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Introduction

The field of International Relations (IR) draws greatly from political theory and its classics, such as Thucydides, Hobbes, Kant and Grotius. These classical political theorists are often employed to explain and justify contemporary international politics. Much of the research in IR by contemporary scholars is based on these classics which gives classical scholars decisive influence in contemporary thought and practice.

Beate Jahn, Professor of IR at the University of Sussex and editor of the book *Classical Theory in International Relations*, researches contemporary international and political theory and discusses the use of classical authors in IR. She has determined that IR research rests on the classical authors and wondered about the effects of this usage on contemporary research.¹ Jahn holds that this aim of finding answers to current issues in classical theory is incorrect.² It is necessary to read them for analytical purposes and to establish historical continuities because these enable the researcher to analyze contemporary problems better. What is most interesting here is that Jahn has identified multiple problems or pitfalls that can emerge when contemporary scholars use classical scholars in their research. Jahn stresses the importance of realizing the presence of these problems, because they can grow into a serious obstacle in current research which, in turn, can limit gaining clear insight into essential IR topics. Fortunately, Jahn offers the solution of contextualization to these problems. Therefore, to see whether Jahn is correct in her approach, this thesis will focus on a contemporary IR scholar as the case study, namely Francis Fukuyama, and his use of the leading classical scholar Thomas Hobbes (1588-1678) in a selected demarcated topic.

Altogether, this thesis will evaluate to what extent Beate Jahn’s criticism of the use of classical scholars by contemporary International Relations theorists is applicable to Francis Fukuyama. It will do so by comparing Beate Jahn's main points of criticism to Fukuyama's use of Thomas Hobbes’s *Leviathan* in explaining his view of the modern state.

It is important to contemplate on the complicated relationship between political theory and IR theory because the current use of classical scholars by IR scholars derived from this discussion. The ongoing discussion between the two comes from the confusion over the exact

origins of IR theory and the lack of clarity on what role political theory takes in IR theory. Nicholas Rengger, Professor of Political Theory and IR at the University of St Andrews, makes the following distinction between the two:

“While political theorists have focused more and more on the logical and normative dimensions of what goes on inside the state, IR theorists have turned more and more to the interactions between states and the structures of the international system as a whole.”

The debate surrounding the exact relationship between political theory and IR theory resulted into questions regarding the current usage of classical scholars in IR. In his book, *International Relations, Political Theory, and the Problem of Order*, Rengger argues that both fields largely ignore each other and that the fostering dichotomy between political theory and IR has weakened both fields. It is obvious that the relationship between both disciplines is a complex matter. Despite the lack of clarity, scholars like Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Kant and Bentham, are introduced as part of the intellectual history of IR, even though none of these political thinkers in the past devoted themselves primarily to the study of IR. This makes it clear that IR theory is profoundly entangled with the thought of classical theorists and shows the necessity of focusing on the use of classical scholars in IR. With regard to the term ‘classical’, it is unclear what it exactly entails. For Jahn, classical does not refer to dates but what makes classical scholars classical is simply that it reflects on different historical contexts; classical scholars or texts provide us with a historical reference point.

The problem with classical scholars is that they are often employed to give answer to issues such as conflict, war and peace because of the assumed idea of their timeless wisdom. This is also the case for the concept of the modern state. And although Jahn does not specifically write about the concept, the modern state has been chosen as the overarching topic because of the central role of the state in IR and the role classical scholars have played

---

4 Ibid., x.
6 P. Schouten, Beate Jahn on the State of Nature.
7 Ibid.
in the development of the modern state. This makes them necessary in contemporary research when trying to understand the modern state.

This specific demarcation of the modern state in this thesis still needs more elaboration. Stephen Krasner, Professor in IR at Stanford University, who is most famous for his contribution on the topics of statehood and sovereignty, mentioned that the term state disappeared from academic research in the mid twentieth century. But Krasner also observed that, as his own continued research on the state shows, that the state has once again become a major concern of scholarly discourse. Thus, in these past few decades there has been a renewal of interest in the subject of the state and the lack of clarity in its study has led to debates about the functions and nature of the state. The concept has arrived at a confusing predicament, because it is burdened with contradictory meanings and understanding. On the one hand the state is seen as an object of analysis in political theorizing, but on the other it is presupposed as the foundation of the analysis. The effectiveness of the state has been taken into question and its end has been predicted while at the same time, however, as I. William Zartman, Professor at the Nitze School of Advanced International Studies of the John Hopkins University puts it: “more is expected from the state than ever before.” Thus, all this uncertainty has led to the need for more understanding of the modern state and considering the great role many classical scholars have played in the development of the state; it is not surprising that these classics are employed to explain the modern state in contemporary IR research.

Although there are many classical theorists who have impacted the development of the modern state, as it was a lengthy process that took various forms and saw many transformations, there are a few specific reasons in choosing Hobbes as the classical scholar to analyze in this thesis. It is important to note the modern state primarily emerged out of the

---

tumultuous and peculiar politics of late-medieval period in Western Europe and marked the beginning of modernity. This means that the modern state has been around for quite some time. This distinction is important because this means Hobbes can be regarded as a modern theorist, which separates him from other classical scholars who contributed to the development of the state such as the essential antiquity philosophers, namely Plato and Aristotle, and the medieval ones. In this evolving modern system of state, Hobbes wrote his most prominent work *Leviathan* and formulated the first modern social contract theory that took the development of the state to the next level. The role that Hobbes assumes in contemporary research on the state is immense. He provided a starting place for thought about international politics, is incorporated into discussions of contemporary international politics to explain the modern state, and is considered part of the philosophical foundation for the IR theory of Realism. Thus, the fact that Hobbes has written extensively on the development of the modern state makes him attractive to contemporary researchers, and therefore, a logical choice.

The aim of this thesis is to analyze Jahn’s approach to the usage of classical scholars in contemporary IR while at the same time reaching an understanding of the modern state. This will be achieved by formulating an answer to the main research question. To answer this question systematically this research is split up into several parts with Jahn’s criticism to the use of classical scholars in contemporary research as the main guide. The first chapter will focus on Jahn’s approach to the use of classical scholars. Besides explaining the three different ways classical texts are used in contemporary thought and practice, it will be made clear that finding historical continuities between one period and another need to be established for any fruitful use of classical scholars. Afterwards, Jahn’s criticism to the use of classical scholars, or in other words potential pitfalls she has identified, will be given. However, before explaining these issues, this thesis will clarify more on the relationship between political theory and international theory because the discussion of the use of classical authors derived from this relationship. By discussing Jahn’s work and similar relevant literature on this view,
this thesis will be able to analyze the contemporary usage and influence of classical thinkers. This will be done by taking other work of Jahn and responses to her work into account.

The second chapter will discuss Hobbes who has influenced political order and the development of the state with his thoughts and ideas. Before establishing the context in which Hobbes wrote, this chapter will give the characteristics of the modern state. These characteristics are necessary to explain, considering the modern state is the overarching topic, making a complete understanding of the contemporary modern state a prerequisite. Furthermore, it provides a good starting point to refer back to. In addition, some elements of the modern state were acquired after, or developed separately from Hobbes. These elements are essential to mention because they have impacted contemporary research of the modern state and, consequently, Fukuyama as well. Afterwards, the focus will lie on Hobbes and it will be shown what the contextualization of his thought can reveal about the current use of the scholar in contemporary research. The chapter will argue that Hobbes’s core ideas have directed the development of the modern state discourse over time and are still relevant to the contemporary model of the modern state. After the contributions of Hobbes have been distinguished, this chapter will discuss his relevance in contemporary thought and link this to the uses identified by Jahn. The focus will lay on Hobbes most prominent work *Leviathan: Or the Matter, Forme and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiastical and Civil* (1651). The *Leviathan* translation that has been chosen is by J. C. A. Gaskin who is Head of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Dublin. The reason for choosing this edition is because it reproduces the first printed text, trying to remain as faithfully as possible to the original text while offering the modernized spelling. Also, the book offers thorough and useful annotation and an introduction that guides the reader through the complexities of Hobbes’s arguments.

To evaluating Jahn’s criticism of the use of classical scholars it is necessary to check its applicability. As a result the last chapter will be a single case analysis where the contemporary scholar Francis Fukuyama, has been selected as the specific case. This methodology was the most logical choice because, by narrowing the research to one contemporary scholar, it gives the analysis more precision. The choice of Fukuyama comes from the fact that he assumes a prominent role in IR, especially with his work on the functions of the modern state. He has written intensively on issues related to the modern state contributing to the way the modern state is perceived in contemporary times. Furthermore,  

he acknowledges the relevance of history to the contemporary world. His reputation in IR started with his most known article (and book) *the End of History*, where, in short, Fukuyama concentrated on the ideological victory of liberal democracy as the “final form of human government.” In the contemporary literature, *the End of History* and the book of Fukuyama’s teacher, the influential political scientist Samuel P. Huntington’s *Clash of Civilizations*, triggered an explosive debate in IR that gave Fukuyama a permanent place in IR.

Besides *the End of History*, Fukuyama’s most prominent work on the modern state consists of his series on political order, namely *The Origins of Political Order. From Prehuman Times to the French Revolution* and the recently released *Political Order and Political Decay. From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalization of Democracy* and his work on state-building. These works can be considered prominent because, according to Google Scholar, *the End of History* has been cited at least 13017 times while the other two together have been cited more than 2500 times. When comparing Fukuyama’s books with other work dealing with the same subjects, it becomes clear that Fukuyama has been cited extensively. A good example here is the book of Philip Bobbitt, Professor at Columbia Law School and author of *The Shield of Achilles: War, Peace and The Course of History* which deals with the historical transitions of the state. Bobbitt’s book has been published in 2002 and cited 932 times while Fukuyama, who published *the Origin of Political Order* almost 10 years later, has already been cited 586 times. The same goes for Fukuyama’s *State-building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*, published in 2004 and cited 2078 times. It is notable that the book *Empire in Denial: the Politics of State-building* (2006) by David Chandler, founding editor of *the Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* whose research consists mostly about state-building, has only been cited 519 times. This comparison has shown the prominent place that Fukuyama holds in IR with his state research.

Besides Fukuyama’s contribution to the view of the state in contemporary research, another reason can be indicated for analyzing Fukuyama and his use of Hobbes in explaining his view of the modern state. This is because of his position regarding Hobbes. The name of

---


17 Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, xi.
Hobbes is associated strongly with Realism and his concept of the state of nature remains the defining feature of the theory. 20 Fukuyama does not share this association and actually questions the state of nature in his research. This bring an interesting twist to the research because, as will be shown, political order and the modern state partly derived from Hobbes, making Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes even more interesting to compare with Jahn’s criticism.

Comparing Jahn’s criticism of the use of classical scholars to Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes in explaining his view of the modern state will provide insights on the usage of classical texts in contemporary research. Therefore, in the third chapter, before being able to apply Jahn to Fukuyama, it is necessary to first give a small overview of Fukuyama’s work and his view on the modern state. Afterwards, his use of Hobbes in developing this view will be explained. This will give the necessary information for the most important part of the analysis, namely, comparing Jahn’s criticism to Fukuyama. In the end, this will provide an evaluation of the applicability of Jahn’s approach.

1. The Approach of Beate Jahn

1.1. Political Theory and International Theory

Before discussing Hobbes, his contribution to the modern state and the contemporary scholar Fukuyama’s usage of Hobbes in explaining his view of the modern state, Beate Jahn’s approach and criticism will be further expounded in this chapter, as it will enable us to determine the different ways in which classical scholars still play a role in contemporary international research and the consequences of the potential misuses. Therefore, this chapter will answer what the approach of Beate Jahn to the uses of classical scholars in contemporary thought and practice exactly entails. Prior to explaining the three different uses of classical texts that Jahn ascertains in her research and the problems associated with this usage, this chapter will first touch upon the relation between political theory and IR theory. This is relevant because the discussion of the use of classical authors derived from this relationship. Furthermore, understanding the complex relationship between political theory and IR theory will shed light on why the contemporary usage of classical scholars in IR is so important to take into consideration, and in turn, will show the significance of Jahn’s approach.

Classical scholars are still used by contemporary thinkers to define, illuminate, and shape theoretical and political debates. Although none of the classical political authors, Hobbes included, devoted themselves primarily to the study of IR, their ideas are still applied to the discipline. Thus, there is absolutely no question that classical scholars themselves still play a role in the present. Jahn has done extensive research on the role of classical thought in IR Theory. In short, classical scholars in contemporary research are sensitive to being wrongly interpreted and used which is seriously damaging to our understanding of international politics in general. The multiple issues that have come forward as a consequence of wrongly or abstract usage of classical scholars will be discussed below. Jahn maintains that classical texts should be seen as an aspect of contemporary world politics rather than an explanation.

This position matches the perspective of R.B.J Walker, Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Victoria and David Boucher, a Professor

---

in Political Theory and Government at the University of Wales. However, while Jahn is interested in the ways classical scholars are used in and for IR, both Walker and Boucher are concerned with the relationship between IR and political theory.

The field of IR draws greatly from political theory and the schools of thought in IR trace their foundation back to classical political authors. Liberalism draws heavily from the works of Kant while Thucydides, Machiavelli and Hobbes all play an undeniable role in Realism. The problem is that there is a lack of consensus over the exact origins and traditions of IR theory. When talking about traditions, it was Martin Wright who elucidated international theory with his famous article *Why Is There No International Theory?* This foremost IR scholar distinguished the three traditions of international thought (Realism, Rationalism and Revolutionism) whose classification is still prominently used today but also maintained that international theory was marked by “intellectual and moral poverty.” Wight’s essay has become a point of criticism for those seeking to reconcile the disciplinary relationship between political theory and IR theory. It is unclear if International Theory can be distinguished from, is a continuation of, or is mutually constitutive with political theory.

In the discussion about the origin of IR theory, both Boucher and the Norwegian political scientist Torbjørn Knutsen have provided an account of the history of IR theory that incorporates the work of those who have been commonly associated with political theory. Boucher sees that IR theory rejected political theory as an attempt to establish its own intellectual credentials. Jahn also recognized the field of IR trying to create a separate discipline. Basically, the complete focus was on explaining the field of IR, leaving out everything else of importance. However, according to Jahn, the consequence of this was that the original traditional mainstream IR scholars read classical scholars in a selective way. Thus, this has influenced classical scholars being read out of context and the strong emphasis

---

28 David Boucher, *Political Theories of International Relations*, 4.
29 Beate Jahn, “International Relations theory,” 1411
30 P. Schouten, Beate Jahn on the State of Nature.
upon taxonomy averted the gaze from the quality of arguments. Therefore, it is important to show how the relationship between both disciplines is regarded because it will shed light on the role that classical scholars assume in IR. I agree with the approach of reconciliation by Knutsen, who wrote on the history of IR theory in his book *A History of International Relations Theory*, when contemplating the relationship between the two disciplines. Knutsen tries to reconstruct the tradition of IR theory through modern history by utilizing classical texts of political theory. He uses political theory as its primary source for information about speculations on relations among states.\(^{31}\) While Knutsen does maintain that there is a distinction between the disciplines, he does recognize that the works of classical political theorists almost inevitably include insights on the external relations of states.\(^{32}\) Like Knutsen, I maintain that political theory undoubtedly plays a role because many pressing world issues of today can be found in the history of thought.

### 1.2. Historical Continuity

Now that this relationship has been made clear it is time to focus on Beate Jahn’s approach and her criticism of the use of classical scholars. Admits the claims of globalization and postmodernism in the field of IR, it is obvious that the contemporary world is riddled with change. According to Jahn, it is remarkable, when taking all these changes into account, that classical authors still play an important role when reflecting on a modern international world.\(^{33}\) She has identified three main uses of classical texts in contemporary IR. These uses are as follows: they provide philosophical foundations for theoretical approaches, explain and justify contemporary policies, and structure and define theoretical and political debates.

Jahn’s first usage is that classical authors are “frequently cited as precursors to contemporary theoretical approaches.”\(^{34}\) The mainstream of these contemporary theoretical approaches trace back their roots to different scholars and use them to shape their thoughts. Thucydides, Machiavelli and Hobbes play an undeniable role in Realism while Liberalism refers back to the writing of Kant. It makes sense to cite classical scholars this way because contemporary explorations of world politics commonly begin by invoking a tradition, a starting point from which historical trajectories and future aspirations can be judged.\(^{35}\)

---


\(^{32}\) Ibid., 3; Brian C. Schmidt, “Resurrecting International Political Theory,” 160.


The second usage is that classical authors are often employed to explain contemporary international developments and justify policies. The Democratic Peace Theory and the importance of democracy are influenced greatly by Kant for example. Thirdly, the contemporary debates are defined and structured by the usage of the classical scholars. Boucher also identifies the third use of classical scholars as the predominant way of structuring the literature. He gives the example of the tradition of Realism and Idealism and mentions that they are placed in opposition of each other as exemplifications of radically different conceptions in IR. These three different uses of classical authors ultimately aim at understanding the contemporary world. However, according to Jahn, the issue with these uses is that this aim of understanding relies on the assumption of historical and intellectual continuity.

In general, classical texts are attractive to contemporary authors because of the applicability of ‘timeless’ issues such as conflict, war and peace that classical scholars addressed. The contemporary world is still confronted with these issues and finding similarities between them can help solve them. This timelessness united authors and contributed to the formation of the different schools of thought in IR. John Vincent (1943-1990), the English School scholar, agreed with this view of timelessness. He mentioned in his article about the Hobbesian Tradition in Twentieth Century International Thought that “there is a profound assertion that Hobbes captured certain essential truths which would apply regardless of time and place.” It comes down to the fact that these uses presume a historical continuity in the development of theoretical approaches, in the development of international policies as well as in the structure of the debates.

Jahn does not agree with this assertion of timeless wisdom. Assuming the existence of timeless issues does not allow contemporary scholars to bridge any gaps at all. It will not provide answers. This refers back to Jahn’s goal to read classical texts for analytical purposes and finding historical continuities and differences. Jahn feels this allows scholars to analyze contemporary problems better. She describes this accordingly:

---

36 Beate Jahn, “Classical Theory in International Relations in Context.”
37 David Boucher, Political Theories of International Relations, 13.
40 P. Schouten, Beate Jahn on the State of Nature.
“If Hobbes discussed the problem of civil war – and ‘his’ civil wars have something concrete in common with contemporary civil wars – his writing can contribute to an analysis of contemporary civil wars. And yet, it may also be the case that the necessary ‘point of contact’ between Hobbes’ and contemporary civil wars consists mainly in the use of the same term for historically very different social and political phenomena. In this case, Hobbes’ discussion of civil wars raises questions about the nature and extent of historical change – rather than provide possible solutions for contemporary problems.”

Therefore, Jahn stresses the significance of distinguishing historical change and continuity in her analysis. She explains:

“We are confronted with a puzzling tension between widespread claims of more or less radical change and widespread uses of classical authors based on the assumption of historical continuity.”

This illogical mixture can be solved by a better specification of elements of both historical continuity and change. Simply said this comes down to placing the texts back into context. Instead of reading the classics to find answers it is best to focus on establishing these historical continuities and differences. This will enable scholars to analyze contemporary problems better and obtain more insight. There is no denying that there is an assumption of continuity because the whole reason for engaging with classical scholars is this presence. The state, or more tangible issues such as civil war and peace, are perfect examples of continuity. Classical authors’ reflection on social and political developments has provided a foundation for the state. Without continuity, classical scholars would be irrelevant for the study of IR today because there would be no contact points over the different time periods. Jahn states that these contact points are essential for analyses because, if there are similarities found between situations, the potential solutions offered in classical texts might be applicable on the contemporary problems or might even exclude it as an option. However, it is essential to realize that elements of continuity have to be specified instead of assuming the presence of timelessness. Besides Jahn, Walker also notes that, by tracing the history of certain issues

42 Ibid., 3.
43 Ibid.
44 Ibid., 5.
relevant in IR, it is possible to discover how they emerged. With regard to discontinuity, Jahn mentions that although discontinuities are not good for finding solutions they “are valuable for their specification of what is open to social and political change” and that they “guide research into causes and consequences of historical change and thus lead to a better understanding of contemporary phenomena.” Thus, the relevance of specifying change and continuity cannot be underestimated when trying to understand contemporary issues with classical texts. And finding these contact points can be best done with contextualization.

1.3. The Pitfalls

1.3.1. Presentism

It has been shown with the three main uses of classical scholars that they are still relevant in contemporary IR. However, as mentioned before, Jahn adds to this relevance that a fruitful use of classical scholars requires “the specification of elements of both historical continuity and change.” Unfortunately, more often than not, there has been a wrong usage of classical texts with the result being that the potential of classical texts cannot be unlocked or the misrepresentation of texts and scholars. This latter comes from the problem of presentism, meaning that the contemporary use of classical scholars does not live up to the requirement of specifying historical continuity and change. This can result in that contemporary assumptions are read back into classical scholars instead of being opened up for reflection through the use of classical scholars. The assumption of the presence of continuity needs to be specified and when this falls short the danger is that the use of classical scholars’ function then only serves, as Jahn claims, “to ‘mirror’ back to us contemporary assumptions and prejudices.” Or, to put it roughly, a bias in selecting specific classic fragments to underline contemporary issues without taking the entire context of the classics into account. Classical texts must not be seen as definitive answers to issues but as devices that can open up the subject to more critical examination. Multiple scholars like Walker, Nicholas Rengger and Ian Clark, Professor of IR

47 Ibid., 3.
48 Ibid., 6; Brian C. Schmidt, The Political Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations, 31.
at the University of Queensland, are also not far removed from recognizing the same pitfalls in their research.\(^{50}\)

### 1.3.2. Usage as Confirmation or Justification

Besides the problem of presentism, Jahn claims that the mistake of selective reading in theories also poses as a problem. Because the mainstream theories and their theorists use classical scholars as their solid base it seems that they are unreasonably dependent on them. It is not wrong to cite classical authors to define, illuminate, and shape argumentations or that all contemporary scholars are guilty in this regard. Occasionally there are serious attempts to justify the usage of certain names in relations to the theories. A good example of this is the classical account of the historical narrative of the principle of reason of state and the classical scholar Machiavelli by the late renowned German historian Friedrich Meinecke.\(^{51}\) However, it seems that more often than not, instead of using the classics to obtain insight, classical scholars are used as a confirmation, a justification, or even as a starting point. The context of what you are researching is of utmost importance. For the most part, a number of figures associated with certain theories are constantly repeated as an article of faith. Walker also acknowledges this problem in his research on Machiavelli:

“To mediate on the identification of Machiavelli with the claims about a tradition of international relations theory is to begin to see how it might now be possible to think otherwise: to use references to a tradition not as a legitimating of reification and closure, but as a source of critical opportunity.”\(^{52}\)

Before Jahn embarked upon her more general reconsideration of the role of classical thought in international theory, she did a study on the origins of the ‘state of nature.’\(^{53}\) In this research, she already shows that contextualization is the key to uncovering new insights. Later on, she

---


uses her findings on the state of nature to study the role of culture in IR. Here, she already noticed that classical scholars are used as a starting point by contemporary scholars and how it hinders research. She discusses the strategy that constructivist Alexander Wendt takes in his attempt to integrate culture and identity into the theory of IR. In short, Wendt sets out to prove that the neorealist argument that the state of nature is by definition conflictual is not necessarily true, and Jahn continues explaining that Wendt identifies three different cultures of anarchy, namely the Hobbesian, the Lockean and the Kantian and his conclusion that the international system is defined by a Lockean culture. Jahn explains his mistake: “Wendt, thus, does not question the assumption of the state of nature as such but only the substantive contents (neo)realists have given it” and that:

“Since his “theory” is in entirely governed by a speculative state of nature uncritically taken from Hobbes, Locke and Kant, it is not too surprising to find that Wendt’s conclusion do not differ one iota from the conclusions that the former have drawn hundreds of years ago and that have been diligently reproduced over and over again since then.”

All in all, the problem with the way IR theories use classical scholars can greatly limit the potential of classical authors and impact the intellectual development of the theories as well.

1.3.3. Forgetting other Qualities

Jahn also distinguishes the problem of forgetting or ignoring other qualities of the classical scholars. This mostly derives from the fact that the mainstream theories pit different scholars against each other for argumentation sake, the most obvious in this regard being Hobbes and Kant. It is often forgotten that these scholars can also be used outside their respective schools of thought and can even be compatible. Hobbes actually maintained some classical liberal thoughts while Kant based his theory on the Hobbesian state of nature. It seems like a double standard to put these two at the opposite of each other. Much insight can be obtained when this is taken into account. A good example of new insights is the essay Hobbes’s Theory of

---

55 Ibid., 32. See p. 32 for a complete explanation of Wendt’s research.
56 Ibid.
International Relations of the historian Sir Noel Malcolm where he gives different take on Hobbes’ position as a theorist of Realism.88

Another example of this problem is the use of the classical scholar Niccolò Machiavelli who has the misfortune of having the position in the popular discourse as being a model realist. He is even regarded as one of the founding father of classical Realism.59 Instead of being blinded by this title, it is necessary to go beyond this reputation in contemporary research because Machiavelli has much more to offer. See Bobbitt’s research on Machiavelli’s work, where he underlines the importance of realizing the constitutional nature of Machiavelli, as an example of other potential besides his role in Realism.60 Walker, who has written intensely about Machiavelli in his research on political theory and IR theory, also notes this about Machiavelli:

“Contrary to both the so-called realists who treat Machiavelli as one of their own and the so-called idealists who castigate him for his supposed realism, Machiavelli poses questions about political community and practice that may still be pursued.”61

1.3.4. Lineages of Reception

Another problem that Jahn distinguished in her research is the lineages of reception. It is obvious that classical authors will have gone through multiple different receptions. Their work will have been variously translated, published and republished, as well as interpreted and reinterpreted. Jahn stresses that it is important to bear in mind that this brings some burden with it and can result in the elusiveness of classical authors.62 This also applies to the already mentioned relationship between IR and political theory. As the discipline of IR relies on the interpretation provided by political scholars, they reread and select pieces that are deemed relevant, whether or not classical scholars had anything explicit to say about the international context. Jahn is correct when she says that reflection on interpretations is necessary because it gives room for alternative interpretation and opens the way for critical

reflection. This does not mean to imply that all translations and interpretations are incorrect, only that the realization of this fact should be present.

When reading contemporary work where classical scholars are used, it is of the utmost importance to reflect on which source is cited and the attitude of the translator towards the authors to get a good overview of the context. Harvey Mansfield, Professor of Government at Harvard University and translator of major political philosophers such as Machiavelli, is a perfect example of a scholar who takes this into account. In line with Jahn’s view, Mansfield states, while taking Machiavelli’s bad reputation into account, in his book *Machiavelli’s Virtue*:

“After all, the translators translate for us, and in any case their attitude can be found among those who read Machiavelli in the original. We do not want to join the pack of hounds -the anti-Machiavellians- who chased the fox when he first appeared; that seems too simple and unsophisticated, as well as futile, in our time.”

The number of studies devoted to explaining the meaning of the word *virtù*, a concept that echoes throughout Machiavelli’s *The Prince*, proves the impact that translations and interpretations can have on the direction of research.

1.4. Contextualization

Overall, it is recognized that in order to analyze contemporary issues the specification of continuity and change between classical text and current concerns must be found. Therefore, Jahn and the contributors in the book *Classical Theory and International Relations* offer contextualization as the solution to the misuse of classical authors. It is noticeable that the contributors of the book are all contemporary scholars concerned with topics such as political theory and the historical and philosophical underpinnings of IR theory. Besides Jahn, the contributors that are most relevant to this research are the already mentioned Boucher and Micheal C. Williams, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales in Aberystwyth. In the book, Boucher approaches John Locke’s concept of property while Williams focuses on the Hobbesian tradition of IR. Boucher has published widely in the
history of thought in IR and political theory. He agrees with Jahn on the fact that classical texts are an aspect of the contemporary world. The research field of Williams included the use of Hobbes in IR and one of his recent published is the book *The Realist Tradition and the limits of International Relations.*

Jahn’s solution of contextualization overlaps mostly with the work of Quentin Skinner, famously known for his association with contextualism. His approach is the reconstruction of authorial intentions through contextualization. Recovering the intention of the authors is only a possibility with knowledge of the period in which it was written and a thorough examination of the author’s works itself.⁶⁷ Although Jahn agrees with the Skinnerian approach that aims to open up contemporary issues through a contextualization of classical work she nonetheless stresses that:

> “The authors of this book are not concerned with establishing the authorial intention of a classical author but rather with demonstrating that the changed political and social environment circumscribes the applicability of classical ‘analyses’ or ‘solutions’ to contemporary problems, or with revealing alternative but neglected influences of classical authors.”⁶⁸

Despite the fact that I agrees with Jahn’s reasoning that the use of classical authors should be seen as devices for opening up a subject to critical examination and not as a set of definite answers, it is necessary to make some critical remarks as well. One of the few points that are noticeable in the research of Jahn is that she offers a clear and rational solution to her theory. However, it feels that her solution is rather generally and that the difficulty of finding and naming continuities by contextualization is underestimated. The goal of the book is to reveal possible limitations that the field of IR unconsciously has taken on but this is rather difficult to achieve. The contributors of the book do set out to achieve this goal but only recognition is not enough to demonstrate the depth, complexity and continuing relevance of classical texts today. It is not only a small matter of naming continuities, but intricate research by itself in which demarcation is essential. The comparison between Jahn’s points of criticism and the
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case study of Fukuyama in this thesis forms a good example that demarcation is of utmost importance because if not, researching becomes too complicated and too broad. This can stand in the way of good research. Thus, I wonder if the recovering of contexts of classical texts should not become a focus point by itself.

Furthermore, I also question how far you need to go in your research in tracing concepts and definitions before you start asking intense questions regarding ontology or epistemology. Jahn herself is a good example of this. In Jahn’s study on the state of nature, she traces the social construction of the concept back to its specific historical introduction by the Spanish in their encounter with the Amerindians.69 Thus, she researched where the classics themselves took the concepts from. While Weber in her review of the article maintains that Jahn’s story is a powerful one and that she enables us to approach IR differently, she also mentions that Jahn sometimes “slips from theorizing culture as a context into theorizing it as an ontology.”70 Another subject of interest of Jahn is liberal internationalism. I noticed that, in a critical discussion on liberal internationalism between Jahn and Andrew Moravcsik, the debate drifted off the topic of liberal internationalism to questions regarding the aims and requirements of IR as a social science and about epistemology, methodology and other abstract concepts.71

1.5. Concluding Remarks

This chapter elaborated on the approach of Jahn and distinguished her criticism with the use of classical scholars in contemporary research. However, it was first shown that the questions surrounding the usage of classical scholars derived from the debate on the relationship between political theory and IR theory. The combination of the lack of clarity over the origins of IR theory with the fact that the field of IR draws greatly from political theory and its classics has led to necessity of focusing on the use of classical scholars in contemporary IR.

Jahn has identified three main uses of classical texts in contemporary IR. These are as follows: they provide philosophical foundations for theoretical approaches, explain and justify contemporary policies, and structure and define theoretical and political debates. The aim of

70 Ibid.
these uses is to understand the contemporary world but it has been revealed that they also rely on the assumption of historical and intellectual continuity, something that Jahn disapproves of. The usage of classical authors should be seen as devices for opening up a subject to critical examination. This is done by historical continuity because contemporary situations can be explained and understood if these contact points are discovered. Jahn offers contextualization as the answer to finding these contact points. This contextual interpretation can give new and different insight.

The potential problems that Jahn has identified with the usage of classical texts and classical scholars are presentism, misrepresentation, usage as a conformation or justification, forgetting other qualities by focusing on scholars’ main ideas and lineages of reception. The consequences of these misusages are that they limit the potential of classical scholars and hinder the intellectual development in IR. Besides contextualization, the realization that these problems and their consequences are present is of utmost importance according to Jahn. One finding I have made about Jahn’s approach is that, although it is indeed essential to recognize the presence of these problems, she should have elaborated more on the concept of contextualization.
2. Thomas Hobbes

2.1. The Modern State

The previous chapter has already made clear that the influence of classical scholars should not be underestimated. Therefore, before being able to analyze Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes’s *Leviathan* in explaining his view of the modern state and, in turn, finding out about the applicability of Jahn’s approach, it is logical to first understand Hobbes’s ideas and thoughts. Therefore, in line with Jahn’s solution of contextualization, this second chapter will focus on Hobbes and his masterpiece *Leviathan* to look closer at his influence in the development of the modern state. By contextualizing Hobbes and his work, it is possible to discover historical continuities and reveal how Hobbes is used in contemporary thought and practice. It must be mentioned that Hobbes will be approached holistically because he has written his work before the emergence of schools of thought of IR. The name of Hobbes is associated strongly with the tradition of Realism and his concept of the state of nature remains the defining feature of the theory. Thus, Hobbes cannot be contextualized properly when he is considered as a Realist scholar. The influence of Realism in the usage of Hobbes will be discussed later on in this chapter.

However, prior to analyzing Hobbes, it is necessary to explain the concept of the modern state and give its characteristics to get a good understanding of the concept. Naturally, it will become clear that Hobbes helped develop some of characteristics of the modern state. With regard to the intellectual development of the modern state, classical political theorists tried to make sense of (human) behavior, reflected on social and political developments which continued to evolve. It provided the historical basis of the contemporary system. Over time, this gradually led to the development of important concepts or principles which would eventually shape the modern state. Although we live in a world of states today, it was not always thus. It was the region of Europe that promoted many of the distinctive modern ideas and principles that are now the normative standard in the international community. The concept of the state is a European political idea. The birth of the state system coincides with medieval Europe. It was the overarching structure of the Church that existed in Europe that
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triggered the beginning of the state, and made medieval Europe such a highly original society in comparison to other areas that failed to develop a state system.\textsuperscript{74} However, it was the Italian Renaissance that marked the beginning of modernity and, with this, the emerging of the society of states.\textsuperscript{75} From that moment onwards, the modern state saw many other transitions and attained a series of characteristics. The process of modern state formation proceeded in an enormously complex fashion over roughly five centuries.\textsuperscript{76} At various moments in time, city-states, empires, feudal states, absolutist states or nation-states have been the dominant institutional form.

Although currently the nation-state is accepted by most as the contemporary structure, there is still no consensus on the exact definition of the modern state. Therefore, for the purpose of this thesis, multiple state definitions have been considered and compared. From this literary review a cluster of characteristics of the state has been selected and embraced as the essential features of the modern state, underscoring some of the crucial principles that I deems important for understanding the state. The following characteristics have been embraced (1) (monopoly) control of the means of violence; (2) territoriality; (3) sovereignty; (4) legitimacy; (5) centralized government; (6) the rule of law and (7) citizenship. Notice that the modern state has been defined in terms of means specific to its function. These characteristics show that the key to understanding the modern state lies neither in the laws or political doctrines, but in the means which governmental rule is sustained. From these characteristics, the first two features are important because these are the ones which Hobbes helped develop with his thoughts.

The first feature is the most essential in understanding the modern state. It comes from the German sociologist Max Weber whose definition, ‘a state is a human community that \textit{(successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a territory\textquoteright}, is the most often used state definition in the literature.\textsuperscript{77} It means that the state, or its

\textsuperscript{74} Bobbitt, \textit{The Shield Of Achilles}, 70; Watson, \textit{The Evolution of International Society}, 138. Only mentioning the Church is of course a rather short term, therefore some further explanation is necessary. Probably two reasons can be indicated why the Church played such a huge role. The Church encouraged regularization across the many diverse (culture) communities in Europe which led to an overarching international culture. Moreover, a certain international legal culture was also constructed because of the Church. The concept of election (the pope) and the legal justification needed for war came from the superstructure of Christendom. Thus, the Church contributed to the beginning of certain legal ideas. It is this combination that made medieval Europe able to evolve the state further.

\textsuperscript{75} Phillip Bobbitt, \textit{The Shield Of Achilles}, 825.


administrative staff, has the sole right to control the means of violence to uphold order and guarantee its security.\textsuperscript{78} The control over the coercive means seem rather counter-intuitive, given that one of the ultimate goals of the state is to provide order and peace. However, achieving these goals requires enforcement through courts of law and the police. Weber’s definition can be traced back to Hobbes. Christopher Pierson, Professor of Politics at the University of Nottingham, has written extensively on issues surrounding the modern state. In his book \textit{The Modern State} he links Hobbes and Weber’s ideas on the use of force monopolized by the state together, emphasizing the similarity between their ideas of the monopoly of the state.\textsuperscript{79} In short, for Weber “the state is considered the sole source of the ‘right’ to use violence.”\textsuperscript{80} It came down to the fact that, the more effectively the use of force is monopolized by the state, the less frequent the actual resort to violence may be. This fits with the supposition of Hobbes considering his experience with civil war. He already previously observed that states try to gain control over the means of violence and that this process of centralization was a driving force in state making.\textsuperscript{81} Hobbes’s supposition maintained that, to avoid collapse into civil war, individuals must surrender their rights to the state.\textsuperscript{82}

The second feature, territoriality, is also mentioned in the definition of Weber. This is actually not surprising at all considering the fact that territoriality is perhaps the most notable characteristic of the state and intrinsically linked with the other features of the modern state. Territoriality refers to the fact that the state possesses a defined and exclusive territory. Although the definition of Weber is an important aspect in the functioning of the state, it does not cover all of the elements. The third feature that has been embraced is the concept of sovereignty. One cannot discuss the modern state without touching upon sovereignty because it heavily influenced the formation of the modern international system of states. The state is a sovereign entity which refers to absolute authority within a state’s territory.\textsuperscript{83} The modern usage of the concept is derived from the Peace of Westphalia (1648). It was the philosopher Jean Bodin (1526-1596) that introduced the first modern notion of sovereignty while Hobbes legitimized the concept. During the contextualization of Hobbes, this will be explained accordingly. The current concept of sovereignty has developed even further. It is no longer in

\textsuperscript{78} Christopher Pierson, \textit{The Modern State}, 6.
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., 7–8.
\textsuperscript{80} Max Weber, \textit{From Max Weber}, 78.
\textsuperscript{81} Herbert Wulf, “Challenging the Weberian Concept of the State,” 7.
the hands of the monarch but rather lodged in the institutions that represent the people.\textsuperscript{84} The state has become a people’s state, on par with the feelings of nationalism and now receives its legitimacy from putting the state into the service of the people. This brings us to the fourth feature: legitimacy. Both Christopher Pierson and Brian Nelson touch upon the fact that legitimacy is an essential element and that no state can survive without it in their research on the modern state.\textsuperscript{85} In other words, legitimacy refers to the fact that a state requires the acceptance of its rule by the people. It does not matter if this legitimacy comes from God as was the case in the earlier states. Legitimacy could come by rational consent as the social contract theorists like Hobbes, Rousseau and Locke helped develop. The legitimacy of the modern state is implicitly linked to representing ‘the will of the people’. The concept of legitimacy is intertwined with sovereignty. Although the state cannot fully control its territory, they nonetheless claim the legitimate right to make and enforce laws. This reaffirms the power of sovereignty.

The fifth feature is a centralized government which is a rather logical characteristic of the modern state. Considering the fact that the state evolved into its own entity, it required a centralized government that would become a sole exerciser of sovereignty within the state’s territory.\textsuperscript{86} In the modern sense, this means that the government must abide with the laws of the state. Those who exercise power must do so in ways that are lawful and constitutional.\textsuperscript{87} This relates to the sixth feature of the rule of law. The rule of law implies that everyone – from the individual citizen up to the government itself – is subject to the law. No one is above the law. The rule of law took a long time to develop. Acceptance of the individual natural right was a long process and it was during the Renaissance and the Enlightenment that individualism became important. The final feature of the modern state characteristics is citizenship which gradually developed in history with the rise of nationalism. It transformed the subjects into citizens, giving them rights and shaping the modern state as it is today.

In light of these characteristics, it is good to take a moment to stand still at the remarkable concept of the state. In its simplest sense, it refers to an abstract entity with a government, a population and a territory. However, the collective of the state’s characteristics makes it

\textsuperscript{84} Torbjørn L. Knutsen, \textit{A History of International Relations Theory}, 16.
\textsuperscript{87} Christopher Pierson, \textit{The Modern State}, 17.
immortal when it is considered that governments come and go, populations born and die, and potential shifts in territorial borders. The resilience of the state remains.

2.2. The Contextualization of Hobbes

2.2.1. The Horrors of Warfare

Prior to looking at Hobbes and his use in contemporary IR, it is important to understand Hobbes and how his thought on the state was formed. To comprehend the scholar and his contribution to the development of the modern state, it is first necessary to roughly sketch the situation of the 16th and 17th century because certain developments in this time frame have influenced Hobbes and his view. The 16th and 17th century can be characterized as periods ridden by turbulent war. For this reason, the role of warfare must be mentioned because war goes hand in hand with the development of the modern state. As will be shown later, the influence of war on Hobbes writing was tremendous. Charles Tilly, an American scholar who has written much on state formation, stresses: “state structure appeared chiefly as a by-product of rulers' efforts to acquire the means of war.” Besides the impact of warfare other structural changes transformed the modern state further. Dynastic inheritance and marriage resulted in larger centralized territories. The greater belief in human rationality increased the trend of secularization. The religious struggle led to the Reformation, and the continuous wars raised fundamental questions about the causes and justification of war itself. The sixteenth century was nothing but chaos and confusion which resulted into new thinking that eventually created a path of modernity for the 17th century.
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90 Charles Tilly, Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1992, 14; Michael Howard, War in European History, 36; Phillip Bobbitt, The Shield Of Achilles, 101. The military revolution, with its strategic shift of warfare tactics and the invention of firearms, transformed the nature of war. The costs of military expenditure rose skyrocketed, making the new monarchs more dependent on (national) wealth. This resulted in the centralization of taxation which led to the establishment of centralized bureaucracies. Furthermore, the capacity to sustain war also became increasingly dependent on the growing wealth produced by trade and the exploration of the world by Europe. In the end it increased the authority of the state because only the state was able to supply the administrative, technical and financial resources that were necessary for warfare.
The Thirty Years’ War (1618-1648) and the profound impact of the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) rearranged the European power structure completely. The setting of the Thirty Years’ War was related to two important interconnected conflicts; the accumulation of the religious struggle that began with the Reformation and the goal of the Habsburg dynasty (the Holy Roman Empire) to establish a true imperial realm in Europe and to restore Catholic universality.\(^91\) In the end, the already weakened Holy Roman Empire did not succeed in achieving its goal. The supremacy of the Habsburg dynasty was curtailed which eventually led to French hegemony in Europe under Louis XIV and with this the start of the absolute state.\(^92\) The horrors of the Thirty Years’ War confirmed the theme of order in the seventeenth century. Instead of the approach that God was punishing mankind for his sins, most social thinkers began to explain the wars and chaos in the light of human behavior, reason and individual freedom. It was concluded that a freedom of all could only result in violent conditions, the so-called state of nature, a concept made famous by Hobbes.

This thesis, alongside most contemporary scholars, identifies the Treaty of Westphalia as the beginning of the modern sovereign state system and as the moment the territorial state emerged.\(^93\) Although the exact extent of the influence of Westphalia is subject to much discussion in contemporary research, it is still a turning point in the seventeenth century that needs to be mentioned.\(^94\) The reasoning behind the importance of the Westphalian Peace by scholars derives from the specific modern principles that were codified in the treaty. These principles include exclusive territoriality, state sovereignty, legal equality, non-intervention, standing diplomacy and international law.\(^95\) The desperate need for order in those chaotic

\(^91\) Bobbitt, *The Shield Of Achilles*, 95.

\(^92\) Ibid., 105–107.; Because of the religious struggle between Lutherans and Catholics and the Peace of Augsburg (1555), where the constitutional principle of *cuius regio eius religio* (whose region, his religion) came into being, the Holy Roman Empire was fragmented and weakened.


times gave Europe enough incentive to embrace the concept of independent sovereign states. Furthermore, with regard to Hobbes, the treaty ratified two decisive features that would also be expressed in the classical scholar’s work, namely sovereignty and the right of the sovereign to determine the religion of the state with the principle of *cuius region eius religio*. Furthermore, rulers gained the right to conclude treaties with foreign powers, and no one was able to challenge the king’s authority in his own territory. Eventually, the concept of territoriality became a key characteristic for the modern state. The horrors of the Thirty Years’ War can be considered the reason why territoriality was needed as the new constitutional order. Because of all the chaos, civilians started to look at the state for protection, creating a territorial identity.

The idea that the king has absolute authority over this territory relates to the concept of sovereignty, one of the characteristic of the modern state that Hobbes legitimized. As mentioned before, it was Bodin in his book *Six livres de la république* (1576) that provided the modern notion of sovereignty. Bodin, in response to the religious struggle in France at that time, formulated the concept of sovereignty as a solution to the problem of the issue of the right to rule. He defined sovereignty as “that absolute and perpetual power vested in commonwealth” in which absolute refers to that there is no higher authority than the sovereign, while perpetual means that sovereignty is unaffected by the change of individuals.

2.2.2. The Fear for Chaos

It has been shown that the 16th and 17th centuries were essential in the development of the modern state. It was Hobbes who wrote in the middle of this chaos. And it will be shown that chaos was ever-present in his life and influenced him greatly. Hobbes was born in England in
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96 Brian R. Nelson, *The Making of the Modern State*, 60; Torbjørn L. Knutsen, *A History of International Relations Theory*, 86. In terms of the religious dispute, the principle of *cuius region eius religio* was fully embraced in the treaty. The consequence of this acceptance was that it made the king the supreme religious authority which rendered the church irrelevant in political terms. It marked the end of religion as an important cause of conflict in Europe.


98 Peter T. Manicas, “The Legitimation of the Modern State: A Historical and Structural Account,” 177; Bodin is also responsible for the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* which refers to the insistence that rulers must keep to their agreements. Furthermore, it is important to notice that, in the contemporary literature, there is a lot of debates surrounding the concept of sovereignty. This thesis will exclude these debates but for more reading material on the concept of sovereignty see Stephen D Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).

99 Jean Bodin, *On Sovereignty: Four Chapters from The Six Books of the Commonwealth*, trans. Julian H. Franklin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 1; Brian R. Nelson, *The Making of the Modern State*; Torbjørn L. Knutsen, *A History of International Relations Theory*. Bodin continues to explain in chapter 8 of book I what he exactly means with *perpetual*: “I have said this power is perpetual, because it can happen that one or more people have absolute power given to them for some certain period of time, upon expiration of which they are no more than private subjects.”
the year 1588, the same year that the Spanish Armada made its ill-fated attempt to invade England. This news resulted into the premature birth of Hobbes as he describes in his verse autobiography in 1678:

“For the rumour went everywhere through our town that the last day of the nation was coming by fleet. And at that point my mother was filled with such fear that she bore twins, me and together with me fear.”

This paragraph shows the beginning of his pessimistic worldview that would continuously influence but also inspire his work. His rather depressed views came from different sources, from his difficult childhood to the continuous wars during his life. He witnessed the destruction of the Thirty Years’ War and fled for the English Civil War (1642-1651). His father was an unpleasant fellow, a disgraced vicar who abandoned his family after a brawl outside his own church. Hobbes was fortunate that he had a wealthy uncle that could provide for his education. When he reached the age of fourteen Hobbes left to attend Oxford. After graduation he ended up working for the aristocratic British Cavendish family where he became a tutor to their son, William Cavendish. Although Hobbes had no direct experience in politics, his association with his employee, the Cavendish family gave him the opportunity to be acquainted with people who had a close interest in politics. Furthermore, his work gave Hobbes the opportunity to accompany his student to the European continent where he met great scholars like Galileo and Descartes. This impacted Hobbes greatly and on his return home he started to direct his intellectual thought against his Oxford education and along new paths.

It was during the 1640s with the start of the English Civil War that Hobbes left England to live in France until 1651. He fled alongside many of the aristocratic families who were threatened by the republican army. Hobbes hated the disorder and was deeply distressed by the violence. This resulted in much reflection on political order, the causes of war and human behavior. Roughly he concluded that supreme political authority ought to be individual and absolute. This comes forward in his masterpiece, Leviathan which he wrote, as was central in his life, in the shadow of warfare. Hobbes wrote many books and articles but in this
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thesis the focus will mostly lie on *Leviathan* since here his main thoughts on the state are clearly given.

### 2.2.3. Leviathan

Thus, Hobbes lived at a time where war and violence played a central role. This is essential to take into account when contemplating the scholar because it influenced his thinking and explains his search for the foundations of civil order that is found in his work. He developed a political theory in which the origins of society and the basis of political power were explained through an agreement or contract between individuals. Also known as the social contract theory. Three interconnected concepts of Hobbes have impacted the state greatly; namely his famous concept of the state of nature, the concept of sovereignty which he legitimized and absolutism. Hobbes justified sovereignty by sketching an image of what he called the state of nature. This idea was born when Hobbes contemplated the question of how the world was without authority. The state of nature was inherently a state of ceaseless conflict and violence, or a war of all against all, because of individual freedom and evil aspects of human nature such as greed and pride. The explanation was Hobbes’ conception of how a society would look without supreme authority. As Hobbes wrote in *Leviathan*:

> “Hereby it is manifest, that during the time men live without a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called war; and such a war, as is of every man, against every man.”

Life in a state of nature was, as Hobbes’ famous saying goes: “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short” and was not preferable. In his extensive study of human behavior, greatly influenced by his own pessimistic view, Hobbes concluded that there was only one moral condition in human nature, that is the law of self-preservation, which was continuously filled with desire and fear. Thus, the only valid rule to exist in this natural state of affairs is that everybody has a natural right to all things, which goes hand in hand with the fear of death by jealous others. He refers to this as the Right of Nature.
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103 Ibid.
104 Ibid., 66. As Hobbes says: “I put for a general inclination of all mankind, a perpetual and restless desire of power after power, that ceaseth only in death.”
Hobbes’ theory did provide a way out of this dilemma. In accordance to the principle of self-preservation men realized that they had to remove the cause of their fear and desire. Hobbes concluded that, since men possessed reason, it was possible to put an end to the dreadful state of nature because they would realize that their individual interests would be better served by order.\textsuperscript{105} According to Hobbes:

\begin{quote}
\textit{“it is a real unity of them all, in one and the same person, made by covenant of every man with every man, in such manner, as if every man should say to every man, I authorize 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 authorize all his actions in like manner.”}\textsuperscript{106}
\end{quote}

Thus, everyone must give up their natural rights by making a social contract where all power is given to a strong central authority, the absolute sovereign. They established a state, or as Hobbes called it, a \textit{Leviathan}. Hobbes compared the \textit{Leviathan} to an artificial man wherein the sovereign represented the soul of the person, giving life and motion to the whole body.\textsuperscript{107} This is an important distinction for, although Hobbes insisted that the power of the sovereign is unlimited, he is also the representative of the people. He is chosen to maintain order, to ensure peace and security of his subjects, and guarantee mutual aid against external enemies. The absolute rule of the sovereign, whether a single person or an assembly enforced the social contract and keeps it functioning smoothly. According to Hobbes there were three forms of sovereign authority possible: monarchy, aristocracy and democracy.\textsuperscript{108} Hobbes considered monarchy to be the best of these options because it was the most consistent and had the lowest potential for conflict. He insisted that the sovereign power was absolute and undivided.

Now that Hobbes’s ideas and thought in \textit{Leviathan} with regard to the modern state has been made clear, it is possible to focus Hobbes’s contribution to the field of IR and, especially, his presence in the contemporary modern state. Hobbes is considered one of the founding fathers of political science and helped create the system of states that is still used today. Thus, the modern state as we know it grew in many ways out of Hobbes his ideas and thoughts. He provided us with the moral language in which we think and speak about the modern state. His conception of the modern state introduced lasting themes, and most theories of other scholars

\textsuperscript{105} Torbjørn L. Knutsen, \textit{A History of International Relations Theory}, 95.
\textsuperscript{106} Thomas Hobbes, \textit{Leviathan}, 114.
\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., 7.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., chap. 19.
would not have been possible without his work. Hobbes was the first to articulate the modern theory of social contract. His work laid the foundational myth of the modern state with his social contract theory that continued to evolve during the Enlightenment and is still used to this day.\textsuperscript{109} Hobbes paved the way for John Locke and his liberal theory of government.

With regard to the contemporary concept of sovereignty, although the concept evolved and adopted itself to further developments, it was Hobbes who gave its enduring form with his contract theory. It was the Treaty of Westphalia that formally accomplished the usage of the concept of sovereignty, but as we have seen the theoretical basis was formed by Bodin and Hobbes. With his explanation of sovereignty Hobbes justified the concepts and legitimized monarchical absolutism. In this time the power of rulers was under increasing attack, but Hobbes provided a theoretical comprehension of the functioning of the state and thus, concentrated the power in the hands of the monarchs.\textsuperscript{110} The same goes for the principle of absolutism. For while the absolute state eventually transitioned into more recognizable forms, the idea behind absolutism was the concentration and centralization of political power, strengthening the ability to rule a unified territorial state.\textsuperscript{111}

A crucial contribution of Hobbes to the modern state was the further detachment of the state because of his artificial sketch of political order.\textsuperscript{112} Although Hobbes preferred a monarchial form of government, the actual form made no difference, for it only carried the sovereign power of the state. It was the entity of the state itself that ‘floated’ above society. This distinction raised the state above any claims for political authority and solved Bodin’s confusion about the indivisibility of sovereignty or the questions surrounding the different forms of government.

\textbf{2.3. The Contemporary use of Hobbes}

Naturally, all of Hobbes’s contributions to the development of the state and his thought in general make him relevant and interesting for contemporary state research. Hobbes was remarkably successful in converting us to his point of view. Therefore, it is now necessary to focus on the use of Hobbes in contemporary research and the common issues associated with his usage in IR. However, before being able to explain the use of Hobbes, it is important to mention that Hobbes in fact said little about IR directly in his writing. This resulted in much
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discussion regarding the position of Hobbes towards IR. In fact, the following passage from *Leviathan* is one of the few in which Hobbes depicts IR as a state of nature:

“But though there had never been any time, wherein particular men were in a condition of war one against another; yet in all times, kings, and persons of sovereign authority, because of their independency, are in continual jealousies, and in the state and postures of gladiators; having their weapons pointing, and their eyes fixed on one another; that is, their forts, garrisons, and guns upon the frontiers of their kingdoms; and continual spies upon their neighbours; which is a posture of war. But because they uphold thereby, the industry of their subjects; there does not follow from it, that misery, which accompanies the liberty of particular men.”

Like with most of the political thinkers of the past, Hobbes’s primary interest was in domestic politics, which might explain Hobbes’ lack of attention to the relationship between states. Among Realists, there is the assumption that anarchy in the state of nature as depicted by Hobbes in *Leviathan* is also true in the international realm. This analogy between the state of nature and IR is not shared by all and has resulted in much discussion on the role of Hobbes in IR. Again, this proves the complicated relationship between political theory and IR theory: despite Hobbes’s silence on the topic of IR, there exists a strong echo of Hobbes in the field of IR. Hobbes is part of the intellectual history of IR, is considered by many as the first theorist of the modern state and, in line with one of Jahn’s main uses, provided the philosophical foundation for Realism. Furthermore, with regard to theoretical debates, also one of Jahn’s main uses of classical scholars, the mainstream debates are frequently presented as a Hobbesian approach versus a Kantian approach. A. Nuri Yurdusev, Associate Professor of IR at the Middle East Technical University, described the term Hobbesian in his article *Thomas Hobbes and International Relations: from Realism to Rationalism* as follows:

“The epithet ‘Hobbesian’ is commonly used to designate the structure of international relations where there is the lack of authority and cooperation, disorder is the rule and order is the exception, the actors always try to maximize their own interests at the
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expense of the others and peace is temporary and can only come if there is a common or hegemonic power, or if the balance of power is maintained.”

Important here is the fact that the contemporary use of Hobbes is consistent with Jahn’s approach and her identified uses. This means that, consequently, Hobbes is also sensitive to the misuses that Jahn has identified. Accordingly, some of the most common misusages with Hobbes will be discussed briefly. However, before focusing on these misuses, it must said that in the contemporary usage of Hobbes, there is definitely the realization that examining the uncertainties, instabilities and contradictions surrounding Hobbes is a necessity for credibility.

2.4. The Misuses of Hobbes

2.4.1. Presentism

As Jahn has said, much of the contemporary use of classical scholars is characterized by presentism. Or, in this case, the contemporary use of Hobbes does not live up to the requirement of specifying historical continuity or change. There are certainly cases in which contemporary scholars recognize continuity between Hobbes and contemporary times. Hedley Bull, Professor of IR and part of the English School, compared Hobbes’s time with the twentieth century. In his article on *Hobbes and the International Anarchy* he examines Hobbes’s role in IR and examines the analogy between the state of nature and IR. This mostly came from the fact that Hobbes did not write much about the relationship between states. Bull starts by mentioning that the purpose of Hobbes’ political ideas was to provide internal peace and security as a response to the civil war. However, although Hobbes did not write about international conflict, he did have enough reason to reflect on interstate conflict. As mentioned before, Hobbes was born during Spain’s attempted invasion in England and lived through the Thirty Year War. Bull makes the following comparison between Hobbes’s perception of conflict and ours:

“In Hobbes’s time as in ours civil conflicts and interstate conflicts were closely bound up with one another: civil wars provided opportunities for foreign intervention, and
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This shows that there are attempts to explain continuities between contemporary times and Hobbes and that the use of Hobbes is not only associated with the assumption of the presence of continuity. The fact that Hobbes’s thinking, especially with the state of nature, had such a tremendous impact on the field of IR. However, more often than not, the assumption of continuity is present. The general acceptance of this presence had led to a certain bias in selecting specific fragments of Hobbes to underline arguments without taking the entire context into account. This also related to the next misuse of using Hobbes as a confirmation or justification.

2.4.2. Usage as Confirmation or Justification

It has been said that, because mainstream theories use classical scholars as their solid base, they are unreasonably dependent on them. And although prominently in Realism, the state of nature has become a decisive claim and cornerstone in IR in general.\textsuperscript{122} Williams also recognizes this in his book on Hobbes:

\begin{quote}
\textit{The claim that international politics is best described as an anarchic ‘Hobbesian state of nature’ continues to be one of the prominent and evocative common rhetorical devices and analytic touchstones in the study of world politics.}\textsuperscript{123}
\end{quote}

So central is the assumption of the existence of a state of nature between states, that it is also shared by Liberalism. Realism and Liberalism differ only with respect to the question of whether this state of nature should be reformed or overcome or lived with.\textsuperscript{124} This image stands in the way of opening up Hobbes further potential and it seems Hobbes, more often than not, is used as a confirmation. Again Williams acknowledges this:

\begin{quote}
\textit{As often is the case with the use of classical political thinkers in IR, these references tend to be cursory, with declarations of world politics as a condition of ‘Hobbesian
\end{quote}
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Thus, if this use as a confirmation and justification is already the case in IR itself, it is most definitely a problem in the theory of Realism with Hobbes’s position as the major intellectual precursor of the theory. Again, it is not wrong to use Hobbes to shape and underline the arguments in the theory but it is important to be aware of the fact that Hobbes has taken such a prominent place within the theory because it can lead to selective reading and can stand in the way of developing the intellectual development of the theories further. Hobbes is often used to justify an argument instead of logically using him to underline an argument.

2.4.3. Forgetting other Qualities

Another misuse that Jahn identified was ‘forgetting other qualities’ which mostly derives from mainstream theories that place different scholars against each other for argumentation’s sake. This is definitely the case with Hobbes, as the distinction of the ‘Hobbesian approach’ in IR has already shown. Furthermore, in line with the previous misuse, Hobbes’s potential is mostly overshadowed by his place in Realism. Besides his role in Realism, Hobbes can mean much more for IR and it is often forgotten that he can be used outside his respective school of thought.

Yet, although a serious pitfall, alternative approaches of Hobbes have been researched and embraced in contemporary research. There are multiple examples of this. Bull sees Hobbes as a philosopher of peace while Jahn notes that Hobbes is often included as part of the liberal traditions. It can be said this potential misuse is not the greatest challenge for the use of Hobbes in contemporary research because the realization of Hobbes’s potential is present. It is important to realize though, that the use of Hobbes or a classical scholar in general, is always subject to interpretation and perception. This means that there is not a single correct use of Hobbes.

2.4.4. Lineages of Reception
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With regard to the lineages of reception, it is obvious that Hobbes has gone through multiple different receptions. *Leviathan* has also seen many translations, interpretations and reinterpretations. To put this criticism into more perspective, Hobbes produced a Latin version of *Leviathan* in 1668 where some passages differ from the English ones. Furthermore, the biggest problem about interpretations comes from the fact that Hobbes wrote little about IR. Hobbes’ references to the relationship between the states are interpreted differently resulting into much discussion and a certain elusiveness of Hobbes.

2.5. Concluding Remarks

This second chapter has focused on Hobbes and his masterpiece *Leviathan* to get a closer look at his influence in the development of the modern state. This has been done by contextualizing the situation of the modern state in the 16th and 17th century and the background of Hobbes to see how it influenced his thoughts and ideas on the modern state. First this chapter explained the characteristics of the modern state. These are (monopoly) control of the means of violence, territoriality, sovereignty, legitimacy, centralized government, the rule of law and citizenship. It turned out that especially the characteristics of (monopoly) control of the means of violence and sovereignty are important with regard to Hobbes. He played a great part in their development with his thoughts and ideas. Hobbes’ background has made it clear that chaos stood central in his life and influenced his thinking quite a lot. He was appalled with the English Civil War and this occurrence eventually led to the writing of *Leviathan*. It has been shown that Hobbes has an enduring importance in the study of IR. His contribution to the modern state mostly comes from his formulation of the social contract theory that, with his concept of the state of nature, has become a decisive claim and cornerstone in IR. He invented the imaginary Hobbesian state of nature, a conception of how the world would look like without authority. The realization of individuals that their interests are better served with order makes them conclude a social contract with each other where the absolute sovereign is chosen to maintain order. Furthermore, Hobbes justified the concept of sovereignty and detached the state as well with his thoughts in *Leviathan*.

Hobbes has said little about IR in *Leviathan* which has led to much discussion about the way Hobbes interpreted the state of nature between states. This is again an example that proves the role that political theory assumes in IR theory and the intellectual history of Hobbes in IR. The analysis of the use of Hobbes in contemporary research and the common
issues associated with his usage in IR has shown that Hobbes fits with two of Jahn’s identified uses. Hobbes provides the philosophical foundation of Realism and is used to structure theoretical debates. Applying Jahn’s criticism to Hobbes’s general use in contemporary research has shown that he is sensitive to misusage by contemporary scholars.

In short, Hobbes is the most prone to being used as a confirmation or justification. This comes from the prominent role that Hobbes assumes in IR and, especially, in Realism. The consequence of this problem is that it limits the intellectual development of Realism. Presentism is the next problem that is present in the contemporary use of Hobbes. However, luckily, the realization that the difference between Hobbes and contemporary times needs to be specified is being embraced more and more. Consequently, this has led to more insight in the thought of Hobbes. With regard to the criticism of Jahn of forgetting other qualities, Hobbes is intensively analyzed in contemporary research, leading to new alternative approaches to Hobbes besides his usual confirmation of Realism. The lineage of reception has also been found as one of the problem, mostly because of translation issues.
3. Francis Fukuyama

3.1. The Necessity of the Modern State

While Hobbes’ relevance to the contemporary thought of the modern state has been proven in the previous chapter, it has also been shown that, in general, he is prone to misuse. Therefore, it is now time to apply Jahn to the contemporary case study of Fukuyama. This chapter will focus on comparing Jahn’s main points of criticism to Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes in explaining his view of the modern state. This should give insight on the application of Jahn’s approach. Before actually comparing the two, it is necessary to first get some insight on Fukuyama’s view of the modern state which, in turn, will reveal his use of Hobbes. Therefore, a comprehensive overview of Fukuyama’s work on the modern state will be given. His work on liberal democracy, political order and state-building will be expounded because these three are inherently connected and contributed to his view of the modern state. Furthermore, Fukuyama’s view will be linked with the given characteristics of the modern state.

Prior to explaining Fukuyama’s work, it is necessary to mention that the context in which Fukuyama writes today differs greatly from the context in which Hobbes wrote. As has been shown, Hobbes wrote in the backdrop of violence and chaos where the modern state was just beginning to emerge while Fukuyama writes in the presence of the nation-state. Therefore, although rather logical, certain principles of the modern state will not precisely match with each other. As the main elements of the modern state were gradually acquired, they naturally evolved alongside the changing times. Reaffirming the importance of contextualization.

With regard to the context in which Fukuyama writes, the nation-state has emerged from European history and thought. It rose to eminence in the 19th century and eventually became the predominant state form that is still present today. Here, it is necessary to mention that it is often said that the nation-state is facing its demise in the contemporary world. The claims of change in IR goes hand in hands with questions regarding the functioning and effectiveness of the modern state because of worrying challenges such as failed states. The reason why this is important to mention is because Fukuyama’s interest in the modern state and, in turn, political order comes from these questions. Fukuyama writes in response to the issues challenging the functioning of the state. He repeatedly returns to the theme of weak
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state institutions and embraces the importance of a strong modern state as a solution. According to Fukuyama, this can only be achieved with the concept of state-building and understanding the relevance that history can give answers to the contemporary world.\textsuperscript{129} Thus, in the broad sense, Fukuyama can be considered as a state theorist. With his books and articles on state-building and the origins of political order, much of his research involves the workings of the state.

It is now necessary to give a brief overview of Fukuyama’s \textit{End of History} because, for Fukuyama, liberal democracy and the modern state are inherently connected with each other. In short, Fukuyama’s argument in \textit{the End of History} was that the idea of liberal democracy had triumphed around the world and, as such, constituted the “\textit{end of history}.”\textsuperscript{130} Fukuyama does not mean to imply with his usage of the term “history” that there is an end in the occurrence of events but refers to “\textit{a single, coherent, evolutionary process}” or the age-long philosophical struggle on the question what the best form of government is.\textsuperscript{131} The rather provocative argument resulted into the original article exciting an extraordinary amount of commentary and controversy.\textsuperscript{132} Fukuyama derived his argumentations from the great German philosopher G.W.F. Hegel (1770–1831) and the Russian-born French philosopher, Alexandre Kojève (1902–1968) who in turn is known as an influential interpreter of Hegel. Fukuyama explains: “\textit{For Hegel, the embodiment of human freedom was the modern constitutional state, or again what we have called liberal democracy.”}\textsuperscript{133}

In time, Fukuyama became less idealistic about the victory of liberal democracy. This does not mean to imply that he does not believe in liberal democracy anymore, on the contrary, he still sees the modernity of the liberal West as an attractive package.\textsuperscript{134} However, with the effectiveness of the state being questioned, Fukuyama started contemplating on the essential functions a modern state should possess. Consequently, his arguments in \textit{the End of History}...
History contributed to the formulation of his view of the modern state when Fukuyama started combining both concepts:

“Before you can have a democracy, you must have a state, but to have a legitimate and therefore durable state you eventually must have democracy. The two are intertwined, but the precise sequencing of how and when to build the distinct but interlocked institutions needs very careful thought.”

3.2. Fukuyama’s Modern State

Thus, in short, creating a functional liberal democracy is impossible wherever an effective modern state is lacking. It is necessary that the institution is in place before being able to introduce the ideology of liberal democracy. Now that this connection has been made clear it is time to explain Fukuyama’s modern state. Fukuyama’s interest in the functions of an effective modern state resulted in his comprehensive two volume series: The Origins of Political Order and Political Order and Political Decay. The key theme of the two books is on political development and that political order consists of three separate sets of institutions: the state, the rule of law and accountability. He defines the state as “a hierarchical, centralized organization that holds a monopoly on legitimate force over a defined territory”

This matches with Weber’s definition of the state and, consequently, one of the characteristics of the modern state. The rule of law is seen as a set of rules, reflecting society’s view of justice, that are binding to the state as well. Accountability refers to the insurance that the power of the state is exercised on behalf of the whole population. According to Fukuyama, if these three elements are balanced rightly, and enshrined in the local customs and traditions, societies are able to create a modern, liberal democracy. Or, in other words: an effective stable modern state.

Interestingly enough, Fukuyama separates these three institutions while, in contrast, this thesis sees them as elements of the modern state. The reason behind this distinction is because of Fukuyama’s idea of sequencing, the thought that these three institutions do not
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necessarily need to be established at the same time. This corresponds with his thoughts mentioned earlier, that before being able to have a functional rule of law; a stable state must be established. He maintains that achieving this result constitutes ‘the miracle of modern politics’, since it is not obvious that the elements of the state, the rule of law and accountability can be combined, and because there is an inherent tension between them.\footnote{Ibid.} The state concentrates and uses power to achieve compliance with its law and to maintain security from other states while, on the other hand, the rule of law and accountability limits this power. With regard to the aspect of the state, Fukuyama discusses state-level societies which have transitioned from tribal societies. Important are the qualities he gives these state-level societies because they reconfirm his view of the state that he has formulated in his other work. State-level societies possess a centralized source of authority which is sovereign, backed by a monopoly of the legitimate means of coercion, and the authority is territorial.\footnote{Ibid., 80.}

The result of Fukuyama’s distinction between the three elements of the state, the rule of law and accountability is that it took him away from a solely European-dominated approach. Instead, he focuses on ancient China and its state development while briefly touching upon other areas like the West and India. He maintains that China was the first to succeed in creating a modern state because China was able to develop a centralized, uniform system of administration that was capable of governing a population and territory.\footnote{Ibid., 19.} Yet, he concludes that China never moved on to develop the other two elements. This global focus of Fukuyama can be considered rather radical and, at the same time, refreshing since it seems to be the norm to focus on the western account of political development. Consequently, Fukuyama sets aside the classical Western philosophical tradition of, interestingly enough, Hobbes. However, as will be shown later, this does not mean that Fukuyama does not use Hobbes in his work, only that it gives a different twist to the way he uses Hobbes.

This brings us to the next topic, namely the way Fukuyama applies the modern state in his literature on state-building. Fukuyama has adopted the institutional approach in the state-building discussion. The institutional approach in the state-building literature focuses on the importance of the institutions of the state and its goal is closely related to creating the Weberian conception of the state.\footnote{Nicolas Lemay-Hébert, “Statebuilding without Nation-Building? Legitimacy, State Failure and the Limits of the Institutionalist Approach,” Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding 5, no. 1 (2009): 21–45; Stefan Wolff, “Post-Conflict State Building: The Debate on Institutional Choice,” Third World Quarterly 32, no. 10 (2011):} Fukuyama is often associated with this approach. This
becomes clear from his definition of state-building. He sees the concept as “the creation of new governmental institutions and the strengthening of existing ones.”\textsuperscript{142} Fukuyama, in a more recent article on state-building, mentions:

“State-building in a strict sense is about creating the Weberian monopoly of legitimate violence over a defined territory, and therefore has at its core the concentration of the means of coercion—in practical terms, armies and police—under the control of a central political authority.”\textsuperscript{143}

Thus, his state-building literature is built strongly on the definition of Weber which, as has been shown, relates to Hobbes as well. While the book \textit{State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century} of Fukuyama is mostly focused on the causes of state weakness and the differentiation of state capacity in countries, Fukuyama does make some interesting points about the modern state that need to be mentioned. Making a distinction between the strength of state power as “the ability of states to plan and execute policies and to enforce laws cleanly and transparently” and the scope of state activities which refers to “the different function and goals taken on by governments” enabled Fukuyama to make a better differentiation between weak states institutions.\textsuperscript{144} This distinction is important to mention because of two reasons. Firstly, Fukuyama’s emphasis on the capacity of states is widely shared, and contributed to the institutional approach which shows his importance in the contemporary research on state-building.\textsuperscript{145} Secondly, and this is the important one, it shows that Fukuyama’s attention lies on the functions and capabilities of the institutions of the modern state. Important here is that Fukuyama acknowledges the modern state as a centralized bureaucracy that can exercise sovereign authority over a territory.\textsuperscript{146} And at its core is the concentration of the means of coercion under the control of a central political authority. Moreover, Fukuyama acknowledged that the state possesses the ability to provide order and security.

In sum, the functions that Fukuyama ascribes to his modern state match most of the given characteristics of the modern state. These characteristics are (monopoly) control of the means
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of violence, territoriality, sovereignty, legitimacy, centralized government, the rule of law and citizenship. As the comprehensive overview of Fukuyama’s work has shown, the most important functions of Fukuyama’s modern state include a Weberian conception of the state, a centralized political authority, a sovereign authority and a territory. Furthermore, although Fukuyama separates it, the function of the rule of law can also be included in this list. This is important to mention because it shows an important conclusion. Namely, it demonstrates that Fukuyama, instead of contemplating where these characteristics originate from, just assumes the presence of the functions of the state.

3.3. The Hobbesian Fallacy

Now that Fukuyama’s vision of the modern state has been made clear it is time to discuss his use of Hobbes. In short, for Hobbes the state encompassed a sovereign who has absolute power which resulted from a social contract between self-preserving individuals. As the previous chapter has shown, alongside the historical occurrences in Europe, the thoughts of Hobbes evolved and guided the development of the modern state further along. Fukuyama’s modern state is a tricky concept, because he separates certain concepts, such as the rule of law and accountability, which this thesis has attributed to the modern state. Analyzing Fukuyama’s work has shown that the most important aspects of his description of the modern state can be found back in the characteristics of the modern state.

It has already been indicated that Fukuyama rejects Hobbes in his research on political order. This is an interesting observation because, considering the way Fukuyama uses the Western philosophical traditions in his view of the modern state, this should have impacted Fukuyama’s work and view of the modern state more. As the previous chapter on Hobbes has shown, Hobbes has contributed to, and is reflected in, the definition of Weber and the notion that the state is impersonal. Making it is rather odd that Fukuyama distances himself from Hobbes in his research. However, before discussing this observation, it is important to see in what way Fukuyama uses Hobbes in his work. It will become clear that Fukuyama mostly uses Hobbes to explain his different approach on human nature. Thus, although Fukuyama does not agree with the argumentations of Hobbes, Fukuyama does not shy away from using Hobbes to explain and underline his own arguments. This makes it necessary to look more closely at the argumentation of Fukuyama against Hobbes.

Fukuyama’s comments on the British philosopher mostly relate to Hobbes’s perception of human behavior. As this thesis has explained, Hobbes maintained that human
beings are “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short” and that life in a state of nature is a war of all against all. Fukuyama argues against this idea because he does not agree with Hobbes’s conception of the individual human being and establishes something he calls the Hobbesean fallacy. Fukuyama does not agree with:

“the idea that human beings were primordially individualistic and that they entered into society at a later stage in their development only as a result of rational calculation that social cooperation was the best way for them to achieve their individual end.”

In other words, Hobbes saw a great difference between the primitive condition of man in the state of nature and the man in society. In the state of nature man was an isolated individual while the man in society resulted from a rational social contract among individuals. The emphasis on individualistic humans and its starting point in the state of nature is something that Fukuyama does not agree upon. Humans are rational, self-interested creatures that will learn to cooperate if this is their best option, but they do not enter into society and politics as a result of this rationality. According to Fukuyama, they do not need to organize themselves into groups as Hobbes concluded, because human beings are social by nature. Communal organization comes to them naturally, as tribal societies also have shown. Fukuyama builds his argumentation on elaborating on biology and anthropology:

“Everything that modern biology and anthropology tell us about the state of nature suggests the opposite: there was never a period in human evolution when human beings existed as isolated individuals.”

With regard to individualism, according to Fukuyama it has developed over the course of history and has become an essential part of the economic and political behavior of humans. It can therefore help understand the present but, considering its developments, it is not the best way to describe the early evolutions of human politics.
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Finally, Fukuyama also uses Hobbes to clarify and justify his usage of Hegel in *the End of History*. Besides identifying the similarities between the approaches of Hegel and Hobbes, Fukuyama focuses on explaining the difference between Hegel’s approach of the desire of recognition, to Hobbes’s approach of the fear of violent death. Fukuyama does this to further elaborate on his understanding of human nature.

3.4. Applying Jahn to Fukuyama

In light of Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes in explaining his view of the modern state it has become clear that Fukuyama mostly uses Hobbes to underline his arguments for liberal democracy and his use of Hegel. Furthermore, his identification of the presence of the Hobbesian fallacy shows that the use of Hobbes is mostly to explain his own approach to human nature and to provide a starting point. This is a rather disappointing observation because this thesis has shown that Hobbes plays a far greater role in the development of the modern state than that Fukuyama gives him credit for. Especially when Fukuyama’s modern state matches most of the characteristics of the modern state which have, in turn, been impacted by Hobbes. However, the matter at hand is, when applying Jahn’s approach on Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes, whether Fukuyama misuses the classical scholar. It is important to mention that Fukuyama is aware and acknowledged the presence of the potential pitfall of confirmation in researching the topic of political development in his book *Political Order*. He explains this as follows:

“*Theories ought to be inferred from facts, and not the other way around. Of course, there is no such thing as a pure confrontation with facts, devoid of prior theoretical constructs. Those who think they are empirical in that sense are deluding themselves. But all too often social science begins with an elegant theory and then searches for facts that will confirm it. This, hopefully, is not the approach I take.*”
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Thus, this indicates that Fukuyama realizes that he needs to justify his starting point, instead of just assuming the presence of one. When comparing this realization with Jahn’s approach, it shows great potential for Fukuyama’s use of classical scholars. Fukuyama’s awareness can result in better research.
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The analysis of how Fukuyama uses Hobbes has made it clear that Fukuyama does partially use the classical scholar in the way that Jahn has identified. The three main uses that Jahn has distinguished are the citation of classical scholars as precursors to theoretical approaches, the explanation and justification of contemporary international politics and the structuring of contemporary debates. In the case of Fukuyama, although he disagrees with Hobbes’s conception of the state of nature, he uses Hobbes to explain contemporary international politics and to structure the debates. Actually, Fukuyama uses Hobbes as a starting point. This might sound odd because Fukuyama goes against Hobbes but refuting the individual human nature clears the way for Fukuyama to build his own theory. This brings Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes closer to what Jahn had in mind when she indicated that it is necessary to read classical scholars for analytical purposes because this contributed to the establishment of contemporary problems better.

Furthermore, Jahn maintains that classical scholars play an obvious role in contemporary research because they provide the general basis for political thinking in the West. This is exactly what Fukuyama tries to achieve with his usage of Hobbes. His focus on Hobbes is to explain his own view of the contemporary role of the modern state in politics and to structure his arguments in the debate that political order rests on the balance of the three elements of the state, the rule of law and accountability. Fukuyama explains his perception of the original qualities of human nature by comparing it to Hobbes and his concept of the state of nature. According to Fukuyama, understanding this is important because they are the natural building blocks out of which he can construct his theory of political development and understand other evolutions of human institutions. This shows the relevance of why Fukuyama discusses Hobbes.

It can be said that the way Fukuyama approaches Hobbes’s theory on social contract and human nature in Leviathan is rather strong. The link that Fukuyama makes to the field of biology and anthropology is important because he acknowledges that the context in which Hobbes wrote is different. He shows this by including other fields of studies in his research. This also shows that Fukuyama does not assume the presence of Hobbes’s timelessness. He mentioned that:
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“But given the foundational importance of the accounts of the state of nature offered by Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau to Western political self-understanding, it is not unfair to contrast them with what we actually know today about human origins as a result of recent advances in a range of life sciences.”

This has led to new insights for Fukuyama, namely that the humans are not individualistic by nature. A conclusion that Hobbes was unable to make because of the lack of insight in biology. This is something that Jahn has stressed continuously.

Furthermore, it has been shown that the state of nature has a prominent place in IR. The fact that Fukuyama analyzes the idea of the state of nature and comes up with his own interpretation, shows that Fukuyama does not see Hobbes as a definite answer and that he uses the classical scholar to shape and illuminate his theory of development. In the end, it does not matter that Fukuyama dismisses Hobbes’s view because he does so with well-founded argumentations. In line with Jahn’s goal of opening a subject up to critical examination and attaining new insights, Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes offers new insights into the contemporary debate on the functions of the modern state, as the usage of China as the first modern state shows. It gives a new approach in creating a modern, liberal democracy by balancing the three elements of the state, the rule of law, and accountability.

Thus, applying Jahn to Fukuyama has led to a few insights that need to be given before analyzing Jahn’s main points of criticism to Fukuyama. It is noticeable that Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes in explaining his view of the modern state matches the aims of Jahn a lot. Fukuyama’s awareness of the need to justify his starting point and the fact that he does not assume the presence of timelessness in Hobbes shows that Fukuyama does not use Hobbes as a definite answer. Rather, he uses him for analytical purposes to achieve better insight and construct his own approach. However, there are a few points that have come forward that need to be discussed.

3.5. The Misuses of Fukuyama

It has been mentioned that IR is being confronted with multiple changes which has led to discussions and questions about the effectiveness of the modern state in the contemporary world. Fukuyama’s interest in the modern state derived from these discussions and led to him embracing the necessity of state-building. His state-building research has shown that
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Francis Fukuyama sees value in the institutional approach as the best solution to the problems and changes the world faces today. All in all, this shows the awareness of Fukuyama to the changing world. When linking this awareness to Jahn’s problem of presentism, this should mean that Fukuyama should have focused on naming the specifying elements of historical continuity and change before being able to fruitfully use classical scholars. Although Fukuyama’s research consists of mapping political development, he does not explicitly name the continuities and just assumes the presence of the functions of the modern state. This impacts his research in general because he would not have dismissed Hobbes so quickly.

It has already been briefly mentioned that Fukuyama is aware of the problem of confirmation. Thus, with regard to Jahn’s criticism of using classical scholars as a confirmation or justification, it turns out this is not the case with Fukuyama. The fact that Fukuyama uses Hobbes to elaborate on his different approach of the state of nature shows that Fukuyama does not assume the timeless wisdom of Hobbes. Furthermore, the previous chapter has shown that the main issue with this criticism comes from the fact that theoretical approaches use classical scholars to shape and underline their arguments. With Hobbes, this mostly comes from his position in Realism. Of course, Fukuyama is not subject to this problem because he does not approach Hobbes from a Realist perspective.

With regard to the lineages of reception, not many issues came forward that could be indicated as a problem. The sources that Fukuyama uses when citing Hobbes are consistent in all his work. The remarks that can be made here are that Fukuyama does not justify his reasoning for choosing this specific work of *Leviathan* and that the book dates from 1958. The fact that the introduction of this edition of *Leviathan* states that it is revised for present-day American usage and that marginal notes of the original edition is included. It makes you wonder why Fukuyama did not select another, more modern version.155

The problem of forgetting other qualities is definitely present in Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes. The contextualization of Hobbes has proven that his contribution to the development of the modern state is intense and that the role that Hobbes assumes in IR is tremendous. By dismissing Hobbes’s concept of the state of nature Fukuyama ignores contributions that could have given more insight in the function of the modern state such as Hobbes’s role in the development of the concept of sovereignty. This all relates to the importance of contextualization. The fact that Fukuyama assumes the presence of the functions of the modern state without actually contemplating where these characteristics originate from, while

at the same time dismissing Western philosophical traditions, does not make a lot of sense. In fact, it seems that the contextualization of Hobbes revealed this double standard. Fukuyama’s argument would get more depth if he had addressed this issue. I maintain that if Fukuyama would have contextualized Hobbes in his research, he would have seen the role that the British scholar still plays in the contemporary modern state. The result being that Fukuyama would have paid more attention in explaining where the functions of the state came from, instead of just assuming its functions.

3.6. Concluding Remarks

This chapter has answered how Fukuyama uses Hobbes in explaining his view of the modern state. In short, by looking at Fukuyama’s work on liberal democracy, state-building and political development, it has been made clear that Fukuyama’s modern state includes a Weberian conception of the state, a centralized political authority, a sovereign authority and a territory. The contextualization of Hobbes has shown that all of these functions can be traced back to him. It was therefore, rather odd to notice that Fukuyama sets aside Hobbes in his book *Political Order* and barely uses Hobbes to illuminate his view of the modern state in his state-building research. It seems Fukuyama just assumes the presence of the functions of the modern state. However, he does use Hobbes to underline his argument of the Hobbesian fallacy and when explaining his own interpretation of Hegel with regard to liberal democracy as the end of history.

Surprisingly, although Fukuyama did not agree with Hobbes, Fukuyama does match the aims of Jahn’s approach. Fukuyama uses Hobbes to underline his arguments and his dismissal of Hobbes’s state of nature creates a new starting point to work from in researching political development. Therefore, Fukuyama uses him for analytical purposes to achieve better insight instead of a definite answer. Important here is that Fukuyama is aware of the problems that can result from using classical texts to a varying degree which prevented him from the worst misusages.

When applying Jahn’s main points of criticism to Fukuyama it becomes clear that the problem of presentism and forgetting other qualities have impacted Fukuyama’s overall research and argumentations. Fukuyama does not explicitly name the historical continuities and just assumes the presence of the functions of the modern state. This is his biggest fault. The comparison between Jahn’s criticism and Fukuyama has revealed gaps in Fukuyama’s
research with his dismissal of Hobbes and his conception of the Hobbesean fallacy while, at the same time, he is still embracing these thoughts as elements of the state in his statebuilding research.
Conclusion

This thesis has focused on the case study of Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes in explaining his view of the modern state to evaluate whether Jahn’s approach to the use of classical scholars in contemporary IR research is applicable. This has been done by applying Jahn’s main points of criticism to Fukuyama. The fact that much of the research in IR is based on classical texts gives them a decisive influence and makes it therefore necessary to pause for a second and contemplate on the exact way they are used in research. Beate Jahn has done so and concluded that classical scholars are still relevant to contemporary research. However, she emphasizes that finding answers to current issues in classical scholars should not be the main use of classical scholars. Instead they should be used for analytical purposes to achieve more insight.

By focusing on Jahn’s approach it has been revealed in the first chapter that the issue surrounding the use of classical scholars came from the broader discussion of what kind of role political theory should play in IR. The necessity of focusing on the use of classical scholars in contemporary IR comes from the combination of the lack of clarity over the origins of IR theory and the fact that the field of IR draws greatly from political theory and its classics. Jahn’s approach criticizes several issues and pitfalls with the use of classical scholars in contemporary research. Chapter one explained Jahn’s distinction between three main uses of classical scholars in contemporary research. They are used to provide philosophical foundations for theoretical approaches, used to explain and justify contemporary policies, and used to structure and define theoretical and political debates. The aim of these uses is to understand the contemporary world but it has been revealed that they also rely on the assumption of historical and intellectual continuity. Jahn disapproves of the presence of these assumptions because they stand in the way of the potential of the use of classical scholars.

Furthermore, these uses are intertwined with potential problems as well, namely presentism, usage as a conformation or justification by theories, forgetting other qualities by focusing on scholars’ main ideas and lineages of reception. The realization of the presence of these problems is essential because, if present, they can stand in the way of hindering research. Jahn says that the whole point of using classical scholars in research is so that they can contribute to opening up a subject to critical examination. By contextualizing classical scholars, historical continuity can be found and given new and different insights in research.

Whereas it is clear that Jahn offers the solution of contextualization and historical continuities as methods for improving research and gaining more insight, it is curious that
Jahn does not specifically elaborate on her solution. Only recognition is not enough and the complexity surrounding the relationship between political theory and IR theory only intensifies the difficulty of finding historical continuities. This can result into the debate wandering to more abstract concepts such as epistemology and methodology. This stands in the way of actually achieving insight at all.

The demarcated topic that has been analyzed in this thesis is the concept of the modern state. Therefore, the second chapter has elaborated on the characteristics of the modern state to give an overview of the most important and embraced functions that exist in the use of the modern state. These characteristics are (monopoly) control of the means of violence, territoriality, sovereignty, legitimacy, centralized government, the rule of law and citizenship. Furthermore, the chapter has revealed Hobbes’s thoughts and ideas in *Leviathan* which has been done by contextualizing Hobbes. By discussing the background of Hobbes the role that chaos has played in his life (which, in turn, influenced his thinking) has been made clear. He was appalled with the English Civil War which led to the writing of *Leviathan*. It has been shown that Hobbes has an enduring importance in the study of IR.

Hobbes’s contribution to the modern state mostly comes from his formulation of the social contract theory. The Hobbesian state of nature has become a central concept in our current system. The realization of individuals that their interests are better served with order makes them enter into a social contract with each other. Here, the absolute sovereign is chosen to maintain order. Hobbes’ justification of sovereignty gave the modern state legitimacy and detached the state further. By analyzing Hobbes and his contribution to the development of the modern state, it has been made clear that the characteristics of the modern state, namely the (monopoly) control of the means of violence, territoriality and sovereignty, reverberate back to Hobbes’s thoughts and provide historical continuities. Therefore, it has been proven that Hobbes needs to be taken into account when contemplating on research relating to the modern state, such as state-building.

The approach of Jahn was applied to the contemporary use of Hobbes. This showed that Hobbes fits in with two of Jahn identified uses, namely providing the philosophical foundation of Realism and structuring contemporary debates. Applying Jahn’s criticism to Hobbes’s general use in contemporary research has shown that he is sensitive to misusage by contemporary scholars. It has been revealed that Hobbes is most prone to being used as a confirmation or justification. Hobbes’s decisive role in the theory of Realism, but also IR in general, is the biggest problem that stands in the way of using to gaining new insights because
it stands in the way of the intellectual development. Presentism is the next problem that is present in the contemporary use of Hobbes. However, as Bull’s article has shown, the realization that the difference between Hobbes and contemporary times needs to be specified is gaining ground. Consequently, this has led to more ways of interpreting the thought of Hobbes and the necessity of contemplation on Hobbes.

All these findings have come together in the final chapter where the illustrative single case study of Fukuyama was compared with Jahn’s criticism, to evaluate Jahn’s applicability. Explaining Fukuyama’s work on liberal democracy, state-building and political development has shown that Fukuyama’s modern state includes a Weberian conception of the state, a centralized political authority, a sovereign authority and a territory. The contextualization in the second chapter has shown that all of these functions can be traced back to Hobbes. However, Fukuyama sets aside the Hobbes’s state of nature because of the Hobbesean fallacy and barely uses Hobbes to illuminate his view of the modern state in his state-building research. It seems Fukuyama just assumes the presence of the functions of the modern state.

However, with regard to Jahn’s approach it has been found that, interestingly enough, even though Fukuyama does not agree with Hobbes, his way of approaching Hobbes to underline his own argument against the individualistic nature of humans shows potential of new insights to the understanding of the state. In line with Jahn, Fukuyama uses Hobbes for analytical purposes. It was also revealed that Fukuyama is aware of the problem of using a classical scholar as a confirmation. He specifically mentions in his research that he will attempt to avoid this problem. When applying Jahn’s main points of criticism on Fukuyama it became clear that the problem of presentism and forgetting other qualities are present in Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes. This has impacted Fukuyama’s overall research and argumentations. Mostly, it has revealed that Fukuyama does not explicitly name the historical continuities and just assumes the presence of the functions of the modern state. His dismissal of Hobbes should have been elaborated on if he still indirectly uses him.

By applying Jahn to Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes, I have found out that there is a double standard in the research of Fukuyama. Fukuyama’s use of Hobbes is mostly in line with Jahn’s approach and aims. He has gained new insights and does not assume the timelessness of Hobbes. Thus, in that sense, Jahn is applicable to Fukuyama. However, the focus of Jahn on contextualization in combination with the demarcation on the modern state revealed a gap in Fukuyama’s research. Fukuyama’s dismissal of Hobbes’s human nature
should be more thoroughly explained if he wants to keep addressing the essential functions of the modern state as the solution to the issues the world faces today.

As such, this thesis can answer that Beate Jahn’s approach definitely has potential in helping contemporary research obtain more insight in certain topics by contextualizing and that she is correct in addressing the use of classical scholars. The realization of the presence of problems with the use of classical scholars is of great importance. Furthermore, this realization can play a huge role in guiding contemporary research in understanding, or even solving, contemporary issues. This also impacts policymakers who are influenced by academic literature because it helps shape their policies. A good example here is the huge demand of understanding state-building to respond to the discussion of the effectiveness of the state. However, some side notes must be made here as well. It was mentioned earlier that the idea of Jahn to identify historical continuities and contextualization is too broad and rather complex as well. Furthermore, it is a tricky slope because contextualization is sensitive to shifting the discussion rather quickly to broader, abstracter discussions, namely back to the discussion about the exact role of political theory in IR theory and questions regarding IR as a social science. Therefore, the concluding note must be that Jahn’s approach is essential but, to make its applicability even better, further developing of Beate Jahn’s framework is necessary, especially with regard to the extent of contextualization.
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