

Personalization and Institutionalization of Social Contract: Structuralism in the Social Contract of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau

Tahir Ahmad

Lecturer, Department of International Relations, National University of Modern Languages,
Rawalpindi

Fizza Ali Janjua

Lecturer, Pakistan Studies, National University of Modern Languages, Lahore Campus

Zainab Mohsin

Demonstrator, Lahore College for Women University, Lahore

Muhammad Noaman Yousaf

Lecturer, Department of International Relations, National University of Modern Languages,
Rawalpindi/Corresponding Author at -noaman.yousaf@numl.edu.pk

Abstract

The study applies structuralism's theory to the social contract to examine how societies evolve and undergo revolutionary changes. A relationship is referred to as structural when two units or elements are related in a way that allows them to transmit equivalent identities upon one another. The interpretations of the state of nature and the social contract provided by Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean Jacques Rousseau can be viewed as structural based on this argument. Personalised social contracts refer to those in which a government has absolute power, while institutionalised social contracts refer to forms of governance that are based on accountability, majority consensus, and general will. The paper is based on qualitative analysis with logicism and thematic analysis.

Keywords: Institutionalization, Personalization, Structuralism, Reforms, Evolution, Objective rule of law, Socialization of mankind, Authorization

Introduction

The study aims at analyzing the justification of the existence of state by arguing that it is a structure in which the rulers and the ruled impart their corresponding identities upon each other. It further explores how that structure gets institutionalized and personalized. It is argued that institutionalized social contract is reformatory or evolutionary whereas personalized are prone to revolutionary-to-revolutionary changes. For the justification of the existence and the analysis of state as a structure, the paper dwells on the theory of social contract with its main focus on Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau. Hobbesian social contract is related to personalization whereas Locke and Rousseau provide basis for institutionalization.

These three philosophers have derived their argument of social contract from the famous hypothetical state of nature. All of them have presented the state of nature as unwarranted, and a solution for governing the state either by absolute power or by majority rule. The Hobbesian absolute sovereign is personalized wherein power is concentrated in one or a group of minorities at the expense of majority. In Locke and Rousseau's scheme the will of the majority upheld. This study analyses as to how social contract gets institutionalized and personalized by apply structuralism. It is followed by an analysis as how changes take place in institutionalized and personalized social contracts. Method of research is based on rationalism and causal inferences. The research design therefore is qualitative and inductive.

Questions posed are analytical and predictive. How social contract gets institutionalized and personalized? Why revolutionary changes take place in some societies and evolutionary changes in others?

Structuralism

Structuralism is considered a return from the diachronic study of linguistics to the investigation of synchronously functioning unified language system.¹ Saussure had used these two terms for the first time in the study of linguistics. According to him the diachronic study of linguistic takes a language dynamic as it undergoes changes with time whereas in synchronic linguistics, language is taken as static in a particular moment of time. He argued that if a language is taken as constant at a particular stage, then it will be easy to understand the logical and psychological connection existing between the constituent elements of a system. In the diachronic analysis only connections that exist between the two sequences of an item or event are studied. For Saussure, the diachronic analysis emanates from the collective consciousness of the individuals. This element of collective consciousness in the study of linguistics is regarded as a shift from the atomistic analysis towards a structural analysis.² In the field of psychology, structuralism opposes the atomistic study aimed at reducing the whole to their constituent elements. Presently structuralism is discussed in all disciplines.³

The reason for this is that the atomistic explanation ignores external factors while analyzing a reality (It is more focused on the role of Agency). The subject of the focus was units, which however, was questioned with other factors, external to units that impart a significant influence on the behavior of the units and their identity. This limitation was overcome by the application of structural method of analysis.⁴ The paper does not debate the various forms of structuralism rather it focuses on the definition of structure and its application in the study of social contract. Although, there are many aspects of structure but the paper focuses only on those features that are common to all.⁵ It provides a base for the general definition of the structure. In this regard two aspects common to all, are important for consideration- firstly, structures are self-sufficient, the comprehension of which does not require referring to external factors, and secondly, although, comprised of elements, structure is a system of the laws of transformation. It is the interplay of these laws that yield results entirely endogenous in nature.⁶ It means that when a change in structure takes place it is related in one way or the other to endogenous elements. This argument is applied in studying the role of endogenous factors responsible for changes in a state.

However, this chapter deals with the relational aspects of the structure that exists among its elements. In the case of social contract, it is applied to the investigation of elements of social contract and the type of relationship that exist among them. It analyses as to how the structure among individuals existed prior to the formation of social contract; the state of nature as explained by Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. Further, it explains as to how relationship among the constituent elements gives rise to personalization and institutionalization of social contract. It, however, argues that the elements of structure are subordinated to laws on the basis of which the system is defined but does not debate on these laws applicable to other (different) disciplines.⁷ It narrows its focus only to the kind of laws regulating the relationship among the elements of the social contract. The main argument is restricted to the description of these laws defined in the paper as the agreement on the form of government; whether absolute or majority rules, among the members of society.

Thus, the structure is defined as an organization that includes a set of elements and their laws of composition. Even if the nature of these elements vary in form and nature, the inner coherence of the structure is central. In other words, the relationship among the elements of the structure is more important than the intrinsic qualities of its constituent elements.⁸ In this regard, social contract includes its three elements the rulers and the ruled, and the relationship among these elements. The elements of the structure are not comprehensible completely in isolation. Rather putting these in a frame of reference with respect to each other in a structure, in which they exist, can have more explanatory power.⁹ It suggests that the observable social phenomenon in society is not shaped by the nature of individual human beings but by the social structure which binds individuals together.¹⁰

The same is applied to the structure of state that binds the rulers and the ruled together. Although, regarding structuralism it is important to mention that there is a debate on the behavior of the units or the role of Agency. Some scholars argue that structure determines the behavior of the units, other say the units or agency have a role in shaping the behavior of the structure.¹¹ The constructivist school of thought argues that both are co-constitutive.¹² This suggests that although there are constraints offered by structures, the entry of an individual in a structure is by his own free will or by compulsion. Applying this argument to the study of social contract, the individuals resistance to or will to join a structure are taken as the basis of revolutionary or evolutionary changes in the structure of social contract.¹³

The State of Nature and the Social Contract

Social contract was the agreement among members of society with which they abandoned the state of nature; a condition that would obtain as if no government existed. Some philosophers are of the view that such condition existed prior to the establishment of the first government.¹⁴ These philosophers use the state of nature to derive legitimacy for the existence of political authority; a term which refers to the state in the modern sense. It means that had the social contract not been achieved there would have been anarchy, a turbulence in society. Or it would suggest that if the state is abandoned today there would be chaos and anarchy.¹⁵ Therefore, it is appropriate to understand as to why the social contract is made by members of society; to understand the justification of the existence of state.

Men in their mental and physical faculties, Hobbes says, were equal in the state of nature who wanted self-preservation by preserving their own liberty and dominion over others. This nature of human beings makes conflict inevitable and life in such conditions is a war of all against all.¹⁶ There is no escape, Hobbes proposes, from the state of nature but by entering into a covenant forming a commonwealth attended by a sovereign, powerful enough to enforce the covenant. The sovereign will make the fear of the consequences of breaching the covenant greater than the breach itself. Such sovereign will have absolute power and will provide security to individuals.¹⁷

Hobbes in his concept of the state of nature gives three forms of structural relations among individuals by which individuals define themselves with respect to each other. These are; diffidence, competition and glory. Firstly, in diffidence, he does not give the atomistic explanation of human behavior rather his argument posits on structural interpretation. Men, in the state of nature, Hobbes says, are equal in their mental as well as physical faculties. In support of this claim, he gives two reasons. Firstly, after acknowledging difference of physical

strength between the stronger and the weaker, he argues that weaker can equally kill the stronger by conspiring or other methods. Secondly, by equality of mental capacity, Hobbes does not mean the quickness of mind but the mental capacity of man, the belief that he is wiser than the other, is according to him, equal among men. Although, some by virtue of their fame may be recognized as wise, it is hardly accepted as everyone considers himself to be wiser than the other. This attribute of human beings makes them equal in their mental faculties.¹⁸

It means that human beings are interrelated with one another in a structural manner. Equality in both the domains is a reflection of their relations which is not endogenous to them as elements of the structure. Their identity is relational or interdependent; therefore, independent analysis is an incomplete explanation of individuals in the state of nature. Hobbes argues the equality makes them equally hopeful of their ends; self-preservation and delectation, and when two or more individuals, aspire for the same thing, become each other's enemies.¹⁹ One would be afraid of being dispossessed forcefully by other, of the gains of his efforts, and life, the other in turn will have the same fears. Hobbes called this state of affair as diffidence.²⁰ The aspiration of the same thing creates a structure of amity and enmity among individuals which is external to both rather dependent upon their relationship.

Secondly, according to Hobbes, there is no escape for man but to pursue his own preservation by getting dominion over others, and continue expanding such dominion. Those who will not expand their dominion will fall to the attack of other expanding dominions. Thus, man can only preserve himself, if he has to live in the state of nature, by dominating others.²¹ This means that the structure gives each individual identical identity; attacker and the victim, as a constituent element. Every individual is an attacker and every individual is a prospective victim. 'Out of fears of being attacked first', it would, in other words, suggest that men will preemptively attack their fellow beings.²² Under such conditions, He argues, every man is the enemy of every other man, - as there is no other power than his own to secure his life - the life of human beings is nasty, brutish and short.²³

Thirdly, the way people want to gain glory is structural in nature which answers the question as to why would, being anti-social in nature, individuals keep company? His answer to this question depicts the structure of human relationship. It is also for Hobbes a contributing factor which makes the state of nature destructive. He argues that man is anti-social by nature; the lack of pleasure individuals has in keeping company, till there is a power to control them all.²⁴ The argument Hobbes makes is that man wants the degree of value he defines for himself from his fellow beings.²⁵ In the absence of a common power, men will try to extort it by coercion which may result into mutual killings.²⁶ He says that human beings are as anti-social; unable to live, unlike animals bees and ants, in society without a sovereign. For honor and dignity, men compete, their primacy of self-interest over common good, opinion about self-wisdom and about ruling society better than the other that leads to civil wars, the art of words presenting good and bad in such a manner to obfuscate the real good and bad disturbs peace, when at ease the proclivity of men by using wisdom to control the actions of those who rule the commonwealth, and the artificial nature of the agreement among men; based on consensus, needs to have a power to perpetuate it, are the factors which makes men anti-social.²⁷

On the other hand, Man, he argues, keeps company to have compared himself with others, for the satisfaction of selfish reason defined as glory; to satisfy his physical, emotional

and sexual needs. Large society cannot be based on passion for glory, Hobbes further argues, if everyone has it, glory is nothing.²⁸ When glory is extorted from others, a structural relationship would exist among individuals which means that the glorious is nothing but the recognition granted by others. Thus it can be said that gain, safety and reputation, in Hobbes state of nature, drive men to the structural causes of conflict; competition, diffidence and glory.²⁹ It is basically the structural relations of individuals that are dangerous for human existence in the state of nature. Therefore, he suggests, that solution lies in the formation of another structure, social contract.

The way the state of nature is depicted dangerous, is a mere reflection of structuralism. His argument about the lack of justice and the right to everything in the absence of a sovereign involves the relations of individuals. The nature of individuals as dangerous, in isolation does not hold a logical and causal explanation because every individual in Hobbes state of nature reacts to every other individual. There is an exit from the state of nature for the members of society, by making compromise on their right to claim possession to everything and self-force for self-preservation in favor of a sovereign. He justifies his argument by saying that as there is no coercive power or a covenant to restrict men from doing anything, therefore, in the state of nature, every man has the right to everything even to the lives of others.³⁰ This factor to him justified everything done in the state of nature. ³¹ He says that justice derives its legitimacy from propriety, gained from a covenant agreed upon among members of society. For him justice is relational which can exist only when men live in society.³² Therefore, Hobbes suggest, justice can be achieved only by establishing a sovereign commonwealth through a covenant because covenant will create propriety among members and any violation will be punished by the sovereign powerful enough to make the breach of the covenant worse than the breach itself.³³

A question has been raised against this argument why would such individuals who are successful in their expanding dominions make compromise on their powers in favor of their subservient fellow beings? According to Hobbes, two reasons; passion and reason, would compel men to escape from the state of nature. Man's passion for peace - defined as freedom from fear of death and the desire of things necessary for commodious life.³⁴ Reason suggests that those articles of peace upon which men may agree can secure man's self-preservation. For Hobbes, it was the fear of death that brought men closer to each other in society. If a man succeeds today in getting dominion over others, he might lose it tomorrow. This constitutes fear among individuals about the future evil; future harm or death drives men to society instead of living in perpetual fear.³⁵

Allowing the laws of nature to operate, Hobbes argues, will make it lawful for everyone; seeking security by relying on his own strength, and art of self-defense against all. Reason, as mentioned earlier, demands peace and commodious life, therefore, man has to put an end to the state of nature. Locke differs with Hobbes on the interpretation of the state of nature on two grounds. In Locke's view people are restricted from harming others in the state of nature and that everyone has the right to punish the offender. Hobbes on the other hand argues that men have to continue their dominions over others if they want to preserve themselves in the state of nature. Locke like Hobbes treats men in the state of nature as equal beings but with difference that non among them is authorized to take away the possession of

the other, their property, liberty and lives. It means a man is authorized to do everything for his own preservation except to destroy others.

However, everyone, according to him, is authorized to punish the transgressor. All will be secure when all have the power to punish the offender³⁶ which must be based on what calm reason and conscience dictate and what is proportionate to the offence to satisfy the cause of retribution. He allows everyone with the executive power to execute the laws of nature because there is no power to enforce these laws. Locke justifies punishment for the offender by arguing that harming others is tantamount to live by means other than the laws of nature. Those who choose other ways shall be punished to the extent sufficient to deter others from doing the same.³⁷ In Locke's state of nature, there are two things that are structural in nature. Firstly, declaring a transgressor the enemy of all, secondly all have the right and power to punish the transgressor.

These two factors bring individuals in a relationship which is structural in nature. All are given two types of identities, victim and offender. These two elements constitute the institution of punishment which can preserve mankind. In other words, Locke says that anyone who intends or acts to harm others has declared himself at war with the other who in self-defense either by own force or by association is authorized to kill the offender.³⁸ The offender is dangerous for the peace and security of the society that killing him is authorized for everyone.³⁹ It is, thus, in the state of nature, the observance of the laws of nature and the deterrent punishment for Locke which can preserve mankind. According to him, in the absence of an authority to whom people can make appeal, it is the right of everyone to punish the offender and to declare war on those who want to impose their arbitrary decisions on or harm others.⁴⁰

For him, men according to reason in the absence of a common judge are in the state of nature, and force upon the person of another without a common power to make appeal is the state of war.⁴¹ The state of nature, Locke argues, is susceptible to chaos and confusion. Although, he says that everyone is an executive as well as a judge, he is apprehensive of the self-love and friendship of individuals which may tempt them to mis-judge that may become the primary cause of violence in society. Man being free has the right to protect his property; life, liberty and estate, by punishing or killing the transgressor⁴² but the self-love and friendship may cause chaos, therefore, it is necessary to escape from the state of nature.

Formation of Social Contract and Prelude to Personalization and Institutionalization

Both Hobbes and Locke agree on the escape from the state of nature, but both have stark differences on the formation of the social contract. The former supports absolute powers of the sovereign, the latter proposes, rule of majority. It is at this point that in theorizing the structure of social contract, the concept of personalization and institutionalization of social contract takes its roots. Hobbes's concept of absolute sovereign as criticized by Locke in conjunction with Rousseau's concept of self-love provides solution to the definitional problem of personalization of social contract. On the other hand, Locke's concept of majority rule seconded by Rousseau's concept of man's compassion for fellow beings, constructs the basis of definition of the Institutionalization of social contract. Firstly, for the definition of personalization of social contract a comparative analysis of the Hobbes' social contract and Locke's criticism is necessary.

The remedy to the state of nature, Hobbes offers in *Leviathan*, is the compromise on natural rights individuals will have to make through a covenant which will empower a sovereign to impose the covenant. To provide security and self-preservation to human beings, there is no alternative to the creation of a civil society under a sovereign.⁴³ To erect a sovereign, he says that men will have to “confer all their power and strength upon one man or assembly of men”.⁴⁴ The sovereign will represent them all in one voice. The creation of such a sovereign is a “more than a consent or concord”⁴⁵ of all in such a manner that they should say to each other as: “I authorise and give up my right of governing myself to this man, or to this assembly of men, on this condition; that thou give up, thy right to him, and authorise all his actions in like manner. This done, the multitude so united in one person is called a COMMONWEALTH; in Latin, CIVITAS.”⁴⁶

The covenant thus made makes every individual; called as subject by Hobbes, as its author which empowers the sovereign to such extent that he is authorized to do anything for the preservation of common peace.⁴⁷ Thus, the agreement among individuals on the creation of sovereign creates another structure; social contract, in which sovereign is the ruler and rest of the members are the ruled. But in his account of the sovereign, the sovereign is not accountable rather he has all the powers to do anything for the preservation of mankind. Locke on the other hand says that absolute powers mean putting the whole society at the mercy of a single person. Hobbes and Locke differ on two grounds; the powers of the sovereign and the accountability of sovereign. Hobbes sovereign has absolute powers and cannot be held accountable, while Locke’s sovereign is based on majority rule where no one can escape accountability.

The absolute powers and non-accountability of Hobbes sovereign is based on command and obedience, or agency and authorization.⁴⁸ The sovereign cannot be resisted on the charges of misconduct as the subjects have authorized all his actions by consent. It is self-accusation to allege a ruler of misconduct because the rulers do participate in the covenant. Therefore, they are not in a contractual relationship with the subject. By surrendering the right of self-government in favor of a sovereign, political accountability becomes nonsensical. Hobbes says that the agreement is among individuals not between the rulers and the subjects. Therefore, one cannot escape the ruler’s jurisdiction. Those who complain of injury from the sovereign are complaining against themselves as they themselves are the author of the covenant. Hobbes says that the acts of the sovereign are the acts of the subjects and doing any injury constitutes injury to one’s self which is impossible.⁴⁹

However, Locke on the contrary, questions the absolute powers of the sovereign. “... And wherever there are any number of men, however associated, that have no such decisive power to appeal to, there they are still in the state of Nature.”⁵⁰...and hence ‘the absolute monarchy is inconsistent with political society’⁵¹..... ‘No appeal can be made in case of injuries received from the monarch.’⁵²This means that giving absolute powers to sovereign amounts to put all the members of society at the mercy of a single person who may commit injury against all. Locke says that anyone who commits injury is answerable to whole mankind for it.⁵³ Bringing a man under absolute authority without consent is enslavement⁵⁴ and enslavement is to put oneself at war with the master in the long run. A man even by consent cannot give up his liberty in favor of a sovereign as the latter may take away his life. When a man accepts the arbitrary powers by consent taken under compulsion, his relationship is similar to that of a

conqueror and the conquered. Therefore, it is argued that when the rulers assume absolute powers, checking the misuse of power becomes difficult.⁵⁵

Locke says that when everyone is executive and judge in his own case, there are chances of chaos and confusion in society because man's self-love and friendship may become the source of favoritism which in turn may become the source of misjudgments.⁵⁶ To avoid misjudgment, the best remedy for him is the installation of the government which will act as judge and executive on behalf of all. Man being free has the right to protect his property; life, liberty and estate, by punishing or killing the transgressor⁵⁷ but the self-love and friendship may cause chaos, therefore, it is necessary to escape from the state of nature. For this purpose Locke proposes the formation of political society which comes into existence when all men quit their natural rights in favor of a community which will act as a judge according to the established laws and judicature when appeals are made against offences.⁵⁸

When people do not have the right to appeals, as it happens in Hobbes's absolute sovereign, they are still in the state of nature. The purpose of the political society is the preservation of the property of the individuals which is not secure against the absolute sovereign. Therefore, the formation of such a political society which can hold everyone accountable is the only solution of this problem⁵⁹ or such society able to prevent anyone from evading the law.⁶⁰ The society will act as one body on the basis of majority rule⁶¹ and those agreed on such society are bound to follow the majority because unanimous decision may not be possible among individuals. By disagreeing with the majority is similar to going back into the state of nature and there can be no agreement on the formation of a political society when majority rule is not accepted.⁶²

A political society gets dissolved when majority cannot act as one body due to differences. Therefore, consenting to one body is consenting to the will of majority.⁶³ The absolute powers and majority rule are two strands of power structures within the structure of social contract which provides basis for personalization and institutionalization of social contract. Absolute powers of the ruler are taken as personalization and majority rule, as institutionalization. The question as to how the absolute powers and majority rule constitute the personalization and institutionalization is answered by Rousseau's concept of social contract. However, he gives different picture of the state of nature and the formation of social contract.

For Rousseau, in the state of nature, only natural inequalities like physical strength, age and health existed among individuals. He says that natural man was weak and fearful and wanted to avoid conflict. He had two instincts: The love of self and the compassion for fellow beings. His desire was moral perfection.⁶⁴ To achieve this end the compassion for fellow beings compels them to create an association but the opportunity was lost due the establishment of the institution of property and development in agriculture. It created political inequalities i.e. rich and poor. He further adds that the rich were apprehensive of losing their possessions. In order to protect themselves the rich conceived a plan to create a civil society. They persuaded the poor to join in the creation of a power which would protect each what he had. The poor agreed happily. It has, according to Rousseau, produced miseries and sufferings in society.⁶⁵ He argues that such a situation can be rectified not by going back to the state of nature but by creating a new social contract. He says that individual have two kinds of will the individual will and collective will. By surrendering individual will to a sovereign representative of the

general will of all the people, exercising its powers for the welfare of the former and in return people render obedience to such body, a social contract will be achieved.⁶⁶

Personalization and Institutionalization

From the above discussion, it can be deduced that it is the general will based on man's compassion for fellow beings which creates political society. In other words, men who uphold or give consent to majority consensus, create political society where rulers relationship is based on compassion for fellow beings defined as the welfare of his subject, the social contract thus achieved is institutionalized. On the other hand when rulers assume absolute powers; free from accountability, based on self-love is termed in the thesis as the personalization of social contract.

The formation of social contract for Hobbes and Locke are security while that of Rousseau, the general will. When the government is formed, rulers use three tools for deriving legitimacy from the ruled. These are: pragmatism; the acceptance of public demands, moralism; ideological and moral appeals, and force; the use of violence to quell dissidents. Machiavelli says that the nobility may fear the common people and support a ruler who they hope will suppress the majority. The people may support the ruler who will liberate them from the oppression of nobility.⁶⁷ According to him a ruler must not be too kind or cruel for kindness is laxity and cruelty may result in disintegration.⁶⁸ Machiavelli's interpretation of a ruler's behavior gives us three kinds of public appeals, and moralism; by kindness, force; by cruelty and Pragmatism by the using both the aforementioned tools.

However, when tools of moralism, pragmatism and force, fail to uphold the compassion for fellow beings and suppress the self-love, the personalized social contract is challenged a paradigm shift occurs in the shape of revolution. The crux of this argument is that when change occurs in personalized social contract it is more prone to revolution. Chances of reforms are less in such structures. Examining the causes of the French Revolution, Alex de Tocqueville answers the question that why nobility in feudal era was hated and became one of the causes of French revolution? He argues:

“When the nobility possesses not only privileges but also powers, when it governs and administers, its special prerogatives can be greater and yet at the same time less noticed. In feudal times, the nobility was seen in much the same way as we see the government today: people accepted the burdens it imposed in exchange for the guarantees it offered. Nobles possessed irksome privileges and onerous prerogatives, but they maintained public order, administered justice, enforced the law, came to the aid of the weak, and took charge of common affairs. To the extent that the nobility ceases to do these things, its privileges seem more burdensome, until ultimately it becomes impossible to understand why they even exist.”⁶⁹

The nobility had maintained their privileges during the reign of Louis XVI, on account of their helping the poor, moralism, maintaining public order and justice, pragmatism, and lastly, through force. When all the three tools failed revolution took place. Thus, the old personalized structure was overthrown. The debate over how many factors contributed to the French revolution is avoided. The hatred for feudalism in France is taken as an explanation for revolutionary changes in the structure of social contract which are personalized in nature. Institutionalized social contracts are reformatory or evolutionary in nature. States with such structure introduce reforms which keep the structure intact and chances of public unrest are

rare.⁷⁰ This means that rulers follow compassion for fellow beings but in the former case rulers with absolute powers follow self-love which causes unrest in society and eventually overthrow of the ruler.

Conclusion

The element of authorization by the people is present in both the cases which make them taking the roots of authority from human subjectivity to a more objective authority, objective system of the rule of law. It is noteworthy that when the rules determining relationship between the ruler and the ruled once get autonomous may acquire the status of norms binding upon the constituent elements. Personality becomes less relevant in such structures. However, the exercise of authority may go against the wishes of those who consent to exercise of authority. The periodic shifts in the democratic set up through electoral process may be regarded a tool of accountability but however, the autonomy of the rules may be controlled by the power of the people to introduce changes in them whereas sometimes they resist temptation to changes.

There is another aspect of the social which is the will of the majority if ill-informed and unintelligent about an issue may harm the whole society. It may also be argued that decision process may be manipulated for personal interests at the expense of others. To find answer to these questions we have to rely on the presumption of civilizing under certain conditions. Human beings may get socialize and civilize over a period of time that using and manipulating the relationship between the ruler and the ruled for personalized purposes may become a redundant concept. However, it is equally amenable to the rise of hatred and fascism or some other extremist ideology.

The bottom line of the argument is that a structural method of analysis if applied to the stratification of government based on social contract theory gets us into a conceptual framework that has more explanatory power. As such the institutionalized social contract would make personalities less relevant compared to personalized social contracts. In this regard the personalized social contract resists temptations to changes and eventually overthrown by revolutions whereas institutionalized are more prone to reformatory changes.

References

-
- Piaget, Jean, *Structuralism* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971), 6.
John Sturrock, *Structuralism: with a new introduction by Jean-Michele Rabate* (USA: Blackwell Publishers, 2003), 27-30.
Jean Piaget, *Structuralism*, 6-7.
Ibid.
Ibid.
Ibid.
Ibid.
John Sturrock, *Structuralism*, 6.
Ibid., 21.
Ibid., 54.
Alex Callinicos, *Making history: Agency, Structure, and Change in Social theory*. (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2004), 1-102.
Alexander E. Wendt, "The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory," *International Organization* 41, No. 03 (1987), 336-340.
Alex Callinicos, *Making history*, 1-102.

-
- 14 A. Almond, et al., *Comparative Politics today: A world view* (India: Pearson Education India, 2004), 3.
- Glen Newey, *Philosophy Guide to Hobbes and Leviathan* (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), 50.
- Bertrand Russell, *History of Western Political Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 1991), 534-535.
- Judd Harmon, *Political thought: From Plato to the Present* (London and New York: McGraw Hill, 1964), 224-235.
- Murray Forsyth, "Hobbes Contractarianism: A comparative Analysis", in *The Social Contract from Hobbes to Rawls*, ed. David Boucher and Paul Kelly (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 41.
- Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*. (Republished by the University of Adelaide, 2014).
- Ibid.
- Ibid; Glen Newey, *Rutledge Philosophy Guide to Hobbes and Leviathan* (London and New York: Rutledge, 2008), 52.
- Ibid.
- Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*.
- Ibid.
- Ibid.
- Ibid.
- Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*.
- Helen Thornton, *The State of Nature or Eden? Thomas Hobbes and His Contemporaries on the Natural Condition of Human Beings* (New York: University of Rochester Press, 2005), 133-134.
- Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*; Glen Newey, "Rutledge Philosophy Guide to Hobbes and Leviathan", 51-52.
- Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*.
- Susanne Sreedhar, *Hobbes on Resistance Defying the Leviathan* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 11.
- Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*.
- Helen Thornton, *The State of Nature or Eden? Thomas Hobbes and His Contemporaries on the Natural Condition of Human Beings* (University of Rochester Press: New York, 2005), 133-134; Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*.
- Helen Thornton, *The State of Nature or Eden?*, 133-134.
- John Locke, *Concerning Civil Government, Second Essay: An Essay Concerning the True Original Extent and End of Civil Government*, trans. William Popple, (Pennsylvania State University: 1998), 5-6.
- Ibid., 6-7.
- Ibid., 10.
- Ibid., 7-10.
- Ibid., 13-14.
- Ibid., 48-49.
- Ibid., 49-50.
- Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*.
- Ibid.
- Ibid.
- Ibid.
- Ibid.
- Deborah Baumgold, "Hobbes", in *Political Thinkers from Socrates to the Present*, ed. David Boucher and Paul Kelley (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 173-175.

-
- Jeremy Waldern, "John Locke" in *Political Thinkers from Socrates to the Present*, ed. David Boucher and Paul Kelley (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 173-175; Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*.
John Locke, *Concerning Civil Government*, 49-50.
Ibid., 50.
Ibid., 50.
Ibid.
Ibid., 12.
Ibid., 15.
Ibid., 10.
Ibid., 48-49.
Ibid.
Ibid., 48-49.
Ibid., 53.
Ibid., 54.
Ibid., 54-55.
Ibid., 55-56.
Judd Harmon, *Political thought*, 298-302.
Ibid.
Ibid., 302-313.
Ibid., 162.
Ibid., 163.
Jon Elster, ed., *Cambridge Text in the History of Political Thought: De Tocqueville: The Ancient Regime and The French Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press: 2011), 37.
David Parker, *Revolution and the Revolutionary Tradition in the West: 1560-1991* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 1-20.