

Olivia Harwood
Professor Klusmeyer
Western Legal Tradition Midterm
8 November 2019

Thomas Hobbes and Aristotle were philosophers who investigated concepts surrounding politics and law involving the formation of political communities through the establishment of government. The environments in which Hobbes and Aristotle created their theories is key to understanding how they differ from one another. Hobbes lived in England during a time of constant war with other nations involving different religious beliefs which resulted in Hobbes's conventional, or law based, perspective providing a basis for the social contract theory stating that humans create a contract to formulate a political community. Aristotle lived within the Greek city state of Athens which was characterized as a small, homogenous population. Aristotle utilized a naturalistic perspective, which is primarily theoretical, in justifying the creation of a political community. However, Aristotle falls short in providing a realistic guide in forming a political community by failing to contextualize his model while Hobbes bases his model upon human behavior resulting in a realistic and thorough procedure in creating political communities. Realistic is defined as the consideration of human behavior and the general applicability of the model. While Aristotle fails to realistically detail the process of the origins of the political community, Hobbes successfully explains a realistic process through a model that considers human behavior by using the social contract theory through a conventional perspective instead of a naturalist perspective, establishing consent within the social contract as the foundation of the community, and addressing the issue of violent conflict both prior and after the establishment of the political community.

Aristotle fails to present any evidence that humans come together through the natural perspective while Hobbes successfully illustrates that humans come together through a conventional perspective. Aristotle does not present any evidence regarding the belief in the natural hierarchy where everything in

nature falls somewhere on the hierarchy. Aristotle claims humans are political through a “social instinct implanted in all men by nature” and are the “best of animals” when participating in law and justice (Book 1 Part II). Aristotle also claims that when humans are not participating in law and justice, they are “the most savage of animals”. Instead of providing clear evidence, Aristotle makes a sweeping claim that humans create a community out of a natural and intrinsic need to participate in politics while simultaneously claiming that those who do not are “savages”. Aristotle is taking the social and political characteristics of the familiar Greek city states and defining the process as a natural process rendering the model unrealistic because many other communities that existed did not reflect those city states. This also makes Aristotle’s model inapplicable and restrictive to various populations. Hobbes successfully addresses this issue through a conventional perspective stating that humans create the political community using a social contract out of self interest and a sense of acute vulnerability through the act of human agreement. Hobbes poses that, prior to any established community, autonomous individuals live within a “state of nature” described as “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short” with no societal structure (Ch. XIII). All individuals in this state are equal, physically and intellectually, and only live to survive. Hobbes uses the social contract as a pragmatic solution to leave the “state of nature” and create the political community by explaining that the fear of death is the motivation to associate with others. Hobbes’s reasoning for the social contract is realistic because the primary human drive is to survive which is consistent with human behavior, particularly in an environment such as the state of nature, while also being applicable to various populations. The conventional perspective exhibits a clear and realistic approach in creating a political community allowing Hobbes to present the rational reason of survival as the motivator while Aristotle presents a baseless claim that nature is the reason for humans coming together.

In the consolidation of the political community, Aristotle fails to provide any practical explanation on the basis of forming the community while Hobbes explicitly describes how the social

contract is to be built upon consent using the conventional perspective. Similarly to the failings regarding the naturalistic perspective, Aristotle never provides a concrete method in how a political community is to form. Instead, Aristotle continues with the naturalistic perspective by asserting that people create a community based on common values and beliefs in addition to the desire to be political animals. This claim is, again, an attempted explanation through the natural perspective with no basis with a large assumption that every population is homogenous. This assumption is unrealistic and inapplicable due to the fact that there is no evidence presented to support the claim other than Aristotle's own experience. Hobbes clearly addresses what foundation the political community is to be built upon through utilizing the conventional perspective. Hobbes's social contract theory lies on a basis of consent, which is defined as an agreement at free will regardless of the situational circumstances. The political community is then built upon the consent of those in the social contract. As stated previously, this consent is motivated by the desire to survive and the fear of death. Hobbes's progression using consent is a realistic premise for the reason being that is not only applicable to a homogenous, small group but can be utilized in various populations. Due to the perspectives taken by the thinkers, the strength of the foundation of their models determined whether a realistic and applicable basis was provided. Hobbes successfully illustrates the process of forming the political community through using conventional reasoning while Aristotle fails to provide any concrete procedure in forming the political community while also never utilizing any evidence.

Aristotle is ineffective in addressing the inevitable issue of conflict in explaining the creation of a political community while Hobbes presents a coherent solution through the social contract to counteract any violence both during and succeeding the creation of a political community. Due to the natural perspective and lack of any clear process of consolidation, Aristotle fails to present any explanations for conflict prior or during the creation of the political community. The possibility of conflict is not denied in Aristotle's model, but it is not evaluated either with no explanation given on why it is not addressed nor

why conflict may or may not occur. Aristotle's model is unrealistic and inapplicable based on human behavior due to the fact that conflict is often unpredictable. Hobbes's model is centralized on addressing conflict by using consent through the conventional perspective due to the warring political environment of the time. The social contract theory is meant to propel people out of the "state of nature", which is described as a form of war because people are fighting over resources, and implement an absolute sovereign who is a supreme, indivisible, and monopolistic ruler. The ruler is meant to centralize the power and enforce the terms of the social contract. Through the absolute sovereign, Hobbes determined that conflict can be prevented by appointing a single representative of the people who acts as a third party facilitator. Despite Hobbes's model being inherently oppressive through the sovereign's attributes and the fact that Hobbes dismisses the concept of tyranny altogether, there is a realistic form of prevention taken towards conflict in the creation and maintenance of political communities in that the sovereign is the overt agent over the political order. Hobbes provides a comprehensive method in addressing conflict utilizing the feature of consent through the conventional perspective while Aristotle does not address any conflict arising during the formation of the political communities.

Aristotle's model is unsuccessful in providing a realistic and applicable process by providing non substantive evidence using a naturalistic perspective while also failing to lay any form of foundation for his model. Hobbes's model successfully provides a clear and realistic process based on convention with a substantial foundation being that of the motivation to survive out of a sense of acute vulnerability, the formation of the social contract based on mutual agreement defined as consent, and the structuring of the government to prevent conflict. Aristotle interprets his own political community and makes the assumption that every community resembles that of a small, homogenous group. This is exhibited in his claim that humans have a natural inclination to group into a political society with no clear process or concrete motive while also failing to address any issues that may arise. Based off these unsupported claims, Aristotle's model is rendered unrealistic in comparison to Hobbes because the model fails to

address key details of the process while not taking human behavior into account. Instead, Aristotle's model attempts to justify the process through nature which Hobbes is able to counteract through the use of convention and basing his model in a realistic sense of human behavior. Hobbes finds more realism within his model primarily due to the fact that he considers a bigger population with more diversity within the model making it more applicable. Aristotle fundamentally fails to do this. In all, Hobbes successfully produces a realistic model while Aristotle fails to provide any workable explanations for the features of his model.