

Write up on Session- 8A

Submitted by : Tasnim Rahman Moumita

ID : 22301689

Course code : HUM103

Section : 27

Date of submission : 21.03.2023

Yes, human beings are egoistic hedonists in my opinion.

At first, a person who believes finding happiness to be the most significant thing in life; a pleasure-seeker is called a hedonist. And human beings are hedonist and egoistic as well. Again, they are also egoistic as they tend to focus on their self-satisfaction of any action.

In my opinion, Hobbes's Social Contract Theory would be better in creating a peaceful environment for people to survive.

Hobbes related the state of nature to an universe in which each person only exists for himself. Extreme enmity and a lack of empathy for others defines it. He also believed that uncontrolled freedom causes disorder and creates battle.

Hobbes stated that there are no permanent laws of right and wrong in nature in his book Leviathan. Life was isolated, poor, cruel, harsh and limited, and everyone lived for themselves. So, nature was in a constant state of conflict, which could only be stopped if people decided (via a social compact) to give their independence to a ruler on the only condition that their lives would be protected by that power.

Again yes, it is true that it's human's nature desire to enjoy or consume pleasure, but if there are no rules or no limitations to the desires, to the demands, the natural condition of the society might get worse, it might lose its typical system. Per the Hobbes' Social Contract Theory, people

have a natural tendency towards self-interest and are motivated by a desire to survive. People will automatically start war or quarrel with one another for resources, possessions and power in the absence of a strong government or social system of orders, which will result in a situation of all-against-all conflict. Therefore, according to Hobbes, this state of nature is defined by continuous conflict, and people are bound to protect themselves continuously against this kind of danger.

To add on this, manners plays an important role in this context. People's lack of clear philosophical knowledge about the most effective and fruitful approach to balance between strength and fear leads to differences in manners. According to Hobbes, his philosophy can show the wisest path to achieving peace. People frequently worry about potential hazards, negative outcomes of events, or unexpected death since they cannot predict the future or know how their actions will result out.

So, to avoid the uncontrollable situation, people should engage into an union with one another, ending some of their own liberties and rights in exchange for security and protection from a powerful central government. Because, not every natural desire of human beings brings good to them and others. Moreover, Hobbes argued that a strong government, a process of ruling, a system is required to create and maintain social order and keep people from giving in to their natural desires.

On the other hand, the state of nature, according to English philosopher John Locke, is only the absence of a supreme authority. Despite being liberated and equal, Locke believed people lived in a state of nature where they followed the rules of nature. Which mainly indicates the fact that

people would live their lives by obliging one another without abiding by someone superior than their general position. He considered there was harmony in the state of nature. He explains that even in the wild, when people had to care for themselves, they had obligations to one another.

But In reality, nature did not represent a disorganized and useless way of life.

Here the concept of “Hedonism” can arise. As a person who prioritizes pleasure over all else in life is known as a pleasure-seeker, a hedonist. Furthermore, these hedonists only want pleasure, joy, self-satisfaction. They don't consider the wellbeing of others as a whole.

So, I think the absence or lack of a system, a ruling government is not the proper way of establishing a harmonious society or union of people to survive. Because, the nature of human beings always carries the tendency to satisfy themselves to the fullest. So, if there is no law, no rule, there could appear a major situation of disagreement among the dwellers of that society. The fact that Locke's State of Nature Theory contains the assumption that people are naturally rational and able of self-governance is one of its major flaws. This view rejects the idea that some people can be influenced by emotions like greed, lust for power, or other basic desires, and that these moves can cause conflict and violence even in the context of laws and norms.

Therefore, freedom is necessary, but not unlimitedly. It can lead to the condition of disorganization, an uncontrollable situation in the society. As human beings, people need to maintain a sense of control over their demands which will not only just satisfy their ego, but also contribute to the mass people.

Lastly, though Locke's State of Nature Theory describes human nature most accurately, Hobbes' Social Contract Theory is way more applicable and significant in terms of making a peaceful and organized society, a civilization of human beings in my own perspective.
