

# Hobbesian version of the states of nature versus rousseaus disclosure on inequali...

[Environment](#), [Nature](#)



The state of nature is an idea arising from moral and political concepts that try to explain the right and wrong things about human life (Moehler 300). It also elaborates on the perception of human beings and power influence to human life. The states of nature try to explain the human life before civilization with an assumption of what the case would be in case civilization did not exist in the present life (Stănilă 62). However, through the disclosure on inequality, Rousseau presents a different view tracing man way back to the original being. As much as Hobbes argues that there would be no natural inequalities with people living in a society with no government, Rousseau argues that, in communities with freedom make an opinion inequality always existed. The states of nature and the disclosure on inequality thus present two conflicting views on life without government and civilization. The paper presents a counter argument on Hobbes' version of the states of nature using Rousseau's disclosure on inequality as a central counterargument. Hobbes argues that all human beings are naturally equal based on their bodies and mind. Human beings should have the same opinion on general matters because they have the same mental capacity. Equality in body elements means that human abilities are the same irrespective of the state in which a person lives (Moehler 300). He also argues that the equality among human beings puts no person at the position of absolute advantage. This means that people are willing to fight one another in order to become superior. However, Rousseau presents a different idea in disclosure of inequality by saying that every person has the freedom to give his or her opinions on each matter in the society (White, Rashmita and Kirby 372). The freedom of opinion means that every person will have a different opinion

defying the notion of quality among human beings. If every person has a fair chance to present their opinions to others and discuss them based on material facts available to all the parties, fighting will not happen since people can agree on a general point amidst any argument.

Hobbes argues that the law of nature forbids a person from doing anything that is harmful to his or her own being. This naturally makes the people defensive of the philosophies that they believe in them (Stănilă 64). A person engages in a war against all the other people threatening his position due to the urge to preserve his/ her interests and security. He argues that government stabilizes the society because, without it, the war against all would be a constant and unending battle that would create disorder in the society (Moehler 306). However, Rousseau argues that Marx's description of an alienated worker is proof that people in the society were not equal and that some people would be segregated naturally in the society. He argues that when one checks through the mirror, he sees his/ her own image, which differs with other people in the same situation. The differences cause diversity and inequality in the society that do not need a state to discover. Continuous fights would not exist in a society without the state due to the inequality and diversity that would govern the lives of the people.

Hobbes argues that there would be no property or injustice in the society without a government since there would be no law (Stănilă 60). Every man would be contented with justice from the nature and freedom for other people as much as the other people would allow him/ her. He explains that the rules of nature permitted an individual to have peace and freedom at all costs as much as other people would accord him/her. In this situation, a

person would fight for peace. He also argues that a human being is a natural sovereign who values power over other things. However, the idea of equality is not the same case with Rousseau as he argues that life has many natural inequalities. He argues that human nature is naturally unjust, and the people must struggle for justice through arguments and presentation of ideas (White, Rashmita and Kirby 372). Arguments and ideas create peace hence there is no need for people to fight in order to get peace. Mature arguments and thought presentation help people to attain peace in the face of inequality surrounding them.

Concisely, the argument of freedom and peace among human beings in case no state existed rests in the fact that not all people are equal in mental and physical terms. People have different abilities that can integrate to create a peaceful society without the intervention of government. Hobbes argues that all people are equal in the body and mind. This is not true because people have differences they create a diverse society according to Rousseau. He also argues that people constantly engage in wars against the rest of society. Rousseau responds by saying that every person can give an opinion hence the wars will not be necessary. Specifically, Rousseau argues that the society is full of inequalities that have good balance to create harmony, but Hobbes differs with him by saying that all people are equal.

## **Works Cited**

Moehler, Michael. " Why Hobbes' State Of Nature Is Best Modeled By An Assurance Game." *Utilitas* 21. 3 (2009): 297-326.

Stănilă, Ana Maria. " Nature and Society with the Hobbes and J. J. Rousseau.

The Evolution of Man from the Natural State to the Social State and the

<https://assignbuster.com/hobbesian-version-of-the-states-of-nature-versus-rousseau-disclosure-on-inequality-essay-example/>

Social Contract." *Scientific Journal of Humanistic Studies* 4. 7 (2012): 60-65.

White, Elizabeth S., Rashmita S. Mistry, and Kirby A. Chow. " How Do Teachers Talk About Economic Inequality? The Complexity of Teaching at a Socioeconomically Integrated Elementary School." *Analyses of Social Issues & Public Policy* 13. 1 (2013): 370-394.