of glory, honour, fear and sovereignty. Hobbes has an extremely negative attitude towards imitation. He sees imitation as barbarous as heroism, and he emphasizes that imitation could cause serious problems in a commonwealth.

---

185 In the *Elements of Law*, for example, Hobbes refers to Don Quixote. See Hobbes EL, X, 9. p. 58.

186 In *Leviathan* Hobbes explains the principal causes of crime: "vain glory, or a foolish overrating of their own worth." (Hobbes L, XXVII, 13. p. 196.) The difference between worth or value and dignity is that sovereign power orders the dignity of a person (their place in the social hierarchy) whereas worth depends on the context and opinions of the others. Valuing oneself too highly definitely irritates others. See Hobbes L, X, 16. p. 59.

187 Hobbes was interested in the Roman civil religion, however, he was not implementing the idea of a sacred "nation". One should serve the sovereign, not the nation or people. For Hobbes, the sovereign is the earthly god. On Hobbes and civil religion see Beiner 2010, 47-72.

Firstly, imitation of others endangers the (fragile) hierarchy the social contract has established. The central idea of the social contract is that the natural equality of persons, which is typical for the multitude, can be ended.[188] In a commonwealth every person has their own place, their own status and occupation. The sovereign is the one who creates social inequality, which is needed to govern the commonwealth properly, as Hobbes states: "The question who is the better man, has no place in the condition of mere nature; where, as has been shown before, all men are equal. The *inequality* that now is, has been introduced by the laws civil" (Hobbes L, XV, 21. p. 102).[189] In a commonwealth the social statuses have to be stable, otherwise anyone can become a minister, for example, and start preaching in the name of God. Imitation of others would definitely endanger such a system of positions and possessions. It would bring into the commonwealth the mutual fear which instead introduces the disordered motion typical for the multitude. Hence it is important to keep the imitation of fellow citizens, that is the imitation of the motion of others, away from the commonwealth and educate people to understand their own place, worth and duties in the social hierarchy.

Secondly, the aspect of mimesis in relation to honouring the sovereign power is that the imitation of other nations' manners and their forms of sovereign power is to disparage their own sovereignty.[190] Showing honour to one's own sovereign requires the citizens to stand by their sovereign and believe in the capability of the sovereign to solve all problems. Imitating other nations makes a claim that other sovereigns do certain things better. This attitude shows no respect for the domestic sovereign and hence it can be interpreted as treason of the worst case. The sovereign defined by Hobbes fears

---

188 In *Leviathan* Hobbes states very explicitly that mutual equality in the state of nature is the source of war of every man against every man. See Hobbes L, XIII, 2-3. pp. 82-83.

189 See also *Leviathan* chapter XXX where Hobbes writes that "The *inequality* of subjects, proceedeth from the acts of sovereign power; and therefore has no more place in the presence of the sovereign, that is to say, in a court of justice, than the *inequality* between kings and their subjects, in the presence of the King of kings." (Hobbes L, XXX, 16. p. 229.)

190 This is an aspect that Hobbes might have learned from Thucydides, since in his famous Funeral speech Pericles states: "We live under the government, that does not emulate the institutions of our neighbours; on the contrary, we are ourselves a model which some follow, rather than the imitators of other peoples. It is true that our government is called democracy, because its administration is in the hands, not of the few, but of many; yet while as regards the law all men are on an equality for the settlement of their private disputes, as regards the value set on them it is as each man is in any way distinguished that he is preferred to public honours, not because he belongs to a particular class, but because of personal merits; nor, again, on the ground of poverty is a man barred from a public career by obscurity of rank if he but has it in him to do the state service. And only not in our public life are we liberal, but also as regards our freedom from suspicion of one another in the pursuits of every-day life; for we do not feel resentment at our neighbour if he does as he likes, nor yet do we put on sour looks which, though harmless, are painful to behold. But while we thus avoid giving offence in our private intercourse, in our public life we are restrained from lawlessness chiefly through reverent fear, for we render obedience to those in authority and to the laws, and especially to those laws which are ordained for the succour of the oppressed and those which, though unwritten, bring upon the transgressor a disgrace which all men recognize." (Thucydides 1969-77, 324-325.)

that it might be compared to other sovereign powers and in this way its position as almighty and omnipotent power would be questioned. (Hobbes L, XXIX, 13. p. 216.)

Thirdly, the aspect of mimesis in this context is the imitation of a sovereign and in fact the principle of sovereignty itself. Here again hierarchy is everything for Hobbes. The sovereign should stand in a very singular position at the top of the social and political hierarchy. The possibility that someone would imitate the sovereign itself can be treated with three cases.

In the first case the sovereignty is understood as etched to a natural person (as in the case of monarchy). In this case the imitation of the sovereign is simply mockery. There are examples of this in history, stories and myths.[191] In the second case someone could imitate the sovereign's capability to govern people, as when someone starts to act as if they could decide the politics of the commonwealth in the way the sovereign does. For example, if the closest counsellor of the sovereign started to make decisions for the sovereign or act in the name of the sovereign, a crisis would definitely emerge that would endanger the sovereignty. The third case pertains to a situation in which a rival of the sovereign simply denies the legitimacy and authority of the sovereign and demands the sovereignty for itself. Treason and rebellion are evidently a constant cause of fear for the sovereign power.

In all three cases the danger that imitation poses for the sovereignty is very clear. Imitation deteriorates the glory the sovereign enjoys since it shows that people do not honour the sovereign, as they should. In fact, imitation endangers the sovereign's naturalness and the conventional nature of the "second nature" is revealed. Hence it generates unnecessary fears inside the commonwealth. The sovereign cannot control these fears without creating more fear, i.e., showing extreme power to the citizens. This idea stands in the centre of the social contract, as Hobbes writes:

> This done, the multitude so united in one person, is called COMMONWEALTH, in Latin, CIVITAS. This is the generation of that great LEVIATHAN, or rather (to speak more reverently) of that Mortal God, to which we owe under the Immortal God, our peace and defence. For by this authority, given him by every particular man in the commonwealth, he hath the use of so much power and strength conferred on him, that by terror thereof, he is enabled to conform the wills of them all, to peace at home, and mutual aid against their enemies abroad. (Hobbes L, XVII, 13. p. 114).

Now, we must ask what are the means to create fear in the commonwealth? For Hobbes, personal beliefs and religion, or vows made in the name of God are not enough to establish a commonwealth by institution. Consequently, fear has to be real, instead of imaginary, when the state is erected. In the case of the commonwealth, the cause of fear is the whole system, governance and administration of the sovereign power through the army, and church, as well as

---

191 For example the Mesopotamian way of celebrating the day of the false king, which has different variations in many cultures of the Near-East. *The Emperor's New Clothes* is another popular example of mocking the sovereign. See also Girard 2004, who shows how these kinds of rites are a way to oust the violence of the community.

through the laws, religion[192] and the more informal manners of social behaviour. In a commonwealth, religion should be a tool of political power, and the State itself should be honoured in the same manner as gods are honoured. The state is the substitute for God and God speaks to the people through the state.[193] This explains the complex object the state really is and why it causes such fear in its subjects. It is simultaneously imaginary and real, but there is no gap between the real one and the imaginary one. This makes State the most powerful vehicle for instilling obedience – and fear.

This chapter examined Hobbes's use of the concept of fear in its various forms, and of the relationship between concepts of fear, motion and multitude in his political thought and in his theory of sovereignty. We saw why is it so important to create fear in citizens in order to rule the state efficiently. We also noted how fear as a political tool has a much more discreet meaning than just the pure and rude power (sword) of the sovereign. It is both rational and emotional in the state. The aim is to create practical manners that actually perform the social contract and make it happen in everyday life. The concept of motion explains how passions work for Hobbes. Concepts closely related to motion such as *mimesis* also provided the opportunity to study the social aspects of fear, which are important to analyse the reasons why the uncultivated natural passions of men are so problematic for the political order. The concept of multitude plays an equally important role in this analysis, since it is indeed the problem of fear in unorganized human masses that Hobbes wants to overcome. In the end, to control human masses means to control the motions of minds and bodies.

---

192 In Latin *Leviathan* Hobbes defines religion in a following way: "Metus potentiarum invisibilium, sive fictæ illæ sint, sive ab histories acceptæ sint publice, religio est; si publice acceptæ non sint, superstitio. Quondo autem potentiæ illærevera tales sunt quales accepimus, *vera religio.* (Hobbes LL, 45.) Translation of this chapter by Edwin Curley says: "Fear of invisible powers, whether those powers are feigned or publicly allowed from tales, is religion; if they are not publicly allowed, superstition. Moreover, when those powers are really such as we have allowed, true religion."(Hobbes LLE, 31.)

193 State as a substitute and interpreter of God, see for example Jendrysik 2002, 136-138.

4 MULTITUDE AND DEMOCRACY

When posing the question of Hobbes's relation to democracy and sovereign power it is obvious that we must deal with the concept of multitude as well. First of all, we must ask how he understood the concept of democracy while he constructed his idea of instituted commonwealth. Secondly, we must ask what kind of relation the concept of multitude has to the concept of democracy. Hence, our task in this chapter is to offer a re-reading of Hobbes's theory of sovereignty and democracy from the viewpoint of multitude. This can help us reveal some crucial elements of Hobbes's political thought and his theory of political constitution.

In this chapter we argue that, for Hobbes, democratic government is the kind of political risk concerning governance of the commonwealth that puts a threat on the everyday life of the citizens. Hence, he wants to make people aware of this risk and to avoid civil war, which is a common outcome of the democratic government according to Hobbes. In other words, for Hobbes democracy is such a complex and heterogeneous form of government or body politic that it is constantly at the brink of collapsing into a multitude. Democracy as a mode of governance cannot distance itself properly from chaos, anarchy and the logic of the multitude. For Hobbes the democratic body affects the citizen in a dubious way. This is a lesson that Hobbes learned from the classical authors, such as Aristotle, and especially, Thucydides.

However, although democracy is a risk regarding the government of the commonwealth, Hobbes needs the concept to construct his theory of political power and sovereignty at the very elementary level. The social contract cannot be understood without an idea of democracy and it is, in a way, a democratic act. What interests us in this chapter is the question of why Hobbes's theory needs such a paradoxical concept of democracy and people.

The preliminary answer is that Hobbes's positive theory of sovereignty cannot be based directly on the concept of multitude. What Hobbes needs is a mediation that leads from the multitude to the absolute sovereignty. This is, of course, a huge theoretical attempt. Hobbes tries to find a way out from the apolitical state of multitude to politics. If the political subject would somehow

pre-exist the sovereign power and the process of social contract, then this task would be rather simple. But this is not the case with Hobbes. For Hobbes there is no anterior political subject and hence, the political subject must be constructed in the social contract. All this is tightly connected to Hobbes's theory of political representation.

In this process the anarchical and powerless multitude is transformed to a people, a sovereign power and a political subject. What is interesting, however, is that multitude is retained in Hobbes's political vocabulary. In the social contract the multitude becomes an object of governance (population) and thus the concept of multitude is imported inside the political system. In other words, this makes it possible to tame the apolitical monster and turn it to an easily ordered, controlled and governed body of people. This would not be possible without a crucial distinction between sovereign power (sovereignty) and the sovereign, the representative of the sovereign power. The division between the artificial and natural person is of utmost importance, when we try to understand how a multitude is turned to a sovereign power.

4.1 Democracy in Hobbes Studies

Traditionally scholars have interpreted Hobbes as a strong defender of monarchy and royalism, or at least the opponent of democracy.[194] However, the most challenging new arguments, which in fact remind us of the early reception of Hobbes's political thought in the 17th and 18th centuries, emphasise Hobbes's positive attitude towards democracy. Some have even claimed that Hobbes should be seen as a democratic theorist, despite of his argument in *De Cive*: "… Monarchy has more advantages than other forms of commonwealth (the only thing in this book which I admit is not demonstrated but put with probability)." (Hobbes DCE, Preface to the readers, p. 14; p. lat. 152.)

---

194 See for example Martinich 2007, 158-159 and Matheron 1997. David Dyzenhaus states that "Hobbes always talks of the sovereign as one individual, as "he", perhaps because of his own prejudice for monarchy as the form of government best suited to maintain the commonwealth." (Dyzenhaus 2001, 428.) Hoekstra offers another kind of interpretation by saying that Hobbes was not necessary a royalist either (Hoekstra 2004). Curren instead sees that Hobbes was not conventional royalist: "Whatever else the theory is, it is not *conventionally* royalist even though it supports *some* radically royalist ideas. And what might be termed the anti-royalist principles of: (1) sovereignty originating in the people, (2) natural equality and (3) the inalienable rights of subjects to preserve and defend themselves are difficult if not impossible to reconcile with support for Charles I and his style of government." (Curren 2007, 60.) Mastnak (2009) sees that Hobbes opposed democracy because it meant "anti-governmentality": "When 'democratical gentlemen' advocated mixed monarchy, they promoted 'pure anarchy'. Hobbes's charge against the Presbyterians was the same: they 'reduced this government into anarchy'. When the Presbyterians pulled down the existing government, they faced a problem they were unable to solve. They were incapable of establishing government of *any* form. Democracy was a set of ideas that legitimized and directed undoing of the government and civil order. Democracy was a practice of anti-govermentality." (Mastnak 2009, 219-220.) See also Mathie 1976, 460.

Thus, while moderate and traditional interpretations suggest that there may be some democratic elements in Hobbes's theory, some recent studies have claimed instead that Hobbes can be understood as a radical democrat or even as a theorist of politics without sovereignty. The strongest arguments favoring this latter interpretation can be found in James R. Martel's book *Subverting the Leviathan: Reading Thomas Hobbes as a radical democrat* (Martel 2007). According to Martel:

> There are several radically democratic implications of Hobbes's method of interpretation. He promotes rather than resolves the struggle over interpretation. He exposes the rhetorical sources of authority without collapsing that authority in to meaninglessness. […] He demonstrates an ethos of resistance and struggle even in the guise of supporting sovereignty […]. Yet none of these contributions is as important in my opinion as his ability to offer us an insight into the possibility of politics (and interpretation) free from sovereignty. […] Hobbes thus affords us a precious glimpse into a nonsovereign politics, one that, even if it fails to overcome sovereignty once and for all, does suggest that sovereignty is neither inevitable nor necessarily the "best" of set of bad political choices. (Martel 2007, 246.)

What Martel is actually saying here is that Hobbes finely disguised his essentially democratic and anti-sovereign political aims and intentions in his political theory, and that they can be revealed by a careful rhetorical analysis. Martel is proposing a reading of Hobbes that is familiar from the re-readings of Machiavelli, which state that Machiavelli was not actually giving advice to the prince, but instead, warning the people of the absolute power of the prince. This reading of Hobbes is not, however, very convincing. We have no reason to believe that Hobbes disguised his political message this way, and in fact, some recently found texts by Hobbes's prove that Hobbes had "dirty hands" in favor of monarchy during the English Civil Wars[195], if previous proofs are not convincing enough.

There are also other aspects of democracy in Hobbes scholarship that emphasize the importance of Hobbes's possible democratic intentions. The following argument can be found from Philip Pettit:

> This argument for monarchy is decidedly subsidiary in Hobbes's work, however, and we need not give it much attention. He may have been happy for the claim to assume a subsidiary position, wanting to make room for the possibility of a legitimate democracy. Something approaching democracy must have seemed to be on the cards in England right through the 1640s, especially after the execution of Charles I in 1649. (Pettit 2009, 121-122.)

Pettit's idea is that Hobbes's theory of monarchy was not that important and actually Hobbes was writing his theory for the "coming" democracy. Again, the political context, political events and Hobbes's own political intentions disrupt the reading of Hobbes's political theory.

Democracy is, however, clearly a paradoxical concept for Hobbes. This paradox has been noted by Ramon Lemos who has suggested that Hobbes's theory of natural right and natural law are "essentially democratic", but he

---

195 See Malcolm 2012.

nevertheless constructed "the most profound argument for political absolutism in the entire history of political philosophy." (Lemos 1978, 69.)

This democratic paradox is opened up by Alexandre Matheron (1997) in his article *The Theoretical Function of Democracy in Spinoza and Hobbes*, where he shows how democracy was the basis of Hobbes's political system, at least in *De Cive*. Matheron is only interested in Hobbes's theoretical structure and hence, he does not allocate any democratic intentions to Hobbes.

In his article, Matheron deals also with the concept of multitude. According to him, the idea that multitude has to become a people before the sovereignty can be established can be traced back to Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), who was the first to formulate the idea of people as the first instance of sovereignty in *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* (1999, book II, chap. 5.) According to Grotius, a people is constituted by a contract of association.[196] The problem with the democratic sovereign following from this is that:

> Yet in the particular case of democracy it is *obvious* that the sovereign cannot be party to the social contract; for the sovereign is the assembly of the people insofar as it is a *collective person*, which did not exist in the state of nature, and with which, consequently, individuals have not been able to contract. Therefore, the democratic sovereign really *cannot agree to anything*. (Matheron 1997, 210.)

Matheron sees clearly that to solve this problem Hobbes thought that a people, as a sovereign power, must transfer its power again to some other party, to a king for example. However, in this process the collective person of the people is lost. The sovereignty of the people is thus transmitted to a king or an aristocratic council. As Matheron states, for Hobbes "it was paradoxical to derive the legitimacy of the best form of government from that of the worst form." (Matheron 1997, 211.)

According to Matheron it was the question of the relationship between the multitude and the king that shaped Hobbes's thought. The relationship between the multitude and the king called for a transmission of power, and the

---

196 This reminds, as Matheron points out, of an even older idea concerning the relation between multitude and prince in Aquinas *Summa Theologica*, where the authority of the prince derives in a legislative way from the multitude. (Aquinas 1981, Ia II ae, Q 97, a3; Matheron 1997.) The fundamental difference between Hobbes's and Aquinas's use of the multitude is that for Hobbes the multitude is abstract and conceptual whereas for Aquinas the multitude is a name of the common people. Gordon Hull (2009) rightly argues that the question of the difference between multitude and people can be properly understood in connection to his idea of social contract as a geometric theory: "Of greater interest in the present context is another Hobbesian move, one that, as I have argued, Hobbes himself indicates is of utmost importance: the distinction between the multitude and the people. The figure of the multitude stands for axiomatic disorder, for a collection of bodies that cannot be brought intothe *polis*. The constitutive social contract, then, constitutes the *polis* as such bytransforming the "multitude" into the "people." It seems clear that the theoretical justification for this move is not so much to be found in Hobbes's political philosophy as in his geometry. In particular, it lies in Hobbes's adoption of the law of homogeneity, the expression of the Greek reduction of mathematics to countability. As I have indicated, Hobbes invokes this law explicitly in his attacks on symbolic algebra, and here we can see its general application." (Hull 2009, 144.)

answer was found from a newly formulated idea of the people. For this reason Hobbes revised his theory of social contract, presented originally in *De Cive*, in *Leviathan*, Matheron states. Thus, in the end, all forms of government are equally absolute, since "they are all instituted by the same act of unlimited authorization, which this time is juridically impeccable and thus no longer needs a complement." (Matheron 1997, 212).

The analysis offered by Matheron is profound and theoretically important. It does not, however, concentrate on the *political problem* of the multitude, although it explains the relationship between multitude and sovereign power. Most importantly, it does not show how multitude is captured as an internal power of the sovereign, and transformed as an object of governance.

The idea of multitude as some sort of origin and basis of sovereign power is also presented, although only implicitly, by Richard Tuck in his article *Hobbes and democracy* (Tuck 2007). Tuck claims that Hobbes can be seen as one of the most important theorists of democracy in the early modern period. Tuck argues that Hobbes's idea of political order was not in fact an anti-democratic one, but quite the contrary; his ideas were based on a totally new kind of formulation of democracy. Tuck argues that the views of Skinner and others who claim that Hobbes was a theorist of "counter-revolution" or even of "despotism" is not correct, since this claim is based on a wrong interpretation concerning the history of the concept of democracy. However, he admits that Hobbes was a theorist of despotism, but he claims that it was the democratic despotism that he had in mind. (Tuck 2007, 171-172.)

Tuck states that Hobbes wanted to challenge the political reality of his age that believed in different sorts of mixed governments.[197] Instead of mixed governments Hobbes wanted to re-introduce the Aristotelian idea of "extreme democracy" to his contemporaries, Tuck claims. Yet Tuck adds that this does not implicate that Hobbes spoke for a democratic government. Democracy was a central part of his political theory just because the idea of Hobbesian absolute monarchy can be deduced only from the idea of "extreme democracy" (Tuck 2007, 171-190). The idea of "extreme democracy" was in fact an idea concerning the reign of the multitude in the case of Aristotle, as we will see. Tuck's interpretation is highly interesting and it offers a good starting point for our analysis, but his interpretation falls short precisely because he does not recognize or analyse the concept of multitude at all in his article.

There are also other historical and political interpretations that suggest a very different understanding concerning Hobbes's relation to democracy than Matheron or Tuck. For example Kinch Hoekstra (2007) has claimed that Hobbes was not a democrat of any kind, and what is most important, his theory of sovereignty, was not based on a theory of democracy. The same aspect is given by Alan Apperley in his article "Hobbes on Democracy" where he states that

---

197 Hobbes opposed strongly all kinds of mixed governments. According to him, government of the state should be "simple and absolute". (Hobbes L, XLII, 82. p. 367; Hobbes EL, I, 15-17. pp. 134-136.)

Hobbes rejected the democratic form of government as an unstable and unreliable political form. (Apperley 1997.)

We see that while these new interpretations favouring the democratic interpretation of Hobbes's political thought are interesting, they are problematic at the same time. In general, the debate over Hobbes's alleged democratic ideas seems to concentrate too much on Hobbes's alleged intentions and on his political aims. Following from this, many writers comprehend Hobbes as an active political player, who tried to give answers to the crucial questions of his own time, changing his views as the political situation changed. Hence, some writers suggest that Hobbes's relation to democracy changed during the English Civil War and that he even turned his views from royalism towards democracy[198] and republicanism.[199] These interpretations are not new, since Hobbes's contemporaries made the same accusations claiming that he wrote *Leviathan* to support the Cromwellian regime.

In this chapter we are not interested in Hobbes's political intentions and aims, or in the hidden messages of his texts. Instead, we concentrate on understanding Hobbes's theory of democracy[200] from the basis of the two aspects offered by Matheron and Tuck.[201] First, we explain how the idea of "extreme democracy" is in fact an idea of the reign of multitude in Aristotle's texts. We argue that Hobbes did not turn around Aristotle's idea of extreme democracy and he did not make it the basis of his own theory as Tuck claims, but instead, we see that Hobbes's opinion on the rule of the multitude was similar to Aristotle, although their conception of the multitude was rather

198 Matheron (1997) shows that Hobbes's conception changed between *De Cive* and *Leviathan*. Also Tuck (2007) mentions that Hobbes's idea of democracy is different in *Elements of Law* and *De Cive* compared to *Leviathan*. See also Jaumé (1984, 117-124) who shows how Hobbes's conception of representation and democracy changed.

199 Rahe (2008) suggests that Hobbes should be seen as a republican writer. In Rahe's opinion, Hobbes was heavily influenced by Francis Bacon's thought, which Rahe takes to be essentially republican and to follow Machiavelli's thought (Rahe 2008, 249-261). He even states that Bacon was a "genuine revolutionary" (Rahe 2008, 252). Thus according to Rahe, Hobbes was led to the republican thought by Machiavellian Bacon and also from other influences he gathered in his "republican youth". Rahe explains that Hobbes used Machiavelli in the teaching of young William, for example. He also thinks that two of the early discourses on Rome in *Horae Subsecivae* are influenced by Machiavelli.

200 We see, like Creppell, that in a theoretical sense "his writings are a response to a new social condition – a democratizing world and the demands from mobilized populations. *Behemoth* is an extended description of and reaction to that dynamism, both positive and negative, of new conditions (circumstances) of democracy." (Creppell 2009, 241.)

201 Thus, we do not approach our question of the relationship between multitude, democracy and sovereignty primarily from the viewpoint of artificial person and the question of representation closely related to it, which have provided several profound books and articles in Hobbes studies, since we feel that the questions pertaining to artificial person have been scrutinized rather exhaustively. Most important of these are Lucien Jaume's (1986) book *Hobbes et l'État representative moderne*, David Copp's (1980) article "Hobbes on Artificial Persons and Collective Actions" and Quentin Skinner's (1999) article "Hobbes and the Purely Artificial Person of the State". David Runciman (1997) also deals with this question in his Book *Pluralism and The Personality of The State*, chapter I.2 "Hobbes and the Person of the Commonwealth."

different. Secondly, we follow the tracks of Matheron and clarify the distinction between the concepts of sovereign power (sovereignty) and the sovereign. By taking up the issue of multitude in this context, we are able to understand the structure that made it possible for Hobbes to incorporate the multitude into the body politic and to properly introduce the newly found concept of motion to modern political theory.

4.2 Hobbes and the Classical Conceptions of Multitude: The Extreme Form of People

Hobbes was familiar with the ancient texts concerning the modes of democracy and demagogy. He translated Thucydides' *Peloponnesian Wars*, which broadly treats the democratic system of Athens and its collapse during the Peloponnesian wars. He was also acquainted with the texts of Aristotle and his theory of democracy. Along with this he also had an understanding of the Roman political system: he writes about it in his first texts, *Horae Subsecivae*, and returns to the problems of democracy and demagogy several times throughout his career. He also refers to Cicero in many places.

His classical knowledge and understanding of the classical political theory must have influenced his understanding of and attitude towards trends that were contemporary during his life, trends that emphasized the supremacy of republicanism, mixed governments and even democracy over the monarchy. Perhaps Hobbes saw that there was definitely something to be learned from the classical examples, but not in the sense that his contemporaries, "the democratic gentlemen" thought, when they "design of changing the government from monarchical to popular, which they called liberty." (Hobbes B, 26.) Hobbes knew what problems were connected to democracy in the classical texts and he saw that the "democratic gentlemen" were not taking the dangers of democracy seriously.

In *Behemoth* Hobbes describes the position of the "democratic gentlemen" in the following way:

> There were an exceeding great number of men of the better sort, that had been so educated, as that in their youth having read the books written by famous men of the ancient Grecian and Roman commonwealths concerning their polity and great actions; in which books the popular government was extolled by the glorious name of liberty, and monarchy disgraced by the name of tyranny; they became thereby in love with their forms of government. (Hobbes B, 3.)

For Hobbes the problem was that in the minds of agitators and common people, democracy was connected to liberty, especially to individual liberty. People thought that by supporting democracy their own freedom would increase. This is, according to Hobbes, a false conclusion. As we have already seen, according to Hobbes the absolute liberty of the individuals does not lead to the liberty of the state, but instead, it leads to a chaos and anarchy. Thus, this is something

that makes Hobbes warn people and politicians of imitating the ancient political doctrines of Greeks and Romans.[202] Democracy will easily, too easily in Hobbes's sense, slip to the reign of multitude, which is not absolute liberty, but instead, absolute stagnation. (Hobbes L, XXIX, 14. pp. 216-217.)

The wrong interpretations concerning the ancient writings were not just something that annoyed Hobbes, but it seems that he really blamed the "democratic gentlemen" for causing the civil war:

> (studying Greek and Latin) [they] became acquainted with the democratical principles of Aristotle and Cicero, and from the love of them eloquence fell in love with their politics, and that more and more, till it grew into the rebellion we now talk of [i.e. English Civil War], without any other advantage to the Roman Church that it was a weakening to us, whom, since we broke out of their net in the time of Henry VIII, they have continually endeavoured to recover. (Hobbes B, 43-44.)

The democratic interpretations of the ancient texts caused a rebellion and weakened the English crown, which made it vulnerable in the face of foreign powers, such as the Catholic Church for example. Interest concerning democracy puts the whole commonwealth in danger and creates confusion inside the state, claims Hobbes.

Next we move to one of the clearest examples of the dangerous and oscillating border between democracy and multitude through an analysis of Aristotle's *Politics*, where Aristotle introduces us an idea of the "extreme form of the democracy". This discourse was important for Hobbes, and it is very important for the contemporary Hobbes research, since in his aforementioned article *Hobbes and democracy* (2007) Richard Tuck argues that Hobbes's theoretical position concerning democracy stands at the end of a long line of political thought starting from Aristotle's formulation of "extreme democracy", as Tuck translates δημος εσχατος (*demos eschatos*), in IV book of *Politics* and in some parts of the *Constitution of Athens.* Tuck's idea is that Hobbes adapted this idea of "extreme democracy" as the basis of his own theory of the body politic. He claims that Hobbes turned over an old and negative idea of "extreme democracy" and made of it the positive basis of the modern state, as he writes:

> Particularly in *De Cive*, Hobbes granted democracy a very special status, in a way which was quite unprecedented. It is true that he was (from the point of view of his liberal readers) an advocate of despotism or tyranny, but the clearest example of tyranny, as far as he was concerned, was the tyrannical democracy, which Aristotle had attacked in book IV, and his whole theory of the body politic was designed to show how the union which Aristotle had criticised in that passage was in fact the only legitimate form of political association. (Tuck 2007, 183.)

In this chapter this approach is contested. To do this, let us first see what Aristotle said about the democracy and especially about the possibility of

---

202 Hobbes seems to think that his contemporaries who favoured the democratic parliament took a wrong teaching from the ancient writers. They were also wrong in claiming that *Magna Charta* gave them liberties to resist King's sovereignty and his demands. Hence *Magna Charta* was wrongly equated to the liberties of ancient democracies, thinks Hobbes. (Hobbes B, 37-38; see also Skinner 2008, 142.)

"extreme democracy". After this we can shortly analyse how well Tuck's interpretation of "extreme democracy" fits on this frame.

In *Politics* Aristotle distinguishes between five different types of democracy. The first one is based on equality, where the rule is equally in the hands of poor and rich.[203] The second one is a democracy where the criterion of participating in politics is property. The third type of democracy allows the people with unquestionable descent to take part in the governance and the rule of law reign above all the others. The fourth type of democracy is where all can take part in the governance but the law rules. The fifth type is the same as the fourth but here the reign of the law ceases and the *multitude*[204] (*plethos*) has the authority (*kurios*[205]). This fifth type of democracy erects when the decrees rule over the propositions of the law and demagogues take the power. What is important in this fifth type is that the rule of law is suspended i.e. it does not have any authority. (Aristotle 1959/1995e, 1291b30-1291b39; see also Lintott 1992, 118-121.)[206]

This typology of democracy points out how the rule of the poor without law actually means the rule of the *plethos*, the rule of the multitude. In other words, when democracy goes too far, the multitude rises above the law. The Aristotelian view sees this as dangerous since the rule of the multitude is in a constant danger of falling into a state that is analogous to despotism and tyranny. The threat of tyranny derives from the fact that in a multitude demagogues take the lead of politics instead of officers. The demagogues arrive instantly when the rule of law breaks. (Aristotle 1959/1995e, 1292a7-1292a31; Lintott 1992; see also Tuck 2007, 176-177.)

---

203 William Mathie argues that the lack of equality, or the alleged experience of the lack of equality, is the reason for people becoming fractious in Aristotle's political thought. Once fragmented, they start to seek a political change, that is, they become revolutionary. (Mathie 1976, 453-454.)

204 The word multitude is used in this context as a valid translation of the Greek terms *oi polloi* and *plethos*. This is justified with Hobbes's own translation of these words by multitude in Thucydides *Peloponnesian Warre*, as well as in his translation of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. We can also refer to the modern translations, which use the word multitude widely as a translation for *oi polloi* and *plethos*, as we have already seen in chapter 2.3. What we must remember, however, is that Hobbes did not use the concept of multitude in exactly the same way as Aristotle and Thucydides used *oi polloi* and *plethos*. Still, it is obvious that the problem of democracy in the classical authors is connected to the collapse of the political order and rule of law, which seems to be the same aspect that Hobbes considers to be to the problematic border between democracy and multitude.

205 Sometimes *kurios* is translated as "sovereignty", but the better translation is authority.

206 Aristotle also gives another typology concerning the different forms of democracy. Here the three first forms are more or less the same as the first one. The fourth and last mode of democracy in this typology is born out of a situation where the states have grown very large (imperialism) and following from this the revenues of the state are equally large. Now also the poor have free time and hence they are able to take part in the governance and gain some salary from it. Here in the fourth type where most of the oligarchies have withdrawn from governance and courts of justice, the rule of law ceases. The supreme power is now in the hands of the free and the poor (*plethos*) and hence, the rule of law is gone. (Aristotle 1959/1995e, 1292b20-1293a10.)

Looking at Aristotle's definition of the rule of the multitude we also find that he does not conceive it as a proper mode of democracy, and especially not as a mode of constitution. The problem here is fundamental for Aristotle. If there is no rule of law, there cannot be any political constitution either. In a multitude all decisions are made on a case by case basis. The reign of *plethos* is problematic just because of this: every single case has to be decided according to the opinion of the multitude. When the multitude reigns, *polis* does not need officers anymore, because it is the mob that decides everything. This means a total corruption of the *polis* since "…a constitution (*politeia*) is the arrangement of the offices…", as Aristotle clearly states. (Aristotle 1959/1995e, 1292a7-1292a31.)

We have seen how Aristotle uses the term *plethos* to describe a situation where the democracy loses its grip and goes too far in the sense that it loses its constitution and falls into the rule of multitude where decisions are made case by case. As Aristotle states, the rule of *plethos* resembles the rule of monarch, that is, the rule of the one. This does not mean that *plethos* acts as one person, but only the fact that in a multitude there are no differences or hierarchies, since the whole system of differences collapses. People become too homogenous and lose the system of differences, which is the all in all for Aristotle. For Aristotle the system of differences is based on natural, essential differences between men and thus homogeneity is unnatural.

What we have not yet scrutinized is the concept of "extreme democracy" as Tuck translates Aristotle's expression δημος εσχατος. Actually *demos eschatos* is mentioned only once in *Politics*. In chapter 11 of the fourth book Aristotle states that in cities where there is no "middling element" (middle class) between poor and rich, i.e. there are no proper differences, there is a danger of falling into a rule of people in its *extreme form* (δημος εσχατος) or into an unmixed oligarchy. According to Aristotle the tyranny arises either from this "most headstrong sort of democracy" or from oligarchy. (Aristotle 1959/1995e, 1295b, 35-1296a10.)

What Aristotle addresses here with the concept of *demos eschatos* is in fact the people in its extreme form, the multitude (*plethos*), not extreme *democracy* as Tuck translates the concept. It is true that Aristotle states that *demos eschatos* is the "most headstrong sort of democracy", but the concept itself does not refer to democracy as a legitimate form of government. Tuck connects the logic of *demos eschatos* to the earlier examples of different types of democracy given in another part of the book, as was showed above (Tuck 2007, 176). What he fails to show, however, is that neither the rule of *plethos* nor the *demos eschatos* are forms of democracy, but examples of cases where the rule of law collapses and *polis* enters to a chaotic state where multitude rules without any political structure, norm or tradition, that is, without authority. *Demos eschatos* means that the rule of the people (*demos*) has gone too far: *Demos eschatos* is the rule of the multitude beyond the law and constitution.

Reading Aristotle it comes obvious that he eluded the idea of *demos eschatos* and the rule of the *plethos* in favor of legitimate forms of democracy,

although he did not generally support democracy as a good or stable form of government.[207] It is known that he supported the idea of *politeia* where the mass rules but looks for the interest of the whole *polis* at the same time. In *politeia* the aim is the wellbeing of the whole *polis*, not only the class interest of the poor as it is with democracy (Lintott 1992, 117-118).[208]

In his article Tuck provides an interpretation of the history of the concept of "extreme democracy". This history concerns changes in political thought that originally denied the possibility of extreme democracy as a basis of political order (like Aristotle etc.), but later came to the conclusion that the model of extreme democracy could in fact be the basis of the whole political system (Hobbes, as Tuck argues). (Tuck 2007.)

Considering that Tuck makes such a strong claim about the rule of extreme democracy (*plethos*), it is interesting that he does not put any interest on the problem or concept of multitude. And since he neglects the concept of multitude in his analysis, he also misinterprets Hobbes's relation to Aristotle's idea of *demos eschatos*.[209] In short, Hobbes did not take the Aristotelian idea of *demos eschatos*, or *plethos*, as the basis of his own theory of sovereignty since he totally rejected the idea of the reign of multitude as we will see in more detail in this chapter. For Hobbes, Aristotle's idea of the rule of the *plethos* or *demos eschatos* was only a negative example of democracy. The construction of the people was the basis of Hobbes's theory of sovereignty and for this, multitude had to be transformed into a people.

---

207 Some scholars note especially that Aristotle did not support democracy at all. (See Yack 2006, 418; Nieuwenburg 2004, 449.)

208 Most of the scholars agree with a view that Aristotle truly supported *politeia* as the best form of government as he states in VII and VIII books of the *Politics*. However, there has also been speculation about Aristotle's sympathy to monarchy. See Miller (1998) for his arguments on this matter. Miller says that Aristotle worked as an agent for Macedon in Athens, which explains his paradoxical relationship to monarchy. Alexander (2000) has argued that Aristotle did not see *politeia* as the best possible regime, but instead he considered the kingship or even monarchy to be the best one. Alexander claims that Aristotle had not one, but two approaches to the best government, and the one that he "quietly" expresses in the III book of politics is the kingship (or monarchy) that is very close to the model that Plato gives in his *Republic*. Both Miller and Alexander argue that Aristotle had an idea of a superior person, who would rule just because he has more virtue than any other. This kind of "superhuman" would rule the *polis* as he rules a household, which is strange since Aristotle usually separates politics from *oikos* and *oikonomia*. However, Aristotle's idea of an absolute ruler in *polis* differs considerably from Hobbes's idea of an absolute sovereign.

209 There are also other reasons to criticize Tuck's interpretation. As Kinch Hoekstra has shown in his article *A Lion in The House,* there is no proper reason why Hobbes might have adopted particularly Aristotle's idea of "extreme democracy" as the basis of his theory. Tuck's interpretation is not convincing, since there might be several other sources to invent the idea of extreme democracy, as Hoekstra shows in his article (see Hoekstra 2007). Hoekstra also shows that Tuck's solution, which claims that the separation between sovereignty and its administration was a crucial new element in Hobbes's idea of democracy, was not in fact new since it can be found already in Bodin's *Six livres de la republique* (Hoekstra 2007, 197-198). From our point of view the problem with Hoekstra's critique is, however, that he does not emphasise the role of the concept of multitude at all in his critique of Tuck.

Thus, the case of "extreme democracy" seems to be quite opposite to what Tuck claims it to be.[210] In my view, what Hobbes understood from Aristotle's examples of democracy was that democracy has *a tendency* to collapse into the rule of multitude when the *rule of law* collapses. Demagogues, who are ultimately unwanted in the political sphere, lead the multitude which makes the rule of the multitude similar to tyranny. Hobbes might have grasped the same kind of interpretation between democracy and multitude also from other classical sources, which he knew very well.[211]

Thus we might state that Hobbes's theory is compatible with Aristotle's, not contrary to it. The fundamental differences between Hobbes's and Aristotle's political doctrines can be found elsewhere, for example from the different arguments concerning the benefits of mixed government. Their views on democracy are different, but not different enough to claim that Hobbes turned around Aristotle's distaste towards *demos eschatos* and made it the basis of his theory of sovereignty, as Tuck claims. Vice versa, what Hobbes learned from Aristotle was that democracy as a mode of government easily goes too far and collapses into the reign of multitude, which means the destruction of the political constitution.

4.3 Hobbes's Conception of Democracy and Multitude

To understand Hobbes's paradoxical relationship to democracy, we have to take a closer look to his twofold conception of democracy and its relation to the concept of multitude. First, we must understand how his theory of sovereignty is based on a sort of democratic voting. We see that Hobbes needs, first of all, the clear distinction between the concepts of multitude and *demos* (people) to build up his theory of social contract and sovereign power.

---

210 Even though Tuck's examples concerning the metamorphoses of the translations of Aristotle's texts, especially concerning the changes of *demos eschatos* in the medieval interpretation of the Roman democracy that followed from this reinterpretation as a sort of extreme democracy are very interesting and informative, this history is not necessary if we want to understand Hobbes's view of democracy. In short, it is highly unlikely that Hobbes had in his mind exactly the history that Tuck is offering while formulating his view on democracy. Tuck says that the translation of Aristotle's *Politics* made by Pietro Vittori includes a sentence, which says "the people becomes a monarch". He claims that this "must have been a source of Hobbes's thinking on the subject" (Tuck 2007, 181). It is also problematic to interpret Hobbes's theory of democracy without an analysis of *Leviathan* as Tuck does in his article. The short fragment of *De Cive* that Tuck uses as his primary source for his general argument is not enough when we have Hobbes's later work available, as we can note while reading earlier article by Matheron (1997).

211 As Mara (2001, 824-825) explains, Thucydides, as well as Plato, can be seen as critical towards democracy, but they do not support oligarchy either. Thucydides did see the *politeia* of the 5000 as the best regime, which is not in fact that far from democracy. Others, such as Mortimer Chambers have claimed too that Thucydides cannot be seen as a democrat. He admired Pericles most of all "but he was suspicious of sovereign action by a popular free assembly." (Chambers 1957, 82, 88.)

Second, we come to understand that even though Hobbes's idea of legitimacy and authorization of the sovereign power derives from a sort of democratic decision, he actively avoids democracy as a mode of governance. Thus, what he opposes in the practical imitation and implementation of the ancient texts to English politics is the idea that the commonwealth could be governed democratically. However, what is completely new in his theory is the idea of a social contract that transforms the multitude into a people at a very abstract and conceptual level. This is something that opposes the traditional, essentialist theory of different political regimes, which was based, more or less, on the idea that a certain political regime is an outcome of certain kinds of people ruling. Democracy, for example, was connected to the idea of the poor and the many, whereas aristocracy was the rule of the "good" (*aristoi*). Hobbes tries to avoid these sorts of essentialist groundings and argues that the constitution of the body politic must be totally based on the contract. Thus, in Hobbes's system there is no pre-political subject, but the political subject is instead created and upheld in the process of the social contract.

4.3.1 Democracy and Social Contract

As we remember from chapter 2.3.2., Hobbes's theory of multitude is, at one level, a theory of individuation. Facing the chaotic and violent body of the multitude in the state of nature people come to understand that they are first of all an individuals. Participating in religious sections, political parties or rebellious groups means that the individual puts their own life in danger. Even the loyalty to a family might be dangerous. The most important thing for a human being is to safeguard their own life: self-preservation is the highest moral law.

With his theory of multitude Hobbes calls for people to understand that the biggest threat to their safety and well-being is the unlimited action and motion of themselves and also of other people. Yet, disengaging from this threat is not possible by attacking others, since in the multitude people are equal. Instead, the answer is to lay down arms and subject oneself to the arbitrary power of the others. Hobbes believes that everybody finds the same fear of violent death inside themselves. By self-examination, recognizing the fundamentality of the fear of violent death, people prepare themselves to make an individual decision about forming a sovereign power that transcends all the possible political, religious or militant groups: in other words, the logic of the multitude.

It seems that the distance of the multitude, be it an ensemble of different, heterogeneous groups or lonely individuals, from the sovereign power is vast. How is it possible to create a sovereign power out of the multitude and fill this deep gap? And why cannot a multitude be a political subject?

For Hobbes, a multitude cannot ever be a political subject, a political entity or a commonwealth. The main reason for this is that the multitude does not have one will but instead a plurality of wills. Every individual has her own mind, her own will and own endeavour. There is no common understanding

about anything. The multitude cannot act as one person and it cannot make collective decisions. The multitude is a direct expression of the actions of the individuals: "…whatever is done by multitude must be understood as being done by each of those who make up that multitude." (Hobbes DCE, VI, 1. p. 76; p. lat. 218. Translation modified[212].)

In a multitude there is no representation of men, no mediation between the actions of men and the authorization of those actions. Multitude is a direct expression of individual desires and actions. The multitude cannot act in the name of commonwealth and for this reason it is impossible to attach any legal action to multitude: civil law does not concern the multitude. This is because the multitude is not a natural or an artificial person, but a plurality of natural persons and it has not yet become an artificial person by institution.

The meaning and the problem of multitude in the social contract becomes clearer if we analyze it with the concept of power. Let us look at the formulation of the social contract in *Leviathan*:

> This done, the multitude so united in one person is called a COMMONWEALTH; in Latin, CIVITAS. This is the generation of that great LEVIATHAN, or rather, to speak more reverently, of that mortal god to which we owe, under the immortal God, our peace and defence. For by this authority, given him by every particular man in the Commonwealth, he hath the use of so much power and strength conferred on him that, by terror thereof, he is enabled to form the wills of them all, to peace at home, and mutual aid against their enemies abroad. (Hobbes L, XVII, 13. p. 114.)

This unanimity, the artificial construction of one "mind" and one will is necessary since otherwise:

> For being distracted in opinions concerning the best use and application of their strength, they do not help, but hinder one another; and reduce their strength by mutual opposition to nothing. (Hobbes L, XVII, 4. p. 112.)

What we see here is the case between absolute power (sovereignty) and total absence of all power (multitude). The "danger" is that without a contract where people join together and form a sovereign power, there is no possibility to live politically and in an industrious way. Without a contract that ties human beings together there is no common power and there is no state. Without common power there is no possibility to do things that are beyond the strength of one single individual or multitude, such as lift heavy stones or build large buildings (see Hobbes L, XIII, 9. p. 84).

Multitude is absolutely incapable of bringing peace and security to the state of nature. It does not have the power to calm down the violence between individual men or groups of men (sects, parties etc.) since in multitude there is no (qualitative) majority, only an ensemble of minorities:

> Nor is it the joining together of a small number of men, that gives them this security; because in small numbers, small additions on the one side or the other, make the

---

212 Silverthorne and Tuck translate the word *multitudo* systematically as "crowd", as I mentioned above. I have modified their translation by using "multitude" instead.

> advantage of strength so great, as is sufficient to carry the victory; and therefore gives encouragement to an invasion. The multitude sufficient to confide in for our security, is not determined by any certain number, but by comparison with the enemy we fear (Hobbes L, XVII, 3. p. 112.)

It is for this reason that the *bellum omnium contra omnes* is such a crucial formulation in Hobbes' theory. It is not that in the state of nature there could not be different kinds of groups where individuals can act together. Hobbes names few examples of these such as small families and "cities and kingdoms which are but greater families" (Hobbes L, XVII, 2. p. 111). We must also note that Hobbes is not interested in legitimating the dominion of some patriarchal person, be it the head of the family or the ruler of the kingdom. Instead, he tries to form a theory of power that can secure peace in a large area and population, by explaining how the principal enemy of all political order, the logic of multitude can be won.

Thus, a multitude is incapable to act together as "one man" or one person. The next thing we must ask is how the social contract is actually made in the multitude. The "weird production" (Jaume 1986, 23) of the sovereign power happens in the act of an (imaginary) social contract where every individual, living in a multitude gives away their right to resist the action of other human beings and the right to govern one self, as it is expressed in *Leviathan*:

> I authorize and give up my right to governing myself, to this man, or to this assembly of men, on this condition, that thou give up thy right to him, and authorize all his actions in like manner. (Hobbes L, XVII, 13. p. 114.)

This authorization means the denial of the use of the individual's own powers by their own will and the transfer of these powers to a third person. In this case the word *person* means the one who acts with the authorization of others, or in other words, who represents the others.[213] In *Leviathan* Hobbes sees the person as a kind of a theatrical actor.[214] Hence, the public or artificial person[215] created in the social contract is simultaneously an actor and a representative of the multitude that has now united to this one person. Here the logic of multitude

---

213 "A PERSON, is he, whose words or actions are considered, either as his own, or as representing the words or actions of another man, or of any other thing to whom they are attributed, whether truly or by fiction." (Hobbes L, XVI, 1. p. 106.)

214 "So that a person, is the same that an actor is, both on the stage and in common conversation; and to personate, is to act, or represent himself, or another; and he that acteth another is said to bear his person, or act in his name […], and is called in diverse occasions, diversely; as a representer, or representative, a lieutenant, a vicar, an attorney, a deputy, a procurator, an actor, and the like." (Hobbes L, XVI, 3. p. 107.)

215 "Art goes yet further, imitating that rational and most excellent work of nature, man. For by art is created that great LEVIATHAN called COMMONWEALTH, or STATE, (in Latin CIVITAS) which is but an artificial man;" (Hobbes L, Introduction, 7.) Besides the artificial and natural person, there is also a fictitious person. As Runciman summarizes, acts of a natural person are owned by himself, acts of an artificial person by another and acts of a fictitious person by the one to whom the ability to own actions is granted by pretence (Runciman 1997, 7). Fictitious and artificial persons are rather different and only an artificial person is necessary for the escape of men from the state of nature to the state (Runciman 1997, 10-11).

transforms to the logic of sovereignty, since people give up their private interests and their right of nature.

Thus, the theory of social contract takes away the individual powers and rights and combines these powers to one superpower by transferring the individual rights to the abstract, artificial sovereignty. In commonwealth everyone is equally powerless in the face of the omnipotent sovereign power. This means that in the social contract human beings lose their independence and become dependent on the sovereign power. The individual, who is subjected under the sovereign power, is called a citizen. Hence, Hobbes' theory of social contract is at one level a theory of a contract between individuals and this contract forms the sovereign power. At the second level it is a theory of subjection to this sovereign power:

> It is required that there be a single will [*una voluntas*] among all of them in matters essential to peace and defence. This can only happen if each man subjects his will to the will of a single other [*alterius unius*], to the will, that is, one Man [*Hominis*] or of one Assembly [*Concilium*], in such a way that whatever one wills on matters essential to the common peace may be taken as a will of all and each [*omnes et singuli*]. By ASSEMBLY I mean a group [*coetus*] of several men deliberating about what is to be done or not to be done for the common good of all. (Hobbes DCE, V, 6. p. 72; p. lat. 213.)

And Hobbes continues:

> In every commonwealth, the Man or Assembly to whose will individuals have subjected their will (in the manner explained) is said to hold SOVEREIGN AUTHORITY (SUMMAM POTESTEM) or SOVEREIGN POWER (SUMMUM IMPERIUM) or DOMINION (DOMINIUM). This Authority (*Potestas*), this Right to give Commands (*Jus imperandi*), consists in the fact that each of the citizens has transferred all his own force and power [*potentia*] to that man or Assembly. To have done this simply means (since no one can literally transfer his force to another) that he has given up his right to resist. Each of the citizens, and every subordinate civil person, is called SUBJECT of him who holds the sovereign power. (Hobbes DCE, V, 11. pp. 73-74; p. lat. 215.)

Still, even though a citizen must subject to a sovereign power, we have to remember that at the same time the sovereign power is something that cannot exist without the citizens. And it is exactly from this mutual dependence where the highest moral law, *salus populi suprema lex*, for the sovereign power derives. To safeguard its own existence, the sovereign power must take care of the security and wellbeing of the citizens in every way.

We begin to see why the question of democracy in Hobbes's political thought is primarily a question of the social contract, a constitution of the state. The movement from the reign of multitude to the commonwealth is a question of the right kind of contract between every man with every man (Hobbes L, XVII, 13. p. 114). The sovereign power is an outcome of a metamorphose[216]

---

216 It is noteworthy that in Hobbes's early writings he did not had an idea of social contract. Instead, the beginning of the commonwealth is seen as "accidental" and the term 'multitude' is used equivalent to what is later called as democracy: "The first form of government in any State is accidental: that is, according to the condition the Founder happens to be of. If one man of absolute power above rest, be the Founder

where the plurality of wills have been condensed to one will and this body has the authorization of every man that belonged to a multitude and who participated to the constitution of the sovereign power, that is, everyone who participated in the act of voting:

> A *commonwealth* is said to be *instituted*, when a *multitude* of men do agree, and *covenant*, *every one*, with *every one*, that to whatsoever *man*, or *assembly of men*, shall be given the major part, the *right* to *present* the person of them all (that is to say, to be their *representative*;) every one, as well he that *voted for it*, as he that *voted against it*, shall *authorize* all the actions and judgements, of that man, or assembly of men, in the same manner, as if they were his own, to the end, to live peaceably amongst themselves, and be protected against other men. (Hobbes L, XVIII, 1. p. 115.)

The basic idea of democracy as a rule of voted majority is in fact at the heart of the Hobbesian idea of social contract and sovereignty. For Hobbes the sovereign power is originally a democratic majority. This becomes clearer if we take a look at what Hobbes says about democracy in his earliest political work, *The Elements of Law*:

> The first in order of time of these three sorts is democracy, and it must be so of necessity, because an aristocracy and a monarchy, require nomination of persons agreed upon; which agreement in a great multitude of men must consist in the consent of the major part; and where the votes of the major part involve the votes of the rest, there is actually a democracy. (Hobbes EL, II, 1. pp. 138-139.)

In *The Elements of Law*, democracy, as a rule of the majority of the votes, is chronologically the first instance of sovereign power. Yet, the crucial problem of democracy seems to be that in democracy there is actually no contract between the sovereign power and its subjects. This is because when "democracy is a making, there is no sovereign with whom to contract." (Hobbes EL, II, 2. p. 139). In *De Cive* Hobbes states that "Democracy is not constituted by agreements which individuals make with the People, but by mutual agreements of individuals with other individuals." (Hobbes DCE, VII, 7. p. 95; p. lat. 240). This is in a way the purest form of social contract and it means that the birth of the sovereign is at the same time the birth of the *demos*, that is the *people* and vice versa. "[P]rior to the formation of a commonwealth a People [*populus*] does not exist, since it was not then a person but a multitude of individual persons." (Hobbes DCE, VII, 7. p. 95; p. lat. 240).

The birth of the people, the first instance of the sovereign power and a political subject, takes place when the majority of multitude decides to contract every one with every one in a way that ends the powerless state of the multitude and forms a power of the majority that can subject all the others under its power. In democracy everyone who has voted is subjected under the

---

> of a City, he will likewise be the Ruler of the same; if a few, then a few will have the government; and if the multitude, then commonly will do the like." (Hobbes HST, 31-32.) This piece of text shows how Hobbes had rather traditional conception of political regimes still in 1620s.

will of the majority of the people. This means that the existence of the multitude as a chaotic and anarchical force ends, since there now exists a sovereign power.

To conclude, we can state that the sovereignty, the sovereign power that is the "soul" and thus the mover of the commonwealth as Hobbes states in the beginning of the *Leviathan* (Hobbes L, Introduction, p. 7.), is formed at the social contract, which is essentially democratic. The social contract in its purest form is an act of voting where the majority of individuals in a multitude decide to take power over the plurality of individuals and minorities that the multitude is composed of. This simply means that the source of the sovereign power is the people, which is formed out of multitude in a social contract. For Hobbes the idea that there would be a political subject that is anterior to state and sovereign power is impossible. The political subject is born at the same time as the state is established. The sovereign power is upheld by the everyday action and performance of the subjects that reproduces the existing sovereign power.

Besides this, we must note that sovereignty (sovereign power) is theoretically something fundamentally different from the sovereign, the representative of sovereign power. In *De Cive* Hobbes, writing about the differences between the kinds of sovereign power, states very clearly that "The differences between commonwealths are derived from the difference in the persons to whom sovereign power is committed." (Hobbes DCE, VII, 1; p. 91; p. lat. 235.)[217] He continues a little later by clarifying the difference between Aristotelic concepts (that are closely related to motion), *potentia* and *actus* by applying these concepts to politics by stating that:

> For government [*imperium*] is a *capacity* [*potential*], administration of government is an *act* [*actus*]. *Power* is equal in every kind of commonwealth; what differs are the acts, i.e. the *motions* and *actions* of the commonwealth, depending on whether they originate from the deliberations of many or of a few, of the competent or of the incompetent." (Hobbes DCE, X, 16. p. 125; p. lat. 276.)[218]

Hence, there are in fact two phases in representation. Firstly, the sovereign power gathers together and represents the powers of the individuals, which in the multitude are hindered by each other and as a consequence, their powers amount to nothing. Hence, sovereign power is ultimately the power of the people, not of the multitude. The sovereignty is the actual omnipotence of the people over the multitude, or in other words, the omnipotence of the political subject over the apolitical mass of individuals. Secondly, a government, be it monarchy, aristocracy or democracy, represents this sovereign power, as the sovereignty. The sovereign is the one who orders the ways that the commonwealth acts and moves. In other words, governing the commonwealth means to control the motions of the people.

---

217 A little earlier Hobbes states, that in democracy "*sovereign power* lies with an *Assembly* in which any citizen has the right to vote; it is called DEMOCRACY." (Hobbes DCE, VII, 1. pp. 91-92; p. lat. 236.) The difference between sovereign power and the ones that use that sovereign power is very clear.

218 Translators of *De Cive* translate here the *imperium* with the word government. In my text I use the term government to refer to administration of the sovereign power.

Furthermore, we must note however that according to Hobbes, sovereignty (sovereign power) and the sovereign (the representative of the sovereign power) should never be actually separated. The sovereign power rests always completely in a natural person who bears the sovereignty, as Hobbes writes: "…whosoever beareth the person of the people, or is one of that assembly that bears it, beareth also his own natural person." (Hobbes L, XIX, 4. p. 124.) Otherwise sovereignty is put under a division (mixed government), which is not in Hobbes's interests.

The negative examples given by Hobbes concerning the "elective kings" and other limited sovereigns tell us that the sovereign power and the bearer of the sovereign power should be always completely united in one natural person. In other words, although the person of the state is artificial, the best outcomes in government are reached if this person looks and acts like a natural person. This means that in the case of a monarchy the sovereign power of the people must be transferred completely to a king, as we will see later. A situation where a sovereign people would limit the power of the king would mean that the king is only a minister of the sovereign power, not the sovereign itself. (Hobbes L, XIX, 10-14. pp. 127-129.)

For this reason there is in fact another contract when an aristocracy or a monarchy is made out of the democracy. In this contract, which resembles a second level of the basic social contract, a people transfer its right and sovereignty. In this transfer of rights the people as a *person* no longer exists but it does not, however, return to a formless and anarchic multitude. All obligations towards the public person of the people cease and new obligations towards the new representative of the sovereign power, for example a monarch, are created. But it is important to note, that originally the sovereign monarch gets its power from the sovereign people that has voted for this transfer of power. In this way there is no possibility to act legally against the will of the sovereign monarchy, since the citizens have voluntarily transferred their rights to a monarch. (Hobbes DCE, VII, 10-12. p. 96; pp. lat. 241-242.)

Since the people is the first instance of government after the social contract, or in fact, the social contract is basically a democratic meeting[219], we must understand why Hobbes wants to get rid of the democratic government and why he prefers monarchy as the best form of government. If democracy is needed to establish a sovereign power, why it is so important to get rid of it as soon as the state is properly formed? According to our argument the basic reason for this is that the people as a sovereign, that is, as a representative of sovereignty, is a form of government that is too close to the unwanted multitude.

4.3.2 Democratic Government

As we start to analyse Hobbes's aversion to democratic government, the first and perhaps the most important thing we encounter is that in democracy the

219 "When men have met to erect a commonwealth, they are, almost by the very fact that they have met, a *Democracy*." (Hobbes DCE, VII, 5. p. 94; p. lat. 239.)

power relation between the sovereignty, the representative of the sovereign power and the governed subjects is superposed in a way that it is difficult to actually separate them from each other. In this sense power relation between those who govern and those who are governed is in democracy "flatter" than in aristocracy and monarchy. In fact, the problem of the divided nature of the political subject is the most palpable in democracy. The democratic government is not the best example of the possibilities of the geometry of power, Hobbes seems to suggest.

The state of human beings under a sovereign power is: individuals, who are the *citizens*, exist only for the state and produce the state that exists only for them but which is at the same time something more than those individuals. (Jaume 1986, 23.) In Hobbes' own words "… the nature of commonwealth is that a multitude of citizens[220] both exercises power and is subject to power, but in different senses." (Hobbes DCE, VI, 1. p. 76; p. lat. 217.) Hence, every human being living in a state is in one sense a citizen i.e. the author of the sovereign power. The legitimacy of the state and sovereign power derives from the people.[221] On the other hand, every individual is also a part of the multitude, that is, a part of the mass of human beings that are governed by the political subject, a people.

In Hobbes's presentation this makes things very complicated in democracy: the same people are the rulers and the governed subjects. Every individual is divided in two since they must see themselves as authors of the sovereign action and as well as the subjects of the government. From this dichotomy there follows several problems. In *The Elements of Law* Hobbes states:

> …how unjust soever the action be, that this sovereign *demus* shall do, is done by the will of every particular man subject to him, who are therefore guilty of same. If therefore they style it injury, they but accuse themselves. And it is against reason for the same man, both to do and complain; implying this contradiction, that whereas he first ratified the people's acts in general, he now disalloweth some of them in particular. (Hobbes EL, II, 3. p. 140.)

Hobbes sees that it is difficult, or even impossible to expect that people could be able to see themselves operating in two roles. Quite the contrary, they constantly mix up the two roles, that of the political subject and the object of political governance. To clarify this problem, let us cite a longer text from *De Cive* that explains how Hobbes sees the relationship between political subject (people) and governed object (multitude):

> …men do not make a clear enough distinction between a *people* and *multitude*. A *people* is a *single* entity, with a *single will*; you can attribute *an act* to it. None of this can be said of a multitude. In every commonwealth the *People* Reigns: for even in *Monarchies* the *People* exercises power [*imperat*]; for the *people* wills through the will of *one man*. But the citizens, i.e. the subjects, are a *multitude*. In a *Democracy* and in an *Aristocracy* the citizens are the *multitude*, but the *council* is the *people*; in a *Monarchy*

---

220 The term *multitudo* is used here simply to refer to the large number of citizens, not to political concept of *multitudo*.

221 Mairet puts this in a simple way: "Hobbes est celui qui invente le peuple comme source originaire de l'État." (Mairet 1997, 53.)

> the subjects are the *multitude*, and (paradoxically) the *King* is the *people*. Ordinary people and others who do not notice this point, always speak of a *large number* of men as the *people*, i.e. as the *commonwealth*; they speak of the *commonwealth* having rebelled against the *king* (which is impossible) and of the *people* wanting, or not wanting, what malcontent and murmuring subjects want or do not want; under this label of the *people*, they are setting the *citizens* against the *commonwealth*, i.e. the *Multitude* against the *people.* (Hobbes DCE, XII, 8. p. 137; pp. lat. 291-292; See also Hobbes EL, II, 11. pp. 145-146.)

What we see here, first of all, is that the multitude does not in fact vanish in the social contract. Instead, when the political subject has its birth, a multitude becomes an object of governance, a population in modern language. From this follows that if a people as a sovereign does something to a subject, in this case an individual, who is ultimately in the state of war relation towards the sovereign[222], this subject has a right to do the same thing, since every member of a democratic state is part of the sovereign government, thinks Hobbes. Every subject in democracy is directly responsible for every action that this sovereign, the people, does. (Hobbes EL, II, 3. p. 140.)

In democracy the democratic government and multitude (political subject and object of governance) are superposed, since the material of the both are the same people. This means that the power of the people is not actually gathered into one omnipotent point, but is instead dispersed to every particular man. Thus, democracy is a rather abstract form of government, since the artificiality of the public person is so obvious. The system of authorisation and representation does not work properly in democracy: one is not able to distinguish between the source of a sovereign power (people) and the user of that sovereign power (people). What is even more important is that one is not able to distinguish between the ones who are governing (people) and the ones that are governed (multitude, "population"). Hobbes argues that the multitude must be always subjugated, if we do not want anarchy.

Along with this fundamental, theoretical difference there are also practical problems that are especially related to democracy as a mode of government. The most important of these are the problems related to the democratic process and permanency of democratic meetings.

Let us begin with the problems related to the democratic process. Hobbes sees that the democratic meeting is a sort of open gathering, where people are allowed to take part rather freely. This picture is particularly depicted in *The Elements of Law*. Here the most important thing is that Hobbes seems to argue that a state cannot operate properly if it is tied to a democratic process of constant deliberation and rhetoric, which are most typical for democratic meetings. In a democratic meeting, all the negative elements related to demagogy and eloquence, and thus to the multitude, actualize:

> In all democracies, though the right of sovereignty be in the assembly, which is virtually the whole body; yet the use thereof is always in one, or a few particular

---

222 According to Hobbes, citizen is always in the relation of state of nature to sovereign power. Sovereign power has a power to kill its subject, if needed. (Hobbes L, XXI, 7. pp. 141-142. See also Hobbes L, XXI, 11-12. p. 144.)

> men. For in such great assemblies as those must be, whereinto every man may enter at his pleasure, there is no means any ways to deliberate and give counsel what to do, but by long and set orations; whereby to every man there is more or less hope given, to incline and sway the assembly to their own ends. In a multitude of speakers therefore, where always, either one is eminent alone, or a few being equal amongst themselves, are eminent above the rest, that one or few must of necessity sway the whole; insomuch, that a democracy, in effect, is no more than an aristocracy of orators, interrupted sometimes with the temporary monarchy of one orator. (Hobbes EL, XXI, 5. p. 141.)

Practically, democracy is always a rule of one or few capable men, who can persuade the whole democratic assembly of their own opinions and ambitions. In a democratic meeting the orators and demagogues can easily gain power and actually rule over the whole democratic body politic as aristocrats or monarchs do. The difference is that demagogues do not have legal authority for their rule like monarchs do, since in the democracy the authority to act is officially at the democratic meeting.[223] Hobbes does not rely on the process of democratic deliberation by a long set of orations, but he seems to endorse the fact that every time there is a possibility to persuade people by speech, the majority of them will follow those who possess good eloquence and "ornamentary style of speaking".

It is also possible that because of the tyrannical demagogues[224], the arbitrariness and cruelty of the "leaders" of the democratic meeting will be much stronger than it is in monarchies. In *De Cive* Hobbes states that "In a *Monarchy* therefore anyone who is prepared to live quietly is free of danger, whatever the character of the ruler." (Hobbes DCE, X, 7. p. 120; p. lat. 270). In democracies instead the demagogues become "Neros" who will cruelly use people for their own interest and join with other orators to oppress people. For this reason, in a democracy no one is safe from the cruelty of the demagogues and orators.

We see, how according to Hobbes, the democratic meeting resembles too much the gathering of multitude, where demagogues lead the ignorant, but passionate people and the worst character of the people are manifested publicly. This picture of democracy brings to our mind the Athenian democracy and the oratories of Pericles and Alcibiades described by Thucydides[225], not to

---

223 In *De Cive* Hobbes states that "But in a *Democracy* the large numbers of *Demagogues*, i.e. orators who have influence with the people (and there are a lot of them and new ones come along every day)…" (Hobbes DCE, X, 6. p. 119; p. lat. 269). It seems that in democracy the problem of demagogy is permanent, since there are always new candidates who seek political power.

224 It is obvious that Hobbes has in mind such classical examples as Alcibiades and especially Caesar.

225 The case of Pericles in *Peloponnesian Wars* clearly shows what the relationship between the democratic *demos* and the democratic leader was. Even though Pericles was a strong leader, he is still constantly oscillating between the people's favour and despise. On one hand it seems that the advice Pericles gives to the people leads them easily to war. But, in the time of trouble people start to hate their leader and give him a fine for leading Athens to war. Yet, soon after this the people of Athens still elect Pericles as the leader of the Athenian troops. This defines how confused the Athenian people were, "as is the way with the multitude" as Thucydides correctly states. (Thucydides 1969-77, XX, 35.) The relationship between the Athenians and

forget the cases of the Roman politics.[226] It is highly possible, that Hobbes might have combined the ancient examples of democracy in his contemporary experiences of parliament.[227] Thus, we should not take this picture of democracy as an accurate description of the British parliament in the 17th century, but instead, it shows the negativity and suspicion that Hobbes had of democratic government in general.

Another thing that reminds us of the political problems connected to multitude and rhetoric is the power that political speech has over individual minds. In *The Elements of Law* Hobbes explains how passions form a great problem in such assemblies as democracy and aristocracy[228]: "if the passions of many men be more violent when they are assembled together, then the

---

Pericles is very interesting and it demonstrates those elements which Hobbes saw as dangerous in the Athenian democracy. Even though Pericles was a good leader, a man of the State and patriot, nothing like the demagogues such as Alcibiades, Pericles's rule was still very fragile. The picture that Thucydides gives of Pericles is admirable, but at the same time he reveals how people did not after all act as Pericles would have wanted. Straight after Pericles died, the people became confused and forgot everything they had learned from Pericles.

226 For Hobbes the case of Caesar is a good example of the problems of democracy and its constant danger of falling in the hands of charismatic populists in Roman Empire. The example of Caesar shows how people can easily be drawn away from the obedience to the laws towards the spells of a charismatic leader (Hobbes refers to demagogy as witchcraft). (Hobbes L, XXIX, 20. p. 220.) Demagogues like Caesar flatter the people. They offer grain and wine, appoint popular civil servants and build temples that please people. Plutarch describes how Caesar gained popularity in Rome by spending the money gained from the Gallic wars to build up popular temples etc. (Plutarch 2010). See also Suetonius who describes vividly how Caesar gained power right from the beginning of his career by building temples, organizing gladiator shows etc. for the common-people of the Rome (Suétone 1961, 1-62, particularly pages 7-8 and 27). Also the reputation of the leader might impact the people's mind to not follow the laws and lawful leaders, but instead to join the rebellious action of multitude. What is interesting in the example of Caesar is that Hobbes explicitly expresses how this kind of action is in more danger of happening in popular governments (that is, in democracy) than in monarchy, because "an army is of so great force, and multitude, as it may easily be made believe, they are the people." (Hobbes L, XXIX, 20. p. 220.) Although Hobbes does not defend the republican model of power, he however notes that the reason for the ruin of the senate in the rebellion that lead Caesar finally to power was the unleashed power of the multitude. With the help of the raging multitude, Caesar subverted the power of the senate. After this he became the master of both the senate and the people/multitude with the help of his army. (Hobbes L, XXIX, 20. p. 220.) This example shows clearly how the line between people and multitude is continually oscillating and the fundamental problem for Hobbes is that the people, as a political subject, is in constant danger of becoming a multitude that is, turning into an apolitical monster.

227 In his Introduction to Thucydides' *Peloponnesian Wars* Hobbes states that "For his [i.e. Thucydides] opinion touching the government of the state, it is manifest that he least of all liked the democracy." (Hobbes THU, xvi.) According to Hobbes, imperial Athens was not in fact a democracy, but monarchy: "He [Thucydides] praiseth the government of Athens, when it was mixed of the few and the many: but more he commendeth it, both when Peisistratus reigned, (saving that it was an usurped power), and when in the beginning of this it was democratical in name, but in effect monarchical under Pericles." (Hobbes THU, xvii.)

228 In the *Elements of Law* Hobbes goes as far as to state that democracy and aristocracy are actually the same, since "democracy is but the government of a few orators." (Hobbes EL,V, 3. p. 165.)

inconvenience arising from passion will be greater in an aristocracy, than a monarchy" (Hobbes EL, V, 4. p. 166).

When political questions are debated in large assemblies everyone tries to push their own interests and ideas forward. This leads men to exaggerate their opinions and passions, as we remember from chapter three of the present study. The outcome is a sort of extremism, where bad is made even worse and good even better. The most efficient way to do this is to give a speech to a large crowd of people and influence their passions with extreme examples and figures of speech. This instead leads to a situation, where the extremism of some private men angers even the moderate people: "as a great many coals, though but warm asunder, being put together inflame one another", states Hobbes. (Hobbes EL, V, 4. p. 167.)

According to Hobbes, monarchy is not that prone to passions as democracy and aristocracy are, since affections and passions have the strongest power in large social gatherings. This follows from the fact that "the mind of one man is not so variable in that point, as are the decrees of an assembly." (Hobbes EL, V, 7. p. 168.) Orators are the "favourites of sovereign assemblies". They can easily hurt the commonwealth with their eloquence, but they cannot heal what they have made with their words. (Hobbes L, XIX, 8. p. 126.)

In *The Elements of Law,* Hobbes also gives an interesting insight into his understanding of the meaning of corruption. The alleged inconvenience of the monarchy, or any kind of sovereign power as Hobbes specifies in *De Cive* (Hobbes DC, X, 6. p. eng. 119.; p. lat. 268-269), is that the monarch may legally take property from his subjects to fulfill the needs of the state. But sometimes he may also use the funds of the state to enrich his children, relatives, friends and others. This kind of corruption is, however, even more dangerous in an aristocracy and democracy, Hobbes claims. The more there are people taking part in the governance of the state, the more there are relatives, children and others, who also might demand their share of the wealth and power. Aristocrats can also ally together as "twenty monarchs" and "set forward another's designs mutually". In democracy there are always new people coming to seek the benefits of power and this easily leads to high costs of bribery and corruption that it cannot be done without exploiting the citizens. In a monarchy the corruption takes place in reasonable limits, argues Hobbes. (Hobbes EL, V, 5. p. 167; Hobbes DC, X, 6. pp. 268-269; p. eng. 119.)

Thus, Hobbes sees that the public interest of the state is best watched when the leader of the state is a monarch, who takes care of his own interests while considering the best of the state. In *Leviathan* Hobbes makes a very interesting argument by stating that:

> …where the public and private interest are most closely united, there is the public most advanced. Now in monarchy, the private interest is the same with the public. The riches, power, and honour of monarch arise only from the riches, strength and reputation of his subjects. For no king can be rich, nor glorious, nor secure; whose subjects are either poor, or contemptible, or too weak through want, or dissension, to maintain a war against their enemies; whereas in a democracy, or aristocracy, the public prosperity confers not so much to the private fortune of one that is corrupt, or

> ambitious, as doth many times a perfidious advice, a treacherous action, or a civil war. (Hobbes L, XIX, 4. pp. 124-125.)

Here Hobbes seems to state that democracy and aristocracy are prone to all sorts of confusion between the private and public interest. Monarchy better suits the needs of a commonwealth that wants to live a secure and happy life. In other words, it is in the interest of the monarch to make his people happy and prosperous. The case is not so clear in aristocracy and democracy.

Now, moving from these minor problems of democratic government presented in *The Elements of Law* and other works to the very fundamental problem of democracy, we must consider what Hobbes says about democracy in *De Cive*. In *De Cive* Hobbes states several times that democracy is a convention where decisions are made by the majority. Thus, the act of voting is something that Hobbes relates strongly to the democratic practice of power. (Hobbes DC, VII, 1, 5 & 16. pp. lat. 235-236; 239; 244-247; pp. eng. 91-92; 94; 98-100.) To practice voting there needs to be some kind of an institution where the voting takes place. Hobbes defines democracy by stating that:

> From the fact that they have gathered voluntary, they are understood to be bound by the decisions made by agreement of the majority. And that is a *Democracy*, as long as the convention lasts, or is set to reconvene at certain times and places. For a convention whose will is the will of all the citizens has *sovereign power*. (Hobbes DCE, VII. 5. p. 94; p. lat. 239.)

To keep the convention of democracy, that is the practice of voting and the expression of every particular citizen's mind, on-going, there has to be a strict decision of time and place where this public deliberation and voting can take place. Without this democracy will revert to the state of multitude, claims Hobbes.[229] Without a clearly set time and place for the next democratic meeting there is no longer a *demos,* but instead a disorganized multitude, "to which no *action* or *right* may be attributed." We see that *demos*, a people as a political subject, is in fact a democratic meeting that has an uninterrupted schedule. (Hobbes DCE, VII, 5. p. 94; p. lat. 239.)

Along with this basic requirement, there has to be something more to secure that the sovereign power (people) also preserves the power between these meetings. It is impossible, says Hobbes, that a democratic meeting could sit uninterrupted. For this reason, a people as a sovereign have to relinquish the authority (*potestas*) of the people to one man or assembly of men for the interval between meetings. Again, democracy is in danger of turning into a corrupted aristocracy or monarchy, since it seems practically impossible to have a permanent and stable democratic meeting, which is capable of making decisions all the time.[230] (Hobbes DC, VII, 6. pp. lat. 239-240; pp. eng. 94-95.)

---

229 Aristocracy resembles democracy in this sense. Hobbes writes: "…without a fixed schedule of the times and places at which the *council of optimates* may meet, there is no longer a *council* or a single person, but a disorganized multitude without sovereign power." (Hobbes DCE, VII, 10. p. 96; pp. lat. 241-242.)

230 "But if a People is to retain sovereign power, it is not enough to have settled times and places for meeting. Either the intervals between the meetings must not be so

The last thing that grasps our mind in the long list of disadvantages of the democratic government is the role of deliberation in the governance of the state. Deliberation is, of course, the most important thing since political decisions and the will of the state according to every particular question is formed in the process of deliberation. In *De Cive* Hobbes gives four reasons that prove why deliberation does not work properly in a democracy.

The first reason is that in democracy deliberation is reduced under the public display of prudence and eloquence: "each member [of a democratic meeting] has to make a long, continuous speech to express his opinion; and deploy his eloquence to make it as ornate and attractive as possible to the audience, in order to win reputation." (Hobbes DCE, X, 11. p. 123; pp. lat. 273-274.) Hence, deliberation, which should be the work of reason becomes instead an interplay between rhetoric and passions, where people are persuaded under whatever opinion by eloquence.

In *Leviathan* Hobbes goes as far as to compare democracy to the infant king, who must take counsel and advice from the several people. These *custodes libertatis,* as Hobbes ironically calls them, easily become nothing more than dictators and temporary monarchs. Hence, in democracy the counsel given by several people might lead to a situation where the actual power and sovereignty lies in the hands of counsellors, not in the hands of the people. (Hobbes L, XIX, 9. p. 127.)

The second reason why deliberation does not work in democracy is that in democracy decisions are mostly made by diletanttes and novices. In military matters, for example, common people do not have enough knowledge about the external powers and their resources. (Hobbes DC, X, 11. pp. lat. 273-274; p. eng. 123.) This means that, again, those who possess the skills of rhetoric are able to guide the ignorant multitude to whatever opinions and decisions on very serious matters.

The third reason is that in a democratic, public deliberation where eloquence is used too easily leads to the formation of different kinds of factions. Factions instead, "are the source of sedition and civil war." (Hobbes DCE, X, 12. p. 123; p. lat. 275.) The birth of the factions follows from the fact that every orator tries to make other orators look bad, and for this reason they gather together such a group around them that is able to destroy the competitors. Hence, democracy is all about the competition of the different factions, or parties in contemporary language.

This is also evident in meetings, where different factions join together to take the power, that is the majority of the votes. This leads to a politics where the sole aim is power and the wellbeing of the commonwealth is easily forgotten. When power is not reached by eloquence, people take up arms and

---

long that something could happen in the meanwhile which (for lack of sovereign power) would endanger the commonwealth, or the people must devolve at least the exercise of sovereign power on some one man or one assembly for the intervening period. If this has not been done, no adequate provision has been made for the defence and peace of individuals." (Hobbes DCE, VII, 6. p. 95; pp. lat. 239-240.)

the outcome is civil war. Another possible outcome, albeit not quite as disastrous as civil war but nevertheless a bad outcome of factions, is that the laws of the state are reduced under the arbitrary decisions of the leading factions. Hobbes simply means that the laws of the state become uncertain and subject of constant change, as he compares them to the waves of the sea. Constant, unpredictable change and uncontrolled motion is not good for a commonwealth.[231] (Hobbes DC, X, 12-13. pp. lat. 274-275; pp. eng. 123-124. See also Hobbes L, XIX, 6. p. 125.)

The fourth and last reason why deliberation in democracy does not work is that secrets of the state are easily revealed to large audiences and, as a consequence, to the enemies as well. In this way the security and wellbeing of the state is endangered (Hobbes DC, X, 12-13. pp. lat. 274-275; pp. eng. 123-124). In other words, public talk about the matters of the state is not suitable, since it tends to reveal the most important secrets of the state to the masses and via masses to enemies.

We notice here that even though the birth of *demos* is a birth of the sovereign power and in this way democracy is a basis of an absolute sovereign government of any sort, for Hobbes democracy is the worst kind of government for a commonwealth. In fact, democracy is not very capable of taking care of the basic task that sovereign needs to look after. For Hobbes the basic task of the sovereign is the security and well-being of the people (*salus populi suprema lex*) and the best government is that which can take care of the security in the best possible way, as Hobbes states in *Leviathan*:

> The difference between these three kinds of commonwealth, consisteth not in the difference of power; but in the difference of convenience, or aptitude to produce the peace, and security of the people; for which end they were instituted. (Hobbes L, XIX, 4. p. 124.)

In the democracy the power-relations between the sovereign and the subjects is as direct as possible. In democracy, every member of the commonwealth is also part of the sovereign assembly. For Hobbes this "flatness" of power-relations is a real problem and a threat to security: it is difficult to separate those who govern (people) from those who are governed (multitude). People as citizens carry the artificial body politic of the people with their natural persons. For this reason, the democratic sovereign has much less power than the aristocratic or monarchic sovereign, since the power has dispersed all over the body politic. Democracy as a mode of government does not fulfil those hopes that Hobbes had put for the effectiveness of the governance in his geometric analysis of power.

---

231 This view can be identified even from Hobbes's earliest texts, *Horae subsecivae.* In his *A Discourse Upon the Beginning of Tacitus* Hobbes states: "After the people had delivered themselves from the authority of Kings, and came themselves to undergo the cares of government, they grew perplexed at every inconvenience, and shifted from one form of government to another, and so to another, and then to first again; like a man in a fever, that often turns to and fro in his bed, but finds himself without ease, and sick in every posture." (Hobbes HST, 34.)

For Hobbes, a monarchy is a sort of an Archimedean point where the use of the power towards the multitude, or population in contemporary language, is easiest. While in democracy it is difficult to distinguish between those who govern and those who are governed, in a monarchy this difference is very clear. A monarch governs with the authority that the artificial body of the people has transferred wholly to the monarch. Those same people are governed as a multitude, that is, as the object of governance by their own will. In contemporary language, the difference between people and population is of utmost importance for Hobbes. What we see here is a significant change in the way the concept of multitude is used: multitude can never be a political subject for Hobbes, but it must be an object of governance. Political power must be able to take over and control the motion of the multitude.

For Hobbes democracy is un-pragmatic and problematic form of government and it is too closely linked to the multitude. It is in danger of dissolving into anarchy, to the state of nature, which is not a form of any commonwealth, but a lack of commonwealth as Hobbes states: "…anarchy (which signifies want of government;)" (Hobbes L, XIX, 2. p. 123). Instead of an un-pragmatic and "archaic" democracy, Hobbes prefers the "modern" monarchy. A simple reason for a monarchy is: it is a more practical form of power because in a monarchy the use, or capability of using power does not cease at any moment: "in the case of monarchy deliberation and decision occur at any time and in any place." (Hobbes DCE, VII, 13. p. 97; p. lat. 242.) In this way the monarchy is in practice a more omnipotent form of power than a democracy, since in monarchy power is permanent and unidivided unlike in democracy.

5 THE CONCEPTS OF REVOLUTION AND MULTITUDE

In the previous chapters we have scrutinized the concept of multitude and its relation to the formation of the commonwealth and sovereign power. We have seen that multitude is a complex concept that redefines the problem of motion in human communities. For this reason multitude is a political problem which Hobbes aims to solve with his theory of the process of individuation and the individual. The prerequisite for the social contract is the idea of an individual who is free from all personal relationships. Only from this basis it is possible to build a social contract, which actually harnesses the living powers of the multitude as a driving force of the commonwealth. In his political philosophy, Hobbes mapped the reasons for the psychological and social motions and builds up his theory of "lasting" commonwealth on this basis. Thus, such fundamental social passion as fear is used, for example, as a tool to govern the multitude, or in contemporary language, population, in a commonwealth.

In this chapter we move our focus from the "generation" of the commonwealth to the potential corruption of the commonwealth. As the analysis of the concepts of motion and multitude explain why and how control over the free movement of people is needed, motion and multitude also clarify what happens if the control and order over the citizen is lost. Revolution, rebellion, sedition and upheaval are the words that describe the destruction of the sovereign power. What interests us in this chapter is the way in which Hobbes conceives the overall temporal motion of the body politic in time: we know already that the origin of the state is the social contract and that the social contract must be constantly upheld by performing its crucial principles. Now we ask how much turbulence and rotation Hobbes allows for the sovereign power. In other words we consider whether revolution, which is a political concept of motion *par excellence*, is a possibility for Hobbes and what are the outcomes of the potential "revolution" in the Hobbesian context.

Unlike previous research concerning Hobbes's alleged "revolutionary" or anti-revolutionary political thought and action, this chapter considers what kind of political concept revolution is in Hobbes's political philosophy. Our

intention is to find out how Hobbes used and did not use the concept of revolution in his texts and contrast his ideas to the ancient understanding of the regime change and to the uses of the concept of revolution in his own era. By doing this we are trying to discover what kind of relationship Hobbes had particularly to revolution and how he balanced between classical and contemporary theories of regime change. The important thing is, we claim, that Hobbes's idea of state and social contract strongly opposes the classical theory of regime change and it is the idea of multitude that also separates Hobbes's theory from the modern theories of revolution. Thus, Hobbes seems to stand on a threshold between classical and modern understanding of regime change, rebellion and revolution. Hobbes's theory of multitude thus limits both his approach to regime change and his alleged "revolutionary" action.

5.1 The Concept of Revolution in Hobbes Studies

While considering Hobbes's position and role during the events of the English Civil Wars we face a rather complex and multilayered collection of different aspects.[232] Modern interpretations usually conceive him as a moderate political theorist, whose aim was to secure the order of the commonwealth by establishing the strong sovereign. Thus, we are told, Hobbes was a royalist whose political philosophy was directed against those who used sedition and rhetoric to topple the monarchy. For this reason, Hobbes is usually seen as an anti-revolutionary writer, who strongly opposed any kinds of rebellion and insurrection.[233]

This picture of Hobbes is plausible, at least if we accept what Hobbes himself states about his position in this great quarrel.[234] It seems that accepting Hobbes's own views cannot go totally wrong when his ideas are scrutinized in a wider historical perspective. It is true that Hobbes can be seen as a

---

232 This derives most likely from the complexity related to English Civil Wars. For the analysis of several different actors in "English revolution" see for example Quentin Skinner's article "History and Ideology in the English Revolution". (Skinner 2002, 238 - 263.)

233 See for example Levine 2002; Martinich 1998, 16, 121; Sommerville 1992, 3; Tuck 1993, 313; Skinner 1996, 229. See also Sreedhar 2010, 132-133. For a complete analysis of the views that conceive Hobbes as royalist, see Curran 2007, 11-25. According to her, even though there exists a huge variety of interpretations on Hobbes, one of the strongest orthodoxies is that Hobbes was a loyal royalist and supported Charles I to the end. This idea is clearly presented by Sim & Walker who state that: "Hobbes' drastic prescriptions to resolve the 'disorders of the present times' are well known: absolute sovereignty, preferably in the person of a monarch, who could not be divided against himself, and absolute obedience on the part of the state's subjects, who could not question the sovereign's actions (or would be severely punished if they dared to do so)." (Sim & Walker 2003, 13.)

234 See Hobbes's *Considerations upon the Reputation &c. of Thomas Hobbes* where Hobbes clarifies his position in "late rebellion" (Hobbes *CRLMR*). In this work Hobbes explicitly states that he was not on Oliver Cromwell's side: "To that other charge, *that he writ his Leviathan in defence of Oliver's title*, he will say, that you in your own conscience know it is false." (Hobbes *CRLMR*, 420.)

philosopher who sought for moderate behaviour and the restriction of strong passions in politics, as we have already seen in chapter three of this study. Certainly, Hobbes's aim was to bring peace to the commonwealth and the way to promote peace was to establish a strong, absolute sovereign power, which would have a monopoly of violence as chapter four shows. Hobbes argues that any political uprising against the sovereign power is dubious.

Yet, when we turn our focus to Hobbes's contemporaries and to the reception of Hobbes's political thought we notice that this tranquil picture of Hobbes as the modest promoter of peace is violently broken. There are several studies that concern the reception of Hobbes's thought and all of them repeat the same thing: Hobbes was perceived as a dangerous and suspicious writer among his contemporaries.[235] This was not only due to his atheism, but also well to his other political opinions and theoretical inventions, not least to the idea of a strong sovereign power.[236] As Susanne Sreedhar (2010, 3) points out, Hobbes's idea of inalienable rights was perceived as odd as well. In fact, Hobbes's *Leviathan* was named as "Rebells cathechism" by Hobbes's contemporary and sparring partner, Bishop Bramhall.[237] Thus, the immediate response to Hobbes's political thought was mostly negative and he was accused several times of being a philosopher of rebellion and sedition. This critique was not confined only to England or to the 17th century: later Hobbes's philosophy

---

235 See for example Mintz 2010; Skinner 1966; Sreedhar 2010, 132-136; Parkin 2007, 361-368; Curran 2007, 26-62. For original sources, see G.A.J. Rogers (ed.) *Leviathan: Contemporary Responses to The Political Theory of Hobbes,* which includes four contemporary responses to Hobbes's *Leviathan* (Robert Filmer, George Lawson, John Bramhall and Edward, Earl of Clarendon.) In his investigation of Hobbes's reception, Parkin (2007) explains, for example, that most of the Tories in 1679-1684 linked Hobbes to a seditious and disloyal contract theory. Of course, Hobbes was also used for political ends, but fiercely opposed as well. In fact, many loyalists ever since the 1650s saw Hobbes as a philosopher of subversion and rebellion. White Kennet for example ranked Hobbes as one of the 'Grand Patriots of Rebellion and Confusion.' (Parkin 2007, 362). In 1679 Hobbes was even called "Mr. Multitude" by an anonymous pamphleteer who wrote that 'Leviathan: I mean the Original Soveraign Power of Mr Multitude' while arguing against Hobbes that God is the author of order and government, not man (Parkin 2007, 362), (Pamphlet 1679: *A letter to a friend shewing scripture, fathers, and reason, how false that state-maxim is, royal authority is originally and radically in the people*). Parkin says that even John Locke's *Two Treatises on Government* can be seen as an anti-Hobbist and anti-absolutist work (Parkin 2007, 368).

236 Among other things causing suspicion in Hobbes's readers was Hobbes's idea of the anarchic state of nature. Many contemporaries doomed Hobbes's idea of the state of nature because it put man in such a condition that could not be understood as an intention of God. The contemporaries also thought that it was against experience to claim that people were at war of all against all. (Thornton 2005, 75-86.)

237 Bramhall's title page of his *The Cathing of Leviathan, or the Great Whale* tells us almost all that is necessary of his view: "Demonstrating, out of Mr. Hobs his own Works, That no man who is thoroughly an Hobbist, can be a good Christian, or a good Common-wealths man, or reconcile himself to himself. Because his Principles are not only destructive to all Religion, but to all Societies; extinguishing the Relation between Prince and Subject, Parent and Child, Master and Servant, Husbands and Wife: and abound with palpable contradictions." (Bramhall 1995, 115.)

was a typical point of reference when arguing against atheist and other suspicious political doctrines in England and in France as well.[238]

Consequently, we have two traditional and very different pictures of Hobbes. The first one is the product of "pro Hobbes" literature that has been produced ever since the beginning of the 20th century. It celebrates Hobbes's contribution to the principle of positive law and strong state. The second one is the reception of Hobbes as a negative and sometimes even monstrous example of rather dangerous and radical political thinking.

Nevertheless, we also have a third and more recent way of interpreting Hobbes's political thought, which does not endorse the established modern view of Hobbes as a royalist and anti-revolutionary writer, but instead, claims that Hobbes participated strongly to the "revolutionary regime" of England.[239]

This interpretation, articulated by Jeffrey R. Collins in his book *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*, starts from an idea that the English Civil Wars should be understood as a revolution and for this reason one must acknowledge, that Hobbes lived in a revolutionary period, too.[240] It also claims that Hobbes was, after all, a rather radical and revolutionary thinker, who tried seriously to influence the political life of the 17th century England by writing "in sympathy with broad religio-political ends of the English Revolution" (Collins

---

238 For the English reception see Jon Parkin 2007: *Taming the Leviathan* and for the French reception, see Yves Glaziou 1993: *Hobbes en France au XVIII siècle.*

239 See for example Curran, who, unlike the traditional interpreters, states that we should seriously reconsider Hobbes's alleged absolutism (Curran 2007, 2, 12). Curran finds her inspiration to read Hobbes as an ambiguous writer that opposed many royalists from the reception of Hobbes's thoughts by his contemporaries. She also finds the fact that Hobbes was not molested, or killed, when he returned to England as a proof that he was not seen as a loyal royalist (Curran 2007, 19-25). Sometimes, Hobbes is also seen as a writer who advanced a theory of resistance rights (Sreedhar 2010). There are also suggestions that Hobbes's idea of inalienable rights echo the views of Levellers (Curran 2007, Hill 1975, 387-394). These ideas are closely connected to the claims that Hobbes's intentions were actually republican. In his massive study on the impact of Machiavelli to the English political thought in the 17th century, Rahe claims that we should see Hobbes as a republican writer. He states that: "Above all, one must attend to the degree to which the Malmesbury philosopher's monarchism was at all times prudential, provisional, and subject to republican revision, and one must ponder whether, in publishing *Leviathan*, in returning to England, and taking the Engagement required by the Commonwealth, he was not just acquiescing in the roundhead victory, as scholars generally assume, but actively lending support to the Rump and to its lord general, Oliver Cromwell, by offering then sage counsel and attempting to guide public policy – especially with regard to ecclesiastical polity." (Rahe 2008, 3; generally on Hobbes's alleged republican tendencies, see Rahe 2008, 249-346.) Rahe also states that James Harrington was influenced by "Hobbesian republicanism" (Rahe 2008, 321-346).

240 Collins writes: "If, however, the English Civil War is understood as a watershed moment in defining the nature of the British kingdoms as Christian polities, the term 'Revolution' seems much more suitable. The demolition of a millennium-old ecclesial structure, the psychologically shattering advent of pervasive religious pluralism, the earliest efforts to make the individual the arbiter of religious obligation: these represented epochal transformations. And when accompanied by mass violence and regime change, such transformations merit the designation 'revolution'". (Collins 2007, 278.) On the contrary, Susanne Sreedhar says only that Hobbes lived through rebellious times, but she never uses the term revolution or revolutionary to describe Hobbes. (Sreedhar 2010, 132.)

2007, 6)[241]. According to Collins, Hobbes favored church revolution and the Erastianism promoted by Cromwell and for this reason, his sympathies were more on the revolutionary side.

It seems that our contemporary concept of revolution influences our interpretations of Hobbes. When it comes to Hobbes's contemporaries, he was most likely not called a "revolutionary". The simple reason is that the concept of revolution was not yet developed in the sense that it could have been used to label Hobbes's political action. Revolution was known in the political vocabulary, but it was still a very unusual concept, as we will see in this chapter. For this reason, his contemporaries talk more about Hobbes's rebellious doctrines than his "revolutionary ideas".

On the other hand, it is clear that Hobbes is not called a revolutionary writer in modern Hobbes scholarship, since the contemporary, post-French revolution meaning of the term does not fit well with the picture we have of Hobbes. Hobbes scholars have not been willing to see him as "revolutionary", since it is obvious that Hobbes opposed the action and doctrines that we might call revolutionary today. While Hobbes's contemporaries might have accused Hobbes of being a rebellious and dangerous writer, our contemporary research on the contrary has emphasised how modest, clever and modern Hobbes's viewpoints were. It seems that Hobbes did not write his texts in opposition to the dominant power, but instead, he tried to defend the king and monarchy.

In facing the third, most recent interpretation of Hobbes as a revolutionary and anti-royalist writer, we have a twofold conceptual problem. First of all, we are engaged in the problem of the politics of naming. It is especially at the history of English Civil Wars where the name of those past events has been politicised over and over again.[242] This means that our interpretation depends heavily on the understanding concerning the events of English Civil Wars. We might be talking about one war (English Civil War), several different wars that, however, had something in common (English Civil Wars) or we might be talking about the first "modern" revolution (English Revolution).[243] In the case

---

241 Collins however admits, that "Hobbes was not a revolutionary firebrand… He was deeply averse, theoretically and personally, to factionalism and political resistance. There is no doubt that his initial political sympathies were with Charles I." (Collins 2007, 58.) Yet, even though Collins makes this correction to his otherwise strong claim, most readers have interpreted Collins' argument in the way that it posits Hobbes on the revolutionary side. See for example Sreedhar 2010, page 134 footnote 9 and page 136, where Sreedhar states that Collins is right in his claim that Hobbes's allegiance was "with the ideology of revolutionaries."

242 Concerning the problem of the title of the events in English Civil Wars in historiography see Jakonen 2011 and Adamson 2009.

243 On the different terms used for English Civil Wars, see for example John Morrill, *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*, 1991; E.W. Ives, *The English Revolution 1600-1660*, 1968; Michael Braddick: *God's Fury, England's Fire*, 2009; Blair Worden: *The English Civil Wars: 1640-1660,* 2010. See also Robert Ashton, *The English Civil War. Conservatism and Revolution 1603-1649,* 1979, which uses the terms revolution and revolutionary, but argues that the Civil Wars were mainly due to the conservative people who defended the old ways against the innovative kingship of Charles I that started the rebellion. See also Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714*, 1961.

of Collins it is obvious that he supports the idea that those events were a "revolution". From this follows a second conceptual problem, which is connected to Hobbes's political action and his intentions. The way that Collins interprets Hobbes is that Hobbes moved with, not against the revolutionary currents of his age. Thus, he names Hobbes as a "revolutionary" writer and political actor. (Collins 2007, 6-7.)

What is common to all three ways of interpreting Hobbes's possible "revolutionary" intentions, writings and attitudes is that they very seldom, if ever, really consider how Hobbes used the concept of revolution in his texts. It is obvious that Hobbes's contemporaries were not really interested in this aspect. The modern philosophers and political theorists have instead, quite rightly, concluded that Hobbes's arguments against rebellious action tell us that he was not a "revolutionary" writer. In the last case, Collins is using a rather wide historical framework and research material combined with a contemporary understanding of the concept of revolution. However, he is not really interested in the uses of the concept of revolution in Hobbes's philosophy, even if he makes a rather strong case out of the pro-revolutionary aspect in Hobbes's thought and political action.

There are, however, a couple of articles that scratch the surface Hobbes's understanding of the concept of revolution. The most important of these is Mark Hartman's "Hobbes's Concept of Political Revolution" from 1986. In this article, Hartman opposes the views of Karl Griewank and Perez Zagorin who have suggested that with the concept of revolution Hobbes did not mean the events of the English Civil War and the Long Parliament, but instead understood the restoration of the Stuart monarchy to be a revolution.

To explain his view, Hartman briefly looks at the uses of the concept of revolution in Hobbes's own time and then shows how Hobbes's idea of revolution in *Behemoth* resembles his idea of the analysis and synthesis in *Leviathan*. From this basis Hartman concludes that Hobbes use of the word revolution in *Behemoth* did not only mean the restoration, but instead, the whole process where usurpation leads the political system to a revolution. According to Hartman, Hobbes opposed certain ideas of his age, which held that every political regime is necessarily corrupting, that fortune impacts the development of the commonwealth, and that regimes change according to predestined "rotation". Hartman points out that some of Hobbes's contemporaries even believed that God mysteriously affects the changes of political systems. Thus, Hartman states, Hobbes actually revolutionized the concept of revolution by bringing totally new aspects to it. (Hartman 1986.) Although Hartman hits some spots in Hobbes's concept of revolution, his article is rather narrow and perhaps oversimplifies as well.

Other authors have dealt with Hobbes's ideas on revolution as well. We have already mentioned Karl Griewank's book *Der neuzeitliche Revolutionsbegriff: Entstehung und Entwicklung* which concerns Hobbes's position in the history of the concept of revolution, and Perez Zagorin's book *The Court and the Country: The Beginning of the English Revolution,* which is equally brief

regarding Hobbes. Both see Hobbes as a writer of the restoration. (Griewank 1973; Zagorin, 1977.)

A rather different aspect is taken in Vernon F. Snow's article "The Concept of Revolution in Seventeenth-Century England", from 1962. Snow concentrates on studying the uses of the concept of revolution in 17th century England. His article is a reaction to Peter Laslett's article "The English Revolution and John Locke's *Two Treatises on Government*". In the course of his examples from the 17th century usages of revolution, Snow also mentions Hobbes. According to Snow, Hobbes does not use the concept of revolution in a political sense; for political changes Hobbes uses traditional terms such as "rebellion", "revolt" and "overturning". According to Snow, Hobbes is close to other political theorists such as Bacon, Coke, Greville and Selden, who do not either use the term revolution in their texts. (Snow 1962, 169.)

Although Snow's article is a very good piece of work regarding the history of the concept of revolution in the 17th century, the way that it conceives of Hobbes's concept of revolution remains narrow and fails to mention that Hobbes actually used the term revolution with a political meaning. This point is endorsed by Ilan Rachum (1995) in his article "The Meaning of 'Revolution' in the English Revolution (1648-1660)", which also deals with the uses of the term revolution. Rachum points out that Hobbes must have known quite well the political connotations of the term revolution, especially the aspects presented by political theorist and parliamentarian Anthony Ascham (c.1614-1650), since Hobbes had a close working relationship with Edward Hyde, the 1st Earl of Clarendon (1609-1674). (Rachum 1995, 202.) However, Rachum states that Hobbes rejected the use of revolution in a political sense. He did not use it in *The Elements of Law* at all. In *Leviathan* the term revolution appears, but according to Rachum, it is impossible to say whether Hobbes refers to politics or astrology. The way in which Hobbes uses the term in *Behemoth* is equally confusing. (Rachum 1995, 210.) It seems that Rachum is mostly right in his interpretation, according to which Hobbes did not use the concept of revolution in its political meaning.

Finally, Hobbes's concept of revolution is also briefly analyzed by Onofrio Nicastro in his article *La vocabulaire de la dissolution de l'Etat* from 1992. Nicastro also states that Hobbes did not use the concept of revolution in a political sense, but instead was happy to use such terms as rebellion, sedition and civil war. Nicastro points out that Hobbes used the term twice, in *Leviathan* and *Behemoth* and also in his translation of Thucydides *Peloponnesian War*. Like Snow and Rachum, he also notes that the concept of revolution was already partly developed as a political concept in Hobbes's time. (Nicastro 1992, 269-273.)

Thus, we know something about Hobbes's use of the concept of revolution, but we are still left in the state of ignorance concerning the reasons why Hobbes did not use the term more frequently in his political texts. This lack of studies concerning Hobbes's concept of revolution might derive from the fact that many times Hobbes's ideas of "revolution" are considered to be equal with his ideas of "rebellion" and "sedition" as Sreedhar notes when she states that many use the concepts of rebellion and revolution interchangeably.

According to her, it is not clear what term one should use, but it is clear that Hobbes usually uses rebellion. She, however, refers to Koselleck's work *Futures Past,* which states that Hobbes uses the concept of revolution in *Behemoth* (Sreedhar 2010, 136-137, footnote 14). Yet, Koselleck can be criticized of taking this rare example of Hobbes's use of the term and making it sound like a general idea and term, although it was not. (See Koselleck 2004, 46.)

Thus, what we have are several studies that consider Hobbes's attitude towards rebellion, resistance and generally the dissolution of the commonwealth, but no proper study on the uses and non-uses of the concept of revolution in Hobbes's philosophy has yet been published.[244]

5.2 Classical and Early Modern Ideas Concerning the Regime Change and "Revolutions"

It would be tempting to think that since the term "revolution" was not known in the classical period, there would be no political experiences or political theory concerning the revolution. However, events that resemble "revolution" are known, of course, in the classical period and there is actually a rather advanced set of theories which explain why regimes change from one to another.

Philosophers of the classical era provided a variety of answers while explaining why certain regimes went into turmoil and why they were destroyed or changed to new forms. At least three different explanations can be distinguished. The first of these are the socio- economic, political and moral explanations deriving from the classical thought. The second set of explanations consists of mystical and natural explanations. The third set of explanations derives from the Christian ideas of time and especially the ending of times.

The first set of explanations can be characterized with the help of Plato. Plato's main task was to fight against the constant change of regimes and leaders in Athens and to stabilize the movement of the society. In *Republic* he describes how different types of people and personalities are the cause of different forms of government. (Plato 1963, VIII.) He offers a solution where the hierarchies inside the state are built in a way that only the best possible princes can come to power. As the classic allegory of the cave teaches, the philosophers should be the kings/princes since they do not actually want to be kings. In short, all those who want to govern because they have a will to govern, should be guided to other offices and only those who live a truly philosophical and virtuous life should govern the people. Plato's critique is definitely directed against such demagogies as Alcibiades, and perhaps against Pericles, too. The same problem is analyzed also in Plato's *Seventh letter*, where he explains his

---

244 Concerning the dissolution of the state and its relation to rebellion see for example Jendrysik's article 'Thomas Hobbes: Divided Sovereignty and Civil War' in his *Explaining the English Revolution*". (Jendrysik 2002.)

journeys and political aims in Sicily (Plato 1990). In this sense, the political question that Plato poses is the one of the right persons as leaders and the right virtues of the leaders. Bad governors cause political instability, which in fact reveals the whole rotten social structure of *polis*, where the principle of justice (*dike*) is lost.

The second example in this set of explanations is more concerned with political and economic reasons for political change. This example comes from Aristotle's *Politics*. Aristotle shows how different forms of government evolve from one form to another, and on the other hand, how they degenerate to unwanted forms of government. Hence, *politeia*, the government of the citizens is turned into democracy, the government of the people, or in the extreme case to the government of the multitude. As we saw earlier, aristocracy, the rule of "the good" becomes an oligarchy; while a monarchy, the rule of the one, becomes despotism.

While both of the aforementioned examples of "revolutions" are very "sociological", and in that sense "modern"[245], the classical thought also used more mystical ideas concerning the relationship between cosmological and political change. The second set of explanations for political change derives from this discourse.[246] One example of the mystical explanations can be found in the myth of the *Statesman* where Plato describes the "golden age" where people lived under the direct guidance of God. Due to the cosmological change this golden age ended and the beginning of history where men are born of men, began.[247] The same kind of story can be identified in the *Old Testament* where the evolution of state-forms is documented starting from the direct guidance of God and developing later to the power of prophets, ministers and kings.

In addition to the mystical and theological explanations, also cosmo-political and natural explanations were very typical in the antiquity. Polybius is perhaps the one who writes most clearly of these matters in his *Histories*:

> Now the first of these to come into being is monarchy, its growth being natural and unaided; the next arises kingship derived from monarchy by the aid of art and by the correction of defects. Monarchy first changes into its vicious allied form, tyranny; and next, the abolishment of both gives birth to aristocracy; and when the commons inflamed by anger take vengeance on this government for its unjust rule, democracy comes in to being; and in due course the licence and lawlessness of this form of government produces mob-rule (*ochlokratia*) to complete the series. The truth of what I have just said will be quite clear to anyone who pays due attention to such beginnings, origins, and changes as are in each case natural. (Polybius 1968-1976, VI, 4.)

---

245 See Friedman Goldstein's article "Aristotle's Theory of Revolution: Looking at the Lockean Side" that demonstrates how Aristotle saw inequality and oppressive governments as a cause of revolution, and claims that Aristotle's view of the causes of revolution are in fact quite near the ones Locke presents in *Two Treatises on Government* and in *Letter Concerning Toleration*. (Goldstein, 2001.)

246 See Koselleck 2004, 45; Dunn 1989, 335.

247 Plato 1952, 49-65; see also Vidal-Naquet's (1978) article "Plato's Myth of the Statesman, the Ambiguities of the Golden Age and of History".

Later, after he subtly defines how regimes change, Polybius considers "revolution":[248] "Such is the cycle of political revolution, the course appointed by nature in which constitutions change, disappear, and finally return to the point from which they started" (Polybius 1968-1976, VI, 9). It is noteworthy that for Polybius the first form of political regime was monarchy. Only after monarchy (in ancient Greek meaning literally the rule of the one) came kingship.

Generally, the cyclical understanding of time and history widely affected classical political thought. For any political philosopher of Greek and Rome it seems almost impossible to escape from this cosmological cycle. Political art may have included the idea of hastening or slowing the cosmo-political metamorphoses but there is no evidence of the idea of totally leaping out of the natural and cosmological cycle, which is typical for modern revolutions as Koselleck has pointed out. (Koselleck 2004, 49-57.)

Along with the classical explanations of regime change, there are also Christian and early modern ideas on this matter. These explanations concern the problem of time, or more precisely, the ending of times. Hence the third set of explanations of regime change derives from the contemplations on linear versus cyclical time. One example of this is the emergence of the new scientific thought. After the astronomical and scientific revolution, the scientific innovation of lasting linear motion and following from this, lasting linear time replaced the ancient cosmological and political thought. While the cyclical idea of history and time fitted well with the Aristotelic-Ptolemaic world system, the introduction of linear movement and time caused serious troubles for the older cosmological understanding.

However, it is Christianity, not the scientific revolution that originally broke the natural cycle of time typical to antiquity. The Christian theology speaks of the return of the Christ, but at the same time it is very clearly manifested that everything will be different from the first time. The first time when Christ was on the Earth was a preparatory visit. The second coming would be redeeming. Waiting for the second coming of Christ and the coming of the City of God, as church father Augustine described it, is definitely a break from the old conception of time that was typical for the Antiquity. If the Christian idea of time is not straightforwardly linear, it is, however, more or less a spiral. Time may develop in circles, but these circles are not closed. According to the Christian view, time as we know it will end and a totally new kind of time, or eternity, will begin. It is the Christian mind-set that brings with it a new idea of the end of time[249], which has both negative and positive

---

248 The translations of Polybius use the term "revolution" several times to define regime change and "revolutionary action" in his texts. Usually the Greek term is μεθιστημι (*methistémi*) meaning change of the place, change of mind, crossing to other side, change one's party etc. See for example Polybius 1968-1976, II, 41.

249 Augustine states this ontologically in his *Confessions* while saying that: "If, then, time present — if it be time — comes into existence only because it passes into time past, how can we say that even this is, since the cause of its being is that it will cease to be? Thus, can we not truly say that time *is* only as it tends toward nonbeing?" (Augustine 2008, XI, 14.)

consequences. Eschatology[250], escaping from this particular time and space, is definitely a Christian idea that has caused, directly or indirectly, many revolts and rebellions throughout the Christian history (Arendt 2006, 16-18).

The third example of the third set of explanations for regime change is the obvious dissonance between Christian and traditional time conceptions, which is manifested in a political way in the writings of Niccolò Machiavelli. Machiavelli, although he was a contemporary of the astronomical and scientific revolution, does not place those new ideas in his political philosophy. Instead he draws his inspiration from the classical Roman histories, as his *Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio* (*Discourse of the First Ten Books of Titus Livy*) proves.[251] Still, even though Machiavelli gathers his inspiration from the classics, such as Polybius, his political imagination and language is already mixed with the Christian conception of time. As Paul-Erik Korvela shows, Machiavelli understood that the religious sects have the same kind of life spans as political regimes. (Korvela 2006, 77-83.) The earlier sects have vanished because the new ones who, reasonably enough, try to erase the memory of the old religion. Based on this kind of understanding Machiavelli calculated, as did many of his contemporaries, that the Christian religion should come to an end about 150 years after his time. The anticipation of the fall of the Christian religion was based on astrological calculations and a sort of tradition that awaited the rise of a new religion and political order.

Machiavelli's works show that he had some comprehension of cyclical time, which had its inspiration in both pagan and Christian tradition. Cyclical time and the cycle of religious and political order, however, are not causal reasons for the present political situation. Machiavelli sees that the political actors also have their word to say in the course of things. Machiavelli views that religions and republics should be restored to their origins.

This kind of revolution, although the very term was still lacking, is a very modern one, yet at the same time it is very old. The aim of "rinnovazione", a term that Machiavelli uses instead of "revolution", is the restoration and regaining of original powers of the republic. Furthermore, Machiavelli already has an idea of a revolutionary subject. The prince who is "extraordinary" has the capability to bring order, ordinary life, in the republic. An innovator, a substitute for a revolutionary, is the one who prevents the negative innovations of the citizens and classes. This kind of action can resist *fortuna*, if anything. Paradoxically, to retain the stability of the republic or religion, the republic and religions must maintain the capability to reform themselves. According to Machiavelli, constant change, following historical cycles, is the only way to keep the power. (Korvela 2006, 80-83.)

Searching for a more concrete history concerning the change of the concept of revolution, we find that the political concept of revolution has

---

250 In fact, Agamben states, the name Christ is synonymous with "eschatological king" (*sovrano escatologigo*). (Agamben 2009, 38.)

251 The revolution of state-forms is analyzed especially in Machiavelli's (1950b) first book, paragraph two.

developed ever since the 14th in Northern Italy as Ilan Rachum shows in his book *"Revolution": The Entrance of a New Word Into Western Political Discourse* (Rachum 1999). The word *rivoluzione* had started to develop first in the Tuscan dialect at the end of the 13th century. The old terms to mark political change had been derived from Latin, such as *coniuratio*, *seditio*, *tumultus* and *rebellio.* All these terms were bolstered by the term *rivoluzione* in the middle of the 14th century. It was innovated by two important Florentine historians, Giovanni Villani and his brother Matteo Villani. The term was used in a political sense in a context where an attempt was made to overthrow the existing powers by a violent *coup d'état*. *Rivoluzioni* could mean several things, such as political unrest, popular uprising or result of a tumult against government. It meant also something that is beyond human control, that is, it is seen as some kind of force of nature. (Rachum 1999, 17-18.)

Rivoluzioni is closely related to the concepts of *rivolgimento* and *rivoltura*. All three words have their background in the Latin term *revolvo* ("to roll backwards"). *Rivoluzioni* can also be a vernacular from the neo-Latin word *revolutio*, meaning a circling motion. The term was thus related to astronomy, but also to time, when time was understood as a completion of these gyratory movements and measured by cyclical phenomena (day, month, year). According to Christopher Hill, the concept did not only connote "going back", but it had also the meaning of something "coming back". In the large body of different Christian and utopian ideas, the original Garden of Eden or some other position was hoped to return after the political upheavals. Thus, the concept might have had a different path of development, not necessarily connected to astronomical language. (Hill 1990, 82-83; Rachum 1999, 19-22.)

Interestingly, after Villani brothers it is Savonarola, a late 15th century Dominican friar and revivalist preacher against moral corruption of the Church and clergy of his time, who is the most important user of the term before he was put to the rack and sentenced to be executed by hanging and burning. Savonarola used *rivoluzioni* in his writings and sermons. The word also spread by word of mouth in Florence. Thus, the term must have been known and somewhat popular and in the beginning of the 16th century it may have been part of the Florentine slang, which was not suitable to be used in proper texts.[252] This is why other terms such as *mutazione di stato* were used to describe political changes. (Rachum 1999, 22-28.)

It was only at the beginning of the 17th century when the word began to spread to the political language. Christopher Hill shows that several lexicographers knew the word "revolution" in the 17th century. Several different meanings were given, some of them repeating the old Latin connotations of revolving and coming back, some of them also employing new ideas of political change. (Hill 1990, 85-86.)

---

252 Such an influential writer as Machiavelli hardly used *rivoluzioni* in his texts, except one time in the end of *Il Principe*. According to Rachum, Machiavelli might have thought that it is too coarse, lacking refinement or just bad language, not belonging to good writing. The same goes with another political writer of that time, Francesco Guicciardini. (Rachum 1997, 27-28.)

Like Hill, Rachum also finds different uses of the term revolution from the 17th century vocabularies. The most dramatic change in the status of the word can be traced back to the publication of *Vocabolario degli accademici della Crusca* in 1612. The word was already used in Francesco Alunno's *Della Fabrica del mondo* (1584) where it was given as an equivalent to Latin *perturbatio*, *commotio* and *desidium*. Most importantly it was used in John Florio's Italian-English dictionary *A World of Words* from 1598 where it is defined as follows:

> *Rivolgimento*, a revolving, a revolution, a turning and tossing up and downe. Also a winding or cranking in and out. Also a cunning tricke or winding shift. Also a revolt, a revolting or rebellion. (Florio, cited by Rachum 1999, 34.)

After these entries the word started to play an important role in the political jargon, and when the Italian historians used it the word revolution was established in the political language of the 17th century. Revolution became a part of the "noble" political language.[253] In this way, revolution had a new life in the upheavals of the 17th century. (Rachum 1999, 34-37.)

Rachum provides good information about the words that were used together with the concept of revolution (*rivoluzioni)* and as substitutes for it in these 17th century histories. Birago for example used in his *Delle historie memorabilia che contiene le sollevazione di stato de' nostri tempi* from 1653 along with terms such as: *sedizioni*, *tumulti*, *moti*, *rumori*, *turbolenze* and *ribellioni* which remind us of the attributes connected to multitude (see chapter 2.2. of the present study). Popular revolts were also understood as contagious diseases ("morbid contagiosi") that move from one group of people to another, from one place to another. In this disease, people imitate and emulate what other people do in other places, which again reminds us of Hobbes's negative conception of *mimesis* (which is typical for multitude) in chapter 3.3. Thus, if there is a rebellion in one place, people might copy that and start to act in a similar manner. What is important with Birago is that he does not want to explain the events and tumults as the influence of the stars: nothing could be more ridiculous in his opinion. According to Rachum this is the reason why Birago avoids using the term revolution: it might hint that the radical events, revolts, rebellions and tumults are not an outcome of people's own action but instead of some fatal event caused by the revolving of the stars. Rachum argues that the concept of revolution is not used here because it is closely linked to simplistic explanations: that is, to astrology. (Rachum 1999, 47-48.)

---

253 At the beginning of the 17th century, Europe was entering a long and deep crisis of wars and sedition. It was the Italian historians who tried to document these changes and simultaneously, tried to use new language and metaphors to describe what was happening. Looking at the conceptual history of revolution, four books by Italian historians are above others: Luca Assarino: *Delle rivoluzioni di Calaogna* (Genoa 1644), Giovanni Battista Birago Avogadro; *Historia della riviluzioni de regno di Portogallo* (Genoa 1646), Alessandro Giraffi: *Le rivoluzioni di Napoli* (Venice, 1647) and Placido Reina: *Delle rivoluzioni della città di Palermo* (Verona 1649). As Hill points out, the word was used as a description of the current events in Europe and in England as well. (Hill 1990, 88-90; Nicastro 1992, 269-273; Rachum 1999, 40.)

The first English book that used the term revolution was Anthony Ascham's *A discourse wherein is examined What is particularly lawfull during the Confusions and Revolutions of Governments,* published in 1648. Robert Mentet de Salmonet's *Histoire des troubles de la Grande Bretagne*, published in 1649, considered the English Civil Wars with the concept of revolution as well. It is obvious that the Italian authors influenced these and other English authors who used the term. In England such writers as Robert Boyle or Joseph Salmon, among others, also used the term. The word was also used by Shakespeare in his *Henry IV* and as well in the translation of Montaigne's *Essais*, although the French original does not use the word. (Hill 1990, 88-90; Nicastro 1992, 269-273; Rachum 1999, 54-55.)

It is especially interesting that the "revolutionaries" themselves used the word revolution.[254] An evidence of this can be found in the correspondence between Henry Marten and Oliver Cromwell. In addition, Cromwell used the term "revolution" in his speech at the time of the dissolution of his first parliament in 22.1.1655 saying: "Let men take heed how they call this revolutions, the thing of God and his working of things from one period to another, how…. They call them necessities of men's creations." This meant that to deny that the English rebellions were God's work was to deny God's sovereignty. Thus Cromwell warns people of thinking that revolutions were only human design: they were part of God's predestined will. However, as Hill points out, Cromwell also uses the word in the modern understanding. Still in these and other texts the word revolution was used in plural, rather than in singular form. Revolutions thus more or less meant "changes" rather than one big "revolution" as in the French Revolution. (Hill 1990, 90-92.)

When absolutism started to gain power again in Europe, uses of the term revolution seemed to diminish. The same development can also be documented in England: after the Long Parliament the word was still used, but its use started to become rare. This might implicate that the term was related to a new cycle of republicanism and tumults, which were not seen as noble after the reformation. (Hill 1990, 94-97; Rachum 1999, 54-55.)

As the three aforementioned sets of classical and early modern explanations for a regime change explain, political change has always been connected to some larger historical, astronomical, mystical or religious cycles. Although the classical and early modern philosophers did see that political change calls for real action of individuals, religious and political sects, they, however, believed that the political change was a part of some larger cosmological changes beyond human powers. On the other hand, looking at the conceptual history of revolution in the early modern period, it is obvious that

---

254 John Dunn defines, following Hatto (1949), that "Before 1789 there was no word in any world language which carries the meaning of the modern word "revolutionary" (the intentional agent of revolution); and the word "revolution" (which figures in a variety of European languages) was in no sense an important instrument of political understanding." (Dunn 1989, 334-335.) Dunn says that Condorcet was perhaps the first who used the concept of *révolutionnaire* in *Journal d'instruction sociale*, June 1, 1793. (Dunn 1989, 335, footnote 2.)

the concept of revolution had some crucial modern elements long before The Glorious Revolution in 1688 and the French Revolution 1789. There was evidently a shift in the concept of revolution from the strictly astrological and mystical connotations to the political one. Still, we must realize that the concept was not very popular and it was, at least partly, a special concept that was connected perhaps more to a republican and democratic political movement, than to the absolutist and royalist political jargon. This is the context that widens and clarifies our interpretation concerning the way in which Hobbes uses, or does not use, the concept of revolution in his philosophy.

5.3 Hobbes's Conception of Revolution

In Hobbes's major work on philosophy, *De Corpore*, the word revolution appears several times. In chapter *XXVI*, Hobbes gives the following example[255]:

> The causes of different seasons of the year, and of the several variations of days and nights in all the parts of the superficies of the earth, have been demonstrated, first by Copernicus, and since by Kepler, Galileus, and others, from the supposition of the earth's diurnal revolution [*revolutionem*] about its own axis, together with its annual motion about the sun in the ecliptic according to the order of the signs; and thirdly, by the annual revolution of the same earth about its own centre, contrary to the order of the signs. (Hobbes DCOE, XXVI, 6. pp. 427-428; pp.lat. 348-349.)

This example demonstrates how Hobbes understood the term revolution in the physical and astronomical context. Revolution means the circular motion; it is a route that a body travels in a space in a certain time. It is evident that Hobbes knew the concept of revolution in its astronomical meaning rather well. The word was a central part of the radical astronomical discourse in the early modern period. For Hobbes it was not a problem to state that planets revolve around the sun, since it was more or less the current understanding of the audience that Hobbes was writing to. Later on Hobbes referred several times to this theory of the circulation of the planets with the term revolution in his work concerning physics *Decameron Physiologicum* (Hobbes DP, 102-104; 165) and in a mathematical context in his *Six Lessons for the Professors of Mathematics* (Hobbes SL, 214-215; 218; 261; 310).

Yet, when we start to look for other uses of the word revolution in Hobbes's philosophy, especially the political ones, we notice that the word is more absent than present. In Hobbes's texts, the concept of revolution, unlike rebellion, sedition or tumult, is a very rare one. Hobbes uses rebellion most often when he describes an action that tries to topple the dominant power.

---

255 Another, similar example can be found from the chapter *XXI of circular motion*. Here Hobbes states that: "Coroll. From hence it is manifest that those two annual motions which Copernicus ascribes to the earth, are reducible to this one circular simple motion, by which all the points of the moved body are carried always with equal velocity, that is, in equal times they make equal revolutions uniformly." (Hobbes DCOE, XXI, 2, p. 320; p. lat. 261.)

Rebellion is something that calls subjects to unite for war against the sovereign power and thus returns the hostile stage of war into the commonwealth. Hence, according to Hobbes, rebellion is against the law of nature and its natural outcome is slaughter. (Hobbes L, XV, 7. p. 98; XXVIII, 23. p. 210; XXX, 4. p. 223. XXXI, 40. p.244.) Rebellion is the term, among such terms as sedition, tumult etc., that Hobbes uses dozens of times in his texts, always with a negative connotation as an action against the ones who hold the sovereign power.

Unlike rebellion, the word revolution is used only once in *The Elements of Law*, and in *De Cive* the word revolution is not even mentioned.[256] In *Leviathan*, Hobbes introduces the term revolution on the last page of the book. *De Corpore* introduces an astronomical understanding of revolution and *Behemoth* echoes politically this astronomical understanding. In what follows, we scrutinize these rare political uses of revolution in Hobbes's texts and try to understand, how Hobbes conceived this problematic term.

The first instance where we meet the concept of revolution in Hobbes's work is his translation of Thucydides' *Peloponnesian Warre* in 1629. Here the decision to use the concept of revolution is made by no one else but Hobbes, since the original Greek word is μεταβολε (*metabole)*. *Metabole* is a general term related to motion which especially denotes a change in kind, as for example, when a person gets old, or when leafs turn from green to yellow in the autumn. Metabole is also a term that is related to regime change and other political upheavals. Let us see what Hobbes makes Thucydides say:

> For what I have spoken of the city hath by these, and such as these, been achieved. Neither would praises and actions appear so levelly concurrent in many other of the Grecians as they do in these, the present revolution of these men's lives seeming unto me an argument of their virtues, noted in the first act thereof and in the last confirmed. (Hobbes THUPW, 2.42. p. 196.)[257]

---

256 Even though Hobbes did not use the term revolution (*revolutio*) in *De Cive*, when reading Chapter XII, paragraph 9 of the newest English translation (2003) of the book we find that the term revolution is used. The comparison between the original Latin version and the translation made by Silverthorne and Tuck reveals the evident confusion in the translation. The original is: "Quod autem ij qui videntur sibi totâ ciuitatis mole oppressi, proni ad seditiones sint; quedque nouis rebus delectentur, quibus praesentes nocent, satis per se manifestum est." (Hobbes DC, XII, 9. p. 293.) The English translation says: "It is pretty obvious that those who believe themselves to be carrying the whole massive burden of the commonwealth are prone to sedition; and those who are hurting in current conditions are glad for revolution." (Hobbes DCE, XII, 9. p. 138.) The same mistake is repeated in the next paragraph, paragraph ten: "Ideoque mirum non est, si rerum novarum occasiones cupidis animis opperiantur." (Hobbes DC, XII, 10. p. 293.) Silverthorne and Tuck have translated this as: "Hence it is not surprising if they passionately expect opportunities for revolution." (Hobbes DCE, XII, 10. p. 138.) We do not know why Silverthorne and Tuck have translated the words *novae res* ("new things") with the word revolution. What is clear, however, is that they are pushing a rather modern and atypical word into Hobbes's language, which seems to be an obvious mistake when we look at how Hobbes generally uses, or does not use, the term revolution. It is clear that in this chapter Hobbes is talking about the internal causes that lead to the dissolution of the state. He does not however use the term revolution in this context.

257 Similar use of the term revolution is to be found in Hobbes THUPW, 2.52. pp. 207-209.

It is interesting that Hobbes has chosen revolution to describe these "changes". In this case, Hobbes seems to use revolution in a similar way as Shakespeare did in his *Henry IV*, where he uses revolution to describe the change of a person's position in the world.[258] As we have noted before, the term revolution was still rather rare in the beginning of the 17th century and mostly used in astronomy. What is important is that Hobbes does not use revolution to refer to the political revolutions or rebellion, which could have been possible in the case of Thucydides, but it is still obvious that he already knew the word by the end of 1620s and used it in different meaning than the astronomical one.

The second time that the concept of revolution appears is in the *English Works IV* that includes *The Elements of Law* as two separate texts: *Human Nature* and *De Corpore Politico*. Here the title of *De Corpore Politico* is following:

> De Corpore Politico or the Elements of Law, Moral and Politic, with discourses upon several heads: as Of The Law of Nature; of Oaths and Covenants; of Several Kinds of Government; with The Changes and Revolutions of Them. (Hobbes EL, 77.)

Even though the term revolution appears in the title, the term "revolution" is not used in the text of *De Corpore Politico* itself. It is also uncertain who has added this title to Hobbes's manuscript. However, as the title of *De Corpore Politico* provides an opportunity to interpret *The Elements of Law* as if it would concern revolution we are able to analyse it from this perspective.

De Corpore Politico consists of ten chapters, all concerning political issues starting from the formation of a commonwealth, ending with the reasons that tend to break a commonwealth down. Some chapters discuss the relationship between the sovereign, the church and divine authority. Especially chapters II and VIII delve into the kinds of matters that can be linked to the concept of revolution. In Chapter II of *De Corpore Politico*, Hobbes presents his idea of the relationship between democracy, aristocracy and monarchy. This chapter also concerns, along with chapter I, the generation, or in the Hobbesian language, the institution of the Commonwealth. Chapter VIII deals with another classical theme, the corruption or dissolution of the commonwealth. Hence Hobbes comments on the classical theme concerning the birth and death of the body politic, the generation and corruption of the political power in Chapter VIII. As we have seen, classically this question had semi-mystical and naturalistic answers along with political, ethical and economic answers. Hobbes's answers differ significantly from the earlier approaches.

In Chapter II of *De Corpore Politico*, Hobbes explains the order in which different forms of government, democracy, aristocracy and monarchy, take place after the sovereign power is erected. As we remember from the previous chapter, the first instance of the government for Hobbes is always democracy.[259]

---

258 In part two, act three, scene one of the play *Henry IV* states: "O God! that one might read the book of fate, / And see the revolution of the times / Make mountains level, and the continent, / Weary of solid firmness, / melt itself Into the sea;" (Shakespeare 1966.)

259 In *Horae Subsecivae*, the earliest work known by Hobbes today, Hobbes sees that the first form of the state is accidental. (Hobbes HST, 31.)

Considering revolution and regime change, what should be noted here are the changes from one form of government to another. The change from a multitude (in a state of nature) to a people (*demos*) is a work of man's political skills and art. It is an outcome of vote where the major part gives its voice and authority to a democratic meeting. Thus, according to Hobbes, there is no historical *telos* or necessity involved in this act. For Hobbes democracy, or any other form of government, was not historically or cosmologically destined: political order could not exist "naturally". Democracy is the first in order both historically and logically since otherwise it would be impossible for Hobbes to argue as he does in his theory of the social contract, that is, to claim that the origin of the commonwealth lies in the mutual contract, nothing else. Whether Hobbes is right or wrong in his theory is not important. Rather it is the logic that he sets against the classical understanding concerning the erection, development and changing of the state-forms that is interesting.

In Hobbes's vision the cause for the change from democracy to aristocracy or monarchy is the political action of a people. Organized as a body politic, as a democratic meeting, the people has the possibility to govern itself as a democracy or to continue to more sophisticated, secure and effective ways of governing. In Hobbes's view, the main reason why democracy should be avoided is its closeness to the multitude and the state of nature: that is to the absence of all political rule. Hence, people have to develop their political governance further. Building up an aristocracy or a monarchy is realised by another contract that the people make with the sovereign power, such as a monarch.

To build up a monarchy, what are needed are two contracts; first the constitutive contract that separates a people from the multitude and then a transfer of the people's power to a sovereign such as a monarch. What is utmost important here is that these kinds of contracts are understood as a development and hence, outcomes of the free deliberation by the people. Moving from one state-form to another is not dependent on any cosmological or natural cycle, or on the corruption of certain persons, like classical thought suggested. It happens, primarily, because men are willing to develop their commonwealths, that is, due to political action. If the political governance fails for some reason, the whole body politic is shattered and it reverts to the state of nature and multitude. Thus, the outcome of the rebellion is not, according to Hobbes, a new and transformed body politic, but instead, the death of a body politic. This gives us rather strong evidence in favour of the fact that Hobbes did not support action that we might call today "revolutionary".

Things leading to the dissolution of the commonwealth are analyzed more deeply in chapter VIII of *De Corpore Politico*. Here rebellion is the main subject of the chapter and it is linked to the destruction of the commonwealth. It seems that Hobbes simply wants to explain how rebellion is always wrong in the commonwealth and following from this, he condemns all rebellious action. Hobbes states that the reasons for rebellion are discontent, pretence and hope of success. He writes: "when the same are all together, there wanteth nothing thereto, but a man of credit to set up the standard, and to blow trumpet."

(Hobbes EL, VIII, 1. p. 201.) Here again, the internal reason for the dissolution of the commonwealth can be found from people's action. Hobbes does not offer a totally "natural" or deterministic explanation for the dissolution of the commonwealth. In fact, in the commonwealth human nature by itself is not enough to produce anything: political activity and even political philosophy is needed to bring out the, wanted or unwanted, effect from human nature.

In addition to human activity, rebellion also needs political organization. When describing the third general reason for rebellion, the hope of success, Hobbes separates four different conditions: "I. That the discontented have mutual intelligence; II. That they have a sufficient number; III. That they have arms; IV. That they agree upon a head." (Hobbes EL, VIII, 11. p. 209.) What happens when these conditions are fulfilled is the formation of a sort of body politic inside the body politic, which means that the logic of the multitude, competition over the leadership and sovereignty of the state, starts to rule. Only an organized group of people can attack the sovereign power inside the commonwealth, but while people organize to attack the sovereign power they simultaneously plant a seed of anarchy, since Hobbes sees there can be only one political organization in commonwealth. Among these things, good orators are needed who spread the word of rebellion and turn people against the sovereign. Hobbes claims that the human nature starts to work in favour of bad intentions if there is no political education and organization opposing those agitating forces. In short, the logic of the multitude is erected when people start to plan rebellion.

From Hobbes's analysis of the causes of rebellion it becomes clear that what we nowadays call revolutionary action, is for Hobbes a rebellion. Comparing rebellion and rebellious plans to Ovid's story of *Medea* from *Metamorphoses*[260] Hobbes claims that rebellions never succeed in restoring the original powers of Commonwealth or in creating a new one:

> The daughters of Pelias, king of Thessaly, desiring to restore their old decrepit father to the vigour of his youth, by councel of Medea, chopped him in pieces, and set him a boiling with I know not what herbs in a cauldron, but could not revive him again. So when eloquence and want of judgement go together, want of judgement, like the daughters of Pelias, consenteth, through eloquence, which is as the witchcraft of Medea, to cut the commonwealth in pieces, upon pretence or hope of reformation, which when things are in combustion, they are not able to effect. (Hobbes EL, VIII, 15. p. 212.)[261]

---

260 See Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, book VII, 179-293 where Medea rejuvenates Aeson (Ovidius 1971).

261 This same story is repeated, with even more clarifying words with a direct reference to multitude in *De Cive*: "in the manner in which once upon a time (as the story goes) the daughters of *Pelias*, king of Thessaly conspired with *Medea* against their father. Wishing to restore a decrepit old man to his youth, they cut him in pieces by the advice of *Medea* and placed him on the fire to cook, in the vain hope that he would be rejuvenated. In the same manner the mob [multitudo] in their stupidity, like the daughters of *Pelias*, desiring to renew their old commonwealth and led by the eloquence of ambitious men as by the sorcery of *Medea*, more often split it into factions and waste it with fire than reform it. (Hobbes DCE, XII, 13. pp. 140-141; p. lat. 296.)

Rebellion will not work, says Hobbes in *The Elements of Law* and he repeats this view in full in all his other political texts. In another words, rebellions will never turn out to be revolutions in the classical (restoring original powers and order) or modern (creating a new political power and order) sense. Hobbes is definitely against any rebellious action, since the end will be a civil war, anarchy and non-rule of the multitude – not restored or reformed powers of commonwealth.

Perhaps it was for these reasons that Hobbes avoided the term revolution in *The Elements of Law* as well as in the other works where he treats these matters: rebellion is a strict, clear definition of negative action against the sovereign power, which is connected to the dissolution and destruction of the state. Revolution instead is a vague term that refers to astronomical cycles and returning of something that has been lost, which is completely opposite to what Hobbes wants to say in his political theory: for him, the political power is never the return of some old power but is always connected to building and maintaining something "new".

Hobbes's major work, *Leviathan,* was labelled by Bishop Bramhall as a "rebels catechism". Hobbes indeed writes about the dangers of rebellion in his book, but the word revolution is used sparingly. Actually, he uses the term only once when referring to the current situation in England after the Civil Wars when the commonwealth of England was about to be established. Hobbes writes:

> And thus I have brought to an end my Discourse of Civil and Ecclesiastical Government, occasioned by the disorders of the present time, without partiality, without application, and without other design, than to set before men's eyes the mutual relation between protection and obedience; of which the condition of human nature, and laws divine (both Natural and Positive) require an inviolable observation. And though in the revolution of states, there can be no very good constellation for truths of this nature to be born under, (as having an angry aspect from the dissolvers of an old government, and seeing but the backs of them that erect a new;) yet I cannot think it will be condemned at this time, either by the public judge of doctrine, or by any that desires the continuance of public peace." (Hobbes L, A Review, and Conclusion. p. 475.)

It is possible to understand Hobbes's usage of the term revolution in two different registers. In the first register, it seems that the term refers to the astronomical idea of revolution by pointing to the "constellation". Hobbes is obviously talking about the moment of birth of his masterpiece. It is possible to interpret that his book, which immediately caused wide controversies and threatened Hobbes's safety, too, was not the kind of work that would get praise from its readers. In this sense, *Leviathan* is a book "born under the bad stars" and the reason for the wrong constellation is the revolution of states, the English Commonwealth especially. The real reason for neglect of his work might derive from the fact that Hobbes sees that his "truths" might have favored the royalists more than the "democratic men" who now held power.

The second interpretation is connected to the fact that in *Leviathan* Hobbes sees the revolution as a kind of breaking point. There are those who have

dissolved the old government and those who are about the erect the new one. This idea of revolution is reminiscent the modern idea of revolution. The revolution is a breaking point, a sort of *kairos* that separates the old era from the new one. At the end of the Civil Wars, Hobbes might have seen the new day rising and might have thought that the times had truly changed for the good. Something was surely different after the period of Civil Wars and the victory of Cromwell. The old regime surely seemed to be history and it was time for building up a new regime. Perhaps Hobbes thought that his *Leviathan* would become a cornerstone of the new Commonwealth of England, even though he later clearly denied that he wrote *Leviathan* in favor of the Cromwellian regime.[262]

Hence, the modern reader might easily think that in *Leviathan* Hobbes uses the concept of revolution in a rather modern way. This is, however, a false interpretation. It is impossible to imagine why Hobbes would have suddenly started to promote "revolutionary" action, because he restated his distaste for rebellion in *Leviathan* in a similar tone as in The *Elements of Law* and *De Cive*. There is not enough evidence either to prove that Hobbes wanted to appeal to Cromwell or other "revolutionaries". At least the use of the word revolution does not reveal anything significant in this matter. Certainly he does not refer to the cosmological circulation of the state forms, as the Finnish translation of *Leviathan* suggests while translating revolution with the word "kiertokulku", that is, "cycle" or "circulation" (Hobbes LF, 587).

Nonetheless, what is interesting is that we encounter the idea of the circulation of the sovereign power from the very last political work of Hobbes, *Behemoth.* In this dialogue the major problem for Hobbes is that no one seems to have learned anything from the Civil Wars. Just before Charles II was put back to the throne the situation in England was nearly the same as it was at the beginning of war. The Rump parliament was almost the same as the parliament in 1640, except for those who had died. Most of the members of the parliament were Presbyterians. In Hobbes' words: "They had learned nothing. The major part was now again Presbyterian" (Hobbes B, 202). He continues: "But I have not yet observed in the Presbyterians any oblivion of their former principles. We are but returned to the state we were in at the beginning of the sedition." (Hobbes B, 203-204).

Like a planet revolving around the sun, the political power seemed to return to the original place where it had begun. Nevertheless, this is only one part of the story. Another character in the dialogue, called A, denies this kind of "revolution" without progress. In his opinion something had changed, and this concerned the omnipotent power of the sovereign. Before the Civil Wars, says

---

262 In his *Considerations Upon the Reputation, &c. Of Thomas Hobbes*, he writes that: "To that other charge, *that he writ his Leviathan in defence of Oliver's title*, he will say, that you in your own conscience know it is false. What was Oliver, when that book came forth?" After explaining the position of Cromwell in relation to his book he says that: "Then primarily his *Leviathan* was intended for you masters of the Parliament, because the strength was then in them." (Hobbes CRLMR, 420.) Here Hobbes admits that he wrote for those who possessed the sovereign power, but this does not mean that he favoured "revolution" or rebellion in any way.

A, the King had no simple rule over the militia. Now the parliament had decided that the King was the only one who had the rule over the militia. Even the parliament itself could not argue against the King if he chose to use his power. This act means, for Hobbes at least, that the same kind of propagandist and seditious movement inside the Commonwealth would not be possible again. The King now had something that Hobbes wanted him to have: power over the disordered violence of the rebellious multitude. This suggests that Hobbes sees some progress in the events of the civil war and in fact, that his own idea of the omnipotent sovereign power, and especially the power of monarch, is now properly established.

Eventually, at the last lines of *Behemoth* Hobbes says something very important concerning the concept of revolution:

> I have seen in this revolution a circular motion of the sovereign power through two usurpers - father and son - from the late King to this his son. For (leaving out the power of the council of Officers, which was but temporary, and no otherwise owned by them but in trust) it moved from King Charles I to the Long Parliament; from thence to the Rump; from the Rump to Oliver Cromwell; and then back again from Richard Cromwell to the Rump; thence to the Long Parliament; and thence to King Charles II, where long may it remain. (Hobbes B, 204.)

What we see here is something extraordinary: Hobbes presents the whole period of the English civil wars as a single revolution. The idea is not that of upheaval, but rather of the fact that the sovereign power first resided with a king, then departed from him and then returned back to another king, through symmetric phases that formed a beautiful circle.

Hobbes writes as if the sovereign power really was something separate from the person who carries it. Here he undisputedly applies his own theory of sovereignty to the events of the Civil War. Nevertheless, he does not see any serious lack of sovereignty at any phase of revolution, or problems of democratic government, which are otherwise so important for his political theory. He does not even claim that the form of sovereignty changed in some way at any point of the revolution. This means that Hobbes sees the *same* body politic and its sovereignty existing continually during the "revolution", only the representatives' of that sovereign power change.

In Hobbes's view, the English Civil Wars did not include an end of sovereignty and a beginning of a new one. Instead of this, the sovereignty moved from one person to another and from one form of government to another, from one parliament to another. This is a very strong argument from Hobbes, considering that in the English Civil Wars the absolute monarchy had ended and the Commonwealth of England had been established. Hobbes denies any kinds of change in sovereignty. Applying Hobbes's own concepts to this case, this would mean that the social contract that in some phase of history had established The Kingdom of England did not vanish during the "rebellion". We can only guess why Hobbes changed his mind in this matter, but what is evident is that his usage of the concept of revolution gets a whole new level at the very end of the last book of politics he ever wrote. One reason might be that

he was convinced of the superiority of the monarchy and he ridiculed the revolutionary writers by stating that in the end it is the monarchy - and an even better monarchy than before - that returns. The Kingdom of England had not dissolved into a multitude but instead reformed itself as a monarchy.

What we note from our inquiry concerning Hobbes's concept of revolution is that for Hobbes the revolution was not a proper political concept that he would willingly use. This might follow from several reasons, but it is obvious that Hobbes did not want to use widely this problematic concept, which was linked to heavenly cycles and rebellious, perhaps to republican and democratic political action. Generally Hobbes's idea was to defend the idea that once the commonwealth is erected, it lasts as long as people sustain it by their own action. Rebellious action is subversive for the state and nothing good can follow from it. Hence, "revolutionary" action was self-evidently doomed by Hobbes, since supporting the subversive powers means an attack against sovereign power and thus it means to enhance the spread of the logic of multitude in commonwealth. Rebelling against the sovereign power does not establish a new and better power, but instead collapses the whole commonwealth back to the state of nature. Yet, the curious anomaly in this logic that we find, *Behemoth* tells us that in the end Hobbes completely understood the political nature of the revolution. At the end of *Behemoth* Hobbes introduces a conservative idea of revolution, by stating that in the motion in which the body politic travels in time there is no collapse of the sovereign power, but instead an even better form of monarchy is reached by this revolution, which actually included the slip to the reign of a kind of "democratic" parliament that Hobbes otherwise conceived as almost as a non-government of the multitude.

6 MULTITUDE OF STATES OR INTERNATIONAL MULTITUDE?

State is limited in timely perspective both by its generation and corruption by the multitude. The ordered motion of the body politic is possible only as long as it is separated from the chaotic multitude, that is, only as long as the form of the state prevails. Hobbes allows certain limits for the mutations and metamorphoses of the state (a government can be changed from democratic to monarchic for example), but radical revolutions are out of question: the state must be recognizable by its motions, otherwise it will be like an animal suffering of hydrophobia as Hobbes vividly explains. (Hobbes L, XXIX, 14. p. 217.)

Now, following from this we must ask how the body politic moves and lives in the spatial dimension? Are states and sovereigns absolutely "free" like individuals in the state of nature, or are there confines to the life of states. And if there are confines for the states in the international field, what are these confines? Are states responsible for other states and nations, or only for their own citizens? What kind of field is the alleged "international state of nature"? Is the result of the absolute freedom of the states the congestion where nothing develops or changes? The answers to these questions can be found by re-reading Hobbes's ideas concerning international relations along with the concepts of multitude and motion.

In this re-reading our aim is to go beyond the typical dichotomy concerning Hobbes's international relations theory. Most scholars choose sides between the anti-moral / moral or "minimalist" and "maximalist" Hobbes as Haig Patapan (2009, 13-15) calls the two approaches. According to Patapan, the "minimalist" interpretation is endorsed by the classical realist school of international relations and it sees the international relations between states as a "state of nature". According to this "standard" interpretation there is no place for morality in international relations. The "maximalist" interpretation instead states that the laws of nature have much more importance for Hobbes and thus, there is also more place for morality and cooperation in IR.

In our re-reading we explain why both of these interpretations are possible and how, in fact, they both are essential parts of Hobbes's international political theory. Thus, we do not see Hobbes only as a cynical supporter of egoistic power politics of the states as the traditional realist interpretation claims, or as a semi-liberal author of the international society, who leaves a place for moral action in international relations as the liberal and rationalist interpretations claim. In our reading both of these interpretations are too narrow and they do not easily fit to Hobbes's, at times rather paradoxical, way of writing concerning political theory, which emphasizes both the necessity of moral action for the sovereign and the inevitable right to take care of the state's self-interest by any possible means. In our reading we are not trying to solidify our interpretation too much on either format, but instead see the obvious paradoxical aspect of Hobbes's IR as an essential feature which enhances the possibilities for sovereign power to act in the international field.

Our re-reading of Hobbes's international relations is framed by two conceptualizations which aim to help in the analysis of Hobbes's understanding of IR. One should note that these readings are meant to be suggestive, not exhaustive. The first one of these is named "multitude of states" which refers to Hobbes's normative theory of IR. As we will see, it is this normative theory which is traditionally read as Hobbes's theory of international relations. In our understanding we see this normative model as a rather stagnant and passive field of international relations.

The second approach to Hobbes's IR is titled "international multitude". This title refers to a re-reading which presents Hobbes's own descriptions of his contemporary international field. We depart here from the critique given by Navari (1982, 212-214), who claims that Hobbes's text's on IR are "logical", not descriptive. Our aim is to show that we can use both a logical and a descriptive reading with Hobbes. In the descriptive reading, the fact that Hobbes really portrayed the international relations of his time is especially relevant while reading *Behemoth*. However, the logical, or what we call here the normative, reading of Hobbes is more plausible in the earlier works on political theory, although one can also find descriptive fragments from *Leviathan* for example.

Thus, while the "multitude of states" reading offers the state as a basic unit of international relations, reading international relations from the viewpoint of an "international multitude" instead, highlights the fact that in Hobbes's descriptions of the international field there are several other operating agents as well: states, corporations, churches, individuals and different political factions and movements all belong to this "international multitude". Thus, by offering a reading of the international multitude we are able to sketch out the political problem of the international field in Hobbes's texts.

Reading Hobbes from the viewpoint of the multitude, his normative answer to international politics, which is given in his idea of the "multitude of states", becomes reasonable and theoretically acceptable. Hence, it is through the reading of the concept of multitude in Hobbes's IR that enables us to re-evaluate the former claims by the realists, anti-realists and contemporary philosophical interpretations as well.

6.1 Hobbes and the Theory of International Relations

The heritage of the Realist school of international relations significantly marks Hobbes's position in the theory of international relations and world politics.[263] While the supporters of the realist school, and the realist approach to politics in general see Hobbes as a clearheaded forefather of the 20th century international system, the critics such as anti-realists and liberals have claimed that Hobbes and the realist school are fundamentally wrong in their interpretation pertaining international politics. Some scholars have also endeavoured to point out how Hobbes's view on the international relations is not in fact realist at all, but instead rationalist or constructive. There is also a more recent way of interpreting Hobbes's texts on the international relations not as descriptions or models for the international field, but simply as historical texts reflecting his own time (contextualism).[264] Thus, we have several, competing ways of interpreting Hobbes's political theory from the perspective of international relations.[265] For this reason, we must see how, firstly, the standard and advanced realism has interpreted Hobbes and after this, secondly, what kind of criticism the anti-realists, liberals and thirdly the more recent philosophical and history of political thought type of interpretations have provided.

---

263 It is a widely accepted view that Hobbes is the grandfather of the classical realism and his views of anarchical relations between states are repeated in several introductions of the international relations theory (see for example Weber 2005, 14-17; Brown 1997, 21-122; Walker 1993, 105-124).

264 Malcolm, who criticizes the earlier realist and anti-realist interpretations states rather harshly that "…the interpretation of Hobbes put forward by modern international relation theorists, meanwhile, has become fixed and ossified, functioning at best as an 'ideal type' and at worst as a caricature." (Malcolm 2004, 433.)

265 We should note, however, that traditionally Hobbes's IR –theory has not been a very crucial part of Hobbes scholarship. Even though there is nowadays a greater amount of research on these questions, basic introductions to Hobbes's philosophy still do not recognize his theory of IR as an important part of his philosophy. As Noel Malcolm (2004, 432, footnote 2) states, only a few books on Hobbes offer any speculation about the theme. Some recent introductions to Hobbes's thought do not mention this theme at all (see for example Béal 2010). The same goes with more established editions on Hobbes. See for example *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes's Leviathan* (edited by Patricia Sprinborg) or *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes* (edited by Tom Sorrell). Even an article by M.M. Goldsmiths' *Hobbes on Law* in this latter edition does not pay any relevant interest in Hobbes's view of the question of the law of nations in relation to natural law. There are also other sources that one would assume to have something to say about international relations and the law of nations, but several important texts remain silent on these matters. See for example Luc Foisneau's article "*Leviathan's* Theory of Justice" in *Leviathan After 350 years* (edited by Luc Foisneau and Tom Sorrell). Similarly, although Franck Lessay's book *Souveraineté et légitimité chez Hobbes* (1988) is one of the most profound works concerning the relationship between sovereignty, law, right and legitimity, it does not concern itself with the problem of the law of nations as a separate chapter and has in this sense very little to say about international relations. Again, Jean Terrel's book *Hobbes, matérialisme et politique* (1994) also treats the laws of nature in a profound way, but does not say much about the relationship between the natural law and the law of nations. Another problem is that there is not much dialogue between IR and political philosophy concerning Hobbes's theory, as it is pointed out by Navari 1982; Malcolm 2004 and Armitage 2007.

Firstly, concerning realism, it can be stated that for the classical realists Hobbes was a true representative of the international system where the independent state is the principal actor. The classical realists typically used Hobbes's texts and theory in a rather narrow way. They used, for example, the Hobbesian idea that human nature is wicked and negative as their starting point in the analysis of the international system. Following from the argument on human nature they also argued that it is possible to compare individuals and states[266]: since the state of individuals without common power is the disposition of war of every man against every man, the same must be the case with states.[267]

They also endorse the idea that human beings are egoists and hence, states are egoists, too: The states must gather power, resources and learn to survive at the "state of nature".[268] Hence, the only reasonable outcome is power politics.[269] Following from this egoism, states act like human beings in the state of nature: they strive for more and more power. Thus, states are understood to be, in Hobbes's words, as "Gladiators, having their weapons pointing, and their eyes fixed to one another." (Hobbes L, XIII, 12. p. 85.)

Yet, we must note, the realists do not usually assume that states would be in a constant, total war of every state against every state. Instead, states are in the disposition of war and the main motivation for their action is the safety of their citizens, *salus populi suprema lex*, as Hobbes stated it. What prevails is rather a balance of power than a state of war. However, as Malcolm points out, one of the basic faults of classical realism is to mix individual psychology with political action of the states: Hobbes's theory of power should not be seen as psychological, as Carr and Morgenthau do, but instead, it should be understood as analytical. (Malcolm 2004, 433; 442.)

---

266 We can find, of course, a very simple definition sustaining this view from Hobbes. In the *Elements of Law* the formulation is: "For that which is the law of nature between man and man, before the constitution of commonwealth, is the law of nations between sovereign and sovereign, after." (Hobbes EL, X, 10. p. 228.) These kinds of formulations made by Hobbes are taken very seriously in realism, where the idea is that the "Hobbesian state […] is little more than Hobbesian man writ large" as Malcolm states. Malcolm points out that this parallelism is not true in Hobbes's philosophy: it can be made only at the juridical level, not at the moral. It is simply impossible to compare the individual and state in every respect. (Malcolm 2004, 434; 443.) Navari, 1982, instead states that some theorists of IR use Hobbes's theory of individuals as a model of IR and others as a description of IR. According to Navari, Hobbes would have been in accord with the model interpretation, but not with the description. (Navari 1982, 203-204.)

267 As Hanson states, this assumption is rather difficult with Hobbes since Hobbes's ultimate aim was to show a "highway to peace" (Hanson 1994, 333).

268 Kavka, among many others, sees that according to Hobbes human beings are naturally egoistic (see Kavka 1986, 44-51). Following from this assumption states are seen to behave equally in a self-interested and egoistic way in the state of nature of states. Sometimes this assumption is accompanied with rational choice theories such as the game theory, which allegedly explains international relations (see especially Hungerland 1989; Newey 2011, 58).

269 See Navari 1982 who questions the views of John Vincent in his article "The Hobbesian Tradition in Twentieth Century International Thought". According to Navari, we should not interpret Hobbes's description of the state of nature as a "guide to political behaviour" (Navari 1982, 206).

It is evident that the realist interpretation of Hobbes's philosophy is rather narrow and simple. Usually they use only *Leviathan*, and often refer only to chapters 13 and 14 from book I as their source and they do not even try to have a wider reading or perspective on Hobbes.[270] One reason, as has been repeated several times, might be that Hobbes did not write that much about international relations.[271] Still, one must acknowledge that the picture of Hobbes offered by the realists is not accurate or true: several too far-fetched conclusions have been made on the basis of a few narrow definitions and statements.[272] Usually Hobbes is used in these texts in the same manner as other classics: their whole theory is confined to represent some narrow point of view or argument, which serves the purpose of the writer.[273] Yet, we must remember that the truthful interpretation of the classics was not their aim either. None of the realists were scholars of intellectual history or political theory but instead scholars of political science and sometimes political actors in the Post-World-War period.

Unlike realists, neorealists such as Kenneth Waltz etc. have a vague relationship to Hobbes, since on the one hand they accept basic realist assumptions concerning Hobbes, but on the other hand they also offer new and wider interpretations of Hobbes's thought. Still, when it comes to Hobbes, the neorealist interpretation does not offer anything profoundly new when compared to classical realism.

The so called "English School" of international relations or the "rationalists" criticized the idea of anarchy between the states as well, but they did not totally abandon Hobbes as an important theorist. According to them the international sphere is characterized at best by the international society, not by the system of states.[274] The principle of anarchy in realism is based on the

---

270 Among several examples we can list a couple of the most important here: Morghentau's *Politics among nations* refers only to *Leviathan*. The same is the case in E.H. Carr's *Twenty Years' Crisis* that uses many fragments from Hobbes, but they are always from *Leviathan*. Also the neorealists confine themselves mainly to *Leviathan*. See for example Keohane (ed. 1986) *Neorealism and its critics* that refers only to *Leviathan* although there are several references to Hobbes. Like others, Hedley Bull (1977) refers also only to *Leviathan* in his *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. Donald W. Hanson summarizes well the basic problem of the realist interpretation: "…the reading of Hobbes as the supreme realist of (at least) international political theory rests on a handful of his most striking phrases arbitrarily lifted out of a very carefully crafted and interdependent whole." (Hanson 1984, 332.)

271 See for example Hanson 1984, 331; Armitage 2007, 220.

272 Malcolm formulates this viewpoint in a very strict way: "It [that is, the standard realist interpretation] appears to be based, for the most part, on a handful of passages in one or two of his works (ignoring many comments on international affairs elsewhere in his writings); and even those few passages have been misunderstood." (Malcolm 2004, 435.) See also Hanson 1984, 331.

273 The classical realist writer and one of the very founders of the realist thought, E.H.Carr uses Hobbes as an important theorist in his book *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. However, all the references to Hobbes are quite narrow and they illustrate the general theory Carr is formulating with the help of other theorists and hence, although we do not have any reason to claim that Carr does not know his Hobbes, the picture he gives of Hobbes is somewhat limited. See for example Carr 2001, 63, 136 and 163.

274 Hedley Bull argued in 1977 that the concept of anarchy and the analogy between natural man and state is not very coherent. However, although Bull writes about

Hobbesian idea that in the state of nature every individual is equal with each other. Yet, it is indeed difficult to understand how states could be conceived as equal powers with each other as individual men are, as it has been noted by several authors.[275] This point, among several other crucial differences between Hobbes's philosophy and the realist assumptions, is highlighted by Navari.[276] Another important question following from this was why Hobbes did not propose a contract between states to build up a global state or government if his theory of states was equal with individuals. Thus, the pure rational-choice theory was put in question as well.[277]

Secondly, unlike the neorealists and the English school, the liberal tradition, which is critical towards the realist schools all together, instead throws out the baby, or in this case should we say the grandfather, with the bath water.[278] According to the liberals Hobbes has to go, since the realists have to go too. The principal critique against the realist school by the liberal tradition is that unlike the realists claim, there is, after all, space for moral and morality in the international field. The anti-realist critique claims instead that there is, actually and really, lots of moral factors affecting to the way we understand the international realm. However, the liberalist way of reading Hobbes is sometimes even narrower and their reading is also openly hostile: there is no effort of re-interpreting Hobbes or showing that the realist understanding is limited. Their aim is simply to attack realism and everything they represent. For this reason their reading of Hobbes's moral theory in the context of international relations is not plausible.

The third way of interpreting Hobbes's texts concerning international relations is mostly an outcome of reconsiderations concerning Hobbes's IR theory that began to emerge slowly after the 1970s. However, we must acknowledge that the amount of philosophical reinterpretations of Hobbes's theory is really small when considered in relation to the vast amount of literature published, and read, in the field of the IR theory.[279] What is important

---

Hobbes, he concentrates on showing how the contemporary world does not resemble the one of Hobbes's theory and does not give that much logical analysis between these two realms. See Bull 1977, 46-51. On the difference between the realist and rationalist interpretations on Hobbes, see Williams 1996, 213-215.

275 As Weber (2005) correctly states, anarchy is one of the central myths in international relations.

276 See Navari 1982, 207-212. Navari shows subtly how it is very difficult to derive the realist principles of international relations from Hobbes's philosophy. She conceives of Hobbes as a rationalist rather than a realist, a nominalist rather than empirist or historian etc. She also opposes Machiavelli and Hobbes, by stating that Hobbes does not resemble Machiavelli in his understanding of politics. The same aspect is later repeated in full by Malcolm (Malcolm 2004, 440-442). The most important thing that Navari points out is that for the realists all political life is one. Hobbes instead endorses the radical difference between the state of nature (apolitics) and the state (politics), for example.

277 On the critique against rational-choice theory see Williams 1996, 224-225.

278 The most important claims in this matter have been made by Beitz 1979, 13-66 and Walzer 1977.

279 Among others, these reinterpretations include such articles as Navari 1982; Hanson 1984 and a book edited by Airaksinen & Bertman 1989. However, there are also reinterpretations done by political scientists and theorists of international relations

is that most of these reinterpretations came from Hobbes scholars, who wanted to re-evaluate Hobbes's heritage in IR. In recent years these issues have gained even more new, special interest among Hobbes scholars.[280] The recent interpretations operate in a vast selection of different approaches like history of political thought, political theory and continental thought, not only in the confines of analytical philosophy.

However, even though the history of political thought type of interpretations on Hobbes operate beyond the rather restricting dichotomy between realism / anti-realism, the new interpretations are not free of these debates either. The anti-realist interpretations of Hobbesian IR –theory accused Hobbes and realists for the lack of proper emphasis on international morality. This problem set by the realist / anti-realist debate has also influenced the interpretations concerning the real meaning of Hobbes's international theory in political philosophy. Thus, the possibility of morality in international relations or in other words, the liberalist view of Hobbes's IR is an essential feature in the interpretations made by scholars of history of political thought, political philosophy and political theory.

Noel Malcolm, for example, claims that we should be able to distinguish between moral and juridical levels at Hobbes's theory of the right of nature and as an outcome, we all should subscribe to the view that a moral law exists in the state of nature and it limits the actions of the sovereign power, and individuals as well. (Malcolm 2004, 446-448.)

There is also another selection of interpretations too. As Newey (2011) sums up in his article "*Leviathan* and Liberal Moralism in International theory" there are at least liberal views (Malcolm), anti-realists (Covell 2004), rationalist (Bull et all.) and even constructivist interpretations (Wendt 1992; Williams 1996) on Hobbes's international thought in the contemporary literature. Newey's own idea is to promote a revised realist interpretation and he opposes liberal, rationalist and constructivist interpretations. A rather different aspect is given by Sorell, who opposes a narrow realist reading and points out that Hobbes was particularly interested in the economic well-being of the state and thus, he did not see international relations as hostile as realists have traditionally interpreted (Sorell 2011).

Common to all contemporary philosophical interpretations is that they do not try to apply Hobbes's theory to the contemporary world system or at least it

---

such as Heller (1980) in his article "The Use and Abuse of Hobbes: State of Nature in International Relations." We should also note the critical historical re-interpretations, most importantly the one made by David Armitage (2007) in his article *Hobbes and the Foundations of modern international thought*. He claims that interpreting Hobbes's theory of international relations as anarchic only represents the modern scholars' worldview and is thus anachronistic.

280 There are several recent articles on this matter. See for example the aforementioned article of Noel Malcolm (2004); A. Nuri Yurdusev (2007) "Thomas Hobbes and International Relations: An assessment" and Haig Patapan (2009) "The Glorious Sovereign: Thomas Hobbes' understanding of leadership and international relations." The latest and most ambitious effort in this field is a book *International Political Theory after Hobbes* edited by Raia Prokhovnik and Gabriella Slomp 2011. For a comprehensive list of literature in this field, see Armitage 2007, 221, footnote 10.

is not their primary interest.[281] Instead, they read and analyse Hobbes's texts and theory of international relations from a profoundly philosophical and historical perspective, highlighting the fact that Hobbes's international theory must be consistent with other parts of his philosophy. Still, there remains a wide disagreement among scholars.

In sum, we can conclude that the debate over Hobbes's theory of international relations has become more vivid during the recent years. Simultaneously, there is increasing interest in theorizing the international relations both in IR and political theory, since the traditional distinction between domestic and foreign politics is becoming ever more blurred. This is a good starting point for re-reading Hobbes's political philosophy, since it is such an important theory in both disciplines as Prokhovnik and Slomp point out. (Prokhovnik & Slomp 2011, 1.)

6.2 Re-Reading Hobbes's Theory of International Relations

The aim of our re-reading is to offer the widest possible reading instead of the standard, rather narrow reading of Hobbes's IR. Firstly, we have to reconsider the texts that serve as the basis of our understanding of Hobbes's IR. As it has already been stated, traditionally *Leviathan* has been the main source. Along with *Leviathan*, our reading offers some insights into Hobbes's IR from such texts as *The Elements of Law* and *De Cive*. What is even more important is that we re-read *Behemoth or the Long Parliament* as an important texts concerning IR. We claim that *Behemoth* greatly elucidates Hobbes's understanding of international politics and it is indeed a very different source compared to *Leviathan*.

From this we arrive to the second aspect of our re-reading. While the traditional reading of Hobbes has been rather restricted when it comes to the depth of interpretation, our aim is to offer a reading that goes beyond explicit excerpts concerning the relations of states. Thus, we are seeking for texts that describe, comment or normatively demand something that we consider to be "international". From this basis we build a reconstruction that highlights both descriptive and normative sides of Hobbes's international thought.

The third aspect we want to emphasize in our re-reading is the concept of multitude. Our re-reading is built on the understanding of multitude as something different than a state of nature of lonely individuals. Instead, as has been shown in the previous chapters, we consider the multitude to be a confused, disorganized but yet in some ways logical whole. What especially

---

281 Although the articles combined in an edited book called *Hobbes: War Among Nations* (edited by Airaksinen and Bertman) offers interesting insights and aspects to Hobbes's IR –theory, its orientation is rather odd since the disposition of the articles was to answer to the question "whether World Goverment can be justified on the basis of the principles of Thomas Hobbes" (Airaksinen & Bertman 1987, vii). The obvious answer is that we cannot reach world government from the Hobbesian basis. What we should also ask is what are the "principles of Thomas Hobbes" since it seems that there is no consensus on this either.

interests us here is the difference between what we call "multitude of states" and "international multitude". With the multitude of states we refer to Hobbes's normative theory of IR, which aimed to build a system of independent states. The multitude of states is Hobbes's answer to a general problem of multitude, the logic of multitude, to which we particularly refer here with the concept of "international multitude". Hobbes relation to international politics is essentially twofold and thus, we want to keep our re-reading as open as possible for different aspects that Hobbes's texts offer for us.

Our reading proceeds thematically. We go through different aspects of Hobbes's international thought firstly by presenting his understanding of the law of nature and law of nations by asking a crucial question: is a sovereign morally obliged. Secondly, we ask what is Hobbes's relationship to "biopower". Thirdly, we investigate matters concerning Hobbes's understanding of the military, "imperialism", "colonialism" and foreign trade. And lastly, we consider how Hobbes grasped the influence of the external political powers, that is, international politics, on internal conflicts. All these issues highlight how a commonwealth moves and acts in the international field and how the international actors, or international multitude, limit the action and motion of the sovereign state. Thus, the concepts of multitude and motion serve as the basis of the analysis in the next subchapters.

6.2.1 Law of Nature and Law of Nations – Is Sovereign Morally Obliged?

The standard interpretation of Hobbes's IR concentrates on a few, yet important fragments from *Leviathan*. One of the principal starting points of the classical realism was, as it has been stated above, that states live in a similar state of nature as individuals do when there is no sovereign power. This idea is expressed by Hobbes himself for the first time at the very last page of *The Elements of Law*:

> And thus much concerning the elements and general grounds of laws natural and politic. As for the law of nations, it is the same with the law of nature. For that which is the law of nature between man and man, before the constitution of commonwealth, is the law of nations between sovereign and sovereign, after. (Hobbes EL, X, 10. p. 228.)

The same aspect is repeated in *De Cive*, although now in a more complex way:

> *Natural law* can again be divided into the natural law of men, which alone has come to be called the *law of nature*, and the natural law of *commonwealths*, which may be spoken of as the *law of nations* [*lex gentium*], but what is commonly called the *right of nations* [*ius gentium*]. The precepts of both are the same: but because commonwealths once instituted take on the personal qualities of men, what we call a *natural law* in speaking of duties of individual men is called the *right of Nations*, when applied to commonwealths, peoples or nations. And the Elements of *natural law* and *natural right* which we have been teaching may, when transferred to whole *commonwealths* and *nations*, be regarded as the Elements of the *laws* and of the *right of Nations*. (Hobbes DCE, XIV, 4. p. 156; p. lat. 316.)

In these fragments, Hobbes states that the law of nations is ultimately the same thing as the law of nature between individuals. This identification of two realms of law might make us interpret Hobbes's definitions of the life in the state of nature as a sort of a guide for a sovereign commonwealth and its foreign policy. According to this interpretation we should read how individuals live in the state of nature and equate this with the action of the states.[282] The ultimate interpretation would thus suggest that states should egoistically seek power after power[283], since it is the only way to survive in the hostile state of nature.

However, a lot depends on the way we interpret Hobbes's theory of the law of nature. It is possible to follow the standard interpretation, which equals individual and state: the law of nature means that there are no moral codes or obligations between individual states in the state of nature. This interpretation is possible at least from the basis of *Leviathan*, which states as the first law of nature "*that every man, ought to endeavour peace, as far as he has hope of obtaining it; and when he cannot obtain it, that he may seek, and use, all helps, and advantages of war.*" (Hobbes L, XIV, 4. p. 87.) Thus, every human being, and commonwealth, should seek peace, but if it is not possible, it is their natural right to seek all the means of war to ensure their own existence.

Yet, when we look at what Hobbes says about the law of nature particularly in *The Elements of Law* we notice that the standard interpretation actually confuses the right of nature and law of nature, which is a fact Hobbes himself warns of in *Leviathan* (Hobbes L, XIV, 1, 2, 3. p. 86). The egoistic nature of Hobbesian natural man is highlighted in Hobbes's definition of the right of nature (*jus naturale*). According to the right of nature, human beings are entitled to all sorts of amoral actions: defending their own life gives them a possibility to use any possible means for their survival. This follows from the fact that the ones who judge those actions in the multitude are individuals alone. (Hobbes EL, I, pp. 81-86. Particularly I, 7, 8, 9; p. 83.)

However, his explicit formulation of the law of nature (*lex naturalis*) in *The Elements of Law* is following: "One precept of the law of nature therefore is this, *that every man divest himself of the right he hath to all things by nature.*" (Hobbes EL, II, 2. p. 87.) In other words, the precept of the law of nature guides individuals to approach, step by step, the social contract: it is the logical outcome if individuals only follow their own reason, that is, the laws of nature, Hobbes seems to suggest.

In *Leviathan* Hobbes's approach is almost the same. What is different in *Leviathan* are Hobbes's cautious formulations: unlike in *The Elements of Law*, Hobbes reserves a right to defend one's life by any means possible and states that the law of nature (and thus not only the right of nature) entitles man to

---

282 Apparently, we should read chapter I of the *De Corpore Politico*, chapter I of *De Cive* and chapter XIII *Leviathan* as the guiding texts of foreign politics and policies.

283 One of Hobbes's most famous excerpts is the following line: "… I put for a general inclination of all mankind, a perpetual and restless desire of power after power, that ceaseth only in death." (Hobbes L, XI, 2. p. 66.)

defend himself.[284] It is obvious that Hobbes's rather peaceful approach to the law of nature in *The Elements of Law*[285] has become a more cautious version in *Leviathan*. Still, when we follow the list of other laws of nature (laws dictated by reason) in all Hobbes's three political texts, the only conclusion we may draw is that the laws of nature for Hobbes are a guideline that suggests reasonable articles of peace and its logical outcome is the social contract.[286]

Since the laws of nature are such a crucial thing for Hobbes we must ask what is the source of this law. In *The Elements of Law* (Hobbes EL, II. pp. 86-87) Hobbes states first of all that the law of nature is not the same thing as consent between nations. For Hobbes it is impossible that nations could come together and decide (reach consensus) together what is the law of nature. Secondly, the right to define the law of nature does not belong to the wisest nations either. Thirdly, not even all mankind can collectively decide together what is the law of nature. According to Hobbes there is no such international organization that could define these laws. At this point we see that states cannot actually be obliged towards each other: there is no contract that would make the states limit their actions towards other states and nations.

Hence, the law of nature is for Hobbes a principle that must be defined outside of any political institution. Thus, "there can therefore be no other law of nature than reason" (Hobbes EL, II, 1. p. 87). Reason instead is something that is common to everybody and especially with the right way of reasoning[287] it is possible to discover what the true natural law is. On the other hand, as chapter V of *De Corpore Politico* shows us, Holy Scripture stands for everything that right reason has established. For Hobbes it is important to emphasise that the law of nature found by reason is identical with the principal Christian moral codes, which can be found from the Holy Scriptures. For Hobbes the law of nations is thus the law of nature, which is equal with the divine law.[288] This brings a strong moral element to Hobbes's idea of the law of nations and transfers the burden of obligation from mutual contracts to the relationship between God and sovereign.

---

284 In *Leviathan* Hobbes combines the law of nature and right of nature as one "general rule of reason". See Hobbes L, XIV, 4. p. 87.

285 In *The Elements of Law* war is mentioned being "contrary to the law of nature, the sum whereof consisteth in making peace." (Hobbes EL, II, 2. p. 87.)

286 One should note that the laws of nature are always combined with Hobbes's theory of contract. See Hobbes EL, II, III, IV pp. 86-111; Hobbes DC, II-III. pp. lat. 168-198; pp. eng. 32-57; Hobbes L, XIV-XV. pp. 86-106.

287 It is important to note that for Hobbes reason as such is not sufficient, but one must have the right reason, which for its part is an outcome of the right process of reasoning. The right reason is a cultivated reason that follows the right method. See for example Hobbes L, V, 3. p. 28. See also *De Corpore* where Hobbes states that the civil and moral philosophy follow from the analysis concerning the motions of the mind. In other words, only by understanding the basic principles of motion through the geometrical method it is possible to understand civil science (Hobbes 2005 DCO, VI, 7. pp. lat. 65-66; p. eng. 73).

288 In *The Elements of Law* and *De Cive* a whole chapter is devoted to prove that the natural law (the law of reason) is the divine law (law made by God). (Hobbes EL, V. pp. 111-116; Hobbes DC, IV. pp. lat. 199-208; pp. eng. 58-65.)

Now, the true problem for the later IR –theory and Hobbes exegesis has been that Hobbes did not follow the route he himself pointed out: the route that would lead to the institution of the global sovereign. If the natural law is something that leads almost inevitably to a social contract between men, and if men and states are equal, then we should expect that the states would somehow end up in a similar contract, which would create an international sovereign or a global Leviathan. Yet there is nothing of the kind that would hint that Hobbes had this in mind. He never writes about the global sovereign and actually, the idea of the sovereign power that could rise over the instituted sovereign would stand against Hobbes's own principles. As Hobbes states, the sovereign power must not be divided and the sovereign does not have the right to sign away the trust it has received from the people.[289]

As a result Hobbes was seemingly happy to state that the relations between sovereigns resemble the states between individuals in the state of nature. Prominently, states have their natural right to defend themselves, as Hobbes states in his last formulation of the law of nations at *Leviathan*:

> Concerning the offices of one sovereign to another, which are comprehended in that law, which is commonly called the *law of nations*, I need not say any thing in this place; because the law of nations, and the law of nature, is the same thing. And every sovereign hath the same right, in procuring the safety of his people, that any particular man can have, on procuring his own safety. And the same law, that dictateth to men that have no civil government, what they ought to do, and what to avoid in regard of one another, dictateth the same to commonwealths, that is, to the consciences of sovereign princes and sovereign assemblies; there being no court of natural justice, but in the conscience only; where not man, but God reigneth; whose laws (such of them as oblige all mankind), in respect of God, as he is the author of nature, are *natural*; and in respect of the same God, as he is King of kings, are *laws*. (Hobbes L, XXX, 30. p. 235.)

Hence, we must conclude that according to Hobbes's conception of the law of nature and the law of nations it is not possible to form an international system that would oblige the sovereign to follow any other law than the law of nature, which instead obliges only the conscience of the sovereign. States cannot make mutual contracts that would obligate them more than their right of nature obliges them to safeguard their own existence.

Still, there arises another problem. If the laws of nature are obligatory only in the sovereign's conscience, how is it possible to watch over the real actions of the sovereign: is it not possible that the sovereign may use its right of nature to do whatever to safeguard its existence?[290]

Again, this depends on how we interpret Hobbes's texts and what fragments we highlight. It seems that law of nature is ultimately only a silent law in the conscience of the sovereign, since there is no power over the sovereign in the international field. Even if God is the author of the divine law, God is not actually present in the world. The sovereign instead is God's

---

289 See Hobbes L, XVIII, 16-20. pp. 120-122. A subject is obliged to stay loyal to the sovereign even if the sovereign is in prison for example (Hobbes L, XXI, 25. p. 148).

290 On Hobbes's conception of conscience in general, see Hamin 2012 and Ojakangas 2013.

lieutenant on Earth (Hobbes L, XVIII, 3. p. 116). This would mean that the law of nature as such does not make the sovereign follow the dictates of peace, although it obliges it morally, as he states in *The Elements of Law*:

> …till there be security amongst men for the keeping of the law of nature one towards another, men are still in the estate of war, and nothing is unlawful to any man that tendeth to his own safety or commodity; and this safety and commodity consisteth in the mutual aid and help of one another, whereby also followeth the mutual fear of one another." (Hobbes EL, VI, 1. p. 117-118.)

It seems that the law of nature does not oblige the sovereign in any other way than in the sovereign's conscience, but in principle, it still obligates the sovereign. The problem is that the laws of nature should hinder people in the state of nature, but they actually do not, since there is no external force (sovereign) that would make people follow the dictates of the reason. Without the sovereign power, the natural laws remain silent[291] and one is obligated only to one's own conscience.

This is manifested by several definitions given by Hobbes concerning the *in foro interno* aspect of the law. In *Leviathan* Hobbes writes: "The laws of nature oblige *in foro interno*; that is to say, they bind to a desire they should take place; but *in foro externo*; that is, to the putting them in act, not always." Thus, "The laws of nature oblige in conscience always, but in effect then only where there is security." He continues: "And whatsoever laws bind *in foro interno*, may be broken…" (Hobbes L, XV, 36. p. 105).

It seems that we have here a kind of circle, which promises no way out. On the one hand it seems that the laws of nature guide individuals and states to live according to reason and high moral standards. Natural laws oblige men and sovereigns in their conscience. Yet, this morality does not hinder the real actions of the sovereign. Thus, it is wrong to say that there is no morality in the state of nature, but what must be emphasised is that this morality does not hinder the real actions of the individuals or states. Hence, we must acknowledge, if the laws of nature apply to states as they apply to individuals in the state of nature, the peace building on the basis of the conscience of the sovereign is not very convincing. Sovereigns seek peace and they are not bellicose, but when it comes to their own self-preservation, they can and will use any means possible to survive.

Hobbes's doctrine of natural law does not give a proper solution to the question of whether or not sovereigns are limited by the principles of moral action, i.e. natural law. If the abstract moral codes such as the laws of nature do not hinder the sovereign power enough to act morally, it is the very practical limitation related to the principle of *salus populi suprema lex* that guides the actions of the sovereign and prevents the most brutal and excessive use of the

---

291 In *De Cive* Hobbes states that: "It is commonplace that laws are silent among arms. This is true not only of the civil laws but also of natural law, if it is applied (by ch. III, art 27) to actions rather than to state of mind, and if the war in question is understood to be the war of every man against every man." (Hobbes DCE, V. 2. p. eng. 69; p. lat. 210.)

right of nature, as we will see in following sections. In other words, the motion of the people will resist and limit the motion of the sovereign and, in the end, the sovereign power cannot force all the people to act against their will. Thus, in international relations the sovereign is predominantly responsible to the people and God, not to other states.

6.2.2 Hobbesian Biopower?

The idea of "biopower" and "biopolitics" was first conceptualized by Michel Foucault in the first part of his *Histoire de la sexualité*, *La Volonte de Savoir*.[292] With the concept of biopower Foucault refers to a government of the modern nation states, which are particularly interested in increasing the productive potentiality of their populations. Biopower is a power over life. Foucault is especially interested in the diverse technologies and scientific investigation that are invested to bring about the well-being, productivity and re-productivity of population to reach the most effective ways of governing and controlling it. However, biopower is not only a state's monopoly: all kinds of actors can use biopower over population. (Foucault 2007, 177-211.)

Foucault emphasizes that biopower is rather different logic of governing compared to societies of discipline and especially, to sovereign power, which Foucault conceives as medieval. According to Foucault, Hobbes, with his theory of sovereignty, belongs to the group of theorists of archaic power and "thanatopolitics", that is, the political power that uses the fear of death as their primary instrument. Biopower instead invests in the population and human life. Its ways of governing and controlling a population are drastically different from the politics that the sovereign power uses.

Now, why should we be interested in Hobbes's contribution to biopolitics or biopower, since even Foucault himself did not count Hobbes as a theorist of biopower and actually used Hobbes as an opposite example of biopower, that is, he saw Hobbes as a juridical philosopher who was only interested in a state's reign over the subjects. Again, is it not anachronistic to use such a concept while considering Hobbes's political thought?

Since several other authors have referred to Hobbes's philosophy from the viewpoint of biopower[293], it seems important to see to what extent this is really

---

292 See especially Foucault 2007, 177-211. Originally Foucault developed his ideas on biopower and biopolitics during his lectures in Collège de France, which have been published posthumously. See especially Foucault, *« Il faut défendre la société ». Cours au Collège de France 1976*, *Sécurité, territoire, population. Cours au Collège de France 1977-1978* and *Naissance de la biopolitique. Cours au Collège de France 1978-1979.* (Foucault 1997; Foucault 2004a; Foucault 2004b.)

293 Concerning Hobbes as a thinker of biopower, see Hull 2009, 137-143 and passim. Hull argues that Hobbes was the first major theorist of biopolitics and since our own time is fundamentally biopolitical, Hobbes is very useful while we analyze the politics in our contemporary era. See also Marshall 1996, 118-119 who states that Foucault is not actually attacking Hobbes with his discourse on biopower, but Rousseau. The reason why Foucault opposes Hobbes is that Hobbes masks biopower with his juridical philosophy. Thus, Marshall thinks that Hobbes is not a proper thinker of biopower, unlike Rousseau. According to Agamben (1998) Hobbes does not contradict the principle of biopower, but instead, Hobbes seems to be the theorist

possible. Secondly, in our interpretation we are not trying to find exactly Foucault's concept of biopower from Hobbes and thus we do not see that our interpretation is anachronistic. However, there are certain elements in Hobbes's philosophy that seem to invite us to analyse his theory from the viewpoint of biopower. This is especially important in the contexts of international relations, since Hobbes's theory takes on a totally different tone when we understand that his aim was not only to govern citizens with the fear of death, but instead, increase the security and well-being of the population as well.

Let us start with Hobbes's Ciceronian principle *salus populi suprema lex*.[294] This principle has been traditionally translated too narrowly: "the security of the people is the highest law". Yet, in Hobbes's use, the word *salus* gets a much wider meaning. In *The Elements of Law* Hobbes states that:

> For the duty of the sovereign consisteth in the good government of the people. And although acts of sovereign power be no injuries to the subjects who have consented to the same by their implicit wills, yet when they tend to hurt people in general, they be breaches of the law of nature, and of the divine law; and consequently, the contrary acts are the duties of sovereigns, and required at their hands to the utmost of their endeavour, by God Almighty, under the pain of eternal death. And as the art and duty of sovereign consists in the same acts, so also doth their profit. For the end of art, is profit; and governing to the profit of the subjects, is governing to the profit of the sovereign […] And these three: 1. The law over them that have sovereign power: 2. Their duty: 3. Their profit: are one and the same thing contained in this sentence, *Salus populi suprema lex*. By which must be understood, not the mere preservation of their lives, but generally their benefit and good. So that is the general law of sovereigns, *That they procure, to the uttermost of their endeavour, the good of the people*. (Hobbes EL, IX, 1. pp. 213-214.)

Thus, a proper translation of the phrase could be "the well-being and security of the people is the highest law". What we must note here is, however, that for Hobbes s*alus populi suprema lex* is not a law of nature. It is some kind of general advice, or perhaps, a law over law. Since this principle is external to the laws of nature, it is also not, at least not directly, part of the divine laws even though it is a breach of the law of nature to act against this important principle. Notwithstanding, while reading Hobbes one gets an impression how this principle is purely political and practical: a demand to obey the *salus populi* does not derive from the God, but instead from the people. It is a principle that obliges the sovereign in its acts since the sovereign power is originally derived from the people. If the actions of the sovereign do not satisfy the people it is possible that they might rise against the sovereign power.

What is interesting with this doctrine is that it leaves the sovereign with rather free hands to act against internal and external enemies, as long as its action sustains the security and well-being of the majority of the people. Thus,

---

of biopower in Agamben's interpretation. For other commentators of Foucault's relationship on Hobbes, see for example Pavlich 2010, 24-27. Esposito sees Hobbes as a theorist of negative, that is, immunitary idea of biopolitics. According to Esposito, Hobbesian model only conserves life, but does not affirm it. However, he argues that Hobbes was utmost important theorist for the development of the idea of biopolitics. (Esposito 2008, 46; 56-59 and passim.)

294 See Cicero 1998b, 3.8.

we must acknowledge, *salus populi suprema lex* is not only a peaceful doctrine. It can be also a bellicose slogan that gives the sovereign a right to all sorts of actions.

Concerning the question of international morality the most important lesson Hobbes provides is concerned with the constraints of the actions and behaviour of the one who holds the sovereign power. The natural law binds the sovereign only in its conscience. *Salus populi suprema lex* is instead a much more practical demand. The judge is not God, but the people. And even though Hobbes states that people do not have a right to rebel against sovereign power, however bad that sovereign is, he does not deny that people might try to rebel against it.[295] A strife between the sovereign and people is the worst case scenario for Hobbes. For this reason, the sovereign should carefully consider its actions in domestic and in foreign politics as well. According to Hobbes the sovereign power benefits most from the actions that do *not* endanger its subjects, but vice versa, make them more powerful and strong:

> And just as the people's safety dictates the law by which Princes come to know their *duty*, it also teaches them the art by which they look after their own interest. For the power [*potentia*] of the citizens is the power of the commonwealth, that is, his power who holds the sovereignty in the commonwealth. (Hobbes DCE, XIII, 2. p. 143; p. lat. 298.)

Now, this principle that we find at the centre of Hobbes's political thought is something that reminds us of the principle that is later to be called biopower. For Hobbes the only way for the sovereign power to flourish is through its people: if people suffer, are weak or behave in immoral ways, the sovereign power cannot expect anything more than lack of rectitude and internal strife. The power of the people is the power of the commonwealth and for this reason the sovereign has to look for the benefit of its people, since in the end its position at the international field depends solely on its powers and capabilities.

However, as Foucault states, the sovereign power works through the fear of death, through the possibility that the sovereign may kill its subject. As we have already seen in chapter three, this is one of the principal ways that Hobbesian sovereign governs its citizens. In this respect Foucault is right, since Hobbes clearly states that the sovereign has a right to kill its subject if the benefit of the commonwealth and the people needs it: "and it is sometimes good for the safety of the majority that bad men should do badly." (Hobbes DCE, XIII, 3. p. 143; p. lat. 299.) Still, as we remember from the chapter three, Hobbes was more attracted to the idea of a long-term political change reached by the education of the people.

Yet, we can also find another logic from Hobbes's text. This logic assures a sovereign that it is much better to rule according to the rules of peace and make efforts to increase the population and the wellbeing of the population. Hobbes is not only interested in the survival of the people, but of "a happy life so far as that is possible. For men willingly enter commonwealths which they had

---

295 See Hobbes L, XVIII *of the rights of sovereigns by institution.*

formed by design in order to be able to live as pleasantly as the human condition allows" (Hobbes DCE, XIII, 4. pp. 143-144; p. lat. 299). This is only logical, since by establishing the commonwealth people try to escape the darkness and horror of the state of nature and confusion of the multitude. Hence, people ought not just live and stay alive, but instead, the commonwealth should make them strong since the true source of the powers of the state lies in the people, as Hobbes explicitly states while considering the case of those people who have been subjugated to sovereign power by acquisition:

> And those who have acquired power by arms all want their subjects to be fit to serve them with the strength of both mind and body; hence they would be acting against their own aim and purpose if they made no effort to see that they are provided not only with what they need to live but also with what they need to be strong. (Hobbes DCE, XIII, 4. p. 144; p. lat. 299.)

Given this basis resembling the idea of biopower that structures the behaviour of the Hobbesian sovereign power there follows some crucial limitations for its actions both domestically and internationally. What interests us here are the international dimensions. It is obvious that a happy life and the well-being of the people cannot include constant war with other nations. It is also difficult to have biopower, which includes the idea of the governance people in a way that they are not feeling governed, since pushing people to war is unavoidably an act of governance. Ultimately Hobbes saw sovereign power as an organization that promoted peace. The power of the commonwealth might mean the wellbeing of the people, the flourishing of arts and philosophy, just as Dante expressed his will in *De Monarchia*.[296] In the end, Hobbes's aim was to build a political power that could do all the things that were not possible in the state of nature.[297] Engaging in perpetual war with other nations and states would eventually mean that the benefits of the commonwealth would be turned to be the destruction of that very commonwealth. Thus, it is the well-being of the people that limits the amorality of the sovereign power – perhaps even more than a bad conscience.

---

296 In *De Monarchia* (*Monarchy*) Dante combines the philosophies of *The Bible* and Aristotle, and states: "Hence it is clear that universal peace is the best of those things which are ordained for our human happiness." (Dante 2003, 8.) Dante presents the idea that by reaching universal peace, mankind is most able to actualize the potentiality that lies in it.

297 Hobbes's words in *Leviathan* describe things that are not possible in the state of nature: "Whatsoever therefore is consequent to a time of war, where every man is enemy to every man; the same is consequent to the time, wherein men live without other security, than what their own strength, and their own invention shall furnish them withal. In such condition, there is no place for industry; because the fruit thereof is uncertain: and consequently no culture of the earth; no *navigation*, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by sea; no commodious building; 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 worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short." (Hobbes L, XIII, 9. p. 84.)

6.2.3 Military, Imperialism, Colonialism and Foreign Trade

However much we would like to think that Hobbes's project was to build up a peaceful political organization, we must recognize the fact that the Hobbesian sovereign lives, by Hobbes's very definition, in the state of nature and thus possesses the right of nature. As we have already seen, the law of nature binds the sovereign only in its conscience. This gives a reason to doubt the good will of the sovereign power, especially when it comes to the power of the sovereign in relation to other sovereigns and nations. As Hobbes states, the "sovereign is the judge of what is necessary for the peace and defence of his subjects." (Hobbes L, XVIII, 8. p. 118.)[298] The sovereign is the one who has "the right of making war, and peace with other nations, and commonwealths; that is to say, of judging when it is for the public good…" (Hobbes L, XVIII, 12. p. 119). In other words, it is possible to sustain the well-being and peace of the people by waging a war on foreign nations and commonwealths, as well as by the "colonialism" and "imperialism". We must see next what kind of understanding Hobbes has on these things.

Let us consider the role of the military and army first. What is needed to secure people's life from the foreign enemy according to Hobbes is to be "forewarned and forearmed". Hobbes says that states live in a kind of condition of hostility. The periods between fights should not be called peace, since there is no security that the peace would last.[299] What marks the intervals between fights is the incessant observation of the motions of other states. To build up a proper surveillance of the neighbours, the sovereign has to have intelligence that forecasts all the plans and movements of the potential enemies. Hobbes uses here the metaphor of the rays of light for the human body: as the rays of light enable man to see what goes in the world outside of him, in a similar manner the sovereign uses intelligence to seek what happens in the world. Another metaphor of intelligence in foreign relations is a spider's web. The sovereign is the one who waits in the middle of the web, which rapidly mediates the knowledge all the motions to the sovereign. (Hobbes DC, XIII, 6,7. pp. lat. 300-301; pp. eng. 144-145.)

According to these metaphors, the sovereign's relation to foreign powers is primarily that of an observer, who deliberates on the basis of the information received. Secondly, the web of intelligence in foreign lands must be as dense as a spider's web so that the sovereign can react to the smallest possible actions. Yet, the sovereign can always deliberate and judge whether a reaction is necessary. The sovereign power is not only reactive, but it can also suspend

---

298 Hobbes states rather explicitly that: "And because the end of this institution, is the peace and defence of them all; and whosoever has right to that end, has right to the means; it belongeth of right, to whatsoever man, or assembly that hath sovereignty, to be judge both of the means of peace and defence; and also the hindrances, and disturbances of the same; and to do whatsoever he shall think necessary to be done, both beforehand, for the preserving of peace and security, by prevention of discord at home, and hostility from abroad; and, when peace and security are lost, for the recovery of the same." (Hobbes L, XVIII, 8. p. 118.)

299 See Hobbes L, XIII, 8. p. 84.

itself from actions that might endanger its existence. Thus, without information of the outside world there is no possibility to operate as a responsible sovereign for the citizens. The sovereign must be interested in the undertakings of the other states. (Hobbes DC, XIII, 7. pp. lat. 300-301; pp. eng. 144-145.)

However, as the sovereign is such a spider it must be ready for anything all the time. Being ready in this case means that a commonwealth must be able to go to war at any time and hence, the sovereign should not abandon the task of military training and resourcing. This is the second principle that Hobbes conceives under the title of being "forarmed". Here Hobbes's main concern is that the citizens do not realize that armies should be ready before the war, since there is no use to gather men and arms while the fight is already on. Hence, people should be willing to give money to the sovereign all the time, so that the sovereign can sustain credible defence mechanisms, that is, an army. (Hobbes DC, XIII, 8. pp. lat. 301-302; pp. eng. 145-146.)

It is easy to see how all this arming might lead to warfare in the name of securing of the interests of the state. On the other hand, we must remember that Hobbes needed the army first and foremost to fight back rebellious forces inside the commonwealth, not foreign enemies. However, these foreign enemies, as we will later see, operated and agitated usually inside the commonwealth. For this reason, the army was needed to keep people in awe inside the commonwealth. Secondly, arming for war does not necessarily mean aggressive warfare, but instead a credible defence. Building an army to fight wars in foreign lands was not a good idea according to Hobbes, as we will see next.

Hobbes tells us something about the military operations abroad. One could easily imagine Hobbes as a forespeaker of imperialism[300], but his ideas could not be further from the imperialistic doctrines. According to him the military activity abroad is very suspicious, since: "military activity, which sometimes increases the citizens' wealth, but more often erodes it." (Hobbes DCE, XIII, 14. p. eng. 149; p. 307.) Hobbes implies that *Salus populi* is not defended by waging a war abroad.

In fact, Hobbes compares military activity to piracy and raiding. They are honourable ways of gaining power in the state of nature, especially for the families and small communities, but this kind of action is not appropriate for a commonwealth. In other words, Hobbes does not completely identify the state of nature between individuals to the one of states. Some former empires such as Athens or Rome increased their wealth and power by conquering new lands and placing nations under their power. Against this Hobbes explicitly states that: "But we should not take enrichment by these means into our calculations. For as a means of gain, military activity is like gambling; in most cases it reduces a person's property; very few succeed." (Hobbes DCE, XIII, 14. p. 150; p. lat. 307.) Gaining wealth through military conquest is not suitable for a commonwealth since it puts the whole commonwealth in danger, as Hobbes later specifies in *Leviathan*. Here he calls imperialism *bulimia*, which means

300 This is for example the argument of Hannah Arendt in her *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. See Arendt 2000, 146-147.

"insatiable appetite" which follows from enlarging the dominion of the commonwealth all over the world. Foreign colonies cause wounds for the body politic in the battles that are fought for them and they may become wens that are better to be removed before they become serious and start to cause troubles. (Hobbes L, XXIX, 21. p. 221.)

Even though Hobbes did not endorse the idea of enlarging the dominion of the commonwealth abroad, i.e. in what we call nowadays imperialism, he approved of the idea of colonialism in some respects. In general, the art of navigation is for Hobbes a technique "by which the products of the whole world, which cost virtually no more than labour, are gathered into one commonwealth" (Hobbes DCE, XIII, 14. p. 150; p. lat. 307). Yet, he has a sort of humane idea of colonialism, which is quite opposite to what we have become acquainted with from the history of colonialism. According to Hobbes the people sent to foreign lands should not oppress the original population, steal and exploit their lands and property. Instead, they should build up their little colonies and carefully take care of their own plantations.

However, Hobbes also has another tone in his texts while he explains what colonies are. A colony means, for him, a number of men that have been sent away from the commonwealth under a leader to inhabit a foreign country "either formerly void of inhabitants, or made void then by war." (Hobbes L, XXIV, 14. p. 168.) This suggests, in the end, a possibility that the colony might be taken by violence and war.

From these two descriptions on colonies we get an inconsistent picture of Hobbes's opinion. Colonies should be built peacefully, but there is, in the end, a possibility to gain space for living by war. Colonies, the "children of the commonwealth" might become independent of their *metropolis* ("mother city"), or they might stay as their provinces. It is obvious that both types of colonies make use of the economic and military power of their *metropolis*. (Hobbes L, XXII, 16. pp. 152-153.) We notice that this example speaks for the possibility of some kind of imperialism after all, although it does not encourage it.

All these aspects of imperialism, colonialism, war and biopower come together in the chapter of *Leviathan* where Hobbes talks about the idle population and colonialism. This fragment also reveals how Hobbes conceived the world of his age:

> But for such as have strong bodies, the case is otherwise: they are to be forced to work; and to avoid the excuse of not finding employment, there ought to be such laws, as may encourage all manner of arts; as navigation, agriculture, fishing, and all manner of manufacture that requires labour. The multitude of poor, and yet strong people still increasing, they are to be transplanted into countries not sufficiently inhabited: where nevertheless, they are not to exterminate those they find there; but constrain them to inhabit closer together, and not to range a great deal of ground, to snatch what they find; but to court each little plot with art and labour, to give them their sustenance in due season. And when all the world is overcharged with inhabitants, then the last remedy of all is war; which provideth for every man, by victory, or death. (Hobbes L, XXX, 19. p. 230.)

Here, first of all, Hobbes reveals how deeply he thought about the wellbeing of the commonwealth from the perspective that we might call nowadays a perspective of biopower. He understands that no laws and no sword can keep men in awe, that is, living a decent life with good manners towards each other, if the very possibility of everyday work is taken from them. The state has an interest to engage in individuals' lives and to guide them with laws. Idleness is a big problem for Hobbes, since those people that do not have anything to do, but have strong and capable bodies, are easy to agitate or hire for rebellion. Hence, the first thing to do is to harness those powers for the good of the commonwealth. State should educate and employ these people in such occupations that increase the well-being of the state, like fishing and agriculture. If this does not work, if there are too many people, this "multitude of poor" should be "transplanted" to areas that do not yet have too many people. Foreign land should be taken to reduce the pressure of an idle population in a commonwealth, but this should be done peacefully. Land should be cultivated in peace and with art, so all the people could live properly from that land.

However, the very last sentence of the fragment reveals the "Hobbesian necessity" and realism underlying his thought: when the world is full of inhabitants, only a war can resolve the question of who has a right to a certain part of the land. Nonetheless, we must note that this was not the case in Hobbes's time. He knew that most of the world was empty and there was plenty of space for everybody. Yet he admits that after the world is inhabited a sort of state of nature, war of every man against every man returns.

For Hobbes work and war are not the only ways of gaining wealth and well-being for a commonwealth. According to Hobbes, international trade is a good way of gaining wealth and resources.[301] In *De Cive* he gives an example of a lonely island in the sea, which can "grow rich by trade and manufacturing alone, without sowing and without fishing" (Hobbes DCE, XIII, 14. p. 149; p. lat. 307). Still, if people have land and they are ready to labour for it, they become even richer and hence, commerce alone is not enough to secure the well-being of a commonwealth.

Commerce, both domestic and international, however feeds the whole body politic and increases its capability to operate. In *Leviathan* Hobbes explains how money, or capital, can help the sovereign to act internationally. Money is for Hobbes the blood of the body politic.[302] It should be possible to possess commodities without them hindering the motion of men from one place to another. Gold and silver have such qualities that they are highly valued among all the nations of the world. Money instead is a means of exchange within the commonwealth and sovereign coins its value. (Hobbes L, XVIII. 16. pp. 120-121.)

---

301 Hobbes knew this already from Thucydides *Peloponnesian Wars*, since in *The Elements of Law* he tells us that: "For would the Athenians have condescended to suffer the Megareans, their neighbours, to traffic in their ports and markets, that war had not begun." (Hobbes EL, V, 12. pp. 101-102.)

302 Hobbes L, XXIV, 11. p. 167.

Money makes, almost magically, things move for the benefit of man without the burden of carrying goods around. While money circulates around the body politic it nourishes all the parts of the commonwealth. Silver and gold instead, since they are internationally recognized, enable the whole commonwealth to move around in the world and "stretch out their arms, when need is, into foreign countries; and supply, not only private subjects that travel, but also whole armies with provision." (Hobbes L, XXIV, 12. p. 167.) Thus, a commonwealth should have capital like gold and silver, since it helps it and its citizens in troubled times.

Thus, Hobbes does not say that a commonwealth should stick only inside its borders, but it is very clear that he fears the troubles that conquering lands and extensive intercourse with other nations might bring. A commonwealth should primarily take care of its own citizens and enlarge its territory only if the population, and especially the idle population, grows too large. In this case, Hobbes is ready to accept colonialism, in the same manner as the Greeks did.

In general Hobbes's views of the international actions of the sovereign are quite modest. He seems to believe in trade and hard work, and he is ready to conquer new lands for the commonwealth, but only if it does not mean war. Gaining power and wealth through military action is not recommended by Hobbes, since it endangers the safety of the people by putting too much effort in such a risky business.

6.2.4 External Causes of Internal Conflicts

At the beginning of *Chapter XXIX of those things that weaken, or tend to the dissolution of a commonwealth* in *Leviathan* Hobbes tells us how the commonwealth is "designed to live, as long as mankind, or as the laws of nature, or as justice itself, which gives them life" (Hobbes L, XXIX, 1. p. 212). Now, the question is, do external powers, such as foreign states or other political entities have anything to do with internal reasons that tend to dissolve the commonwealth? The traditional explanation concerning the reasons that speed up the dissolution of the state are internal problems: civil strife is the most obvious reason for the collapse of a commonwealth. In this chapter we try to understand instead how external powers might cause and speed up the formation of the logic of multitude inside the commonwealth and thus expedite the destruction of the sovereign power.

At least three things expedite the corruption of the body politic: *mimesis*, foreign religion and false doctrines of civil science. Let us start from *mimesis*. As we remember from chapter three, Hobbes conceives *mimesis* as a profound problem in the state of nature and in the commonwealth as well. Imitation leads to social competition and ultimately to pride, which leads eventually to fighting and war. In the case of a commonwealth, imitation of the manners and laws of other commonwealths endangers first of all the sovereignty itself, and hence, the whole order and structure of the commonwealth. Mimesis is a social phenomenon that fosters the emergence of the logic of multitude.

Hobbes gives three examples. The first derives from the *Bible* where the Jews start to demand a king since other nations have a king too. As this story goes, the Jews end up in problems because of their demand. The second example comes from the ancient Greece, where the lesser cities started to imitate the democratic regimes of Athens. The example is familiar from Thucydides, who shows how democracy causes real problems and eventually civil wars in islands and small cities. The reason for this was the imitation of different governments in neighbouring cities.[303] The third example concerns the way in which the English citizens wanted England to imitate the policies of the Low Countries. The Low Countries, as Hobbes later tells us in *Behemoth*,[304] were promoting a strange policy towards traders by not collecting any taxes from ships and their cargos. Due to this early idea of free trade and capitalism, the English traders and bourgeoisie started to demand the same kind of - obviously profitable - freedom. This led to problems with the King and was one cause for the civil war. Imitating the manners of the neighbouring countries is definitely a bad thing to do and the international relations between other states might be dangerous for a commonwealth, thinks Hobbes. (Hobbes L, XXIX, 13. p. 216.) All in all, although he does not say it explicitly, it is most obvious that the commonwealth should carry its external relations with care and select carefully those persons who are about to become initiated to the foreign manners and cultures.

Now, moving to the second and third set of external things causing internal confusion and rebellion (foreign religion and false doctrines of civil science), we must see what kinds of groups Hobbes names as the troublemakers at the advent of the English Civil Wars. At the very beginning of the *Behemoth* Hobbes gives us a list of agitators and rebellious groups that caused troubles for the King in governing the commonwealth. (Hobbes B, 3-4.) This list includes seven groups, that all have, interestingly enough, relations with foreign powers.

First, there were the Scottish Presbyterian priests, who questioned the rule of the monarch with the word of Christ. The second group were the Papists, the ones who believed that Pope should govern England and other territories, just as he had done before the law of supremacy. The third group consisted of various other religious sects that were inspired by their own interpretation of the English version of the *Bible*. The fourth group was formed of the "exceeding great number of the better sort" (Hobbes B, 3) who had read classical writers and believed that democracy was preferable to a monarchy. The fifth group

---

303 We must remember that in his famous funeral speech Pericles states that the form of government in Athens is superior compared to other *poleis*, since Athens has not imitated its laws from anybody else. (Thucydides 1969-77, II, 37.) Thucydides tells about the imitation also in other parts of his history (Thucydides 1969-77, II, 43; VII, 63; VII, 67). Admiring Pericles Hobbes might have received his anticipation of imitation from Thucydides' text.

304 In *Behemoth* Hobbes tells us: "Fifthly, the city of London and other great towns of trade, having in admiration the prosperity of the *Low Countries* after they had revolted from their monarch, the King of Spain, were inclined to think that the like change of government here, would to them produce the like prosperity." (Hobbes B, 3-4.)

included London and other large towns of trade rebelled against the King by following the example given by Low Countries in their rebellion against their former sovereign, the King of Spain. The sixth group was comprised of persons who did not have money or anything better to do, that is, idle people who were easy to agitate to war for money. The seventh and last group of rebellious people were those who did not know their duties as citizens and hence denied the King a right to collect taxes.

Even though it seems that all of these groups and their reasons for rebellion were internal, it is striking how clearly Hobbes relates all these groups to foreign actors and to the foreign policy of the sovereign as well. Next we will concentrate on the most interesting cases that *Behemoth* has to offer concerning the analysis of foreign relations. These are obviously the case of universities (knowledge) and the question of Pope's international power (religion). Let us start from the religious problems.

One of the biggest problems in the international relations for Hobbes was definitely the intertwined relation between the Pope and the national sovereigns. Hobbes was, as it is widely known, speaking strongly for the religious supremacy of the national sovereign. The sovereign should be the head of the church and the national sovereign should order the national church. The power that the Roman church had over England and other nations was problematic for Hobbes. In fact, he explicitly denies the power of any "universal church" on Earth as he denies the possibility of any "universal prince or state" on the Earth in his *Answer to Bishop Bramhall*:

> and that there is not any one universal church here on earth, which is a person indued with authority universal to govern all Christian men on earth, no more than there is one universal sovereign prince or state on earth, that hath right to govern all mankind. (Hobbes ABB, 337.)

In *Behemoth* Hobbes is likewise most clear on these matters. First of all, he notes that the Papists are wrong when they claim that all the nations in the world are like the Jews in their relation to God:

> as the Jews were the people of God then, so is all Christendom the people of God now, they infer from thence, that the Pope, whom they pretend to be the high-priest of all Christian people, ought also to be obeyed in all his decrees by all Christians, upon pain of death. (Hobbes B, 5.)

This assumption could not be more wrong, says Hobbes. He insists that the Jews were a special people and one should not compare all the nations of the earth to the Jews. The Catholic church has taken the place of God by stating that it represents God's will on earth. The logic of the argument was that since the Christ was the King of all world, the world consequently belongs to the Pope since he represents the Christ's power on the Earth. The Catholic church thinks that it can intervene in any domestic matter between the sovereign and its subject, and what is even more outrageous, it can decide who has a right to govern this or that part of land. As an example Hobbes gives us the case of Atabalipa, the Prince of Peru. By his decision the Pope had decided that the

Roman Emperor Charles the Fifth was the true sovereign of the territory that belonged to Atabalipa. Atabalipa refused to yield to the Pope's commandment and consequently the Spanish army murdered Atabalipa and took over his land. (Hobbes B, 11.)

Hobbes ridicules the Pope's power by stating that "why do not Christian kings lay down their titles of majesty and sovereignty, and call themselves the Pope's lieutenants?" (Hobbes B, 6). As we remember, Hobbes's doctrine supposes that the sovereign is God's lieutenant on earth. Hence, his view on this issue is clear. The Pope or the Roman Church has no legitimate right to demand temporal or spiritual power over or in sovereign states. If this is allowed, then the national sovereigns are left with little or no power and the whole idea of sovereignty is ruined. Hobbes stands strictly against the international or cosmopolitan power of the Roman church and makes every effort to form arguments that speak for the supremacy of national sovereigns. For example in the case of excommunication of heretics, which practically meant that the subject excommunicated was sentenced to hell, does not make Hobbes turn his head in front of the Pope. If the Pope is ready to excommunicate a King or a whole nation from the Roman church, then those people are on their own and ready to govern themselves as they wish. People should not yield to the Pope's threatening. (Hobbes B, 6-7.)

The Pope's power is not only limited to spatial questions, such as questions of territory. The Pope's power wriggles inside the commonwealth through several kinds of procedures and policies. Several examples are given. The Roman Catholic Church can for example free all the priests, friars and monks from criminal charges. This means that the power of the Roman church surpasses the power of the national sovereign. Secondly, the Roman church can give benefits to whomever it wants, and again, act without the blessing of the sovereign. Thirdly, it can collect its own taxes despite the orders of the sovereign. All this confuses the population about the question who exactly has the authority. Fourthly, the Catholic Church can appeal to Rome and its power in every single case it sees important. The fifth problem is the fact that the Roman church can decide about marriage and hence, it is the "supreme judge concerning the lawfulness of marriage, that is, concerning the hereditary succession of Kings" (Hobbes B, 7). Sixthly, the Pope has a power to absolve subjects from their duties, which is again very problematic for the sovereign (Hobbes B, 7).

Evidently this list was very aggravating, and shows us how Hobbes saw the foreign power, the power of the Pope as an infiltrator to the English domestic politics. If we add to this list that in Hobbes's opinion the practices of confession are the same thing as the agents of the foreign power operating legally inside the state, we come to understand that Hobbes felt in a very concrete way how the foreign power was ordering and governing the commonwealth that should have been independent and free to govern itself.[305]

---

305 In the Latin *Leviathan* Hobbes worries about the fact that those who give counsel to the sovereign must have seen all the archives of the commonwealth, treaties with

The Pope's worldwide power was this kind of cosmopolitan governance and international sovereignty, which Hobbes opposed every possible way he could. It is not difficult to understand why Hobbes did not suggest an idea of "global Leviathan". According to Hobbes, global political power such as the Catholic Church is a warmonger; it is a mode of imperialism and a mode of arrogant pride that should not exist in the world. It seems that the option of the global Leviathan was not really possible for Hobbes since he had very bad experiences with the Catholic Church.

The example of the Catholic power inside the English commonwealth also explains more concretely the critique of two kingdoms, the earthly and the "ghostly", that Hobbes gives in *Leviathan*.[306] The two kingdoms lead us to the themes of mixed governments and other sorts of "Siamese twins"[307] or monsters such as Hydra[308], which refer to the multitude and the monstrosity of the body politic. Hobbes takes the metaphor of the body politic very seriously: a body cannot have many heads without becoming a monster. The subject has to know whom to obey, to whom listen. Two heads and two sets of orders confuse a subject and this is ultimately the cause for the dissolution of the commonwealth. For example, Hobbes sees that the practice of confession is a clever way of spying on what is going on in a particular commonwealth. Secondly, the "ghostly" power is present also in the "magic" powers of the priests, when they say for example that they can discharge all of the people's sins. They also educate people falsely to think that they could turn wine to blood and bread to flesh through the doctrine of transubstantiation. Furthermore, they preach among the people and turn them against the sovereign. Hobbes states very clearly that: "and the end which the Pope had in multiplying sermons, was no other but to prop and enlarge his own authority over all Christian Kings and States." (Hobbes B, 16.) All this together meant that the ministers' power in the commonwealth strongly questioned the power of the sovereign and this systematic propaganda made people believe, and what is most important, fear, the clergy more than the sovereign. (Hobbes B, 13-16.) In the end, Hobbes states explicitly that "It is true that rebellions have been raised by Church-men in the Pope's quarrel against kings, as in England against King John and in France against King Henry IV" (Hobbes B, 18). All these things provide a good basis for the logic of multitude to spread in the commonwealth.

Among the practical politics and policies of the church and clergy, both the Presbyterian[309] and the Catholic, there was also another, more indirect way

---

other nations and letters sent to other commonwealths. This forms a great threat to sovereign power, if the information is delivered to wrong hands. (Hobbes LL, XXV, 194-195.)

306 Hobbes L, XXIX, 15. pp. 217-218.

307 Hobbes refers to Siamese twins in *Leviathan* XXIX, 17. p. 219.

308 Hobbes refers to Hydra in *Leviathan* XXX, 24. p. 232.

309 I have treated only the Catholic Church in this context. Hobbes's attitude was also negative toward Presbyterians who acted as if Scotland was a foreign power and challenged the crown of England. According to Hobbes, their actions were extremely harmful to England. See for example on the question of Presbyterian preaching Hobbes B, 22-26.

of taking hold over the society in a foreign country by the Pope. In a way, Hobbes transforms the whole question of the causes of the rebellion to a question of knowledge and education. If we want to know why the rebellion was possible, we must recognize the fact that all the clergy, all the civil servants, many members of the parliament and many other rebellious people were educated in the University, claims Hobbes. As he dramatically states, "The *Universities* have been to this nation, as the wooden horse was to the Trojans." (Hobbes B, 40.)[310]

The whole question of universities and education of the citizen is deeply linked to the question of foreign relations and international politics. The roots of foreign indoctrination in England, as well as in other countries, are deep and strong, states Hobbes. According to Hobbes, the origin of the universities dates back to the time between Emperor Charles the Great and King Edward III of England. It was then when the Pope encouraged the Emperors to establish different kinds of schools to educate an elite for the country and for the church. From this the institution of the university began in Paris and Oxford. The aim of the institution of the university was, according to Hobbes, very clear:

> The profit that the Church of Rome expected from them, and in effect received, was the maintenance of the Pope's doctrine, and of his authority over kings and their subjects, by school-divines; (Hobbes B, 17.)

Another example is even more frank:

> B: What was the Pope's design in setting up the Universities?
> A. What other design was he like to have, but (what you heard before) the advancement of his own authority in the countries where the Universities were erected? (Hobbes B, 40.)

Hobbes explains that there are no doubts about the true causes of the rebellion and civil war.[311] The reason was, unquestionably, in false doctrines taught in the universities, which were designed to increase the Pope's say in England.

But what were the means of achieving the Pope's wishes? Hobbes accuses the scholastic philosophy most of all, that is, the mixing of Aristotle and Biblical studies together as an obscure doctrine. The obscurity of this doctrine pushed aside the common people as well as the most of the civilized men who simply could not understand such vague metaphysical, physical and logical questions that were at the centre of the university education. However, the political and ethical doctrines of Aristotle were not the important part of the scholastic university education. Hence, it was ultimately those metaphysical doctrines to which Hobbes furiously objected and which he saw as the cause of false beliefs and rebellion.[312]

---

310 On the question of universities, see also *Leviathan* XXX, 14. p. 227-228.

311 Hobbes states for example that: "It is true that great rebellions have been raised by Church-men in the Pope's quarrel against kings, as in England against King John, and in France against King Henry IV." (Hobbes B, 18.)

312 At the center of these false beliefs were such things as the claims that the soul of man is the first giver of motion to the body, from which followed the possibility of the

Hobbes seems to think that for the political purposes of the Pope it was best to confuse people by imposing these obscure doctrines on them through sermons and education. While the multitude was generally confused, for a period of hundreds of years, about the magical power that the school-men and ministers possessed, the true political doctrine, that is the doctrines that concern the duties of the sovereigns and its subjects, were neglected and hence, people were totally ignorant. Ignorance, being an integral part of the multitude, became an easy ground for any sorts of agitation, both Catholic and Presbyterian. Paradoxically, because of the long Papal indoctrination it was not difficult for the Presbyterians to make people fight against the Pope's power, as Hobbes shows in *Behemoth*, but it was almost impossible to get the people to understand why they should feel obliged to serve only the legal sovereign as the head of the church and as the head of the state, simultaneously. Producing an ignorant multitude was one of the best methods for the Pope to implement his power in foreign lands.

Hence, the true fault of the universities was the raising up of a wicked elite in England, which was not loyal to King, but to the Pope. This was enough to legitimize the disconnection of England's sovereignty from the Pope's power, Hobbes seems to say. Still, the seditious activity of the Catholic Church did not end with the law of supremacy. The Pope and the universities continued to carry on their wicked politics and indoctrination. This led to Hobbes conclusion that it is only through a university reform that the country can truly be made, slowly, that is for sure, as a true commonwealth, which operates without any intrusion of the foreign power:

> The core of rebellion, as you have seen by this, and read of other rebellions, are the Universities; which nevertheless are not to be cast away, but to be better disciplined: that is to say, that the politics there taught to be made (as true politics should be) such as are fit to make men know, that it is their duty to obey all laws whatsoever that shall by the authority of the King be enacted, till by the same authority they shall be repealed; (Hobbes B, 58.)

University reform is, for Hobbes, much more peaceable, human and efficient way of changing the commonwealth than violence towards the wicked elite.[313] It seems that Hobbes sincerely believed in the power of education. This would make a commonwealth simpler and take the confusion, that is, the logic of the multitude, out of it. If a foreign power can indoctrinate people through the university, or any other institution, it is clear that the commonwealth will be torn apart.

As we have seen in this chapter, the internal strife and emergence of religious and the political sections has its roots in politics of foreign powers. We have concentrated here on the most obvious one, that is, to the international power of the Catholic Church. By implementing their religion and

---

free-will, which Hobbes opposed strongly. See Hobbes B, 42 and generally *The Questions Concerning Liberty, Necessity and Chance* (Hobbes QCLNC).

313 In *Behemoth* Hobbes hints that it would also have been possible to kill 1000 seditious ministers, rather than wait for a massacre of 100 000 people. (Hobbes B, 95.)

philosophical doctrines in England, the Catholics had gained a leading role in the commonwealth for centuries. Hobbes seems to think that their tactics was to widen the gap between King and the people by making people ignorant, that is, by producing an ignorant multitude. By keeping people stupid and disunited the Catholic Church confused the English domestic politics even after the tie between Pope and England had been cut off. Foreign politics is not only about actual war between nations: it includes all sorts of soft power that refer to both passions and reason.

Thus we must conclude that Hobbes's vision of his contemporary international politics was much more complex than we have previously assumed. It is a sort of description of the international multitude, the very international political problem, which admits the constantly changing and sometimes very rude and egoistic power play between all sorts of actors. In an international multitude, trans-sovereign actors like the Catholic Church and corporations pose threats to independent states. On the other hand, his texts also offer a hopeful, normative vision of a relatively peaceful coexistence of independent states, a multitude of states. In this vision, the independent, sovereign state is the basic unit of international action and thus the chaotic nature of the international multitude does not affect the relatively stagnant and peaceful relations between states. The role of Hobbes's design of the sovereign state was to stabilize and quiet the disorder of the international multitude and thus prevent the escalation of international violence and sedition.

7 CONCLUSIONS

Hobbes saw himself as a true founder of new civil science (*scientia civilis*). In the Epistola Dedicatoria of *De Corpore*, Hobbes states that civil philosophy is not older than his own book *De Cive*. In the field of natural philosophy he gives little credit to the ancient philosophers, but emphasizes that true success in natural philosophy had been gained by such authors as "Nicolaus Copernicus", "Galileus", "Joannes Keplerus", "Petrus Gassendus" and "Marinus Mersennus". Hobbes was not very happy with the doctrines posed by "harmless" Plato or "foolish and false" Aristotle. The most problematic thing for Hobbes was the mingling of the classical, sometimes obscure natural philosophy with the Christian religion. Following from this, the scholastic metaphysics was the most important target in Hobbes's philosophy. According to him the scholastic metaphysics is like the monster Empusa, described by Aristofanes in his play *Frogs,* who changed her shape all the time. Sometimes Empusa is like an ox, sometimes like a mule, and sometimes like a lovely woman.[314] One of her legs is made out of bronze, but her other is a leg of an ass. In Hobbes's understanding, scholastic metaphysics is this kind of monster and the only possibility to defeat this monster is to separate the rules of religion from the rules of philosophy. Hence, his aim was "to fright and drive away this metaphysical *Empusa*; not by skirmish, but by letting in the light upon her." (DCOE, Epistle Dedicatory, xi.)

Hobbes's answer to the obscure and complicated scholastic philosophy was a clear and solid geometrical method, the method of resolution and composition that he introduced in his first political text, *The Elements of Law* and further explicated in his philosophical *summa De Corpore,* among other texts.[315] Hobbes thought that all phenomena should be studied by resolution, that is, by analysing the fundamental elements that compose a particular phenomenon. After the basic elements of the particular phenomenon are clarified, it is

---

314 See Aristofanes 1979, especially 268-315.

315 In Latin *Leviathan* Hobbes says that "Itaque in geometria, quæ sole fere est scientia accurate…" (Hobbes LL, IV, 26). Hobbes sees that geometry is the only precise science.

possible to compose several different kinds of compositions, as far as matter and force allow. This is the utility of the philosophy that Hobbes is interested in and what he requires from it: one should not practice philosophy for the sake of knowledge, but instead for the sake of some practical implementation.

In Hobbes's philosophy the true ontological basic concepts affecting everything are matter and motion. In a similar way, we have argued, the concepts of multitude and motion play a significant role in Hobbes's political thought since they create the very political problem that Hobbes aimed to solve with his political philosophy. Only by understanding the nature of this "ontological" political question, we are able to evaluate the solution offered by Hobbes in his political philosophy. Hence, we have argued that only by studying the nature of the concept of multitude we are able to follow the process of resolution and composition, the geometrical analysis of the politics which Hobbes does in his political philosophy.

Although Hobbes's method is simple and clear, we should be careful when considering what the starting point of Hobbes's political analysis is. It is evident that the ending point of Hobbes's project was designed to be a composition of great Leviathan, a sovereign power or state. To make up the right kind of political power there is a need for education, rewriting of civil laws and ordering of the everyday actions of the citizens. To fulfil this, there should also be a fundamental university reform, based on the profound reform in science and metaphysics. And along with this, the relationship between religion and to sovereign power of the state should be also reconsidered.

Apparently the ideal political composition, the Leviathan, cannot be the starting point for Hobbes, but is more or less a theoretical model that should be implemented in the best possible ways to the political governance after his study on the elements of law and commonwealth is fulfilled. The state for its part is constructed of individuals, defined and described in the process of philosophical resolution. In research and literature concerning Hobbes there has been a wide consensus concerning the starting point of Hobbes's political philosophy, that is, the individual. This is understandable, since Hobbes's major works start with an inquiry concerning "Man". What we find, however, while reading Hobbes's works and following his method is that this picture of man is more or less an outcome of Hobbes's philosophical resolution. Man, as Hobbes describes it, is free of all social relationships, responsibilities, loyalties and duties. The Hobbesian man is not a loving, caring or even sympathetic figure. Instead, as it has been several times rightly stated, the Hobbesian man in the "state of nature" is timid, egoistic and almost a narrow-minded person. The Hobbesian man is interested most of all in his own self-preservation.

Yet, we have argued, this picture of man is not the starting point of Hobbes's resolution, nor is it an essential feature of a human being that would remain totally the same despite the contexts and conditions where human beings live. In this study we have claimed that the Hobbesian egoistic and fearful man is an outcome of the logic that we have called the logic of multitude. Hence, the starting point of Hobbes's political resolution is the condition of the multitude where people live without a proper sovereign power

that could bring order to the commonwealth and end the dangerous and backward coexistence of individuals, political parties, religious sects and corporate unions.

This is not to say that we would deny the existence of the state of nature argument in Hobbes's philosophy. Instead, what we are arguing is that the idea of the state of nature and the picture of a lonely individual living in it is a solution to the starting point of the philosophical analysis, the political problem of multitude. Hence, we have tried to reframe the picture concerning one of the most crucial questions in Hobbes's political philosophy and thus to understand better what has been stated before in Hobbes scholarship. According to our understanding, the important political and philosophical problems are always real. The political problem of the multitude was, we claim, a real and crucial question for Hobbes in his own time. The concrete problem of the multitude was the reason and it was the starting point from which Hobbes entered into his long and profound political analysis, which lasted more than 30 years. An idea of the state of nature and the lonely individual is an outcome of these considerations, an effective epitome of a fundamental, comprehensive political problem.

What is, then, this multitude? In chapter 2 *Multitude in Motion* we studied the concept of multitude in Hobbes's political philosophy from various aspects. Following and analysing the uses of the concept of the multitude in Hobbes's texts it is possible to state that multitude is for Hobbes a multilayered concept, which has several different connotations and uses according to the context, but which is, however, always marked by the logic of anarchy, that is, lack of power, and following from this, by the logic of self-preservation and egoistic power seeking. It refers, first of all, to a large or uncountable number of people, living without one sovereign creator of order. In its most abstract meaning, multitude is human matter in motion: it is the first element of the political composition, a "common-wealth", which consists of "the Matter, Forme & Power" as Hobbes states at the title page of *Leviathan* (Hobbes L).

However, even though the multitude is in a sense an all-encompassing concept since it is difficult to say who belongs to the multitude and who does not, it does not mean that the multitude could not refer to a more concrete phenomena, where several different organized or unorganized groups of human beings coexists, intermingle and live together. In a very concrete sense a multitude can mean an archaic mode of feudal power, where different families, kingdoms, city states, warlords and republics lived together with superposing power relations. The crucial point from a Hobbesian perspective is that all these groups are driven by the logic of multitude. No single order, law or moral code guides these different groups and organizations. Instead, they compete with each other and cause, in the worst case, the famous war of every man against every man. Add to this the constant quarrels between religious sects, philosophical disputes between all sorts of authors, parliamentary men arguing against each other and bourgeois men of corporations demanding their "rights" and "freedom" and we are able to picture the multitude that Hobbes was facing in his own time in England and all over the Europe. All this caused disloyalty,

which then produced uncertain, timid and lonely individuals ready to do anything to safeguard their own life. In this sense the multitude refers to a multiplicity of individuals, who do not have any obligation with each other, much like mushrooms in Hobbes's famous definition.[316]

Yet, we must remember that the concept of multitude was not only a descriptive term for Hobbes. As we saw in chapter two, the concept of multitude has a long but not that glorious position in the history of political thought. Several authors such as Plato, Aristotle, Thucydides, Polybius and Cicero have used terms such as *oi polloi*, *plethos*, *ochlos*, *multitudo* that resemble more or less the concept of multitude that Hobbes is using in his philosophy. The concept is not Hobbes's own invention and it does not enter his vocabulary solely from his contemporary political and religious jargon. The concept and the problem of the multitude was age old already in Hobbes's time. According to our understanding Hobbes realized this very well. With his political philosophy he was not only addressing the burning questions of his time, but also the ancient political problem of political philosophy concerning the nature and governance of human crowds. Again, a multitude manifests as a starting point, as a classical political problem that waited to be solved. Hobbes believed that the classical authors were not able to solve this question, since they lacked the right geometrical method and philosophy that would enable them to really deal with the problem human masses in motion.

In our study we have argued that it is especially the problem of human motion, which is expressed in a profound political way with Hobbes's concept of multitude. In the classical understanding, the multitude always referred to the lower classes of society, to the common people or plebs. Multitude was always a social entity that aimed to take the power, or an "extreme form of the people" that ruled without any specific organization through the action of demagogues.

For Hobbes the multitude is a different kind of concept, although he does not abandon the older connotations of the word. In Hobbes's use, the multitude and the logic of multitude refers to all the people, people as matter, despite their rank or position in society. There are no essential characters in people that would doom them to be part of the multitude. Vice versa, Hobbes sees that anyone might become part of the monstrous multitude. This reminds us of the uses of *moltitudine* in the texts of Niccolò Machiavelli, where ordinary citizens are transformed into a violent mob or throng as an outcome of sedition and rebellion. A mob is unpredictable and erratic, it is ready to rip apart anyone who stands in its way and is not willing to merge with it. Thus, Hobbes really elaborated the ancient concept of multitude. He combined the classical themes with early modern ones, and he conflated metaphysical, linguistic and even mathematical ideas with political ones. The most important thing that he added

316 One of the best known citations from Hobbes can be found from *De Cive* where he states, underlying his method, that: "To return once again to the natural state and to look at men as if they had just emerged from the earth like mushrooms and grown up without an obligation to each other…" (Hobbes DCE, VIII, 1. p. 102; p. lat. 249).

to the concept of multitude was his deep and profound analysis of the concept of motion, a column of the new natural philosophy.

As our short cartography on the studies concerning the concept of motion in Hobbes research showed, the concept of motion is crucial if we want to understand his philosophy. Yet, even though there are many studies concerning the philosophical and scientific aspects of the concept of motion, there are fewer studies that are concerned with the political nature of motion in Hobbes's philosophy. In this study we have tried to display how the political problem of the multitude is a link to understand the political nature of the concept of motion. This was done in the four re-readings of the essential parts of Hobbes's philosophy, which related the concepts of multitude and motion to other important political themes such as passions and fear, the concepts of democracy, revolution and international relations.

The first proper re-reading in chapter 3 *Fear, Motion and Multitude* concerned the very basis of Hobbes's theory of motion in human communities, that is, Hobbes's theory of passions, especially fear. We also analyzed the complex object of state from the viewpoint of the *aisthesis* of political power and compared how two different bodies of human beings, multitude and state, affect individuals and their action. According to our analysis the formation and production of the political subject, the citizen, is all about changing the framework of fear. In multitude the emotion that drives people to seek peace and security from the commonwealth is mutual, reciprocal fear. When the subject lives in a commonwealth, fear of the sovereign power is used for the governance of the citizen, either directly (through the governance of the body) or indirectly (through the control of mind).

In the commonwealth the sovereign power organizes and gives a meaning to *aisthesis*, the sense experience of everyday life. The political syntax explains why this street is closed, why this park is private property and why this street is the only legal way through those private fields. In the end, if the subject does not understand that he cannot cross the barrier, be it an iron fence or just an "artificial impediment" like a civil law, the sovereign power has to have the capacity to make the subject feel that she is heading towards the wrong direction. Here the sovereign power becomes really active; it interferes in the relationship between the subject and the world and corrects the subject in the way that the sovereign sees as best. It is indeed important to note that the sovereign is a mediator between people, but also a mediator between the person and the world. In this way, a sovereign power becomes, in fact, also a mediator of a person's relation to herself. Hobbes thinks that political power is not only useful; it is necessary. In a commonwealth, man is not free, but kept on the right track as water is kept in a channel. However, this limitation of human liberty is the outcome of her own will, as Hobbes describes vividly:

> Liberty, and necessity are consistent: as in the *water*, that hath not only liberty, but a necessity of descending by the channel; so likewise in the actions which men voluntarily do: which, because they proceed from their will, proceed from liberty; (Hobbes L, XXI, 3. p. 140.)

Returning to the issue of the meaning and importance of passions for Hobbes's political theory and his theory of governance, it has become clear that the sovereignty postulated by Hobbes does not hate passions, but instead the sovereign uses passions effectively while constructing political power. Passions, fear especially, are the building blocks of the society and a means to guide it. Passions give constant, and needed, motion to the commonwealth, but they must be kept in order.

This fact reveals the meaning of the theory of passions in Hobbes's theory. The aim of the science of passions and the mapping of the motions of the mind in Hobbes's philosophy is to take control over emotions, to know what they are, how they work and what their function is. Hobbes uses this knowledge and the theory of human nature and passions for political purposes: on the one hand as an argument that erects the whole political system, and on the other hand as a device that organizes and governs people in a desired way.

In general, Hobbes treats fear and passions as meters or indicators of the political climate of the commonwealth. In the governance of the body politic the outbursts of passions indicate the possible instability of the society. Setting the rules of right behaviour and right emotions creates a scale that makes it possible to recognize harmful political phenomena before they spread to society. Hence, it seems that the political *aisthesis* also works the other way around. While people are free to express their feelings they simultaneously inform the sovereign. The sovereign power senses the resistance and most probably tries to dissolve it. Thus, resisting the sovereign power reveals the world that the sovereign power is about to create. The clash of two motions, individual desire and the interest of the state explain why the passions are at the centre of Hobbes's political philosophy.

In our second re-reading at chapter 4 *Multitude and Democracy* we studied Hobbes's theory of social contract and democratic governance. The paradoxical nature of the multitude is that even though it consists of a large number of different individuals, groups, sects and other actors, the total sum of these different factors is nil: it is impossible to calculate such different units together and hence, there exists no power in a multitude or in other words, power is only potential, not actual, in a multitude. Hence, a multitude is a powerless entity, anarchic as Hobbes sees it. The multitude cannot secure itself or any of its members. A multitude is prone to all kinds of sudden movements, and what is its most problematic character, in a multitude the negative motions rapidly cause *mimesis* and a panic that threatens to easily destroy the whole multitude of men. Sudden mutual violence and uncertainty is epidemic for multitude, since according to Hobbes this illness is typical for human communities and spreads only among people.

In this study we have argued that the political problem of motion is a problem of multitude for Hobbes. The complex and disorganized multitude is for Hobbes like water, a metaphor of homogenous mass or matter, on the table: it moves to whatever direction according to finger that draws it. In other words, it is possible to agitate the disorganized, ignorant and anarchic multitude to all kinds of actions with the rhetoric of demagogues. And when the multitude acts,

it is impossible to say who the author of a particular act is. For this reason there is no *meum* or *tuum* in a multitude, it is impossible to say what is mine or yours, right or wrong. In multitude there is no measure for the acts, since it is impossible to judge the whole crowd for a certain act. Multitude is something that exceeds all the limits, and traverses all boundaries. It is full of contingency, treachery and obscurity. No one, not even the best detective can follow the tracks of the crime and deceit in a multitude.

A solution to this fundamental problem of human communities and politics is to be found in Hobbes's theory of individuation. The result of the Hobbesian resolution is the individual, who is free of all the connections to her relatives, family, hometown, religion or political groups. This abstraction, a picture of a human being without any social or political connections, is Hobbes's primary (re)solution to the problem of multitude. The complexity, interconnectedness, heterogeneity and overlapped nature of the multitude is to be demolished only by introducing the figure of an independent individual. In Hobbes's theory the only conclusion that an individual living in a state of nature can reach is that she is absolutely powerless in the face of the whole body of the multitude. No matter what the individual does, however much she struggles to secure her own life and wellbeing, nothing can ultimately secure the future well-being. In the state of nature all human efforts are vain and this ever increases the hopelessness and frustration in human communities.

By presenting a picture of the hopelessness of an individual in a state of nature and in the face of a multitude Hobbes appeals to the very fundamental questions concerning human existence. According to Hobbes, every human being must acknowledge that their ultimate aim in life is their own self-preservation. The source of motion in human being, the inbuilt endeavour or appetite, drives people to seek a better life. It is this natural driving force in individuals, the natural source of human motion that creates the profound problems in the multitude. Instead of these troubles, Hobbes wants to see a political organization where every individual has a task and reasonable work. In other words, Hobbes wants to harness the potential power embedded in multitude as a driving force and strength of a commonwealth.

Hobbes realized that the multitude should be governed but the problem was that it is impossible to take over a whole multitude at once: it is impossible to organize human crowds without any measure. The individual is the basic unit of the commonwealth and the organizing principle, the measure, which enables the re-organization of the multitude according to calculable and geometric principles. It is only through the re-organization of the *individuals* that the social contract and the creation of the sovereign power is possible. A sovereign power is a composition of the individual powers: it is not a power of the multitude that is directly captured as the basis of commonwealth.

The political subjectivity of the people is created in the social contract and it does not precede in any way the state. This is a crucial difference compared to the earlier and some later theories concerning the origin of political subjectivity: there is no natural source of the *demos*, there is only a disorganized multitude, which is impossible to conceive as a political subject, says Hobbes. A multitude

lacks the common will that makes individuals work and act for the sake of common good. Hence, people as such do not have any essential character: it is not a power of the poor or of the wealthy. A people is a composition of equal individual powers. A people is a voted majority that is capable of overcoming all the minorities that the multitude consists of. This is possible simply because in a state people are pledged to be loyal only to the sovereign power, nothing else. Only this sovereign power, an omnipotent, undivided and absolute power can subordinate the different, minor actors under one power and thus force organization and structure upon the chaotic multitude. Hence, it is through the resolution of the multitude where the basic unit of the commonwealth, the individual, is found and the potential powers (*potentia*) of the multitude are captured and combined in the strength and authority (*potestas*) of the sovereign power.

Yet, what is important is that the concept of multitude is not completely excluded when the sovereign power is constructed. In the process of making the social contract the multitude becomes the object of governance, a population in modern language. As an object of governance, the multitude does not have any rights to act against the sovereign power: only an individual is entitled with this right, yet she acts alone in the face of the absolute power. The multitude is the matter that the sovereign shapes and moulds into the right form: the commonwealth. Since the human community is moving and changing all the time, it is the task of the sovereign to bring consistency and lucid order of motion to the commonwealth. This is best done by channeling the natural motion of the people by the civil laws and other silent laws that concern the right kind of action of the people in their daily behaviour and everyday chores. Like water in the canals, the motion of the people must be made useful for the commonwealth. The motion of the people should empower and increase the strength of the commonwealth.

The usefulness of the strengths of the body politic depends on how well it is governed. As we found in chapter four, democratic government is not endorsed by Hobbes. In this sense Hobbes joins the ancient authors such as Plato, Aristotle and Thucydides, who were always very skeptical about democracy. The problem of democratic government was that it too easily slipped into a government of the multitude, which means, the government of nobody. According to Hobbes, democratic government is prone to constant misuse of words and false rhetoric. Agitators draw people to different directions: easy answers and populism take hold over the complex argumentation and proper dialogue. It is difficult for a democratic government to control and govern human masses, since those who should govern are part of that moving and changing mass. Hence, democratic government is disposed to sedition and rebellion, which will evidently lead the whole commonwealth to destruction and bring back the anarchy of the multitude. For these reasons Hobbes saw that a monarchy is the best form of government for the commonwealth, since its power is steady, effective, not susceptible to sedition and demagogy and most of all, it endures time better than a democratic concert.

From this basis, we considered the concept of revolution in our third re-reading in chapter 5 *The Concepts of Revolution and Multitude.* What interested us in the concept of revolution was its obvious nature as a political concept of motion. Thus, we scrutinized Hobbes's relation to this concept which is one of the most important, if not the most important modern political concept. If revolution means, in our contemporary understanding, a violent regime change, it is very hard to accord with Jeffrey R. Collins (2007) who suggests that Hobbes supported "revolutionary" action of his age. In our study we wanted to discover how the commonwealth designed by Hobbes travels in time and how it is able to adjust itself in the times of civil strife and mutiny. In short, we wanted to find how revolutionary action and "revolution" is tied to the threat of a multitude in Hobbes's philosophy. To understand this we sought out how Hobbes used, or did not use, the concept of revolution in his political vocabulary.

According to our research, Hobbes's conception of revolution is confusing and revealing at the same time. First of all, it is obvious that when Hobbes translated Thucydides's *Peloponnesian War* he knew the word revolution already. Yet, in Hobbes's translation this word does not have any particular meaning that could be connected to a political upheaval, although it would have been possible to describe some events of the Peloponnesian wars as "revolution".

Secondly, it is also more than possible that Hobbes knew the early historical writings by the Italian authors who commented on the revolutionary events in Europe. Hobbes may have been acquainted with the *political* nature of the word (along with the astrological one) already in the 1640s, when he was writing his major political texts. However, as we have seen, he does not generally use the word revolution in his three major political works: instead he uses rebellion, and other related terms such as sedition and tumult. According to our interpretation the idea of political revolution was not relevant for Hobbes. Instead he emphasized that all the action against the sovereign power threatens to collapse the political order and release the dangerous logic of the multitude. In short, Hobbes did not develop a positive conception of the revolution, since he did not see "revolution" as possible or desirable and thus he did not want to use the concept of revolution either.

One reason might have been that the word was connected too strongly to the astronomical circulation of the planets, which Hobbes knew well. The astronomical understanding of revolution was semantically tied to the circular motion and revolving. These connotations may have been something that Hobbes avoided while he was writing about political upheaval. In his first three books on politics, political rebellion was always an act that predicted the destruction of the sovereignty, not the revitalization of its original political powers.

Hobbes uses the metaphor of the body politic in a very literal sense. He describes the commonwealth as a person, which has a birth, life and death. It is possible, as he writes in *Leviathan*, that a commonwealth might exist for a very long period of time. However, it is certain that when a commonwealth

dissolves, it cannot be re-erected. The Leviathan is a mortal God, not immortal. This is why rebellion is the same as suicide or a fatal disease to a human being. Rebellion does not have any good outcomes and, hence, the possibility of revolution in a modern sense seems to be impossible. Rebellion is an action that might dissolve the commonwealth, but it will certainly not bring it to another level or develop it. Hence, even though Hobbes states that the individual resistance against the sovereign power is acceptable, he does not support any kind of rebellious action and certainly not revolutionary action in the modern sense.

It is quite understandable that Hobbes did not write about revolution in the modern sense. Yet it is even more striking that he also attacks the older ideas of the cycles of political regimes. Hobbes did not support the cosmological ideas of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero or Polybius. Unlike them, Hobbes argues that the life span of the state is linear. He never refers to the possibility of metamorphoses from one form to another as a cosmological and historical pattern. The danger of falling back to the reign of multitude is so crucial for Hobbes that he will not endanger his political theory by supporting any kind of revolution.

However, reading *Behemoth* we noted that Hobbes used the concept of revolution, interestingly enough, in a political sense that reminds us of the modern uses of the concept. As we noted while describing the history of the concept of revolution in the 17th century England, the concept was rather popular in the time when Hobbes wrote *Behemoth*. Using this word in the way he did might have been some kind of comment on this "revolutionary" concept. However, the concept of revolution that Hobbes uses in *Behemoth* is still in a complex and paradoxical relationship to the modern conception of revolution.

It is interesting how in *Behemoth* Hobbes seems to argue that in the revolution of the body politic the sovereignty remains immutable throughout the revolution. In one sense the body politic even develops during the revolution: the original position where sovereignty is attached to the King returns after its negation, i.e. the phase where the sovereignty was attached to the Lord Protector Richard Cromwell and the Rump Parliament. Hobbes argues that history teaches that democratic commonwealth is not good for sovereignty, which belongs to the King. But revolution also involves some kind of development. The power once divided between the King and the Parliament, is now transferred in the military sense only to the King, as it should be, according to Hobbes's political thought. The old powers are not only restored, but also improved.

Hobbes's view seems to be quite strange in the light of contemporary evidence concerning the English Civil Wars. Since Hobbes does not see any true change in the sovereignty and in spite of all the facts he claims that the sovereignty lasted all the way through this revolution, he seems to stubbornly purport a view that the body politic lasts even through violent rebellions. His idea is at least controversial in historical terms, and it is perhaps in contrast with his own political theory, too. According to his earlier works, Hobbes could have claimed that establishing the commonwealth of England and the killing of

King Charles I destroyed the old sovereignty. Instead he claims that nothing has profoundly changed. For Hobbes the preservation of the sovereign power was the most important thing and here he seems to stretch his own theory considerably.

We have to remember that what Hobbes wants in his political theory, is peace. Killing the people or the King like the rebellious factions wanted to do does not solve any political problems as he states in *De Cive*:

> How many Kings, themselves good men, have been killed because of the one error that a Tyrant King may be rightfully put to death by his subject? How many men have been slaughtered by the error that a sovereign Prince may be deprived of his kingdom for certain reasons by certain men? How many men have been killed by the erroneous doctrine that sovereign Kings are not masters but servants of society? Finally, how many Rebellions have been caused by the doctrine that it is up to private men to determine whether the commands of Kings are just or unjust, and that his commands may rightly be discussed before they are carried out, and in fact ought to be discussed?" (Hobbes DCE, Preface to the Readers, pp. 8-9: pp. lat. 142-143.)

Instead, according to Hobbes the commonwealth is changed fundamentally by the right kind of education. Hobbes certainly supported reforms, church reformation for example as Collins suggests, but as we have seen, "revolution" was not an option for Hobbes. Instead, Hobbes sees that building a perfect commonwealth takes time and hard work, since after all Hobbes is a determinist and a materialist. Hence, what limits the possibilities of revolution as a political concept for Hobbes is the threat of the multitude, the total collapse of the sovereign power and political order.

In our last re-reading at chapter 6 *Multitude of States or International Multitude* we made an analysis of Hobbes's texts concerning international relations. Again, we utilized the concepts of multitude and motion in our analysis and found that it is possible to bring several new elements to the analysis of Hobbes's vision of international politics.

Unlike the previous research on Hobbes's IR, we suggested that there might be in fact two registers in Hobbes's conception of international relations. The first one is the normative idea of states coexisting in an "international state of nature", endeavouring to maintain the laws of nature (and divine laws as well) in the domestic as well as in the international realm. In our re-reading we named this the "multitude of states". This idea of mostly peaceable coexistence of the states is reasonable if we concentrate on what Hobbes is saying about the sovereigns' true endeavour for peace. Taking into account that Hobbes supposedly preferred an international model that would consist only of sovereign states, it is possible to imagine how states would keep the egoistic individual strife for power in check, promote peaceful and co-operative relations with each other, but of course without giving up the right to defend themselves in the time of possible attack. This would mean that the independence of states would secure the international peace as far as it is possible.

According to our re-reading it seems that Hobbes's idea of the best possible international relations is not as amoral as one is accustomed to think.

Vice versa, Hobbes claims that he is engaged to the Christian, peaceful values and is not supporting amoral international politics. One must also note that he is not speaking for the Christian power politics and supremacy of Pope in the world. The actions of the sovereign are limited both by the laws of nature, which are in fact divine and moral laws as well; and by the principle of *salus populi suprema lex,* which requires sovereigns to act for the benefit of the people. We must remember that according to Hobbes's political theory the sovereign has power only inside the borders of the Commonwealth. If he had wanted to build a war-machine that would suppress all the other powers in the world, he surely would have written something about it. However, as we have seen, there is no tendency of this kind in his philosophy.

Hobbes's idea of a sovereign states fits well to the system of Westphalia that was established in 1648. Hobbes's vision of the "multitude of states" is anarchic in the sense that no single nation or power, not even the Catholic Church, can rule over the others. This might, of course, lead to wars since the states want to try their powers against each other. Yet, in Hobbes's vision every state would rather take care of its own business and concentrate on empowering its own citizens. Hence, the multitude of states is in Hobbesian sense an apolitical, but still manageable way of living together in the world. In other words, there is and there ought to be no supreme authority, or global Leviathan, in the world that would create the sphere of politics for the independent states. Hobbes sees that the lack of an international organizer does not lead to chaotic war of all against all between states. The slow inertia of the multitude secures that there are no rapid changes at the international level. Like the multitude in the state of nature, the international system of states remains at a low level of development. The multitude of states is anarchic, that is, it does not have the power to operate as such: all the actions are made by states. Hence, the multitude of independent states designed by Hobbes is a relatively peaceful and relatively reasonable collection of "adult" states that sometimes co-operate with each other by trade and mutual aid, but which sometimes collide in war.

Still, this is only one side of the story. A different view of the international relations, much closer to Hobbes's own era, can be read as well. This is something that we have called here the "international multitude". Hobbes's age was full of controversies, civil wars, religious wars, angry scientific debate and moral rouse. Hobbes knew very well that states are not sovereign in the sense he wanted them to be. Instead, foreign powers affected domestic politics of England, for example through the "soft power" of religion and the university system. He also saw how several actors, which did not have legitimate political sovereignty such as churches and corporations, infected and acted in domestic and international politics. If only states would have been sovereign in the sense that Hobbes wanted them to be, there would not have been such confusion and power-political competition, which drove the commonwealths to the brink of collapse. But this was, as we saw earlier, only a wish and a political project. In short, in Hobbes's theory the strong sovereignty was an answer to this political turbulence, the problem of multitude, both domestically and internationally.

In Hobbes's time the problem appeared to be that the international multitude consisting of states, churches, religious sects, political fractions, economic actors and such was causing tremendous problems and risks to everyone. Here we have the widest possible definition of the multitude encompassing individuals, families, political, economic and religious groups, as well by the political institutions, churches, and states. Everyone, and every group in the world is seeking their own interest and, as an outcome of this, causing constant strife and confusion. As we have seen, multitude is not only a confusion of individuals: it is a complex confusion of different interest groups. We note here again how the principle of individuation, the dissolution of the multitude with the principle of an individual to simple, homogenous, calculable and hence manageable political units, such as sovereign or citizen, is an answer, not a starting point in Hobbes's analysis. With his doctrine of a strong, independent state, Hobbes tries definitely to refute the problem of an international multitude.

As we re-read Hobbes's texts we notice that he has in fact much more to say about the international multitude than we first think. It is true that Hobbes does not speak much about the international relations of the sovereign states. Instead, he discusses at length about international politics where different actors seek their own benefit in spite of the costs. Hobbes describes in detail what a sovereign state should not do, if it wants to stay alive, independent and powerful. This is the true lesson of surviving in the international multitude that we can learn from Hobbes: states should invest in the well-being, education and development of their citizens, in their own "biopower" instead of waging war against other states and nations. The "Empusa" of multitude should not be dissolved by skirmish, namely by war and violence, but rather by education, by letting in the light of reason upon the multitude.

As a conclusion, we can state that the analysis done with the concept of multitude brings new elements to the analysis of Hobbes's international relations. The two orders of multitude help to explain the difference between Hobbes's normative and descriptive political theory, or in other words, between the political answer and the political problem.

In our research on Hobbes's concepts of motion and multitude we have seen how the concept of multitude truly and concretely introduces the theory of motion that was elaborated and developed by the scientific revolution to Hobbes's political philosophy. Hobbes was in no way an outsider in this process of re-founding the physics and metaphysics: he developed the concepts of matter and motion in a significant way in his philosophical texts. However, Hobbes's legacy is even stronger in the field of political philosophy. The way that he worked with the concept of motion in his political philosophy was a significant innovation, which had tremendous impacts on modern political thought. The political problem of the motion, the concept of multitude, gathers together a whole series of different, yet crucial political questions. Most of all it indicates the complex relation of the human community, the individual and the state by introducing the problem of change, contingency and motion in a new way to the sphere of politics. The real political question was now how to

capture and organize these motions and powers in a way that they would not destroy the commonwealth.

In Hobbes's political vocabulary the concept of multitude is a concept that marks the border and the middle ground between apolitics and politics, between chaos and order, decomposition and structure. In this way, the multitude is something that reveals the political problem, but by no means solves it. Hobbes answer to the problem of multitude was a sovereign power that takes constantly care of the right order of the motion of the citizens in the state.

In our research, we have studied, first of all, the uses of the concept of multitude and secondly, its relations to other important political concepts in Hobbes's political philosophy. We have noticed that the concept has a certain classical background as does the concept of motion. In Hobbes's philosophical work, these concepts, their definition and redefinition, occupy a central place. The way that Hobbes elaborates, improves and even rebuilds these concepts is highly interesting. He disconnects certain elements and components from the traditional concepts of multitude and motion and attaches new and interesting ones to them instead. Hobbes builds new bridges between the concepts of multitude and motion, and shows imaginative connections and correspondence to several other political, physical and metaphysical concepts. What is most important, Hobbes shows a totally new, political context where these concepts may appear.

All in all, the aim of this study has been to better comprehend the way that Hobbes wrote his civil philosophy and to understand what the guiding principles and practices in his philosophical programme were. According to our study it seems that the right understanding of the multitude, in other words the political problem of motion, is the key to understand more profoundly his political answer, the social contract and sovereign power based on the individual. To do this we have studied how these two crucial concepts, motion and multitude, collide and join together in Hobbes's political philosophy. As a result we have been able to reveal essential features and questions in Hobbes's political thought in a new way by showing that by using these two concepts in our analysis we reach the heart of Hobbes's political thought.

TIIVISTELMÄ (FINNISH SUMMARY)

Väki liikkeessä: Uudelleenluentoja Thomas Hobbesin poliittisesta filosofiasta

Tutkielmassa tarkastellaan liikkeen ja multituden (lat. multitudo suom. väki, väkijoukko, rahvas) käsitteiden tiivistä ja yhteenkietoutunutta suhdetta Thomas Hobbesin (1588-1679) poliittisessa filosofiassa. Aikaisemman Hobbes-tutkimuksen perusteella voidaan esittää, että liikkeen käsite on keskeisin ontologinen käsite Hobbesin filosofiassa. Se jäsentää hänen käsitystään ensimmäisestä filosofiasta (*philosophia prima*) tai metafysiikasta, hänen teoriaansa fysiikasta, hänen käsityksiään elävistä olennoista ja lopulta myös ihmismielestä. Hobbes käsitti maailman koostuvan liikkeessä olevasta materiasta. Liikettä hän käsitteli mekanistisena ilmiönä seuraten Galileo Galilein (1564-1642) kehittelemää alkukantaista liikkeen inertian lakia. Aikaisemmassa tutkimuksessa Hobbesin liikekäsitys on ymmärretty hänen filosofiansa perustaksi, ja usein myös hänen poliittisen filosofiansa on nähty pohjautuvan liikkeen teoriaan.

Poliittinen filosofia on kuitenkin perinteisesti nähty Hobbes-tutkimuksessa hänen metafyysisen, fyysisen ja psykologisen liikekäsityksensä sovelluksena, siis eräänlaisena seurauksena ”tieteellisestä” (so. luonnontieteellisestä) perustasta. Liikettä ei kuitenkaan ole juurikaan tutkittu poliittisena käsitteenä Hobbesin filosofiassa. Yksi syy tähän voi olla se, että voimakkaasti luonnontieteellistä ja psykologista tulkintaa painottaneet tutkimukset ovat jättäneet huomioimatta Hobbesin filosofian kielellisen, käsitteellisen ja retorisen luonteen. Kamppailu ”luonnontieteellisen” ja ”humanistisen” Hobbes-tutkimuksen välillä on aikaansaanut erityisiä korostuksia, mutta ilmiselvää yhdistävää käsitettä, liikettä, on tutkittu yllättävän vähän. Erityisesti viime vuosikymmeninä vahvistunut niin sanottu kontekstuaalinen tutkimusote on usein ohittanut liikkeeseen liittyvän problematiikan, mahdollisesti juuri sen ”luonnontieteellisen” ja metafyysisen painolastin vuoksi.

Mikä sitten on liikkeen poliittinen ongelma Hobbesille? Tämän tutkimuksen mukaan Hobbesin perustava poliittinen ongelma on järjestäytymättömän, hajanaisen ja kaoottisen multituden, vapaasti liikkuvan ihmismaterian ongelma. Multituden vapaa ja sääntelemätön liike muodostaa perustavan kysymyksen, jonka ympärille Hobbesin poliittinen filosofia järjestäytyy. Kaikki hänen poliittisen filosofiansa tärkeät kysymykset, kuten kysymykset yksilönvapaudesta tai suvereenin vallasta, liittyvät tiiviisti liikkeen ongelmaan. Tässä tutkielmassa selvitetään, millainen käsite multitude on Hobbesin filosofiassa ja kuinka se nimeää liikkeen poliittisena ongelmana. Multituden analyysin kautta nähdään, kuinka Hobbesin luonnonfilosofinen kysymys liikkeestä jäsentyy saumattomaksi osaksi hänen poliittista filosofiaansa.

Tutkimus keskittyy siis liikkeen ja multituden käsitteiden analyysiin Hobbesin filosofiassa analysoimalla näiden käsitteiden käyttöä Hobbesin omissa teksteissä sekä valottamalla kyseessä olevien käsitteiden käsitehistoriallisia taustoja antiikin Kreikan ja Rooman sekä renessanssin poliittisessa teoriassa.

Tutkielmassa tarkastellaan myös aikaisempaa Hobbes-tutkimusta ja luodaan kriittisiä katsauksia aikaisemman tutkimuksen näkökulmiin.

Tutkimus koostuu viidestä varsinaisesta tutkimusluvusta. Yleisen johdantoluvun jälkeen luku kaksi *Multitude in Motion* kartoittaa aikaisempaa Hobbes-tutkimusta koskien liikkeen ja multituden käsitteitä. Luvussa luodaan myös katsaus antiikin ja renessanssin käsityksiin multituden käsitteestä. Antiikin kreikassa multitudesta kirjoitettiin muun muassa käsitteillä *oi polloi*, *plethos* ja *ochlos*. Ne kaikki viittaavat moneuteen ja suureen lukumäärään kuten multitudekin, ja ne viittaavat erityisesti suureen, yleensä järjestäytymättömään, kaoottiseen ja jopa hirviömäiseen ihmisjoukkoon. Antiikin Roomassa kohtaamme ensimmäistä kertaa käsitteen multitudo mm. Ciceron käyttämänä. Latinan termi 'multitudo' viittaa hyvin samankaltaiseen ilmiöön kuin kreikan vastaavat käsitteet. Myös renessanssifilosofi Niccolò Machiavelli käyttää myöhemmin runsaasti termiä *moltitudine* korostaen käsitteen hirviömäistä ja väkivaltaista puolta. Machiavelli näkeekin multituden pääasiassa yhteiskuntia hajottavana voimana, väen valtana.

Käsitehistoriallisen tarkastelun jälkeen luvussa siirrytään tutkimaan multituden käsitteen käyttöä Hobbesin poliittisessa filosofiassa. Siinä esitetään yleiskatsaus käsitteen määrittelyihin ja käyttöön koko Hobbesin tekstuaalisessa *corpuksessa*. Ensin käsitellään multituden käsitteen poliittista luonnetta sekä Hobbesin poliittista pyrkimystä asettaa rajat multituden vapaalle liikkeelle. Sitten tarkastellaan multitudeen liittyvää tasa-arvoa sekä egoistisen yksilön syntyä multitudessa. Toisin kuin aikaisemmassa tutkimuksessa, tässä tutkimuksessa egoistisen yksilön nähdään olevan seurausta elämästä epämääräisessä ja epävakaassa ihmisjoukossa: nimenomaan väkijoukon logiikka saa aikaan ihmisen moraalisen rappion ja epäluottamuksen toisia ihmisiä kohtaan. Näitä piirteitä ei siis nähdä essentialistisina ihmisluontoon väistämättä kuuluvina piirteinä. Tutkimuksessa esitetään, että ihmisten käyttäytymistä (liikettä) on mahdollista muuttaa poliittisella ohjauksella ja juuri tähän Hobbes pyrkii politiikan teoriallaan.

Kolmanneksi tarkastellaan multitudeen olennaisesti liittyvää tietämättömyyttä ja tästä seuraavaa demagogiaa. Hobbesin mukaan suurimpia ongelmia multitudessa on ihmisten mielen ailahtelevaisuus ja holtittomuus, joka johtaa tavoittelemaan lyhytnäköisesti omaa etua. Tämän seurauksena multitudessa pitävät valtaa taitavat puhujat ja populistit, jotka onnistuvat agitoimaan väkijoukon puolelleen mitä mielikuvituksellisimmin lupauksin. Luvussa tarkastellaan myös sitä, kuinka multitudessa jännittyvät negatiiviset voimat ja vastavoimat kyetään kaappaamaan valtion energiaksi. Multitude muodostaa sen alituisesti liikkuvan, muuttuvan ja uudistuvan ihmismaterian ja voimakentän, josta on mahdollista muotoilla kestävä valtio oikeiden poliittisten toimien avulla.

Luvussa kolme *Fear, Motion and Multitude* tarkastellaan pelon, liikkeen ja multituden suhteita. Tunteiden tai mielenliikkeiden tutkimus ja niiden kartoitus oli olennainen osa Hobbesin mielenfilosofiaa. Hän näki itse yhtenä suurimpana ansionaan "vulgaarien tunteiden" tutkimuksen. Hobbesin mukaan tunteet syntyvät ulkoapäin tulevien aistivaikutelmien ja niiden sisäisten tulkintojen jännitteestä. Tunteet ovat siis eräänlainen selviytymismekanismi ihmiselle. Mie-

lihyvää ja siten puoleensa vetäviä tunteita synnyttävät asiat, jotka lisäävät ja vahvistavat ihmisen perustehtävää, joka on Hobbesin mukaan elossa säilyminen ja selviytyminen. Mielipahaa ja luontaan työntäviä tunteita muodostavat puolestaan asiat, jotka uhkaavat tätä samaa periaatetta. Tunteiden perustalla on kaksi liikettä, halu (*appetite*) ja inho (*aversion*). Koska tunteet kuvaavat mielenliikkeitä ja ne myös konkreettisesti liikuttavat ihmisiä, ovat ne olennaisen tärkeitä politiikassa. Miellyttäviä tunteita voidaan synnyttää esimerkiksi retoriikalla, joka lupaa ihmisille hyvää. Ihmiset myös poikkeavat toisistaan huomattavasti erilaisine tunteineen. Tunteet saattavat johtaa ihmiset harhaan, minkä vuoksi niihin tulee suhtautua skeptisesti. Ainoa luotettava tunne on pelko, joka yhdistää kaikkia ihmisiä, sillä ajatus väkivaltaisesta kuolemasta on jotain, minkä kaikki ihmiset ymmärtävät negatiiviseksi. Tästä syystä Hobbes esittää, että pelko on ainoa tunne, jonka perustalle vakaat yhteiskunnat voidaan rakentaa. Pelko ei kuitenkaan ole ainoastaan yhteiskunnan perustava tunne, vaan se on myös olennainen osa poliittista ohjausjärjestelmää, jonka avulla suvereeni hallitsee yhteiskuntaa.

Neljäs luku *Multitude and Democracy* siirtyy tunteiden analyysistä multituden ja demokratian monimutkaisen suhteen tarkasteluun. Luku tarkastelee Hobbesin teoriaa demokratiasta ja suvereniteetista suhteessa multituden käsitteeseen. Alkuun tarkastellaan varhaisempaa Hobbesin demokratiateorian tutkimusta ja tuodaan ilmi, että vaikka demokratian ja multituden suhdetta on tutkittu aiemmin jonkin verran, on tutkimuksessa ymmärretty väärin multituden käsitteen luonne. Erityisesti Richard Tuckin artikkeli *Hobbes and Democracy,* jossa Tuck väittää Hobbesin perustaneen suvereniteetin teoriansa ympärikäännetylle aristoteliselle ”äärimmäisen demokratian” (*extreme democracy*) teorialle sisältää olennaisia väärinymmärryksiä koskien multituden käsitettä. Siksi luvussa tarkastellaan erityisesti ”äärimmäisen demokratian” käsitettä Aristoteleella. Tätä suhteutetaan Tuckin argumentin tarkempaan analyysiin. Lisäksi luvussa tarkastellaan Hobbesin käsitystä demokratiasta ja multitudesta lähtemällä liikkeelle yhteiskuntasopimuksen demokraattisesta perustasta. Sen jälkeen osoitetaan, että huolimatta yhteiskuntasopimukseen kuuluvasta demokratiasta, Hobbes vastustaa demokraattista hallintoa useilla perustelluilla argumenteilla. Tärkeää on se, että Hobbes näki demokratian olevan aivan liian lähellä hänen pelkäämäänsä multitudea. On todettava, että vaikka Hobbes perusti valtion kansan voimalle ja oikeutukselle (perinteisen Jumalalta tulevan oikeutuksen sijaan), ei hän missään tilanteessa ole valmis hyväksymään demokratiaa hyväksi valtion hallintomuodoksi.

Viidennessä luvussa *The Concepts of Revolution and Multitude* tutkimus siirtyy tarkastelemaan vallankumouksen käsitettä Hobbesin poliittisessa filosofiassa. Termillä vallankumous (*revolution*) on modernissa poliittisessa sanastossa erittäin tärkeä rooli. Erityisesti Ranskan vallankumouksen jälkeen käsite vallankumous on leimannut poliittista ajattelua, toimintaa ja keskustelua. Usein termiä vallankumous käytetään myös kuvattaessa varhaisempia yhteiskunnallisia mullistuksia. On kuitenkin tärkeää huomata, että käsite ilmaantui poliittiseen kieleen vasta 1500–1600-luvuilla, eikä siitä muodostunut merkittävää käsitettä ennen 1700 -

lukua. Tässä luvussa tarkastellaan asiaa Hobbesin poliittisen filosofian näkökulmasta. Tärkeimpänä selityksenä sille, miksi Hobbes ei juurikaan käyttänyt vallankumouksen käsitettä teksteissään, esitetään vallankumouksen ja vallankumouksellisuuden tiivis yhteys Hobbesin pelkäämään multitudeen.

Luvussa selvitetään ensin vallankumouksen käsitehistoriaa antiikissa ja renessanssissa. Yhteiskunnallisten ja poliittisten regiimien muutos ei ole vain uudelle ja modernille ajalle tyypillinen ilmiö, vaikka termiä vallankumous ei klassisella ajalla käytettykään. Tarkastelemalla joitakin näkökulmia regiimien vaihdoksiin klassisella ajalla voidaan ymmärtää paremmin, millaista taustaa vasten Hobbes kirjoitti omaa teoriaansa valtiosta ja miksi hän suhtautui vallankumoukseen niin kielteisesti. Klassikkoja koskevan analyysin jälkeen tarkastellaan lyhyesti vallankumouksen käsitteen historiaa renessanssissa ja uuden ajan alun Englannissa, mikä auttaa ymmärtämään vallankumouksen käsitteen asemaa Hobbesin aikalaiskeskustelussa.

Seuraavaksi siirrytään tarkastelemaan Hobbesin käsitystä vallankumouksesta ja erityisesti vallankumouksen käsitteen käyttöä hänen teoksissaan. Tutkimus osoittaa, että Hobbes käyttää vallankumous -käsitettä erittäin harvoin, vaikka hän selvästikin tunsi käsitteen astrologisen ja poliittisen merkityksen. Vallankumous sisälsi Hobbesin aikana ajatuksen revoluutiosta, paluusta alkutilanteeseen, joka näyttäytyy Hobbeslaisessa kontekstissa järjettömältä. Paluu alkutilanteeseen olisi tarkoittanut paluuta multitudeen ennen yhteiskuntasopimusta. On kuitenkin erittäin mielenkiintoista, että viimeisessä poliittisessa tekstissään *Behemoth* Hobbes käyttää vallankumouksen käsitettä selittämään Englannin sisällissodan aikana tapahtunutta suvereniteetin kiertoliikettä, jossa valta siirtyi kuninkaalta (Kaarle I) parlamentille, josta se edelleen kulki lordikansleri Oliver Cromwellille, minkä jälkeen se jälleen palautui kuninkaalle (Kaarle II). Katsaus Hobbesin tapaan käyttää ja karttaa vallankumouksen käsitettä valottaa siis huomattavasti hänen ymmärrystään liikkeen ja multituden käsitteistä valtion perustavina ja sitä ajallisesti rajaavina käsitteinä.

Kuudennessa ja viimeisessä varsinaisessa luvussa *Multitude of States or International Multitude* tarkastellaan Hobbesin kansainvälisen politiikan teoriaa multituden ja liikkeen käsitteiden avulla. Luku alkaa Hobbesin kansainvälisiä suhteita koskevan tutkimuksen kartoituksella. Hobbesin asema kansainvälisen politiikan teoriassa on merkittävä, sillä häntä pidetään yhtenä tärkeimpänä esikuvana 1900-luvun kansainvälisen politiikan tutkimuksen niin sanotulle realistiselle koulukunnalle. Hobbeslaisen realismin mukaan valtiot huolehtivat ennen kaikkea omasta selviytymisestään ja hyvinvoinnistaan. Tämä näkökulma on johtanut niin realismin kuin Hobbesinkin syyttämiseen kansainvälisestä moraalittomuudesta ja oikeudettomuudesta. Erityisesti liberaali kansainvälisen politiikan perinne näkee, että hobbeslaisesta realismista seuraa voimapolitiikka sekä pahimmillaan sotaan eskaloituva asevarustelu. 1980-luvulta lähtien Hobbesin kansainvälisten suhteiden teoriaa on tutkittu myös enemmän historiallisesta ja kontekstualisesta lähtökohdista. Näiden tutkimusten tavoitteena ei ole ollut niinkään selittää nykymaailman kansainvälisten suhteiden luonnetta Hobbesin teorialla vaan pikemminkin ymmärtää, kuinka Hobbes ymmärsi ja rakensi

omaa teoriaansa valtioiden välisistä suhteista. Tämä luku lähtee liikkeelle jälkimäisestä lähestymistavasta ja esittää kattavan uudelleenluennan yhtäältä Hobbesin kansainvälisten suhteiden normatiivisesta teoriasta ja toisaalta Hobbesin esittämistä kansainvälisten suhteiden kuvauksista.

Luku käsittelee ensin perustavaa kysymystä siitä, onko suvereeni moraalisesti velvoitettu ja ketä kohtaan. Toiseksi se käsittelee luonnon lain ja kansojen lakien yhteyttä Hobbesin teoriassa. Esiin nostetaan mahdollisuus lukea Hobbesin teoriaa eräänlaisena biovallan teoriana. Luvussa esitetään, että Hobbesin perustava periaate *Salus populi suprema lex* perustuu kansan turvallisuuden, mutta myös hyvinvoinnin ja ”terveyden” turvaamiseen. Tämän vuoksi esimerkiksi valloitussota ei näytä järkevältä vaihtoehdolta, sillä se asettaa kansan turhaan vaaraan. Luvussa tarkastellaan myös armeijan, imperialismin, kolonialismin ja kansainvälisen kaupan ulottuvuuksia ja osoitetaan, että vaikka Hobbesin teoria mahdollistaa kolonialismin, hän ei kuitenkaan nähnyt sitä kovinkaan järkevänä ulkopolitiikkana. Luvussa osoitetaan, että Hobbes ymmärsi kansainvälisten suhteiden ja kansainvälisen kaupan merkityksen valtion hyvinvoinnille. Lopuksi tarkastellaan, kuinka Hobbes kuvaa erityisesti viimeisessä poliittisessa teoksessaan valtion sisäisten konfliktien, siis erityisesti Englannin sisällissodan, ulkopuolisia syitä. Hobbes näkee, että erityisesti katolisen kirkon kansainvälinen valta niin kirkon kuin yliopistonkin kautta vaikutti ratkaisevasti Englannin suistumiseen sisällissotaan. Tämä luenta osoittaa Hobbesin ymmärtäneen, että kansainvälisellä politiikalla on merkittävä rooli valtioiden sisäpolitiikassa, ja tämä myös selittää hänen erilaisia vaatimuksiaan valtioiden itsenäisyydestä ja riippumattomuudesta.

Tutkimuksen yhteenvedossa todetaan, että Hobbesin poliittista filosofiaa on hedelmällistä lähestyä tarkastelemalla uudelleen liikkeen perustavaa ongelmaa multituden käsitteen kautta. Kokonaisuudessaan tutkielma osoittaa, että multituden käsite muodostaa olennaisen, joskin aiemmin lähes tutkimattoman osan Hobbesin käsitteellistä arkkitehtuuria. Multitude nimeää poliittisen ongelman, siis ihmisyksilöiden ja väkijoukkojen vapaan liikkeen ongelman. Multituden käsite korostaa myös nimenomaan ihmisyhteisön roolia Hobbesin teoriassa. Hobbesin poliittinen teoria ei siis rakennu pelkästään yksilöpsykologian perustalle. Kuten luvussa kolme osoitetaan, multitude muodostaa sellaisen sosiaalisen kappaleen, joka aiheuttaa yksilössä ahdistusta ja pelkoa. Toisin sanottuna juuri multitude ihmisyhteisön moneutena ajaa yksilön erottautumaan ihmisyhteisöstä ja kasvattaa näin egoistisia pyrkimyksiä.

Tämä luonnolliseen ihmisyhteisöön perustuva ”valuvika” on Hobbesin mukaan kuitenkin korjattavissa yhteiskuntasopimuksella rakennettavan suvereenin vallan avulla. Suvereeni valta kykenee pakottamaan ihmiset noudattamaan yhteisiä lakeja ja se antaa näin ollen ”äänen” muutoin hiljaisille, vain ihmisyksilön omatuntoa sitoville luonnon laeille. Hobbes katsoi, että ihmisyhteisön luonnollinen liike eli ihmisten yhteiset pyrkimykset ilman poliittista kontrollia, ei johda mihinkään. Ilman poliittista rakennetta, joka säätelee ihmisten toimintaa, ihmisyhteisöä uhkaa jatkuva sota, kiista ja jopa tuhoutuminen. Selviytymisen ehtona on poliittisen kappaleen (*body politic*) rakentaminen. Sen asettamat sään-

nöt ja esteet ihmisten luonnolliselle liikkeelle takaavat kaikille suhteellisen vapauden ja kyvyn kehittää omia kykyjään ja kasata omaisuutta ilman pelkoa väkivaltaisesta kuolemasta. Keskeisellä sijalla Hobbesin teoriassa ei kuitenkaan ole valtion alamaisiinsa kohdistama voimapolitiikka, vaan kasvatus ja koulutus. Organisoimalla yksilöiden mielenliikkeitä kasvatuksen ja koulutuksen avulla voidaan Hobbesin mukaan saavuttaa parhaita ja kauaskantoisimpia tuloksia kestävän ja rauhallisen yhteiskunnan tiellä. Tämän kaiken tueksi tarvitaan kuitenkin suvereenin yksinvalta käyttää oikeutta ja myös väkivaltaa kansalaisia kohtaan tarpeen vaatiessa. Tutkimuksen mukaan voidaan siis esittää, että ihmisyhteisön vapaan liikkeen organisointi on politiikan tärkein tehtävä.

REFERENCES

THE WORKS BY THOMAS HOBBES

Hobbes, Thomas [1620/1995]. *Three Discourses: A Discourse Upon the Beginning of Tacitus; A Discourse of Rome; A Discourse of Laws. [Horae Subsecivae].* A Critical Modern Edition of Newly Identified Work of the Young Hobbes. Edited by Noel B. Reynolds and Arlene W. Saxonhouse. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Hobbes, Thomas [1629/2005]. Of the Life and History of Thucydides. *English Works VIII*. Elibron Classics, xiii-xxxii.

Hobbes, Thomas [1629/2005]. Eight Books of the Peloponnesian War Written by Thucydides, the Son of Olorus, Interpreted with Faith and Diligence Immediately out of the Greek by Thomas Hobbes. Secretary to the late Earl of Devonshire, Vol. I & Vol. II. *English Works VIII & IX*. Elibron Classics.

Hobbes, Thomas [1630-31/1988]. A Short Tract on First Principles. Thomas Hobbes: *Court Traité des premiers principles*. Paris: PUF.

Hobbes, Thomas [1640/2005]. The Elements of Law (Human Nature and De Corpore Politico).*The English Works IV*. Elibron Classics.

Hobbes, Thomas [1642-47/2003]. *On the Citizen* (English translation of *De Cive*) Edited and Translated by Richard Tuck and Michael Silverthorne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobbes, Thomas [1642-47/2012]. De Cive. *Opera Philosophica, Vol. II*. London: British Library, Historical Print Editions, 133-432.

Hobbes, Thomas [1643/1973]. *Critique du* De Mundo *de Thomas White* (Latin *De Mundo*). Édition critique d'un texte inédit par Jean Jacquot et Harold Whitmore Jones. Paris: VRIN-CNRS.

Hobbes, Thomas [1643/1973]. De Motibus Solis, Aetheris & Telluris. Thomas Hobbes: *Critique du* De Mundo *de Thomas White* (Latin *De Mundo*). Édition critique d'un texte inédit par Jean Jacquot et Harold Whitmore Jones. Paris: VRIN-CNRS, 441-447.

Hobbes, Thomas [1643/1976]. *Thomas White's* De Mundo *Examined*. Translated by Harold Whitmore Jones. London: Bradford University Press in association with Crosby Lockwood Staples.

Hobbes, Thomas [1646/2005]. Of Liberty and Necessity. *English Works IV*. Elibron Classics, 229-278.

Hobbes, Thomas [1651/1994]. *Leviathan with selected variants from the Latin edition 1668*. Edited by Edwin Curley. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

Hobbes, Thomas [1651/1999]. *Leviathan*. Edited by J.C.A. Gaskin. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hobbes, Thomas [1655/1999]. *Leviathan*. Translated into Finnish by Tuomo Aho. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Hobbes, Thomas [1655/2005]. Elements of Philosophy. The First Section, Concerning Body, Written in Latin by Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury, and Translated into English (English De Corpore). *The English Works I*. Elibron Classics.

Hobbes, Thomas [1655/2012]. Elementorum Philosophiæ Sectio Prima De Corpore (De Corpore). *Opera Philosophica, Vol. I*. London: British Library, Historical Print Editions.

Hobbes, Thomas [1656/2005]. Six Lessons for the Professors of Mathematics, one of Geometry, other of Astronomy, in the chairs set up by the noble and learned sir Henry Savile, in the University of Oxford. *English Works VII*. Elibron Classics, 182-356.

Hobbes, Thomas [1656/2005]. The Questions Concerning Liberty, Necessity, and Chance, clearly stated and debated between Dr. Bramhall, Bishop of Derry and Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury. *English Works V*. Elibron Classics.

Hobbes, Thomas [1658 /1974]. *De Homine, Traité de L'Homme*. Traduction et commentaire par Paul-Marie Maurin. Paris: Albert Blanchard.

Hobbes, Thomas [1658/2012]. De Homine. *Opera Philosophica, Vol. II*. London: British Library, Historical Print Editions, 1-132.

Hobbes, Thomas [1661/2012]. Dialogus physicus de natura aeris item de duplicatione cubi. *Opera Philosophica, Vol. IV*. London: British Library, Historical Print Editions, 237-296.

Hobbes, Thomas [1662/2005]. Seven Philosophical Problems and Two Propositions of Geometry. By Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury. With an Apology For Himself and His Writings. Dedicated to the King in the year 1662. *English Works VII*. Elibron Classics, 2-68.

Hobbes, Thomas [1662/2012]. Problemata Physica. *Opera Philosophica, Vol. IV*. London: British Library, Historical Print Editions, 297-359.

Hobbes, Thomas [1666/2005]. A Dialogue Between and Philosopher and a Student of the Common Laws of England. *English Works VI*. Elibron Classics, 1-160.

Hobbes, Thomas [1666/2005]. An Historical Narration concerning Heresy, and the Punishment thereof. *English Works IV*. Elibron Classics, 385-440.

Hobbes, Thomas [1666/2012]. De principiis et ratiocinatione geometrarum, et de mediis proportinalibus in genere in *Opera Philosophica, Vol. IV*. London: British Library, Historical Print Editions, 385-465.

Hobbes, Thomas [1668/2005]. An Answer to a Book Published by Dr. Bramhall, Late Bishop of Derry; Called the "Catching of the Leviathan." *English Works IV*. Elibron Classics, 279-384.

Hobbes, Thomas [1668/1990]. *Behemoth or The Long Parliament*. Edited by Ferdinand Tönnies. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Hobbes, Thomas [1668/2012]. Leviathan. Sive de material, forma, et potestate civitatis exxlesiasticæ et civils. *Opera Philosophica, Vol. III*. London: British Library, Historical Print Editions.

Hobbes, Thomas [1678/2005]. Decameron Physiologicum. *English Works VII*. Elibron Classics, 69-177.

Hobbes, Thomas [1680/2005]. Considerations upon the Reputation, Loyalty, Manners, and Religion of Thomas Hobbes, of Malmesbury, Written by Himself, by way of Letter to a Learned Person (John Wallis, D.D.)*English Works IV*. Elibron Classics, 409-460.

Hobbes, Thomas [1681/1999]: The Prose Life. A New Translation of Vita. Thomas Hobbes: *Human Nature and De Corpore Politico*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 245-253.

Hobbes, Thomas [1681/2012]. Vita. *Opera Philosophica, Vol.1*. London: British Library, Historical Print Editions, xii-xxi.

Hobbes, Thomas [1622-1659/1997]. *The Correspondance of Thomas Hobbes, Volume I*. Edited and translated by Noel Malcolm. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hobbes, Thomas [1660-1679/1997]. *The Correspondance of Thomas Hobbes, Volume II*. Edited and translated by Noel Malcolm. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hobbes, Thomas 1994. *Leviathan, with selected variants from the Latin edition 1668*. Edited, with introduction, by Edwin Curley. Indianapolis / Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.

Opera Philosophica. *Thomae Hobbes Malmesburiensis opera philosophica quae Latine scripsit omnia in unum corpus nunc primum collecta studio et labore Gulielmi Molesworth Vol. 1-5*. Londini: Apud Joanne, Bohn, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. MDCCCXLI. London: British Library, Historical Print Editions.

English Works. *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury now first collected and edited by Sir William Molesworth, Bart. Vol. I-X*. London: John Bohn, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. MDCCCXXXIX. Reprint by Elibron Classics.

OTHER LITERATURE

Abosch, Yishaiya 2006. The Conscientious Sovereign: Public and Private Rule in Thomas Hobbes's Early Discourses. *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (3), 621-633.

Abosch, Yishaiya 2009. Hope, Fear, and the mollification of the Vanquished in Hobbes's "Behemoth or the Long Parliament". *Political Research Quarterly* 62 (1), 16-28.

Aristofanes 1979. Frogs in *Aristophanes in Three Volumes*. Translated by Benjamin Bicley Rogers. Loeb Classical Library. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Adamson, John 2009. Introduction: High Roads and Blind Alleys – The English Civil War and its Historiography. John Adamson (ed.): *The English Civil War: Problems in Focus*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Agamben, Giorgio 1998. *Homo Sacer. Sovereign Power and Bare Life.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Agamben Giorgio 2005. *State of Exception*. Translated by Kevin Attell. Chicago and Longon: The University of Chicago Press.

Agamben, Giorgio 2009. *Il Regno e la Gloria. Per una genealogia teologica dell'economia e de governo*. Torino: Bollati Boringhieri.

Airaksinen, Timo & Bertman, Martin A. (eds.) 1989. *Hobbes: War Among Nations*. Aldershot: Avebury.

Airaksinen, Timo & Bertman, Martin A. 1989. Introduction and Acknowledgements. Airaksinen & Bertman (eds.): *Hobbes: War Among Nations*. Aldershot: Avebury.

Aquinas, Thomas 1963. *Commentary on Aristotle's* Physics. Translated by Richard J. Blackwell, Richard J. Spath and W. Edmund Thirlkel. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Aquinas, Thomas 1981. *Summa Theologiae*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Notre Dame, Indiana: Christian Classics.

Alexander, I.A. 2000. The Best Regimes of Aristotle's Politics. *History of Political Thought* XXI (2), 189-216.

Angoulvent, Anne-Laure 1992. *Hobbes ou la crise de l'État baroque.* Paris: PUF.

Apperley, Alan 1997. Hobbes on Democracy. *Politics* 19 (3), 165-171.

Arendt, Hannah 1998. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Arendt, Hannah 2000. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. San Diego: Harcourt.

Arendt, Hannah 2006. *On Revolution*. London: Penguin Classics.

Armitage, David 2007. Hobbes and the foundations of modern international though. Brett & Tully (eds.) 2007: *Rethinking the Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 219-235.

Aristotle 1959. *Politics*. With an English Translation by H. Rackham. London: Loeb Classical Library. William Heinemann. Harvard University Press.

Aristotle 1995a. Physics. *The Complete Works of Aristotle. The Revised Oxford Translation*. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Volume One. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 315-446.

Aristotle 1995b. Metaphysics. *The Complete Works of Aristotle. The Revised Oxford Translation*. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Volume Two. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1552-1728.

Aristotle, 1995c. On the Soul (*De Anima*). *The Complete Works of Aristotle. The Revised Oxford Translation*. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Volume One. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 641-692.

Aristotle, 1995d. Categories. *The Complete Works of Aristotle. The Revised Oxford Translation*. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Volume One. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3-24.

Aristotle, 1995e. Politics. *The Complete Works of Aristotle. The Revised Oxford Translation*. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Volume Two. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986-2129.

Aristotle, 1995f. Rhetoric. *The Complete Works of Aristotle. The Revised Oxford Translation*. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Volume Two. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2152-2269.

Arp, Ropert 2002. "Re-Thinking Hobbes's Materialistic and Mechanistic Projects". *Hobbes Studies*, Vol. XV, 3-31.

Ashcraft, Richard 1978: Ideology and Class in Hobbes' Political Theory in *Political Theory* 6 (1), 27-62.

Astorga, Omar 2011. Hobbes's Concept of Multitude. *Hobbes's Studies* 24 (1), 5-14.

Ashton, Robert 1979. *The English Civil War. Conservatism and Revolution 1603-1649*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Augustine 2008. *Confessions*. Oxford: Oxford World's Classics.

Ball, Terence, Farr, James & Hanson, Russell. (eds.) 1989. *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barnouw, Jeffrey 1992. Le vocabulaire du conatus. Zarka, Yves Charles (ed.): *Hobbes et son vocabulaire. Études de Lexigraphie Philosophique*. Paris : Vrin, 103-124.

Biller, Peter 2000. *The Measure of Multitude: Population in Medieval Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Béal, Christophe 2010. *Hobbes pas à pas*. Paris : Ellipses.

Beiner, Ronald 2010. *Civil Religion. A Dialogue in the History of Political Philosophy*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Beitz, Charles 1979. *Political Theory and International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bernhardt, Jean 1977. Hobbes et le mouvement de la lumiére in *Revue d'histoire des sciences*, Tome XXX, 1-24.

Bernhardt, Jean 1988. Essai de commentaire in Thomas Hobbes : *Court traité des premiers principes*. Paris: PUF, 59-283.

Bertman, Martin & Malherbe, Michel (eds.) 1989. *Thomas Hobbes de la métaphysique á la politique*. Paris: J. Vrin.

Bible. The New International Version. URL: http://www.biblica.com/niv/

Blits, Jan. H. 1989. Hobbesian Fear in *Political Theory* 17 (3), 417-431.

Borot, Luc 1992. La vocabulaire du contrat, du pacte et de l'alliance: quelques enjeux lexicaux in Zarka, Yves Charles (ed.): *Hobbes et son vocabulaire. Études de Lexigraphie Philosophique*. Paris: Vrin, 187-206.

Bostrenghi, Daniela (ed.) 1992. *Hobbes e Spinoza. Scienza e politica*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale Urbino, 14-17 ottobre, 1988. Napoli: Bibliopolis.

Boulting, Noel 2011. An architecture of fear: the relevance of Hobbes's tripartite contribution in *Distinktion: Skandinavian Journal of Social Theory* 12 (2), 135-155.

Braddick, Michael 2009. *God's Fury, England's fire. A New History of the English Civil Wars*. London: Penguin.

Bramhall, John 1995. The Catching of Leviathan, or The Great Whale. G.A.J. Rogers (ed.) *Leviathan: Contemporary Responses to The Political Theory of Hobbes*. Bristol: Thoemmes Press.

Brandt, Frithiof 1928. *Thomas Hobbes' Mechanical Conception of Nature*. Copenhagen & London: Levin & Munksgaard Norregade 6, Copenhage. Librairie Hachette, 18, King William Str. London W.C.2.

Brown, Chris 1997. *Understanding International Relations*. New York: Palgrave.

Bull, Hedley 1977. *The anarchical society: A study of order in world politics*. Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Bull, Malcolm 2005. The Limits of Multitude. *New Left Review* 35, 19-39.
Carr, E.H 2001. *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. New York: Palgrave.
Chambers, Mortimer H. 1957. Thucydides and Pericles. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 62, 79-92.
Champion, Craig B. 2004. Polybian Demagogues in Political Context. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 102, 199-212.
Cicero 1959. *De Oratore* in two volumes. With an English Translation by E.W. Sutton. Completed, with an introduction by H. Rackham. London: Loeb Classical Library. William Heineman. Harvard University Press.
Cicero 1998a. The Republic. *The Republic. The Laws*. Translated by Niall Rudd. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Cicero 1998b. The Laws. *The Republic. The Laws*. Translated by Niall Rudd. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Collins, Jeffrey R. 2007. *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Copp, David 1980. Hobbes on Artificial Persons and Collective Actions. *The Philosophical Review* 89 (4), 579-606.
Covell, Charles 2004. *Hobbes, Realism and the Tradition of International Law*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Clausewitz, Carl von 2000. *On War*. London: Penguin Classics.
Curran, Eleanor 2007. *Reclaiming the Rights of the Hobbesian Subject*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Creppell, Ingrid 2009. The Democratic Element in Hobbes's 'Behemoth'.Tomaz Mastnak (ed.): *Hobbes's Behemoth. Religion and Democracy*. Exeter: Exeter Imprint Academic, 241-268.
Dante, Alighieri 2003. *Monarchy* (*De Monarchia*). Translated by Prue Shaw. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Deleuze, Gilles & Guattari, Félix 1991. *Qu'est-ce que la philosophie ?* Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
Deleuze, Gilles & Guattari, Félix 2001. *Mille Plateaux*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
Deleuze, Gilles 2003. *Spinoza: Philosophie pratique*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
Deleuze, Gille 2004. *Spinoza et le problème de l'expression*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
Descartes, René 1985a. Principles of Philosophy. *Philosophical Writings of Descartes, Volume I*. Translated by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff and Dugald Murdoch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 177-291.
Descartes, René 1985b. Description of the Human Body. *Philosophical Writings of Descartes, Volume I*. Translated by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff and Dugald Murdoch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 313-324.
Descartes, René 1985c. The Passions of the Soul. *Philosophical Writings of Descartes, Volume I*. Translated by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff and Dugald Murdoch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 325-404.
Dunn, John 1989. Revolution. Ball, Farr & Hanson (eds.): *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dyzenhaus, David 2001. Hobbes and the Legitimacy of Law. *Law and Philosophy* 20 (5), 461-498.

Esposito, Roberto 2000. *Communitas. Origine et destin de la communauté*. Paris: PUF.

Esposito, Roberto 2008. *Bios : Biopolitics and Philosophy*. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press.

Ernout & Meillet 1985. *Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue latine : histoire de mots.* Additions et corrections nouvelles par Jacques Andre. Paris: Klincksieck.

Evans, Connie S. 2000. "An Echo of the Multitude": The Intersection of Governmental and Private Property Initiatives in Early Modern Exeter. *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 32 (3), 408-428.

Feldman, Leslie Dale 2001. *Freedom as Motion*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Finn, Stephen, J. 2006.: *Thomas Hobbes and the Politics of Natural Philosophy*. New York and London: Continuum.

Foisneau, Luc 2004. Leviathan's Theory of Justice. Foisneau & Sorell (eds.) : *Leviathan after 350 years*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 105-122.

Foucault, Michel 1997. *"Il faut défendre la société"*. Cours au Collège de France. 1976. Paris: Gallimard / Seuil.

Foucault, Michel 2004a. *Sécurité, territoire, population*. Cours au College de France. 1977-1978. Paris: Gallimard / Seuil.

Foucault, Michel 2004b. *Naissance de la biopolitique*. Cours au Collége de France 1978-1979. Paris: Gallimard / Seuil.

Foucault, Michel 2007. *Histoire de la sexualité I : La volonté de savoir*. Paris: Tel. Gallimard.

Foucault, Michel 2008. *Le gouvernement de soi et des autres*. Cours au Collège de France. 1982-1983. Paris: Gallimard / Seuil.

Foucault, Michel 2009. *Le Courage de la Vérité. Le gouvernement de soi et des autres II*. Cours au Collège de France. 1984. Paris: Gallimard / Seuil.

Gauthier, David 1969. *The Logic of Leviathan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gert, Bernard 1965. Hobbes, Mechanism and Egoism in *The Philosophical Quarterly* 15 (61), 341-349.

Gert, Bernard 1989. 'Hobbes's account of reason and the passions'. Bertman and Malherbe (eds.): *Thomas Hobbes. De la métaphysique a la politique*. Paris: J. Vrin.

Gert, Bernard 1996. 'Hobbes's psychology'. Tom Sorell (ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 157-174.

Gillioz, Stéphane 1990. *Dieu et Leviathan. Mécanique du vivant et stratégies survivalistes dans la théorie de Thomas Hobbes*. Berne: Peter Lang.

Girard, René 2006. *La violence et le sacré*. Paris: Pluriel. Hachette.

Glare, P.G.W. (ed.) 1994. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford at The Clarendon Press.

Glaziou, Yves 1993. *Hobbes en France au XVIII siècle.* Paris: PUF.

Goldsmith, M.M. 1966. *Hobbes's Science of Politics*. New York and London: Columbia University Press.

Goldsmith, M. M. 1996. Hobbes on law. Tom Sorell (ed.): *Cambridge Companion to Thomas Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 274-304.
Goldstein, Leslie Friedman 2001. Aristotle's Theory of Revolution: Looking at the Lockean Side. *Political Research Quarterly* 54 (2), 311-331.
Goyard-Fabre, Simone 1992. La notion de souveraineté de Bodin à Hobbes.Zarka, Yves Charles (ed.): *Hobbes et son vocabulaire. Études de Lexigraphie Philosophique*. Paris: Vrin, 207-230.
Grangé, Ninon 2009. *De la guerre civile*. Paris: Armand Colin.
Gray, Robert 1978. Hobbes's System and His Early Philosophical Views. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 39 (2), 199-215.
Griewank, Karl 1973. *Der neuzeitliche Revolutionsbegriff: Entstehung und Entwicklung*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
Grotius, Hugo 1999. *Le droit de la guerre et de la paix*. Paris: PUF.
Hampsher-Monk, Iain 1992. *A History of Modern Political Thought*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Hanin, Mark 2012. Thomas Hobbes's Theory of Conscience. *History of Political Thought* XXXIII (1), 55-85.
Hanson, Donald. W. 1984. Thomas Hobbes's "Highway to Peace". *International Organization* 38 (2), 329-354.
Hardt, Michael & Negri, Antonio 2001. *Empire*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
Hardt, Michael & Negri, Antonio 2004. *Multitude. War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: The Penguin Press.
Hardt, Michael & Negri, Antonio 2009: *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Hartman, Mark 1986. Hobbes's Concept of Political Revolution. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 47 (3), 487-495.
Heller, Mark. A. 1980. The Use & Abuse of Hobbes: The State of Nature in International Relations. *Polity* 13 (1), 21-32.
Héraclite 2004. *Fragments* [Citations et témoignages]. Traduction et présentation par Jean-François Pradeau. Paris: GF Flammarion.
Heyd, David 1982. The Place of Laughter in Hobbes's Theory of Passions. *Journal of The History of Ideas* 43 (2), 285-95.
Hill, Christopher 1961/2006. *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714*. London and New York: Routledge.
Hill, Christopher 1975. *The World Turned Upside Down. Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*. London: Penguin Books.
Hill, Christopher 1990. *A Nation of Change and Novelty*. London: Routledge.
Hoekstra, Kinsch 2004. The *de facto* Turn in Hobbes's Political Philosophy.Sorell & Foisneau (eds.): Leviathan *after 350 years*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 33-75.
Hoekstra, Kinsch 2007. A Lion in the House: Hobbes and Democracy. Brett & Tully (eds.): *Rethinking the Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hull, Gordon 2009. *Hobbes and The Making of Modern Political Thought*. London and New York: Continuum.

Hungerland, Isabel C. 1989. Hobbes and the Concept of World Government. Airaksinen, Timo & Bertman, Martin A. (eds.): *Hobbes: War Among Nations*. Aldershot: Avebury, 35-50.

Hussey, Edward 1986. Matter Theory. Ancient Greece in Rom Harré (ed.): *The Physical Sciences Since Antiquity*. London & Sydney: Croom Helm.

Jakonen, Mikko 2010. Hobbes ja tiedon politiikka. *Politiikka* 52 (4), 273-294.

Jakonen, Mikko 2011. Thomas Hobbes on Revolution. *La Révolution Française : Ruptures en revolution*. Institut d'histoire de la Révolution française, Sorbonne, Paris I. URL : http://lrf.revues.org/321

Jaume, Lucien 1986. *Hobbes et l'État représentatif moderne*. Paris: PUF.

Jendrysik, Mark Stephen 2002. *Explaining the English Revolution. Hobbes and His Contemporaries*. Lanham: Lexington Book.

Jesseph, Douglas 1996. Hobbes and The Method of Natural Science. Tom Sorell (ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 86-107.

Johnston, David 1986. *The Rhetoric of Leviathan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kavka, Grogory, S. 1986. *Hobbesian Moral and Political Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Keohane, Robert O. 1986. *Neorealism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Knott, Andy 2011. *Multitude and Hegemony*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Brighton: University of Brighton.

Koselleck, Reinhart 2004. *Futures Past*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Korvela, Paul-Erik 2006. *The Machiavellian Reformation.* Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.

Koyré, Alexandre 1981. *Études d'histoire de la pensée philosophique*. Paris: Gallimard.

Laslett, Peter 1956. The English Revolution and John Locke's Two Treatises on Government. *Cambridge Historical Journal* 12 (1), 40-55.

Lazzeri, Christian 1998. *Droit, pouvoir et liberte: Spinoza, critique de Hobbes*. Paris: PUF.

Leijenhorst, Cees 2002. *The Mechanization of Aristotelianism: The Late Aristotelian Setting of Thomas Hobbes's Natural Philosophy*. Leiden-Boston-Köln: Brill.

Leijenhorst, Cees 2007. Sense and Nonsense about Sense: Hobbes and the Aristotelians on Sense Perception and Imagination in Patricia Springborg (ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes's* Leviathan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 82-108.

Lemetti, Juhana 2006. *Imagination and Diversity in The Philosophy of Hobbes*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Lemetti, Juhana 2012. *Historical Dictionary of Hobbes's Philosophy*. Lanham, Toronto, Plymouth: Scarecrow Press.

Lemos, Ramon M. 1978. *Hobbes and Locke. Power and Consent.* Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Lessay, Frank 1988. *Souveraineté et légitimité chez Hobbes*. Paris: PUF.

Levine, Andrev 2002. *Engaging Political Philosophy; From Hobbes to Rawls.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, Charlton T. (ed.) 1989: *A Latin Dictionary* founded on Andrews' edition of Freunds's Latin Dictionary, revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis, Ph.D. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Clarendon Press.

Lintott, Andrew 1992. Aristotle and Democracy. *The Classical Quarterly* 42 (1), 114-128.

Lisboa, Wladimir Barreto 2006. *Mouvement, nécessité et système selon Thomas Hobbes*. Université de Paris I, Sorbonne. Lille : Atelier national de Reproduction des Thèses.

Lloyd, S.A. 2003. *Ideals and Interests in Hobbes's* Leviathan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lucchese, Filippo del 2009. *Conflict, Power, and Multitude in Machiavelli and Spinoza. Tumult and Indignation*. London and New York: Continuum.

Machiavelli, Niccolò 1833. *Opere complete di Niccolo Machiavelli Volume Unico*. Firenze: Presso Berghi & Comp.

Machiavelli, Niccolò 1950a. *The Prince.* New York: Modern Library.

Machiavelli, Niccolò 1950b. *Discourses on The Ten First Books of Titus Livius.* New York: Modern Library.

Machiavelli, Niccolò 1989. *History of Florence*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

MacPherson, C.B. 1975. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism. Hobbes to Locke*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Magnard, Pierre 1990. Philosophie première ou métaphysique. Zarka, Yves Charles & Bernhardt, Jean (eds.): *Thomas Hobbes : philosophie première, théorie de la science et politique*. Paris: PUF, 29-37.

Mairet, Gérard 1991. *Le Maître et la Multitude. L'État moderne, entre Machiavel, Shakespeare et Gorbatchev.* Paris: Éditions du Félin.

Mairet, Gérard 1997. *Le principe de souveraineté. Histoires et fondaments du pouvoir moderne*. Paris: Folio essais.

Mairet, Gérard 1993/2009. *Les grandes oeuvres politiques. Introduction à la théorie politique*. Paris: Livre de Poche.

Malcolm, Noel 2004. *Aspects of Hobbes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Malcolm, Noel 2010. *Reason of State, propaganda and the Thirty Years' War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Malcolm, Noel 2012. An Unknown Policy Proposal by Thomas Hobbes. *Historical Journal* 55 (1), 145-160.

Manent, Pierre 1977/2007. *Naissances de la politique moderne*. Paris: Gallimard.

Mara, Gerald. M. 2001. Thucydides and Plato on Democracy and Trust. *The Journal of Politics* 63 (3), 820-845.

Martinich, A.P. 1998. *A Hobbes Dictionary*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Martinich, A.P. 2007. *Hobbes, A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marshall, James D. 1996. *Foucault: Personal Autonomy and Education*. Dortrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Martel, James R. 2007. *Subverting the Leviathan. Reading Thomas Hobbes as a Radical Democrat*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mastnak, Tomaz 2009. Godly Democracy. Tomaz Matsnak (ed.): *Hobbes's* Behemoth. *Religion and Democracy*. Exeter: Imprint Academic, 210-240.

Matheron, Alexandre 1997. The Theoretical Function of Democracy in Spinoza and Hobbes. Montag & Stolze (eds.): *Theory out of Bounds*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press.

Mathie, William 1976. Justice and The Question of Regimes in Ancient and Modern Political Philosophy: Aristotle and Hobbes. *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 9 (3), 449-463.

McNeilly, F.S. 1968. *The Anatomy of Leviathan*. New York: MacMillan & Co. St Martin's Press.

Miller, J. 1998. Aristotle's Paradox of Monarchy and the Biographical Tradition. *History of Political Thought* XIX (4), 501-516.

Mintz, Samuel. I. 2010. *The Hunting of Leviathan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moore, V.F. 1899. The Psychology of Hobbes and Its Sources. *The American Journal of Psychology* 11 (1), 49-66.

Moreau, Pierre-François 1989. *Hobbes: Philosophie, science, religion*. Paris: PUF.

Morgenthau, Hans. J. 1978. *Politics Among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Fifth Edition, Revised. New York: Alfred. A. Knopf.

Morrill, John (ed.) 1991. *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution*. London & New York: Longman.

Navari, Cornelia 1982. Hobbes and the 'Hobbesian Tradition'. *International Thought in Millenium – Journal of International Studies* 203, 203-222.

Negri, Antonio 1999. *The Savage Anomaly*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Negri, Antonio 2006. *Fabrique de porcelaine. Pour une nouvelle grammaire du politique*. Paris: Stock.

Newey, Glen 2011. Leviathan and Liberal Moralism in International Relations. Prokhovkin, Raia & Slomp, Gabriella (eds.): *International Political Theory After Hobbes*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 56-77

Nieuwenburg, Paul 2004. Learning to Deliberate: Aristotle on Truthfulness and Public Deliberation. *Political Theory* 32 (4), 449-467.

Nicastro, Onofrio 1992. La vocabulaire de la dissolution de l'Etat. Zarka, Yves Charles (ed.): *Hobbes et son vocabulaire. Études de Lexigraphie Philosophique*. Paris: Vrin, 259-283.

Ojakangas, Mika 2013. *The Voice of Conscience.* New York. Continuum.

Ovidius, Naso Publius 1971. *Ovid in six volumes* 3, 1. Metamorphoses : in two volumes: 1: books I-VIII. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pacchi, Arrigo 1965. *Convenzione e ipotisi nella formazione della filosofia natural di Thomas Hobbes*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia editrice.

Parkin, Jon 2007. *Taming the Leviathan. The Reception of the Political and Religious Ideas of Thomas Hobbes in England 1640-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patapan, Haig 2009. The Glorious Sovereign: Thomas Hobbes on Leadership and International Relations. Hall, Ian & Hill, Lisa (eds.): *British International Thinkers from Hobbes to Namier*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 11-31.

Patrides, C.A. 1965. "The Beast with Many Heads": Renaissance Views on the Multitude. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 16 (2), 241-246.

Pellegrin, Pierre 2002. Introduction in Aristote: *Physique*. Traduction et presentation par Pierre Pellegrin. Paris: GF Flammarion, 9-64.

Pavlich, George 2010. On the subject of sovereigns. Barbour & Pavlich (eds.): *After Sovereignty*. London: Routledge, 22-36.

Pettit, Philip 2008. *Made With Words*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Plato 1952. *The Statesman*. Translated by Harold N. Fowler. London: The Loeb Classical Library.

Plato 1961. Timaeus in *Plato VII*. Translated by R.G. Bury. London: The Loeb Classical Library. William Heineman LTD.

Plato 1963. *Republic.* In two volumes. Translated by Paul Shorey. London: The Loeb Classical Library.

Plato 1967. Gorgias in *Plato III*. Translated by W.R.M. Lamb. London: The Loeb Classical Library.

Plato 1990. *Phaedrus and Letters VII and VIII*. Translated by Walter Hamilton. London: Penguin Press.

Plutarch 2010. *Lives I*. Translated by John Langhorne, and William Langhorne. Nabu Press.

Polybius 1968-1976. *The Histories*. In Six Volumes. With an English Translation by W.R. Paton. William Heinemann. London: Harvard University Press.

Prokhovkin, Raia & Slomp, Gabriella (eds.). *International Political Theory After Hobbes*. New York: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Prokhovnik & Slomp 2011. Introduction. Prokhovkin, Raia & Slomp, Gabriella (eds.): *International Political Theory After Hobbes*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 1-16.

Rachum, Ilan 1995. The Meaning of "Revolution" in the English Revolution (1648-1660). *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56 (2), 195-215.

Rachum, Ilan 1999. "*Revolution*": *The Entrance of New Word Into Western Political Discourse*. Boston: University Press of America.

Rahe, Paul. A. 2008. *Against Throne and Altar. Machiavelli and Political Theory Under the English Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Raylor, Timothy 2001. Hobbes, Payne, and a Short Tract of First Principles. *The Historical Journal* 44 (1), 29-58.

Reik, Miriam, M. 1977. *The Golden Lands of Thomas Hobbes*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Rommelse, Gijs 2006. *The Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-1667). International raison d'état, mercantilism and maritime strife*. Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques 2003. *Discours sur l'origine et les fondaments de l'inégalité parmi les hommes*. Paris: Folio essais.

Runciman, David 1997. *Pluralism and the Personality of the State*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Terrel, Jean 1994. *Hobbes, matérialisme et politique*. Paris: Vrin.

Terrel, Jean 2003. *La Vocabulaire de Hobbes*. Paris: Ellipses.

Tralau, Johan 2007. Leviathan, the Beast of Myth: Medusa, Dionysos, and the Riddle of Hobbes's Sovereign Monster. Springborg (ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes's Leviathan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, 61-81.

Thucydides 1969-1977. History of The Peloponnesian War in four volumes. Translated by Charles Forster Smith. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard Heineman.

Sarasohn, Lisa T. 1985. Motion and Morality: Pierre Gassendi, Thomas Hobbes and The Mechanical World-View. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 46 (3), 363-379.

Sarasohn, Lisa T. 2000. Was Leviathan a Patronage Artifact? *History of Political Thought* XXI (4), 606-631.

Schuhmann, Karl 1992. Le vocabulaire de l'espace. Zarka, Yves Charles (ed.): *Hobbes et son vocabulaire. Études de Lexigraphie Philosophique*. Paris: Vrin. 61-82.

Schaltter, Richard 1945. Thomas Hobbes and Thucydides. *Journal of The History of Ideas* 6 (3), 350-362.

Schmitt, Carl 2002. *Le Léviathan dans la doctrine de l'État de Thomas Hobbes*. Traduit de l'allemand par Denis Trierweiler. Paris: Éditions de Seuil.

Schmitt, Carl 2006. *Political Theology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shakespeare, William 1966. *Henry IV.* The Arden edition of the works of William Shakespeare: The second part of king Henry IV. London: Arden.

Silverthorne, Michael & Tuck, Richard 2003. Introduction. Thomas Hobbes: *On the Citizen* (English *De Cive*). Translated and Edited by Michael Silverthorne and Richard Tuck. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, viii-lii.

Sim, Stuart & Walker, David 2003. *The Discourse of Sovereignty, Hobbes to Fielding. The State of Nature and the Nature of the State*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Skinner, Quentin 1966. The Ideological Context of Hobbes's Political Thought. *The Historical Journal* 9 (3), 286-317.

Skinner, Quentin 1996. *Reason and Rhetoric in The Philosophy of Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skinner, Quentin 1999. Hobbes and the Purely Artificial Person of the State. *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 7 (1), 1-29.

Skinner, Quentin 2008. *Hobbes and Republican Liberty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sokoloff, William W. 2001. Politics and Anxiety in Thomas Hobbes's Leviathan. *Theory & Event* 5, (1). URL: http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v005/5.1sokoloff.html

Sofroniew, Alexandra Katherina T 2006. 'Turba' Latin. Jeffrey T. Schnapp & Mathew Tiews (eds.): *Crowds*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Sommerville, Johann P. 1992. *Thomas Hobbes. Political Ideas in Historical Context*. London: MacMillan.

Slomp, Gabriella 2000. *Thomas Hobbes and the Political Philosophy of Glory*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Slomp, Gabriella 2011. The Politics of Motion and the Motion of Politics. Prokhovnik & Slomp (eds.): *International Political Theory After Hobbes*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 19-41.

Snow, Vernon F. 1962. The Concept of Revolution in Seventeenth-Century England. *The Historical Journal* 5 (2), 167-174.

Sorell, Tom (ed.) 1996a. Hobbes's Scheme of Sciences. Tom Sorell (ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 45-61.

Sorell, Tom (ed.) 1996b. *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sorell, Tom 2011. Hobbes, Public Safety and Political Economy. Prokhovkin, Raia & Slomp, Gabriella (eds.): *International Political Theory After Hobbes*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 42-55.

Spinoza, Baruch 2002. *Traité politique*. Paris: Le Livre de Poche.

Spragens Jr., Thomas A. 1973. *The Politics of Motion*. The World of Thomas Hobbes. Kentucky: The University of Kentucky Press.

Springborg, Patricia 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to Hobbes's* Leviathan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sreedhar, Susanne 2010. *Hobbes on Resistance. Defying the Leviathan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, Leo 1984. *The Political Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes. It's basis and it's genesis.* Translated by Elsa. M. Sinclair. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Suétone 1961. *Vie des douze césars I*. Texte établi et traduit par Henri Ailloud. Paris: Société d'édition "les belles lettres".

Terrel, Jean 1994. *Materialiesme et politique*. Paris: J.Vrin.

Terrel, Jean 2003. *Le Vocabulaire de Hobbes.* Paris: Ellipses.

Thucydides 1969-1977. *History of the Peloponnesian War*. In Four Volumes. With an English Translation by Charles Forster Smith. London: Loeb Classical Library. William Heineman. Harvard University Press.

Thornton, Helen 2005. *State of Nature or Eden? Thomas Hobbes and His Contemporaries on the Natural Condition of Human Beings*. New York: The University of Rochester Press.

Tuck, Richard 1988. Hobbes and Descartes. G.A.J. Rogers, and Alan Ryan (eds.): *Perspectives on Hobbes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tuck, Richard 1993. *Philosophy and Government 1572-1651*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tuck, Richard 2007. 'Hobbes and Democracy'. Brett & Tully (eds.): *Rethinking the Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tricaud, François 1992. La vocabulaire de la passion. Zarka, Yves Charles (ed.): *Hobbes et son vocabulaire. Études de Lexigraphie Philosophique*. Paris: Vrin, 139-154.

Tönnies, Ferdinand 1971. *Thomas Hobbes, Leben und Lehre*. Stutgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Holzboog).

Vaan, Michiel de 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.

Vaughan, Geoffrey M. 2002. *Behemoth Teaches Leviathan. Thomas Hobbes on Political Education*. New York / Oxford: Lexington Books. Lanham. Boulder.

Vidal-Naquet 1978. Plato's Myth of the Statesman, the Ambiguities of the Golden Age and of History. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 98, 132-141.

Virno, Paolo 2004. *A Grammar of the Multitude. For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*. Translated by Isabella Bartoletti, James Cascaito and Andrea Casson. New York: Semiotext(e).

Walker, R.B.J. 1993. *Inside/outside: International Relatios as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walzer, Michael 1977. *Just and Unjust Wars*. New York: Basic Books.

Warrender, Howard 2000. *The Political Philosophy of Hobbes: His Theory of Obligation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Watkins, J.W.N. 1965. *Hobbes's System of Ideas*. London: Hutchinson University Library.

Weber, Cynthia 2005. *International Relations Theory. A Critical Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.

Weber, Dominique 2007. *Hobbes et le désir des fous. Rationalité, prevision et politique*. Paris: PUPS.

Weber, Cynthia 2005. *International Relations Theory*. London: Routledge.

Weiß, Ulrich 1980. *Das philosophische System von Thomas Hobbes.* Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Problemata Frommann-Holzboog.

Wendt, Alexander 1991. Anarchy is What States Make of It: the Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization* 46, 391-425.

Williams, Michael C. 1996 Hobbes and International Relations: A Reconsideration. *International Organization* 50 (2), 213-236.

Willms, Bernard 1990. La politique comme philosophie première: Hobbes penseur radical de la politique. Translated by Philippe Vigier. Zarka & Bernhardt (eds.): *Thomas Hobbes: philosophie première, théorie de la science et politique.* Paris: PUF, 91-104.

Willms, Bernard 1992. Philosophia Prima, Science and Politics. Hobbes in Bostrenghi, Daniella (ed.): *Hobbes e Spinoza, scienza e politica*. Atti de Convegno Internatiozionale Urbino, 14-17 ottobre, 1988. Napoli: Bibliopolis.

Worden, Blair 2010 The English Civil Wars: 1640-1660. London: Phoenix.

Zagorin, Perez 1977. *The Court and the Country. The Beginning of English Revolution*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Zagorin, Perez 1993. Hobbes's Early Philosophical Development. *Journal of History of Ideas* 54 (3), 505-518.

Zarka, Yves Charles 1984. Thomas Hobbes. Denis Huisman (directeur de la publication): *Dictionnaire des Philosophes*. Paris: PUF.

Zarka & Bernhardt (eds.). *Thomas Hobbes: philosophie première, théorie de la science et politique*. Paris: PUF.

Zarka, Yves Charles (ed.) 1992. *Hobbes et son vocabulaire. Études de Lexigraphie Philosophique*. Paris: Vrin.

Zarka, Yves Charles 1995. *Hobbes et la pensée politique moderne*. Paris: PUF.

Zarka, Yves Charles 1999. *La décision métaphysique de Hobbes.* Paris: J. Vrin.

Zarka, Yves Charles 2000. *L'autre voie de la subjectivité*. Paris: Beauchesne.

Yack, Bernard 2006. Rhetoric and Public Reasoning: An Aristotelian Understanding of Public Reasoning. *Political Theory* 34 (4), 417-238.

Yurdusev, Nuri A. 2007. Thomas Hobbes and International Relations: An assessment. *ODTÜ / METU Studies in Development* 34 (2), 413-432.