



A Comparative Glance at Thomas Hobbes and John Locke's Ideas on the Concept of Freedom

Khashayar Bourbouri¹, Hossein-Ali Nowzari^{2*}, Reza Shirzadi³

¹PhD Candidate of Political Science, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

^{2*,3}Department of Political Science, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Received: 22 Nov 2021 ; Accepted: 18 Dec 2021

Abstract:

Since the immemorial time, the concept of freedom is one of the fundamental concepts which have had numerous effects on human lives. Many people suffered countless tortures or were jailed and sent to exile or even lost their lives due to freedom. Nevertheless, freedom can be considered to imply having volition and autonomy in practice and doing things; in a way that no one would force anyone to do anything which is not his desired action. Thus, freedom implies having the ability to do or refuse to do something. Generally speaking, freedom can be regarded as a general law which dominates the whole domain of life. Thomas Hobbes and John Locke are two main theoreticians of social contract who offered different views of the notion of freedom. The study of the view of these two theoreticians of freedom is necessary because one of them is the father of the idea of totalitarianism while the other is the founding father of liberalism. The current research is conducted using descriptive and analytic method and assays the ideas of these two philosophers concerning the notion of freedom within the context of their works.

Keywords: Hobbes, Locke, Freedom, State of Nature, Lex Naturalis or Natural Law

Introduction

Thomas Hobbes, the famous English philosopher, finished his education in Magdalen College in Oxford and started his job as a private teacher. The rulers in Devonshire used to become amazed of him about why he travels to Europe and makes a friend with his contemporary philosophers and scientists, especially Mercene and Gusandy. He accepted the then rationalistic ideas of notions

(to wit those based on intellectuality) and started fostering them in himself. He was interested in math and physics. Parts of his articles about the political sciences caused discontent of the parliament's members upon being published in the newspaper and he escaped to France in 1640 and lived a banishment life till 1651. He was a teacher of Charles who was later on enthroned as

*Corresponding Author's Email: h.nowzari@kiaau.ac.ir

Charles II. Since 1651 till the retaking of the throne, i.e., during the commonwealth and England's republic government, he lived a secretive life in England.

It was with the enthronement of Charles II that he fell in the center of attentions but his ending years of life were spent on struggle and dispute with two sects; he was firstly attacked by the fellows of church for his criticism of a unified religion featuring certain formalities and formations and, secondly, by the mathematicians and physicists of his time about math and physics-related issues. Hobbes also has many works about math. His most well-known book on politics is named *Leviathan* that is related to his social contracts. In *Leviathan*, he resembles the government to a huge and dreadful sea monster. Hobbes states that "the primitive mankind was seminally used an anarchist life and forced to give up his rights that were based on self-love for establishing a government".

He supports the absolutist sovereign power and adjusts it to his materialistic assumptions that are based on motion. Hobbes was an emotional man and he also has teachings in psychology. His successional teachings and beliefs caused the emergence of a storm of criticism based on the rites of the human beings' original nature that, as he puts it, pertain to the acquiring of interest and repelling loss. Hobbes has been effective in the change and transformation of England's old philosophy into mechanical philosophy and social studies more than any other English philosopher. The huge infiltration of his philosophy is not only through the persons who have accepted and promoted and expanded parts of his philosophy but also through the opponents, as well, who criticized parts of his philosophy to open new ways in philosophy.

He also met Galileo in Europe and he was a contemporary of Harvey, B. Johnson, Co-

ley, Sydney Godolphin and John Selden with whom he had a friendly relationship. Amongst the other of his authored works, a book named the human nature and another book called political corpse as well as a third book named *De Sive and Behemoth*, which is an expanded history of the England's domestic wars, can be pointed out. Some of his books have been published in Latin and some others in English; however, his books are detailed and voluminous and all of them form a massive collection (Pazargad, 1981: v.2, pp. 575-576).

The Generalities of Thomas Hobbes's Political Philosophy:

Hobbes enjoys a unique position amongst the English philosophers from several perspectives: the first is that he has written his first regular treatise on politics in English and the second is that he has chosen a novel method in studying the political affairs and the third one is that he has defended despotism by presenting proofs and reasons and not by substantiation on history as Machiavelli has done and the fourth one is that the bigotry and decisiveness surfacing in the majority of his beliefs are vividly different from what we know from the English elites' moderate, complying and easy-going temperaments.

Moreover, even though his thoughts never influenced the trend of the England's political evolutions and the government and the nation acted against one another, England or even the west owe their recent decades' advances in political mindset indirectly to him because the majority of the opinions expressed in political philosophy since 17th century on in the west aim at refuting his thoughts. Hobbes believes that the social regulations are the mental and volitional constructs of the individuals and mark their seeking for a solution to the resolving of social problems un-

like the natural rules that he thinks are the indicators of the divine commands. But, these natural regulations, as well, are in such a way that the human beings had to still observe them even if there was no god.

This part of Hobbes's ideological beliefs reminds of Machiavelli's notions despite the fact that the latter has not offered a comprehensive and clear-cut philosophy about the government; however, Hobbes has at least made a huge effort to build his own ideas of such a philosophy. To do so, he tries in *Leviathan*, as his most important book, to express his materials with care and precision and he explains his intentions, *inter alia*, about such important political terms as power and freedom, law and rights and commitment and governance. Although he does not use these expressions for identical purposes all over the book and sometimes speaks rather paradoxically, understanding his utterances is less problematic and the general orientation of his reasoning is often well clear. The product of Hobbes's words in *Leviathan* is that the society members have to give up all their authorities to a person or an assembly of individuals if they want to enjoy perfect security in the society and do not want the observance of the regulations aiming at establishment of security end in their disadvantage (Enayat, 2012: p. 205).

In Hobbes's opinion, the human beings should live alongside one another in peace and comfort to reach such principles and such an issue can be actualized based on a series of human affections that can be attained only by remaining adherent to the principles and regulations. In *Leviathan*, Hobbes states that the human beings should be motivated to observe these regulations and such a motivation would come about when the human beings grant the command power and authority to an individual or a group of individuals. Therein,

Hobbes knows the human life as a collection of voluntary and inadvertent movements and a mechanical process. Voluntary movement is preceded by an internal movement that is called effort. There have always been existent movements between the human beings' internal tendencies and external prejudices as the motivations of his actions. Being willing to perform a thing is the product of a collection of internal movements between the tendencies and prejudices. All of the human beings' movements take place by the force of their nature in line with the interests of their organism. All in all, zeal and emotions and affections are the determinants of the human behavior and his motivations are irrational, to wit uncontrollable.

Of course, human beings are qualified for intellect in terms of their ability of speaking that distinguishes thoughts and notions but intellect, in Hobbes's mindset, only means the power of calculation and adding and subtracting numbers and, anyway, the function of the main factors of behavior, affections and prejudices. In the same way, each action that is matched with an individual's tendencies is enumerated to be reasonable. The essential principle in the human beings' life is their senses. Everybody's world is limited to their senses. The individuals do not live inside a shared ethical order rather they perceive the truths and pleasures based on their senses in various forms. There are two problems in an individual's life: one is living with the others who have similar tendencies and this causes competition and hatred and the other is the inherent contradiction and pride of the human beings.

These two attributes create a natural status in which there is no such a thing as general power and the people live in a state of war by all against all and constant fear and the risk of violent death. The human beings not only

do not enjoy living together but they are also in tough pain unless there is a power keeping them all in fear. The human beings do not become tamed and calm by the order of intellect rather the only way for creating peace and security amongst them passes through taking advantage of the most powerful zeal and emotion of the mankind, i.e., fear of death that should be imposed on their hearts by an absolute ruler. Therefore, the human behavior is naturally the effect of irrational factors outside intellect and will of them (Bashiriyeh (a), 2008: p. 18).

Hobbes proposed the social contract theory in *Leviathan* that was published in 1651. He has been intensively impressed by the aftermath of the domestic wars in England during 1640 and thought that England can only be saved of the turmoil of the events only with the existence of an authoritative king. Hobbes applies the social contract theory for an objective contradictory to what had been posited for the social contract theory, to wit the elaboration of the source of government, in defending the authoritative power of King Stewart Dynasty. But he concealed his theory behind the veil of general expressions so as to be able to support any authoritative government. Hobbes began his expressions with an analysis of the human nature.

In his opinion, human beings are selfish and self-oriented creatures. The human beings are lonely creatures because their world is different from that of the other creatures. They have their own specific pleasures and wishes and are not attached to any order, ethical or political. But, unlike the other living creatures, the human beings have intellect and the attachment faculty distinguishes the human beings from the other animals. But this intellect is passive whereas the sensual intentions of the human beings are active and strong. The differences in the sensual inten-

tions bring about differences in the human beings' power of thinking. Furthermore, there is a motivation or instinct of superiority-seeking in human beings. This motivation drags the human beings towards competition with one another for acquiring wealth, knowledge and pride and fighting for power.

Resultantly, hatred, jealousy and attempting to subjugate others are all in human nature. But, the nature has physically and mentally created the human beings so equal that nobody can claim s/he has a thing the others don't. If a person is physically strong, the other might be faster and smarter. The human nature is in such a way that although an individual might accept that the others are funnier, eloquent and more knowledgeable s/he would barely accept that the other is more intellectual because s/he sees the thinking and intelligence faculty inside oneself but does not want to see them in the others (Alem, 2010: pp. 183-184).

In Hobbes's idea, the human beings are part of the universe. They are like machines made of similar parts. Hobbes wanted to find a law by way of which he can explicate the movements of these parts and segments and, especially, in relation to the other fellow human beings. He, perhaps based on Bacon's instruction, believed that the human beings' senses are the origins of any sort of cognition. The human beings realize everything through senses that are envisioned as the human beings' receptors and it is this same reception that causes the human beings' mental movement. Hobbes thinks that the human beings' motivation for living is an internal force urging them to search for their own personal interests. But the human beings are not dominant over their destiny because they cannot come to terms regarding the common thread of their ethical ideals and live a peaceful life in the light of such an agreement.

For human beings, peace is only possible as a result of perceiving and recognizing the forces forming the human nature and recognizing the necessity of curbing them. Based on the movement principle, the human beings are forced to want and will. The human beings call good and benevolent what they want and call evil what they do not like. But, the scale for the good and bad cannot be fixed because the human beings are themselves variable; good and bad are only words applied by the humans for specifying their favorable and unfavorable goals. In Hobbes's mind, the fundamental incentives of the human disposition are making efforts in line with what is known as favorable and, secondly, avoiding what is deemed unfavorable (Alem, 2013: p. 237).

Hobbes believed that the human beings are insatiably inclined towards power and that they are generally equal in attaining it. In his opinion, parity in hope in achieving goals are born out of the parity in abilities and two persons become enemies if they both want a thing and their attainment of it is deemed impossible following which they are forced in achieving their goal to destroy one another. The society is comprised of the community of individuals and each person tries attaining privileges and s/he would cause harms to the others whenever invasion is envisaged necessary. Hobbes believed that making efforts for interests and advantages is extensive and general. Nobody wants his or her ability to be limited for attaining power.

All of the society members have such a want and are in constant struggle for acquiring more power. So, the real nature of the human beings is like this: the human beings are individualist, selfish, malevolent and seek superiority in terms of fighting with one another. If the human beings were completely free to perfectly follow their own nature, they

would incumbently engage in a fight by all against all and it is not tolerable to live in such a status with these properties that originate from the natural dispositions. In natural disposition, each human is a foe to another. In other words, humans are wolves of humans and there is no conception of the rightness or wrongness and justice and injustice therein. The only axiom of life is that a person should obtain whatever s/he can and keep it for oneself as long as s/he can. When there is a coercive rule governing, cunningness is considered as a major virtue.

In Hobbes's mind, three main factors give rise to the emergence of such a status: the first is competition; the second is fear and the third is honor.

The first factor encourages the humans for acquiring profit. The second factor provokes them to save their lives and the third factor is pride for becoming outstanding. In the natural status intended by Hobbes: 1) human beings are not social creatures; 2) the human wants and wishes are insatiable; 3) the humans' selfishness and feeling of insecurity forces them to war against their other fellow human beings; 4) in his natural status, the mankind lives alone, indigent, inferior, brutal and short; and, 5) there is no such a thing as peace and security and the human life is always at risk. Hobbes believed that if there was no government, the life could have become calamitous and the people were constantly in war (Alem, 2013: pp. 239-240).

In a state of war by all against all, only the individuals having a physical power and/or its facilities are victorious. Therefore, the status expressed by Hobbes is not only pertinent to the prehistoric, pre-civilization or premodern human beings rather it is related to the general status of the human beings. It is due to the same reason that there has been currently brought about a return or reversion

in political sciences towards the previous meanings. The metaphysical discussions and science of ethics take a lofty and significant position in political sciences and a consensus has been reached by the political philosophers, politicians, theoreticians and analysts as to how many of the behaviors, characteristics and properties of the human beings can be controlled so as not to be aligned towards this direction.

Hobbes believed that the people fear death in their natural status; therefore, they demand peace and security by the rule of their prudence and futurism and/or intellect. But, to achieve this goal, they should give up their rights and freedoms. So, the people agree to delegate their absolute rights to a third person based on certain conventions. This third person should represent every individual member of the people; his will is not the common volition of all the people because, as Hobbes opines, there is no general and shared will considering the human nature. The government causes the unity of the individuals but it cannot remove their diversities.

The contract of the right delegation should be constant and non-voidable. But, because the human beings are essentially and naturally malicious, there should be something other than agreement and contract at work. "Reaching agreements without using sword are merely existent in words". It is based thereon that the necessity for the existence of a general power keeping people in fear and guiding their actions towards public expedencies emerges. Leviathan, as the result of this contract, is the mortal god protecting the peace and manifesting the entire power of the society; it is the only consequence of law and there is no rule other than it; one cannot resort to natural laws against the natural rights because it is only it that is qualified for interpreting the rights and regulations. Freedom

can be only achieved under the flag of Leviathan. However, Leviathan does not interfere with the people's life: "government is like the walls of the road the goal of which is not stopping the passengers rather it keeps them from going astray". All in all, the outcomes of Hobbes's philosophy are individualistic. Leviathan is anyway an artificial phenomenon and, thus, Hobbes, pulls out the government from inside a halo of secrets and mysteries of the prior theories. Although Hobbes represents the politics amongst the classic political philosophers, his mindset was essentially philosophical because he used to basically justify the necessity and conditions of obedience and submission (Bashiriyeh (a), 2008: pp. 26-27).

In Hobbes's idea, an endless competition occurs between the human beings for power, wealth and security in the natural status, to wit in the absence of the government, because everyone is intellectually seeking for their own personal interests but, in practice, such warlike conditions do not come to end in favor of anyone. In the natural status lacking the government, ethics, justice and fairness are meaningless: all of these concepts are rendered meaningful or created by means of government establishment so the mankind, urged by the rule of intellect, prudence and fear of early death, seek for peace and the acceptance of the civil status or the establishment of the government through social contract means submission to peace. Everyone gives up their rights for attacking the others and defending themselves in favor of the government.

The government is the authority guarding peace via punishing those who violate their social promises and commitments. Justice is rendered sensible when there is such an authority (government) and justice is the very preservation and observance of contracts and

promises and conventions. The just person is the one who keeps his or her promises. Hobbes proportionated justice with the modernism era's interests from such a perspective and distanced away from the religious and Aristotelian basics of justice that realized the world as having a predetermined ultimate goal. In Hobbes's viewpoint, the distinction between good and bad is originally made based on the human tendencies and, firstly, it is, unlike what the antecedent philosophers thought, not an objective distinction that can be discovered by means of reason and, secondly, unlike what the Christian philosophers thought, it is not rooted in the God's will.

Hobbes's theory resolved the old problems of the ethics and justice philosophies and that is the idea that nobody acts morally for the mere knowledge of the ethical principles rather everybody might be seeking for their own personal interests. But, in Hobbes's theory the government's punishing power is the sufficient motivation for obeying the social promises and contracts and regulations enacted by the governing authority for the preservation of peace and serving of justice. In the absence of government, no concept would be imaginable of law and justice. In the absence of the governing authority, the governance of the judicial and distributive justice would be none rendered meaningful. From Hobbes's viewpoint, safeguarding justice, as an authoritative action, is the characteristic of the governor not the citizens for a citizen, as an individual, can be profit-seeking, humanist and others but, in more precise terms, citizens cannot be recounted as just or unjust. Hence, ethics, in its perfect sense, refers to the area of the individual actions while the agent of exerting the just actions is the governmental authority whether be it a father in the family level, a judge in a

court, a governor in a country and/or the God in a global level. So, the concept of justice is interlaced with power and governance (Bashiriyeh (a), 2008: pp. 110-111).

Hobbes's Ideas Regarding Concept of Freedom:

The traces of Hobbes's concern about freedom can be found in his numerous works, even in his first work, the elements of law. To discuss about freedom, Hobbes moved beyond it and wrote things in a separate work named "about freedom and its necessity" in more details. Then, in "principles of the philosophy of politics" and "Leviathan", he discusses about freedom with a different approach and expresses his own perception about it. His discussion about freedom includes debates about the existence of the human freedom in a natural status, the limits and boundaries and advantages and disadvantages of freedom in the natural status, freedom in the light of government and sovereign and the constraints and reasons of freedom.

Freedom writes the following statements about freedom: "by freedom, I mean that there should be no unnecessary barriers to the presumed freedom for the human beings based on the laws; it means that there should be no barrier and hindrance on the way to natural freedom except the ones that are necessary for the good of the society and the government". Therefore, Hobbes realizes human beings as obedient to the natural law before anything else. It means that the human beings are free to do what they want unless it violates the natural law. He mentions the society and the government as specific cases that can be factors adding to the limitation of the human freedom or its complete deprivation (Hobbes, 1839: p. 215).

However, in Hobbes's idea, the concept of freedom can be applied to some extent about

the unintellectual, inanimate and intellectual creatures. That is because if a thing is bound or surrounded in such a way that it cannot make a move except inside a limited space and that space is limited by the opposition of some external objects, it can be stated that that thing does not have freedom of motion. In the same way, when any living being is imprisoned or limited by means of walls, chains and cuffs or when water is limited to the walls in the periphery of a river and/or inside some containers and cannot disperse in a vaster space, it can be stated that they are not free to move in such a way that they could in the absence of those external barriers. But, when the barrier to the movement resides inside that very thing, one cannot say that that thing lacks the freedom rather it is stated that that thing lacks the power to move like a piece of rock that is left stagnant somewhere or a person who is pinned down in bed by the force of a disease. The free human being is the person who can rely on his or her vigor and knowledge to do something and can do whatever s/he wants without being confronted with a barrier. But, when the terms “free” and “freedom” are used for anything other than objects, such an application is incorrect because the things incapable of making a move cannot be refrained from movement hence when it is stated that the way is free, the freeness of the road is not intended rather it refers to the freedom of the individuals who can take the road without being forced to stop thereon.

And, when it is said that a gift is free, it does not mean that the gift is per se free rather it refers to the freeness of a gift-giving person who is not bound to any law or commitment in granting it. Additionally, when we speak freely, it does not mean the freedom of voice or speaking of the words rather it is the freedom of a person who has not

been obliged by any law to utter things other than what s/he has said. Finally, in the phrase “free will”, there is not inferred any freedom for volition or will rather it refer to the freedom of the human being in a sense that whatever the thing s/he has a will, volition and wish for doing it cannot be constrained by a barrier (Leviathan, 2017: p. 218).

The human beings are free in all of the actions authorized by the law to perform whatever their intellect rules would be followed by the greatest interest for them because if freedom is defined literally to mean being physically free or freedom of the chain and prison, in this case, all the noisy demands of the mankind for freedom in this sense, that everyone enjoys it, would become useless and in vain. Moreover, if freedom is taken as meaning being exempted and excepted from the law, then, all these demands by the mankind for that type of freedom by which everybody can become the absolute possessor of their lives would similarly become useless. And, although such useless demands seem to be in vain, the human beings want it one way or another while they neglect the fact that the regulations have no power to guard the human beings unless by the strike of a sword in the hands of a person or some individuals who enforce it. Thus, citizens are only free in the works authorized by the ruler for regulating their life like the freedom of buying and selling, freedom in signing any contract with another person, freedom in choosing a house, type of food, job and occupation and education of children in a manner it is deemed favorable by them as well as other types of freedom of the like (Leviathan, 2017: p. 219).

Hobbes divides freedom into two types: the natural freedom of the human beings who enjoy it in their natural status and the artificial freedom in the civil status and in the light of the governing body. After discerning the

Hobbes's stubborn support of the government and its not being required to be accountable to the citizens, one question that is created in the mind of the addressees is that "according to the fact that Hobbes knows everything even the bodies of the individuals under the governance of a governor as belonging to him and, on the other hand, demands the citizens' unbound commitment to the obedience of the government and avoiding resistance against it, would the citizens enjoy the lowest extent of freedom under the umbrella of such an absolute governor or not?"

Although supporting monarchy and the unconditional delegation of decision-making to the governor, Hobbes considers certain freedoms for the citizens under the governance of a monarch. In his most influential work, *Leviathan*, he does not only propose the necessity of establishing an integrated, authoritative and powerful monarchy rather he dedicates a whole chapter to the freedom of citizens in his intended government. The thing reminded by Hobbes as the citizens' freedom, to wit freedom in civil status, encompasses the actions that the citizens have the right and can do them in the light of an authoritative and integrated government. It can be stated in summing the ideas and notions by Hobbes about freedom that, from his perspective, natural freedom means the absence of an external power in doing what one wants.

Hobbes believed that the people should be free to some extent and this is not an issue related to the people's rights because the people deprive themselves of these rights via setting social contracts and creating a governor; rather, the issue simply is the idea that the greedy and interfering commander might breach certain goals and cause dissatisfaction and the discontent of the despotism can be followed by a revolution. In Hobbes's idea,

freedom features a value more of a practical nature than ethical but it is important. The governor's commands are based on preemptive rights. If the governor claims supervision over a certain ground in which the people used to enjoy more freedom of action, this freedom would be diminished because one should not oppose and objects to the want and command of the governor.

On the other hand, the people are free to perform whatever the thing that the governor has banned. Hobbes believed that such an idea about law provides the people with a row of individual freedoms, including the freedom of buying and selling, signing contract, choosing house and living place, food, selection of a career and life path and education of children the way it is deemed more appropriate and things of the like. Furthermore, knowing that governing the people unjustly and unfairly would return them to their natural status, a wise governor tries ruling fairly. The governorship of the law is more a practical necessity than an ethical duty of the governor.

The despotic and authoritative governorship by a ruler destroys the foundations of the government. But Hobbes is more attentive to the security than freedom. His goal is protection of the shared interests of the government and the ruler's power. The human beings would be condemned to the most dreadful destinies, to wit living in a natural status, should the governor's power decline and if the government fails. Hobbes prepares a list of risk assumptions as clear as he remembers Machiavelli that, if actualized, would cause the weakness or destruction of the government. The first of the assumptions is that the government falls short of exercising the supervision it has been exerting or has had the right to exert. This might be accompanied by temporary satisfactory results but the wea-

kening of the governor's supervision is a great danger because the people would reckon that the governor's supervision right has been obliterated. Thus, they would be severely dissatisfied with the re-delegation of the power to the governor, especially for the reason that they have become accustomed to the freedoms accompanied by the management's weakness.

The second risk assumption is this rebellious teaching that "everyone is the judge of the good and the bad of their actions". Such a judgmental method existed in the natural status and nothing would cause the rapid return to this status more than the general acceptance of this dangerous principle. The other risk that has to be removed is the belief that the human beings should not do anything against their conscience; however, it is only a judgment and might be erroneous. The solution to this problem is obeying the law "because the law is the general conscience". The law is not wanted by all rather it is the will of the governor (Alem, 2013: pp. 252-253).

John Locke

John Locke (1632-1704) was born in Wrington, a district in England's Somerset. His main work is a book named "treatise of human nature". It took Locke nearly twenty years to finish the writing of this book. The book was published in 1690, i.e., two years after England's great 1688 revolution that was to some extent inspired by him. The humble title of Locke's book should not mislead us. The book's title speaks of a treatise but it is in fact a very strong work, an eternal epistemological one. The primary perspective of Locke's philosophy can be summarized in several words: empirical, scientific and in agreement to the common understandings.

He states that the material world is all the thing the natural scientists speak of and it is

the collection of the material objects consisted of certain constituents. These objects work like machines and, in this sense and from this viewpoint, one should consider that they are machines. Besides the material objects, there are nonmaterial elements that exert their effect through sensory organs. When the sensory organs are influenced, two kinds of "image" are formed in the brain: one is "the imaginations stemming from feelings", i.e., the imaginations that are directly externally outsourced and the other is "imaginations resulting from mental perceptions" that are the products of the mind's work on the external imaginations.

These two types of imaginations form the collection of awareness and thought. Thus, there is not a thing in our mind that has not been provided via experience. Locke does not claim to know how the stimulation of the sensory organs causes the imaginations to appear in the mind. But, the seemingly evident thing from his perspective is that there is such a motivation and it is the only source of the imaginations. So, the only things over which we have non-intermediated awareness are the imaginations residing in our minds and cognizance is the perception of the linkages between the imaginations. Politically, Locke is the philosopher of conditional and limited monarchy.

His political philosophy was published under the title of two treatises about government in the same year that his treatise of the human nature had been published. The first treatise of his book that contains two treatises about government is related to the rejection of the absolute government theory and the second one expresses his political theory. Unfortunately, Locke's theory does not negate Hobbes's theory of government and, additionally, his theory about the establishment of government via "contract" between

the commander and the subordinates is surely wrong. Like Hobbes, Locke believed that a governor is needed for governing but, unlike Hobbes, he does not grant absolute power to the commander. In Locke's idea, governor should be accountable for what he does and there should be a certain assembly asking him for response and it is an assembly that represents the people.

This type of government is not called "democratic" because it is not the people who are governing rather this type of government is a sort of limited kingship and it is truly the same government that was established by the 1688 revolution and it is compromisingly called democratic for it is more a limited royalism in the Locke's sense of word. Political and epistemological perspectives of Locke were completely consistent with his contemporary spirits. These perspectives owe their credibility more to this same consistency rather than to the others of its considerable originalities. Practical materialism was ascending and Locke granted it a philosophical expression (Haling Dill, 1986, 151-152).

The Generalities of Locke's Political Beliefs:

Locke's political philosophy is more intensively manifested in two books known as the two treatises about government that were published in 1690 and the primary goal in them is supporting and defending the England's revolution. Out of these two treatises, the first one that has been written in denying Filmer's ideas does not feature perpetual importance but the second treatise is significant in several respects because, firstly, it does not suffice to the explication and analysis of the contemporary political statuses rather it seminally retrogressively investigates the whereabouts of the past for discovering the roots of the revolution and the then time incidents.

He discusses about the incidents of the domestic war time and analyzes Richard Hooker's beliefs and his book and speaks about the common political mindsets in England during the later reformation period and before the initiation of the discrepancies between the king and the parliament and, subsequently, tracks the chronology of the events from Hooker's time till the past and scrutinizes the streams of political thoughts in a precise manner till he reaches the time of Thomas Dawkins at whose time, as it is known, the preservation of the soul and ethical abstinence were enumerated by the possessors of power and in regard of the governors' responsibility before the society and government's obedience of the law as the common sciences and preliminary self-evident truths. But it should not be imagined that Locke has been a fogyist and his goal has been the reviving and reviewing of the old-fashioned political beliefs and obedience of the fogyism principles.

From the perspective of the interpreters of the political philosophers' ideas, Locke's intellectual genius should be considered as the result of his very rational and logical knowledge; because the properties and importance of his philosophy lie and always latent in his application of common sense and it seems that Locke has had many studies regarding the antecedent philosophers' beliefs and the political thoughts of the past times and that he has collected the most important opinions in the past times' general philosophy, politics, ethics, culture and experiences that were deemed superior by him and could link those beliefs to one another as well as to his own contemporary experiences thereby to create a new philosophy (Pazar-gad, 1981: v.2, p. 655). The abovementioned principles are considered as the primary natures of Locke's political philosophy.

Locke clearly discusses and analyzes his own topics and materials and leaves the collection of his beliefs, especially the 18th century philosophy, for the future generation. In fact, he paves the way for the analysis of the political philosophy for the 18th century's people. His philosophy should be recounted as the main embryo of the philosophies that were formed in England and in European continent during 18th century and took the form of new political philosophies. The Medieval history and tradition by way of analyzing which Locke could evaluate Hooker's ideas in England's 1688 revolution could take a position amongst the most important constitutionalism ideals and this way the new constitutionalism of the last quarter of the 17th century was linked and related to the ideals of the medieval centuries or even before.

Thus, the 1688 revolution should not be envisioned as being separate from the old political thoughts. The domestic wars caused changes in the old thoughts but they could not destroy them; however, the role that Locke played in the course of political philosophy has not been so that they could have revitalized Hooker's thoughts rather he collected the usable elements and the things that he found useful and appropriate in that philosophy and described those elements in a new form and defined them based on his contemporary events and practical experiences. Hobbes did a service like Locke and, as believed by some philosophical interpreters, Hobbes's logical relationship and reasoning thread is more robust than Locke's and, due to the same reason, this set of the interpreters know Hobbes as being superior to Locke even though he supported the absolute politics or political absolutism. Anyhow, these two persons are considered as two prominent elements and two great political philosophers

of this era. In the second volume of his book, known as the state government, Locke sets the rejection of Hobbes's ideas as his goal and his reasoning in this regard is particularly laid on the foundation of Hooker's beliefs.

The essence of Locke's political beliefs is the investigation of the tradition, the history of action and opinions transferred from Medieval Centuries to Hooker and from him to the 1688's events following which he concludes that the king and the parliament and the other political institutions are equally responsible for preserving the society and the people's life and properties but their power is very limited in terms of England's contemporary tradition and historical background. Locke knows the existence of such a government as definite and inevitable and finds the government's rights non-voidable in a respect and realizes it as stemming from the people themselves in a sense that the government has been created for the good of the nation that is per se comprised of individuals and the happiness and satisfaction of the individuals and preservation of their interests are the objectives of the society (Pazargad, 1981: v.2, p. 656).

Locke's Psychological Hypothesis Regarding Human Nature:

Locke states that "every individual is considered as a unit of a society. Thus, s/he is ethically equal to the other individuals of the society". He believes that the entire individuals of the society should recognize one another's rights. According to Hobbes, the people have been created nearly equal in terms of the physical and mental strength whereas Locke means that the people's natural power, capacity and states and conditions are not related to their ethical parity. In his opinion, the people should be ethically equal albeit not in terms of physical and mental

strength or other things. But, after making such an expression, Locke again renders this ethical parity conditional and states that “the people are ethically equal provided that the intellectual faculty granting them humanity has been sufficiently developed in them to the extent that they can recognize the natural rights as the indicators and specifiers of their own rights and duties and, in other words, this parity can come about in case that the individuals’ conscience has been awakened in them and they have figured out these inherent rights; if their conscience is not awakened and they happen to have their conscience awakened at a later time at which instant they immediately possess these rights, they will be like a child who has just inherited an amount of wealth from his or her father and s/he can take advantage of his or her heritage when s/he reaches the legal age”.

In Locke’s mind, children are not given rights and duties similar to those of the citizens based on this theory because they lack the thinking faculty for the fact that their intellect is yet to get perfected. Thus, they should be managed till they reach the required intellectual growth. But, this same government on children should not be, as Locke states, exercised by force and no despotism and compelling and coercion should be practiced rather it has to be always accompanied by paternal and maternal affection. The conclusion Locke makes of this reasoning is that the relationship between the parents and children as well as the relationship between the individuals and people should be based on humanity and according to humanity conditions. According to Locke’s opinion about the global ethical system’s assumption, there is an ethical system in the world in which the people take part and should adapt their lives to it and observe its order.

Based on Locke’s philosophy, three things are the human stimulators in performing social actions: 1) affectionate feelings; 2) love; 3) sympathy, soft-heartedness and compassion (Pazargad, 1981: v.2, p. 657).

Government from the Perspective of Locke:

In Locke’s idea, the formation of the government is legitimate and authorized in case it has specific and sure benefits to the individuals because citizens can live and strive without government and also because governments are established not because they are necessary but for it is expected to supply us with certain facilities and the comfort we want. So, it is not necessary for us to make efforts for its persistence and continuation unless all of the people are provided with comfort and peace (Pazargad, 1981: v.2, pp. 658-659).

Locke bases his proposed political formation on two hypotheses: the first is the natural status and the second is the social contract. In the first part, he knows the ethical system as a result of the natural status and believes in adjusting the social formations with that ethical system. In the second part, he discusses about the satisfaction of the members of a country and enumerates it amongst the truth and legitimacy conditions of the political formations. But, none of these three great theoreticians who have enacted the social contract makes a discussion about the social contract as to whether this natural status and social contract features a historical reality and truth and can be considered as a historical reality or not?

The followings are Locke’s discussions about the two abovementioned hypotheses:

The first one is natural status. Locke mentions natural rights and states its reliance on the nature in this natural status. It has to be

always taken into account that the natural rights in their today's sense are different with what they have meant in the course of time. It means that the natural rights of the mid-20th century encompassed the collection of general and overall formulas that governed the physical world without having any effect on the wills of the creatures under the governance of those orders like the gravity force to which the mankind and the plants are subjugated and submitted in their wills. But, based on the principles of Locke's time, natural rights embrace the regulations that are solely related to the mankind's way of conduct and behavior and, by them, the regulations indicating the mankind's way of conduct are not intended; it means that they do not indicate that the humans' ways of conduct have been like this or like that rather those regulations are intended that state the humans' ways of conducts should be like this or like that and, if the humans' ways of conducts are not matching with them, they are against the nature and they should be ordered what to do. For example, based on the natural rights of Locke's time, when it is stated by him that "the people should be equal and free in the natural status", it does not mean that the situation has been different in the past from what they are today and/or that this freedom and parity has come about in a historical instant in the past rather it wants to say that "the people should be legally free and equal and, if not, they have violated the rules of nature".

Locke wants to show the way that the people's behaviors and ways of conduct should be if there was no political power. Therefore, some of the people's obligations in the natural state differ from their requirements under the administration of a unified political government. For instance, in his mind, murdering is a bad action both in the natural status and in a political government

so a punishment should be specified for murder. In a part of the natural status that an authorized political power is missing, the implementation of this punishment becomes the duty of a person but it is the responsibility of the political power as the enforcer of the justice in a political government and the other individuals are only to help the political power for fulfilling its duties.

Locke's intention of the natural status is the very ethical system. But the main discussion is that has this social system been existent in the past on a certain historical instant or not? It means that has there been a time in the mankind's history that all the people performed their duties and treated their neighbors peacefully and kindly in a coordinated manner? It appears from several sentences in Locke's writings that he believes that such a golden era has been existent and this same belief has instigated criticisms against him for the critics' state that there has been no such a thing as the golden period and there is no historical evidence proving its existence. But Hobbes contrarily believed that there has been a time that all the people were in fights against one another. Locke's critics find Hobbes's idea closer to the truth. As for this claim by Locke that "in the past eras, there has been a time in history that no political institution, the way Locke defines them, existed", it has to be known that, by the phrase "the past people's life", Locke does not mean natural living status in which the people lived alone and single rather he, following Aristotle, believes that the people have been living socially and in groups at the side of one another.

Locke's assumption of the governor and the people do not deny the truth that the people have always been divided into two sets in all of the human communities: one is the governing class (elites) and the other one

is the citizens' class. But he states that "the governing class has not always ruled the peasants with their satisfaction and in favor of them" and this idea is true (Pazargad, 1981: v.2, pp. 660-661). In Locke's idea, human beings did not live in a constant war or permanent fear in their natural status rather they were equal human beings at that time and freely acted out what they thought based on the coordinated law of nature. Regarding the natural status, Locke writes: "the natural status follows a law that governs it and obliges everyone and the intellect that is the very law of nature teaches all the offspring of Adam who consult with it that everyone is equal and independent and nobody should harm another person's life, health, freedom and properties".

Locke believed that everyone has an identical right of enjoying all the nature's gifts in the natural status because the human beings are intellectual creatures. In Locke's opinion, the human beings are humanists in their natural status. But Hobbes is of the belief that the human beings are selfish in their natural status and only attend to their own personal motivations. In Locke's idea, the natural status has two characteristics: 1) perfect freedom and 2) everyone's equality. As for the first option, i.e., perfect freedom, the human beings can do anything within the limits determined by the law but, concerning the second option, i.e., everyone's equality, no one is superior to anybody and everyone has been born identical. In Hobbes's idea, the human beings' equality and freedom leads to a war between them in the natural status while Locke states the opposite thereof. In natural status intended by Locke, human beings do not live-in mutual enmity rather they live a peaceful life. Locke conjectures that the human beings did not live-in constant war or perpetual fear in the natural status and it has

not been a status before socialization or an era of unlawfulness.

Locke believed that the people's life on earth based on intellect and without a common superior power having the right of governing them is the very life in the natural status that should be accordingly considered as being under the command of the natural law and no human being orders the other. The natural status has a natural law that governs it and it is to be indispensably enforced by all and the intellect, as the natural law, teaches all the human beings requesting advices from it that nobody should harm and damage another's life, health, freedom or properties for everyone are equal and independent. So, in natural status, the natural law governs the human beings (Alem, 2013: p. 276). The human status in nature, though being accompanied by freedom, cannot be unduly free. Although the mankind has the right in that status to do whatever he wants with himself and his properties, he does not have the right to spoil himself.

John Locke believed that the human beings figure out in their natural status that they have certain rights and they generally respect and observe these rights. In his opinion, we can directly and in an un-intermediated manner discern the natural rights and our intellectual capacity rules that we should respect the others' rights in the natural status, as well. John Locke's political thoughts can be found in his second treatise that is about the government. He begins the treatise by explaining about the human conditions in the natural status. Locke, as well, like Thomas Hobbes, commences his investigation with the assumption that the human beings have been living in a natural status before entering the civil society. From the perspectives of both of these thinkers, the natural status is the situation in which the human beings have been

living before signing social contract and establishing government. Locke believes that the human beings have been seeking for the preservation of their lives and properties in such a status and finds out that they should also be careful about the others' lives and properties.

From his viewpoint, the natural status is ruled by a natural law that controls and guides it and obliges everyone to its observation. This law, that is the very intellect, teaches all the human beings who willingly consult with it that everyone is equal and nobody should harm the others' life, health, freedom or possessions because all of the human beings are created by one absolute and wise maker and that they are all servants of a commander and leader and they have come into this world by the order of Him and for the enforcement of his orders (Azadanlou, 2002: p. 145).

In John Locke's idea, every individual is the judge of his or her own actions in the natural status because there is no common authority capable of making such a judgment. Locke holds that the human beings, in their natural status, are not only responsible for guarding and protecting their own lives and properties but they are also to be industrious in preserving and protecting the mankind to the maximum possible extent. In Locke's mind, the natural status is a situation of perfect freedom ... It is a state in which everyone is equal; it is a place wherein all of the powers and areas of authorities are bilateral and complementing one another and nobody has a right more than the other. Although, there is perfect freedom in the natural status, no such a thing as unbound freedom and complete voluntariness governs it. It is true that the human beings have uncontrollable freedoms in natural status for organizing themselves and their assets, "they do not

have the right to destroy themselves or any other creatures they have possessed". Should a person violate or trample beneath his or her feet the rules of nature, s/he has in fact suppressed intellect and justice. Thus, the existence of such a person is dangerous for everyone and "everybody has the right to punish this law-breaker to the extent that s/he stops violating the law".

One of the essential differences between Hobbes and Locke is that the Hobbes's human being is radically thoughtful of one's own self and is unaware of the peripheral world but "Locke's human being is never so much selfish of himself to remain unaware of the reality in his periphery". The key point in Locke's perception of human being is ownership: possession of life, freedom and assets. Not only we but also the other human beings have the right to live. "It is the natural right of every individual to live; we have the right to act freely within the limits of the natural regulations; we have the right to possess and we can mix our workforce with the natural resources to continue life" (Azadanlou, 2002: p. 150).

From Locke's perspective, the mixture of three natural rights (the right to live, be free and have possessions) is manifested in the ownership right. In his mind, ownership is not a tangible and visible thing rather it is the right to live, be free and have possessions. In the natural status, we own whatever the thing for the acquisition of which we have used our own force. Furthermore, it is in this status that we find out that the life is not unlimited and we cannot use our force for obtaining what we see and wish to use. "The force of no human being can subjugate and tame all the things for itself; in addition, one cannot enjoy or take advantage of things for more than a small part".

Therefore, Locke considers limitations for the human rights in the natural status. In his opinion, “the God has not created all the things to be corrupted or wasted by the mankind” and the human beings “can acquire assets for their own use to the extent of benefiting their life before the wastage of that gift. Any more than that thing is not a person’s portion and belongs to the others”.

Locke believes that the human beings invented money long before entering the civil society and it was with this invention that the issue of the wastage and spoilage the products obtained from the nature was somewhat resolved because money does not decay. In other words, various kinds of precious stones and metals were exchanged in the daily transactions with the surplus of the products; these extra amounts of products could not be otherwise legitimately possessed by the other individuals. As it can be seen, Locke portrays two visages or stages of the development in the natural status metamorphosis and clarifies the difference between them through the prevalence of metal money that had been invented long before endorsement of the social contract. In fact, invention of money can be considered as a factor that caused the creation of individuals’ inequalities.

Naturally, when the human beings started accumulating and storing precious metals and some persons could store more than the others, a sort of hidden submission and satisfaction to and about unequal and disproportionate possession came about in the world. In other words, the invention and application of money amongst the individuals caused the unequal ownership to become legitimate to some extent. Thus, the unequal distribution of the natural resources is not a phenomenon that was brought about by the civil regulations rather it was born out of the humans’ agreement in the more advanced stages of the

natural status. Therefore, unlike Thomas Hobbes’s human being, Locke’s human being had many of the social characteristics in the natural status and before signing social contract (Azadanlou, 2002: pp. 151-152).

Amongst the main and important reasons inciting Locke’s natural human being to the signing of social contract, enters civil society and gives up to the obedience of the government is the idea that the conditions were not auspicious in the natural status for preserving the collected assets. First of all, there is no stable and evident law in the natural status and upon the emergence of discrepancies between the individuals for identifying the right from the wrong. It is true that the natural regulations are clear-cut and perceivable to the majority of the human beings, but it is also true that the mankind think about their own interests. In addition, some of the individuals are also unaware of these same regulations and they are likely not to accept the commands of the natural law in resolving their discrepancies.

Secondly, there is no legitimate and impartial person, in the natural status, to intercede the disputes between the individuals based on certain laws. Additionally, the human beings deviate from the impartiality path for the protection of their interests and allow their personal emotions interfere with the resolution of the disputes and engage in fights with their wisdom. In John Locke’s idea, the human beings desert the natural status and yield to the control of a power other than themselves for the fact that “although they have certain rights in their natural status, enjoyment of them is not so sure and they are constantly exposed to the others’ threats” (Azadanlou, 2002: p. 153).

In the natural status, the human beings enjoy the right to live, be free and take posses-

sion of things in their natural status by the rule of their intellect and the natural law. But, trivial discrepancies of that status might inflame large and unending wars between the human beings hence enjoyment of the rights of living, freedom and ownership is not guaranteed. Therefore, the human beings leave the natural status and establish the civil society. But, because the humans are naturally free and equal and the nature does not rule the subjugation of anyone by anyone, the government that is established in the civil status cannot contradict the nature and natural laws and it has to be founded with the satisfaction of the individuals. The human beings only totally give up their right of punishing the others and withdraw from their natural freedom only to the extent that it is deemed necessary parallel to the preservation of their own and others' life and freedom. The contract and consent that make the individuals the permanent members of the civil society and grant legitimacy to the government should be again and again expressed by every new generation; thus, the satisfaction of their ancestors is not enough. Hence, the governments that are not satisfactorily accepted by the people do not deserve obedience (Bashiriyeh (b), 2008: p. 283).

Locke's Ideas about Concept of Freedom:

From Locke's perspective, freedom is a choice and a right defined within an ethical framework and one can enjoy it based on a natural law. Locke believes that the human beings are free to the extent that they have the power to think or not to think based on their priorities or the guidance of their minds. Based on this definition, an individual's freedom is conditioned to several considerations:

The first condition is having power and ability that are both envisioned as the essence and theme of freedom and considered as the

inseparable parts thereof. In other words, an incapable person is not considered free so freedom's main idea is that of the power.

The second condition is enjoyment of intellectuality and thinking competency. Locke searches freedom in thinking. In his opinion, a person capable of thinking is free (Locke, 1824: pp. 224-225). Locke believes that the human being enjoys freedom in natural status and can freely do whatever the thing s/he finds necessary for his or her life and felicity without asking any other person or authority provided that it does not exceed the limits of the laws of nature. The human's freedom is manifested in two forms in the natural status: one is the human beings' natural freedom as a free power of them in doing whatever the thing that is deemed necessary for the preservation of their individual life and felicity.

The natural freedom of the human beings holds that they should not accept orders from any earthly power and not to be under the law or command of any human being and only obey the rules of nature. The humans' freedom in nature holds that they should not be under the command of any legislator unless they have themselves founded a government in consent and willfully and that they should not be ruled by any will and verdict unless it is enacted by the group of the country's legislators based on the agency, they have granted it. Freedom is not as believed by Sir Robert Filmer in the way he defines it: "freedom to everyone is being able to do what one wishes and live the way one wants and it should not be bounded by any law".

But, to those who are under the command of the government, freedom is having certain specified regulations for life and everyone should be equal before it and it has to have been created by the established legislative branch. Freedom is doing what one wants within the limits of the law and being deter-

mined in doing so and not being obedient to the variable, unclear and authoritative will of any other person in the same way that the freedom, in the natural status, is not being obedient to any other law except that of the nature.

This freedom of the absolute obstinate power is so necessary and so related to the essence of our existence that we are envisioned as having been stripped of our survival and persistence in case of losing it because the mankind's right to survive is not decided by himself so that he can be bounded by the chains of servitude through signing a contract and by agreement and willfulness and place oneself in the hands of the possessor of an absolute power who can deprive him of life whenever he wishes so. Nobody can grant another an option beyond what s/he has and because the mankind cannot put an end to his life whenever he wishes so and he would not also have the right to place his life at the discretion of another. If a person is enslaved or found deserving death for perpetrating an action the punishment of which is death, the person having the power to perish him or her might not do so rather s/he might become a slave and installed to service and s/he has not been harmed in this way. Whenever living in slavery becomes tougher than death to him, it is within the domain of his power to disobey the command of the slaveholder and destroy oneself.

This is the perfect status of slavery and it is nothing more than a constant war between the legal victor and the captive. That is because if a contract is signed between them by means of which the power of a party and the obedience of the other is limited, the war status between the two parties is terminated as long as the treaty holds because, as it was mentioned, nobody can transfer, within a contract, the thing that is not in his or her

hands, i.e., the possession of his or her life (Jones, 2016: pp. 115-116).

The mankind has been born with the perfect freedom right and enjoyment of all the privileges of the natural law and he shares these rights with all of the other human beings and is equal to them in them. The nature has given the human beings the right to protect their assets, i.e., their life and freedom and properties, from the others' harms and they also have the right to seek punishment for the abuses to their rights and they can even punish by death the abhorring crimes that deserve death penalty. But, because the existence and survival of the political community is impossible unless it has the right to protect its assets and, in doing so, be able to punish the crimes and transgressions, the political society comes about when each of the individual members thereof give up their natural right and places it in the hands of the society in such a way that they can resort to the assistance of that law any time they want it.

This way, the ideas and notions of the individuals are placed aside in the political community and the society itself sits for judgment and the men who have been appointed by the society make judgements between the individuals in their discrepancies based on the impartial regulations made by the society and penalize the individuals who have committed crimes against the society by the punishments specified in the law. In this way, it can be easily seen who are together in a political community and who are not. The political community is formed by the individuals who have become united and established a single committee that possesses a shared and persistent law and judges who have the power to arbitrate the disputes between the individuals and penalize the culprits. But those who do not have such a common authority at least on earth are still

living in the natural status and, as it was shown before, the common judge does not exist for all of the individuals in the natural status and the individuals are their own judges and law enforces when disputes arise. And, this way, the political community is granted the power to determine punishments for the actions committed by its criminal members and this is the very legislation right and, also, the political community has the right to penalize the harm imposed by individuals outside that community to its members and this is the right to either reconcile or fight. By participating in the political community, the individuals refrain from the rights they had in their natural status for punishing the individuals who harmed them and enforcing their own sentences and grant this right to the community but, in the meanwhile, they also grant this right to the community to use their force for the enforcement of the sentence whether be it similar to their own sentences or be it expressed by their representatives. Here, we come to the origin and source of the legislative and executive branches of the society. The community makes judgments based on its statutory provisions and determines the type of the punishment that has to be enforced and, also, in case that the harm and damage is found having been caused by another society, it is the community that decides what should be done for compensating it. In both of the aforementioned cases, the entire force of all the individuals who have formed the political community would be available for use by the community (Jones, 2016: pp. 149-150).

Human beings are naturally free and equal and nobody can be dragged under the political power of the other unless in consent. A person would deprive oneself of natural freedom when s/he reaches an agreement with

the others to gather around and form a community for establishing comfort and peace and health amongst themselves and safeguard their enjoyment of their assets and grant one another more security against those not belonging to their community. Any number of the people can gather around in this way and such a grouping of them would not harm the freedom of others outside their companion.

When a group of people agree so as to form a community, they take the form of a political committee and the majority has the right to make decisions amongst them and guide the others. That is because when a number of people agree to form a community, their society becomes one body and has the power to act as a body and this is possible when it is accepted that the decision by the majority is the decision by all for what advances the community is the decision by those individuals. The society made of these individuals is considered as a single body and it is necessary for it to be able to move and it has to advance towards a direction that the stronger power drives it and this more powerful faculty is the vote by the majority of the individuals in that society.

If it becomes anything other than this, moving forward and remaining as a society and as a body will be impossible for it and, as it was said, the individuals who have gathered around and created a community together intend to form a single body so any individual in that society is required to obey the decisions made by the majority. Hence it is seen in the societies formed based on the law that even if there is no law predicted, the decisions are made by certain individuals; the majority's vote is considered as that of everyone based on the law of intellect and nature (Jones, 2016: p. 155).

Conclusion:

In his work, named *Leviathan*, Hobbes realizes human freedom, in its exact sense, as the absence of any resisting factor against it. By resistance, Hobbes means external motivations, i.e., the barriers that influence an individual from outside. The internal barriers and motivations, as Hobbes views them, are no limitations to the freedom because these motivations are endogenous and their existence as part of the human body is considered necessary. The internal motivations serve the function of fighting and resisting the external motivations for the actualization of freedom.

According to this definition, a free human being is the one who can perform what s/he has perceived based on his or her own comprehension of the issues without being limited from outside. Hobbes knows this type of freedom as a sort of natural freedom because, from his perspective, freedom is being in pursuit of one's own personal interests and, due to the same reason, if this recognition of the personal interests is due to wrong awareness and conception, it would have no effect on the natural concept of freedom because such a sort of freedom is only directed at denying and resisting the external barriers and the internal motivations, if even wrong and the result of short-sightedness, do not play any role in the determination of the freedom's concept. In Locke's idea, freedom is not undue freeness or being free from the control of any monarch or anarchy.

The preliminary and natural law governing the human wisdom illuminates the pre-governmental era for him and controls his freedom thereby to set the ground for the personality independence and social peace. Hobbes had left human beings alone with the subjugating power of the nature so as to compel them delegate all their individual rights to the governmental authorities so as to

be able to enjoy the blessing of order for symbiosis, security and peace that, as Hobbes opines, can only be rendered feasible in the light of an absolute monarch. But, Hobbes had, in this way, ignored the danger to which the individual was exposed by such an absolute power. It is right in this point that Locke criticizes Hobbes's plan. Locke considers the absolute royalism and/or dictator republican government of Cromwell form, both of which were confirmed by Hobbes, as a situation worse than the natural status for everybody is at fight therein. That is because, in Locke's mind, at least every individual determines his own right in the natural status but nobody has any rights under the force of the absolutist government. The focal point of the natural status features completely different indices in Locke's political idea as compared to Hobbes's perception of the issue.

The outstanding feature of Hobbes's natural status is the conflict between the interests of various persons while Locke places the individuals not in front of one another but at each other's side along with principled parity. The deeply-contemplated equality in Locke's natural status is the parity of the free individuals. These individuals need and depend on one another considering their abilities' limitations and for guarding their equality and freedom. An individual's freedom, as Locke states it, should not be comprehended in its central nucleus as meaning absolute generosity in free and/or unrestrained actions. Locke makes it clear from the very beginning that such an individual freedom should be thematically conceived as simultaneous respect for freedom and equal rights of the other individuals. Locke, as well, considers the human need for protecting oneself as a determinative phenomenon in the social life and gives it a sublime position. He correctly recognizes the proportion and tension existent between need

and right and, thus, reminds of everyone's freedom of right in protecting oneself. Freedom for protecting one's own self and life is the very freedom within the framework of the borders of the natural law.

But which element should prevent the misuse of this uncontrollable freedom and unbridled rampage? It is here that Locke enters the element of human wisdom into his political philosophy. Human beings, as Locke states, possess general inherent characteristics and intellectually specific talents. Every human being is a creature enjoying wisdom hence all the human beings are basically equal. Human wisdom is a cast rendering the natural status persistent and solid. Locke explicitly states that natural law governs the natural status and it is necessary for every person. But, wisdom, as the discoverer of such a law, teaches all the human beings that they are all equal and independent and nobody has the right to harm the life, health, freedom and ownership of the others. It is in this same utterance by Locke that the modern era's human right is formed as a brilliant idea. The entire of Locke's governmental teachings in all its components and outcomes remain based on the human beings' individuality that is per se relying on a combination of belief in wisdom and equality. This composition specifies the entire of Locke's image of the human being and the society.

References

- Alem, Abdolrahman, (2010). "Foundations of politics", 20th ed., Tehran, Ney Publication
- Bashiriyeh, Hossein, (2008). [a], "Intellect in politics (thirty-five chapters on philosophy, sociology and political development)", 3rd ed., Tehran, Negah-e-Moaser Publication
- Bashiriyeh, Hossein, (2008). [b], "Teaching political knowledge", 8th ed., Tehran, Negah-e-Moaser Publication
- Enayat, Hamid, (2012). "Foundations of the political philosophy in the west", 6th ed., Tehran, Zemestan Publication
- Haling, Dill, R. J., (1986). "Basics and history of the west's philosophy", 1st ed., tr. Abdolhossein Azarang, Tehran, Kayhan Publication Organization
- Hobbes, Thomas, (2017). "Leviathan", 10th ed., tr. Hussein Bashiriyeh, Tehran, Ney Publication
- Hobbes, Thomas, (1839). "The English Works of Thomas Hobbes", Vol. IV, S.W.Molesworth,Ed,London:- Retrieved4/3/2016,from <https://books.google.com>
- Jones, V. T., (2016). "Gods of the political mindset", v.2, 9th ed., tr. Ali Ramin, Tehran, Amir Kabir Publication
- Locke, John, (1824), "The works of John Locke", in Nine Volumes, 12th ed., Vol. 4, London: Rivington, Retrieved 3/3/2016, from <http://oll.libertyfund.org>
- Pazargad, Baha'a Al-Din, (1981), "The history of the western policy", v.2, 4th ed., Tehran, Zavvar Publication