

**Thomas Hobbes's Conception of Animality 'Man is a Wolf to Man':
A Theoretical Study in Selected Plays**

Key words: Animality, Sovereignty, human-like animal characteristics

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nahidh Falih Sulaiman

University of Diyala/ College of Education and Humanities

nahidhum@gmail.com

Abstract

Man is a Wolf to Man remains one of the most argumentative political theory coined by Thomas Hobbes to illustrate the bestial status of a man in nature. Contrary to the humanitarian priorities, Hobbes's theory of sovereignty in political and social realms clarifies his references to animal-like human characteristics. It explains the status of animalization lies in man's thoughts and behaviors that may lead to sovereignty. To Hobbes, sovereign politics should be protected and supported even by human's animality in which the absolute obedience to sovereign is the mere protection of the social and political system. However, the absolute obedience, for Hobbes, is the absolute power to establish disciplined governments. Due to "The Social Contract Theory", Hobbes gives priority to the principle that whatever the state does is just and individuals ought to obey blindly. Social contract theory is connected with norms of moral considerations and political major lines of ruling. Though it is coined by Thomas Hobbes, yet John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau shaped theoretically more elaborations clearly seen or might be adapted during modern phase. Hence, Individualism, materialism, sovereignty, and absolutism are interwoven in the theory of Hobbes that archived as most political type of argumentative philosophy. Mostly, in literature, morals of Hobbes's theory were discussed from different points of views. For example, justice is the form and reflection of a well-disciplined soul that indicates consequently the happiness of man's state. Human's animality is the particular view of that brutal part in man's behavior when political and immoral necessity is justified. In Hobbes's view, human psychology follows subjectivity in considering normative nature of needs such as "love" and "hate" which are taken into consideration through the process of formatting states and individual's life ideologies. So, terms like "good" and "evil" have their precise meaning when then they are adopted by their users and adapted to social contract mechanism. Moral terms, in turn, apply what is set through drama by political references that marked Hobbes's theory of social contract or his consideration of "Man is a Wolf to Man".

Hypothetically, the paper theme discusses in part one Thomas Hobbes's idealization of sovereignty from political point of view and the state of human when man becomes a wolf to other man in reference to another Andalusian Arab philosopher Ibn Arabi who was prior in hypothesizing the animality of human to Hobbes. Moreover, the paper indicates that Hobbes's theory of The Social Contract justifies the defeat of "The State of Nature" based on an agreement

between the state individuals and the sovereign. While in part two, the analysis moves to discover the adaptation of Hobbes's political theory and social views in selected theatrical works that possibly conclude the theoretical mechanism of Hobbes on stage. The paper ends its analysis with a brief conclusion.

Part One

1.1 Sovereignty as a Form of Animality

Indeed, when the centralization moves to the representation of animality in human, it is often heading the attention to the physical power of animals. Animality of humans can be generated through the example of slavery and how African people were treated savagely by imposing animality of the masters. The actual animalistic relationship of the oppressive master and the oppressed slave was an experience of inferiority that shows the degree of animalistic attitudes that might be hidden beyond the desire of superiority and control. Under the scope of slavery, black animality was tackled by the racist ideology and looked at through the discourse of aping the black humans. Charles Carroll states in his *The Negro a Beast* (1991):

The Negro, being an ape, entered the ark
With the rest of the animals; and as the
Descendants of Noah spread out over the
Earth they carried with them their negroes
And other domestic animals, domestic plants. (Carroll 9)

Carroll makes clear that Negroes are connected in form and function with apes as he "focuses primarily on the entirely unbridgeable difference that separate blacks from every other racial type in the evolutionary scale: "the fact that they are not even human" (Roberts 82).

In fear of losing superiority and control over others, the animality over blacks had been measured as a sort of human degradation. It has been tackled from two sides; first to consider the black slaves as animals as apes through framing this consideration with animal strength in work and in sexuality. Second, to point out that the failure to act humanly made masters to demean slaves overtly and covertly.

Animality, as similar as oppression, is to mean the de-humanization that can be applied in wars and genocide when oppressive actions intentionally practiced against weak people or weak nations and destroy humanity not far from ethnocide conception, the non-murderous genocide may eventually act as a category of spiritual damage. It shows the dangerous image of the removal of humanitarian merits. As it lacks the normal human norms, spiritual genocide is a term of overmanned with brutalization and degradation that descend people into a lower status.

1.2 Hobbes's Theory of Man is a Wolf to Man

Man to man is an errant wolf, a formula coined by Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) one of the founders of modern political philosophy, that was derived from Plautus (*homo homini lupus*) to indicate that man is a wolf to man. Through behavioral biology, a wolf gathers in groups, lives and associates with one another (Hoffe 127). Albeit wolf can attack individually, yet it crowds successfully with its same class and family. To Hobbes, man has much interest to show his power for a natural domination and sovereignty. Hobbes's vision of the human nature is strikingly keen particularly when he combines between sovereignty and animality that concern in common with political and social orders. He poses alternatives and changeable roles between man and wolf on one hand and to the other sovereign powers (a person or a group that has a superiority to decide and lead any social or political issue) on the other hand. Through sovereignty, human justifies his animality to secure life for future and to be in a successful competition before another power. Hence, to Hobbes, human fights endlessly to gain power and to raise this sovereignty to the level of war and genocide.

Hobbes believes that a human who seeks wolf-like life is searching indeed people who fear harm and death and seek peace to live in. Thus, Hobbes explains that individuals of mental and physical power are "not contented with their present situation" or those of "ambitions of military command are inclined to continue the causes of war; and to stir up trouble and sedition"(qtd. in Hoffe 122).

Hobbes compares between the statuses of man is a wolf to man and the notion of the right of nature (127). He states that the notion of right does not necessarily connect itself with any exception or permission man seeks to get it. It is also not connected to any kind of religious, social, or political authority. Yet, Hobbes notifies the fact that the right of nature and law of nature should be applied when there is a real need to sovereignty. He asserts that freedom and liberty are needed negatively more when man tends to overcome others. Such a negative freedom leads its owners to act oppressively to end up in a real conflict with the positive freedom. This sort of clash creates opponents and causes diffidence of one another. Hence, fame and sovereignty are created out of this conflict to grow up when one human being mistrusts his fellow human being (125).

Hobbes's theory is considered the base of the modern political system. 'Man is a wolf to man', tackled in his book *Leviathan* (1651), chronicles the primitive condition of man and its development until the modern politics of system structure. This primitivism depends on a fact "war of all against all" which sheds the light on the principle of bestiality in the process of civil society establishment. Accordingly, this belief was the foundation step for Hobbes's theory. Deeply in this theory, every man is enemy to every man and this enmity

shows that life is wholly unconstructed or it is constructed in a very dangerous way.

In unsystematic society, men cannot agree. They cannot be social or in a peaceful manner. Enmity appears as the natural construction of the cultural world. Man is always suspicious of others since he looks for bestiality. Therefore, violent men have put a great weight on enmity and animality through the threat of force to lead the system. Hence, the centrality of the modern sovereignty has been based on Hobbes's theory, the study of man's animality, and the natural condition of man. This illustrates Hobbes's dictum of human-animal division. His theory had been discussed by many philosophers and sociologists depending on his final recognition that man is an animal. To him, man is a beast who is born naturally wild but social system forced him to live a sort of capability to be tamed. Moreover, man's relationships with other men increase his attitudes to behave as animal.

Animality represents the status of self-mastery over humanitarian features that show the over balanced scale of reason than passion. Hobbes point out that there is a difference between a sovereign humanity and sweet humanity:

But where a man may lawfully Command, As a Father in his Family, or a Leader in an Army, his Exhortations and Dehortations are not only lawful, but also necessary and laudable: but when they are no more counsels, but commands; which when they are for execution of sour labour, sometimes necessity, and always humanity, requireth to be sweetened in the delivery by encouragement, and in the tune and phrase of counsel rather than in harsher language of command.

(*Leviathan* 183 Ch.XXV)

Despite the fact that man seeks any natural right to fight for, yet the sovereign guarantees what man's need of security and safety.

In Hobbes's realm of *Leviathan*, man is recognized by his society or state, and the members of that state must be associated under the term of their society. Any success may occur must be owned and governed by the state. To Hobbes, a person could speak only through sovereign authority since the latter is the mature performer who does changes fit. In this sense, Hobbes defines sovereigns as men, or gathering of men, as authority that holds two capacities, one is natural and the other is political. While the individuals of the commonwealth are merely persons serve the establishment of the state sovereignty.

Throughout the noticeable absence of a person, the sovereign is ought to be free to decide and act whatever he thinks perfect and needed. Hence, a sovereign requires ministers and lackeys who are distinguished from legal officers of the state to serve precisely what has been drawn (Runciman 20). In Hobbes's *Leviathan*, man is called as Commonwealth or State, but he is not a person, while ministers are 'parts Organicall'. Hobbes stresses that 'of all those,

that have Authority from the Sovereign, to procure the Execution of judgment', that every act they do by such Authority is the act of the Commonwealth [i.e. they represent the person of the commonwealth] and their service, answerable to that of Hands in a Bodie natural [i.e. they respect the hands of the Leviathan] (quot. in Runciman 21).

In partial relation to a psychological reference, some writers suggested madness and animality, as an overlapping content. "Animality and wildness are importantly linked" (Palmer 75). Indeed, animality puts its bases in man's values and morals revealing that the hint of madness lies in man's heart. It represents the wildness of man, his barbaric behavior of insanity. Although such a kind of animality shows a wild sort of freedom yet, it takes its place in human's imagination through the tracing back of this imagination to man's origin. Despite the fact, that animality is within our unconsciousness, but it is the man's choice of product. It is the "bizarre combinations of human and animal" (75).

1.3 The Concept of Animality in Ibn Arabi's Philosophy

Earlier than Hobbes, Ibn Arabi (1165-1240), an Arab Andalusian Muslim scholar, mystic, poet, and philosopher, touched the knowledge of considerable reasons behind the realization of "animality" that lies hidden deeply in man. He believes that in certain places inside man when brutality of animal-like human overcomes the good merits, pure animality would be unveiled of shallow humanity. To Ibn Arabi, when a man abandons himself from reason and naturally behaves due to his desires, he/she then is in a complete ignorance of humanity. Naturally, what is normal to wild animal-like human is the state of unveiling that Ibn Arabi thoroughly actualizes his emptiness of humanity when reason is out of work (Izutsu 16). In such state of actualization, Ibn Arabi emphasizes that the physical and spiritual animalization of human is determined by the experience and the reason. He states:

Once I had a disciple who attained to this kind of 'unveiling'. However, he did not keep silent about his (experience). This shows that he did not realize this animality (in perfect manner). When God made me stand at the stage, I realized my animality completely. I had visions and wanted to talk about what I witnessed, but I could not do so. There was no actual difference between me and those who were by nature speechless (quot in Izutsu 17).

Due to the crucial perspectives, Ibn Arabi views man as that creature of two different aspects: humanity and animality. He piled up the perfect merits to humanity that gathers reason, passion, courage, and experiences, while the aspect of human animality is connected distinguishably to the state of imperfection. Therefore, the animality of man and the animality of animal are the same qua, yet different in rank:

The animality of man maintains its control over the animality of the animals, because, for one thing, God has made the latter naturally subservient to the former, but mainly because animal in its ontological root (asl) is non-animal. This is why animal surpasses man in the amount of taskhir it suffers. (Izutsu 183)

This brings back to mind that in many brutal situations, imaginative or real, the animality of man overcomes the humanity of him, and the animality of animal. Thus, in this sense, Hobbes makes clear that the animality of man is interpreted due to his instinct of good and evil mixture that manifested the earlier view of Ibn Arabi of the experienced and shallow humanity and animality.

1.4 The State of Nature: The Social Contract Theory by Hobbes

Hobbes's masterwork of *Leviathan* that held the political philosophy had gone hand in hand with his developmental elaboration of what is so called Social Contract Theory in that he justified the political principles he did believe in. In an absolute submission, Hobbes believes that individuals should admit and follow the unlimited sovereignty of the state. Yet, first, the theory has to get people's understanding of its nature starting from the general reason that man lived in the state of nature. He was subjected to be ruled under no government or law and he got tired of being oppressed by the hardships of the society.

Due to the mutual benefit of the Social Contract Theory, individuals have to unify together and ought to obey the ruling authority surrendering wholly or partially their freedom and right to that authority. In turn, people's protection and property are guaranteed. Thus, people must agree to establish society in a form of reciprocal trust where a person or assembly has the absolute power and authority to systemize human's life. Such contract allows for the individuals and the elite of sovereignty to live under a common law. Voluntarily, man's trust is surrendered to some authority as a matter of ensuring protection and preservation as reactions to what the state of nature had already offered of fear and chaotic conditions. In Hobbes's *Leviathan*, the absolutism of authority placed the institution of the ruler or monarch and the obedience offered to them as priority. To Hobbes, words are no benefit than sword to secure man. Therefore, the civil law arranges human's necessities and considerably assigns their interests. Hence, Hobbes upheld the principle of Might is always Right.

The theory of social contract which is attributed to Hobbes and particularly as a strong reference in his *Leviathan*, had faced fundamentally various kinds of critical interpretations that strongly suggest the ethical remarks of Hobbes's political and social argument. Hobbes asserts that his ethical views, which are parts of the social contract, are dependent on psychological and physiological analysis of man's behavior. For example, the "good" life style of a man is defined due to all or some of one's desires, and the concept of "right", as that rational line, would be clear in case of obtaining the "good" (Hampton 28). So, due to the social contract "good" and "right" are man's responsible desires

connectedly have self-motivated response toward the absolute obedience to authority. In his *Leviathan*, Hobbes states:

But whatsoever is the object of any mans Appetite or Desire; that is it, which he for his part calleth Good: And the object of his Hate, and Aversion, Evill; And of his contempt, Vile and Inconsiderable. For these words of Good, Evill, and contemptible, are ever used with relation to the person that useth them: There being nothing simply and absolutely so; nor any common Rule of Good and Evill, to be taken from the nature of the objects themselves... (*Lev*, 6,7,24)

In his consideration, Hobbes relatively relates the desires of good and evil to man's way of use. He clearly defines "good" as "what we desire" and "bad" as "what we are averse to" (Hampton 29).

In *Leviathan*, Hobbes affirms that man has to maintain an absolute power if he believes it is targeting in his self-interest. In turn, self-interest has to find its unarguemental obedience to the sovereign. Therefore, through a crystal insight, Hobbes uses the notion of rationality in his account of the role of logic and reason against man's desire of self-unpreservation the time when reason becomes a slave to the passion.

Part Two

Animality and Sovereignty in Dramatic Writings

2.1 DeaLoher's *Leviathan*

Throughout a remarkable reference to Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan*, the German playwright and author Dea Loher borrowed Hobbes's title *Leviathan* in focusing on the nature of state in RAF (Red Army Faction), left-wing terrorism of a German militant group found in 1970. Loher's *Leviathan* (1993) emphasizes on the political and philosophical trends in the German society. In her play, Loher stresses the negativity of Hobbes's idea that the state must be accompanied by power "in order to prevent everybody from fighting against everybody else" (Haas 171). Loher tries to clarify that although the state is the place where individuals can find security and hopes, but it becomes a source of threat that fights its people and argues in their rights. The heroine, Marie, refers to this threat as a state of restrictions that forbid individuals to live and enjoy their natural rights. To Marie, evil sovereignty creates evil humans that end in committing bestial human actions. She is certain that RAF is responsible for terrorist deeds in Germany which was engaged in horrible actions for three decades which led German to the crisis that became known as the "German Autumn". Although to her certainty, yet Marie could not retreat or give herself a choice to live far away from terrorism.

Loher presents Marie to hunt for the evil of terrorist RAF that presents Leviathan. Marie awakes to dreams of crisis when she involved in RAF searching hopelessly to get rid of her past. She couldn't help herself to clean what others did and couldn't escape the feeling of being sinful terrorist especially when she became responsible for the injuries of Karl's (Andreas Baader) guard when the former was imprisoned.

As a terrorist organization, RAF involved, and in most times, responsible in bombings, assassinations, kidnapping, and blood shedding during the rush years of 1970s. Thus, Loher traces back the notion of sovereign groups or states of her play to the questionable and argumentative sovereignty of Thomas Hobbes's *Leviathan*. Through the similarities of both titles, Marie makes another clear resemblance of the German state to the horrible political structure when the system formation leads individuals to falsehood.

Loher intends to show her play's heroine as torn as a person of dual emotions. Marie's feeling is divided between being a mother who longs to her children, husband, and the stable family life, and her terror missions. Her flee to Palestine with Karl to train for guerrilla war fosters Loher to guide the audience that Marie's terrorist feeling overcomes her motherly emotional missing. Loher addresses the terrorist groups especially raised during and after Nazi regime in Germany. Loher tries, on the other side, to show how Marie feels remorse when she recognizes that she hates her ex-husband and general merits of German state. While Marie's sister helps others through her job as a nurse.

Marie's terrorist experiences reveal a fact; that she is the daughter, the product, of the political and social system. She refuses soft means of protesting as writing articles in her husband's journal considering these ways as useless means. Yet, she sacrifices her life to support Marxist revolution. To her, a terrorist must find in waging a guerrilla war, a decisive solution, rather to protest peacefully:

Der Krieg gehtweiter

Die Vertassungwirdgeandert

Die Notstandgesetzeverabschiedet

Der Protest eingemeindet Nein

Die zeit der Diskussionenistvorbei. (*Leviathan*157)

Marie's desire to fight deadly against the German political state makes her another example of the state evil. For Marie, the sovereign of bloody fatal fighting is ultimate principle that should be faced and believed in. Hence, DeaLoher highlights one of the most important results of sovereignty that in false sovereign state and in long suppression of its systems, terrorism gets deep roots. It grows up in frustration and individual's failure to get rights. Entirely, Marie recognized that a disastrous life ruled by the state forced her to admit the big lie that she lived, in first, personally with her family and second, politically in the wider structure of the sovereign state.

2.2 John Marston's *The Malcontent*

It is plausible to note that Hobbes's sovereignty has been applied to many literary texts to put a sufficient identification for the idea of controlling. In *The Malcontent*, a Jacobean play, written by the dramatist and satirist John Marston in 1603, the deposed duke Altofront tried to regain his lost dukedom. In an ultimate belief of the stolen right, Altofront believes that princes are set to hold the governs "muckhill" by venerable persona to "keep men in bonds" (4.2.139, 141) (Marston). To Altofront, losing dukedom is more dangerous and serious than losing one's "soul" (4.2.135,141). While Pietro tries to rule the city, Altofront insists that the new duke usurped the dukedom and he has to correct what he has done by abandoning his pretensions to government. To him, Pietro's false deeds in marital affairs increase the belief that any social disorder comes as a sign of God's wrath. Thus, the usurpation was "devilish" and proved to be a foolish decision to leave the government in small hands. In relation to Hobbes's law of sovereignty, government should be abandoned by weak hands to be in powerful hearts and large hands.

Sovereignty goes in contrast with indulgence because, according to Altofront, the wrong man should accept the effect of undisciplined deeds. Thus, the weak duke, the sovereign must respond to repentance in houses of penance as was determined by Altofront when the latter leads other to more from folly to wisdom. His guidance to change statuses of damnation by glory or from treason to loyalty is a matter of convicting of sin when sovereignty goes to incapable hands.

Removing from the political life of Pietro and his wife Aurelia means the mechanism to "keep men in bonds", and to authorize the controlling of manageable sovereignty. Hence, the returning of the strong duke remarks that the state needs pious and shrewd political minds.

Absolutely, to Altofront, Pietro's failure comes from his incapability to rule the social and political affairs. His incompetence to observe his wife Aurelia creates "smock grace" for Mendoza (1.2.81) when the latter tried to dispose of Pietro in planning to marry Aurelia and become the duke:

And is't you, Ferneze, are wriggled into somck-

Grace? Sit sure. Oh that I could rail against these monsters in nature, models of hell, curse of the earth-women that dare attempt anyth'...

(*The Malcontent* 2.2.23-24)

Pietro's blind trust in his wife and Mendoza shows by evidence that he cannot effectively be a powerful sovereign over both social and political issues.

Sharing with Hobbes's ideology of sovereignty, *The Malcontent* stresses the idea that the sovereignty of kings derives from God rather than from people (McMahon 145). *The Malcontent* presents a worldly and religiously faith which is blessed by God. God's law of sovereignty is non-negotiable because He rejects a weaker ruler "to be dethroned" (145). Thus, this policy is defended

strongly by the shrewd ruling of Altofront when he points out that fear should take place when covert surveillance might threaten the state safety.

2.3 T. S. Eliot's *Sweeney Agonistes*

Another view of Thomas Hobbes's theory of man is a wolf to man and human animality took place in T.S. Eliot's melodrama *Sweeney Agonistes* who published the first two scenes in 1926 and 1927 to collect them in a small book in 1932. *Sweeney Agonistes: Fragments of an Aristophanic Melodrama* performed as one-act play, shows the latent violence of man in modernity and urbanity. It compares man to an animal behavior when it eats its species to stay alive and to satisfy needs. It shows human-like animal behaviors when man is mentally and sexually repressed by modern life. *Sweeney* presents the primitive status of humans when life forces their humanitarian characteristics to be examined at some points in the moment of fading the civilized scales. Man is a wolf to man takes minds and thoughts closer to primitivity when man kills another man to keep power and self-satisfaction. Moreover, the play presents a focal emphasis on energetic repressed sexuality that lies in human to turn them into beasts.

Despite the fact that the playwright presents *Sweeney* as a civilized man living in an urban society, yet Eliot centers on the bestial part inside human when he underlines that brutality and shows that a cannibalistic desire modifies man into an animal and draws the fatal line between life and violent death.

In *Sweeney Agonistes*, the savage's sexualized animality is put to be examined by the playwright and the audience as well. Eliot tries to concentrate on the repression of sexuality and the possible danger that comes in consequences. *Sweeney* concerns with the idea of how to release his sexualized animal desire that he kept in and suffered from because of his civilized repression. Eating the flesh of each other is ranged in both extremes; primitivity and ultimate modernity when the humanitarian relationships find no place to grow and flourish.

Throughout *Sweeney*, the focus is directed toward the horror and savagery of human-like animal and toward the civilized communication in dealing with others (Smith 12). *Sweeney* represents the valueless identity of the modern quality and the evil part in human nature. His repressed sexual desire explains how man is sinful and how he functions a sin to satisfy his natural needs. His character questions the inheritance of animality when man unsuccessfully communicates with civilization. *Sweeney* never shows hesitation to carry Doris off to a cannibal isle to be a cannibalist and to eat her in a "juicy little...missionary stew". Through cannibalism, the play represents the adaptation of Hobbes's theory that human hunger may mean eating flesh of each other to prove their superior being. Moreover, human-like animality introduces the fear of "consuming one's own species" (Rohman). Just before the end of the play, the chorus chants, "Hoo ha ha/ Hoo ha ha/ Hoo/ Hoo/Hoo". Such sounds

seem to imitate a monkey's sound and signify to remind us of the slight difference between human and animal.

But, still, the question of animality works when people interact in dramatic life images. Eliot in *Sweeney Agonistes* acknowledges that the common animality of man lies in modernity when civilization draws up and down. It is the image of man's various statuses of repression, ambition, and aggressiveness that highlight the real human nature and his readiness to return to the deeper core of primitive meaning and existence.

2.4 *Germinal*: The Dramatic Adaptation of Human Animality in Emile

Zola's Narrative Thoughts

Among other documentary and realistic novels adapted on stage. *Germinal* of Emile Zola (1885) took its place significantly as the nineteenth-century melodrama. Due to the political obedience, the play has overtone arguments that caused a quick banning and became among reasons behind Celebre, a battle moved for shaping the Third Republic in which Zola had his role in it. Zola used various available ways to increase that tone and he took a great interest to borrow another authorship name rather his own.

The dramatic atmosphere of Emile Zola's novel of 1885 added extra themes to the historical documentation of the original plot. The on-stage story significantly exposes the exploitation and oppression from sexual and financial points of view. The screenwriter William Gaminara chose a town from the north France that influenced by the tragic stories of the miners' strikes. In the play, the act of oppression the miners subjugated to was portrayed in the Latin word (*Germinal*) for sprout or bud, or it meant the seventh month in the revolutionary calendar that France adapted from 1793 to 1805.

Due to the Parisian miners, the Gregorian calendar reflected the false line of the French ruling throne and church when terror overwhelmed France in 1793 and after. *Germinal*, which took place from late March to late April, witnessed tragically hard times of two revolutions (the Hebertists and Dantonists). During this month, Parisians were stormed by poverty and political conflicts. What matters was that Zola showed his sympathy with the whole situation in general and with the miners in particular. When their strikes were crushed by gendarmes, miners did not look backward to stop fighting the errors of their rulers, and they did not forget later at the funeral of Emile Zola in 1902 to remember his political influence by shouting "Germinal, Germinal" in tribute to his support for their fight against various sorts of exploitation (Riding 31).

In Zola's novel *Germinal* and its adaptation later as a play, the miners' strikes of 1869 in La Riernarie and 1884 in Aubin encouraged him to stand with the revolutionary action that produced his protagonist's inspirational action for setting serious steps in the working community. Etienne Lantier faced the violence and despair by a strong belief in the better coming time. Facing such an absurd situation, animality of humans is discussed from the possible questions of

the monsterring behaviors of man. Zola was so sensitive to both animal and human similarity in that he resembles those of human to animals suggesting that man is enslaved by the system of human beast.

The theme of human animality was discussed politically when Zola engaged in displaying the collapse of the Paris Commune that split the French left between the Socialists and anarchists. To Zola, political clashes create brutal desires to destroy the adversary and antagonist in regardless to moral victory of the battle. Moreover, he importantly touched the point of Marxism with Ivan Turgenev, the Russian novelist, short stories, playwright, and popularizer of Russian literature, in that these points were echoed in *Germinal*. The turning point to Zola was the miserable living of humans made by their animality itself. In part of that animality that man is on his way to lose illusions as the only possibility of resurrecting the lost virtues of a more natural past (Walker 20). In a conversation between Etienne and Souvarine, the latter replaces the hopes of happily changes by a great cry of despair:

Faced with this vision of eternal misery the engineman cried out in a terrible voice that if justice was not possible for mankind then mankind would have to disappear. As long as there were rotten societies there would have to be massacres, until the last human being was exterminated.

(qtd. in *Germinal and Zola's Philosophical and Religious Thought* 20)

When Etienne came to the mining community after he was fired from the railroad, he discovered that level standard of society had been taken slowly, or even quickly, by the hopeless spirits violated by the mine holders. Etienne did not hesitate to try and do something for these groups who cough coal of black liquid. Therefore, Etienne decided to organize a worker's fund and then to plan for a strike when the mining organization lowers the worker's wages: "need to put an end to poverty, even if the price to be paid was death" (Zola 234). So, he led those starving and frustrated employees to attack scabs and to destroy mining property. Moreover, when Souvarine saw how his beloved was hanged in Moscow after she helped him in a failed attempt to blow up a railway line. Watching her hanging increases absolute belief in the animality of his regime and the animality of human's overtone violence.

In *germinal*, the dramatic elaboration of the original narrative has demonstrated the conflict between the social classes. The elements of deprivation had reached the miners' sexual satisfaction that compensates their lack of food and psychological relief. Hence, Zola's assistance to Parisian revolution was recognized metaphorically by human natural action such as sexual actions. The natural catastrophic phenomena have their role as the correlation of natural and social oppositions to human animality such as floods, fires, and earthquakes. The assimilation of men and animal is supported by the examples Zola offered such as the insects and then the horses in which the latter

has a double interpretations of either as strong miners who are imprisoned in their stables, or to those who take the advantage of being distinguished by beauty and power.

The imprisonment of animal quality inside human has been continually faced by Zola when he once more dealt with sacrifice, destruction, degradation, and death in time when miners finally were forced back to work.

Zola's description of human's failure to behave beyond animalistic levels reminds his readers of other thinkers' norms of animal-like human behavior supporting the principle of the same notion. Marguerite Yourcenar, believes that "man has little chance to stop being a torturer for man so long as he will continue to practice on the animal his job as executioner" (Michel 91-92). Pythagoras, the Greek philosopher, thinks also "seeds murder and pain cannot harvest joy and love" (Claudi Levi Strauss 53). Michel de Montaigne, the French philosopher of the French Renaissance, also thought quite the same: "Those who are naturally bloodthirsty when it comes to animal show a natural prosperity for cruelty" (Claudi Levi Strauss 60).

In short, these thoughts of panoramic views of human's evils emphasize "the portrayal of the strong devouring the weak" (Walker 20). So, the philosophical vision of Emile Zola quite willingly accepted *Germinal* as that reflection of modern human animality formed in pessimistic insight into the nature of man when power and sovereignty possible in hand.

The documentation of Zola's own involvement in *Germinal* events through a narrative text in 1885 and its adaptation as a play in 1988 allowed for the text readers and the stage audience to realize that Zola did not ignore the wrath of God in *Germinal*. Because of the sinful deeds of His creatures, God continues to punish the bringers of crimes and the torturers of poor. Regardless of the success or failure of the miner's revolutions, the unfinished struggle of humans against oppression and animalistic inner hatred of man prophesize the arrival of the time of justice where other revolutions will be repeated endlessly as long as animality marks the choice of the sovereign and authorship necessity.

2.5 Animality and Brutal Political Modern Adaptation in the Arab Theatre

In dramaturgy, the political theatre in the Arab World in the wake of the Arab Spring has examined the absolute individual or group sovereign that turned the traditional theatres into a producer of modern political works. The brutal documentary references of the ongoing war in Syria, for example, have made the condition of theatre as that womb bears the conflict out of human's nature animality represented either by individuals or by states indulged in. Arab theatre has most profoundly been affected by the political structure majorly of Egypt and Syria.

The animal-like human messages of Arab theatre have been hidden under political collective conditions that dig deep first to the brutality of modern age and second to the misuse of Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau's theory of Social Contract.

Although traditionally Syrian and Egyptian theatres had held the significant meaning of dramaturgy, yet, recently, each of which targets the uprising calls opposed to unjust absolute obedience to sovereignty and authority. Unlike to Hobbes's mechanism of sovereignty, the imaginable and inevitable damage of the social and political structure dramatized the unbearable living under the absolutism of obedience. Nevertheless, the Arab drama has considered an urgent need to establish a new sovereign of shared-decision makers that establishes a strong political and social theory for the time being. Thus, the concept of "animality" on Arab stage has recognized in the form of brutal actions taken by states. In Egypt, both the political and theatrical scenes were considered by individuals who responsibly re-systemized the important manifestation of their rights as state makers.

Syrian author Mohammad Al Attar, the playwright of the 2015 play *While I Was Waiting*, captures the tragedy of Syrian Civil War of post-spring Arab. It embraces the failure of central sovereignty and the absolute obedience during postmodern time. At stage level, a patient named Taym is in coma, on his hospital bed. He is surrounded by other elements of war and death that indicate for more political and social conflict. Reading some verses from Koran by Taym's mother gives another sign that the brutality of war and the animality inside human sponsored the new interpretations of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. Beside, Taym's girlfriend abortion was a decision she made up her mind to lose a baby rather to keep it for the unknown. Al Attar significantly refers to coma, as already dead due to the spiritual meaning of living, as worse than death in the sense of a man who is still living the situation in terms of "war animality".

Al Attar has created major pre and post- revolution play that provides deep insight into the current political atmosphere in his homeland (Carlson). The brutal beating Tyam subjected to by the political system in his country generated the animalhood of situations that was faced similarly by Egyptian writings. The Egyptian playwright Layla Soliman took her audience back to the 1919 when British soldiers raped numerous women in an Egyptian village. *Zig Zig*, refers to the expression used by British soldiers, is titled Soliman's play as she recalls how human animality is increased when political structure of a state is under colonial invasion.

As a documentary play, Soliman presented the files of human animality that British soldiers killed five villagers from the village Nazlat al-Shobak in March 1919 and raped at least twelve women. Many houses were burnt and many people suffered the trauma of the situation years after. When one of the soldiers asked about the brutal deed, he justified the action was just to test the virginity of the village women and they wanted Zig Zig (Carlson). The dramatic techniques of *Zig Zig* simply presented the experiences of Egyptian victims of animal-like human when the ordeals of the women were examined by their extraordinary tolerance to the animality of humans and the animality of occupation.

Conclusion

Thomas Hobbes's political thought had been applied once by him in his *Leviathan* and once more by other literary writers who find in Hobbes's theory that Man is a Wolf to Man as a natural law for animality in human and sovereignty in community. To Hobbes, a state must find a powerful sovereign to rule individuals to live ever happily and strongly. Many playwrights tried to shed light on Hobbes's theory and philosophical thoughts when they insert this theory as a main theme in their plays. Most of these literary works conclude that sovereignty in most case lead to uprising voices of refusal to state systems and to prepare for the bestial human features as well.

مفهوم الحيوانية لتوماس هوبز: "الإنسان هو ذئب للأنسان"

دراسة نظرية لمسرحيات مختارة

الكلمات المفتاحية: الحيوانية، السيطرة، صفات الانسان الحيوانية

أ.م.د. ناهض فالح سليمان العباسي

جامعة ديالى/كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية

تصف نظرية توماس هوبز الإنسان بأنه كالذئب تجاه بني جنسه، وتُعدُّ نظرية توماس هوبز نظرية سياسية جدلية تُظهر حالة وحشية الإنسان في الطبيعة خلافاً لما يتصف به من مبادئ إنسانية. إن نظرية هوبز في السيادة الإنسانية والاجتماعية تُبرز بعضاً من صفات الحيوان التي توجد في الإنسان وتتجذر في أفكاره وسلوكه والتي يصل من خلالها إلى الحالة السيادية التي يطمح إليها، ورغم ما قرره الفلاسفة وعلماء الاجتماع وأكدوه من أن الشخصية الإنسانية متميزة بشكل واضح عن الحيوان فإن وجود مثل هكذا صفات يعدُّ سلوكاً إنسانياً شاذاً.

يعتقد هوبز من خلال هذه النظرية - إذا ما دُعمت أو توفرت لها الحماية من خلال طاعة المجتمع المطلقة لفئة معينة - بأنها بهذا الدور ستؤدي إلى المحافظة على النظام الاجتماعي والسياسي بشكله السائد؛ إذ إنَّ الطاعة السلبية عنده هي القوة المطلقة الواجب توافرها لتأسيس الحكومات.

أما في ما يخص نظرية العقد الاجتماعي فقد اعطى توماس هوبز الأولوية للنظرية التي تتمحور حول مبدأ أن الدولة مهما تفعل من سلوك فهو سلوك عادل والافراد مطالبين بالطاعة المطلقة. أن نظرية العقد الاجتماعي ترتبط بالمعايير الاخلاقية والخطوط العامة السياسية للحكم. وعلى الرغم من ان هذه النظرية قد ارتبطت بهوبز الا ان جون لوك وجان جاك روسو اضافوا ابعاد واضحة للنظرية والتي قد تضيف تطبيقاً واضحاً خلال العقد

الحديث. ومن هنا فإن مفاهيم الفردية، المادية، السيادية، والمطلقة قد تداخلت كمفاهيم في نظرية هوبز وتأرشفنت كأحدى أكثر النظريات السياسية الفلسفية جدلاً.

غالباً، في الأدب، ان اخلاقيات نظرية هوبز قد تناولت وجهات نظر مختلفة، على سبيل المثال، العدالة هي انعكاس لشكل الروح المنظمة والتي تعكس بالتالي حالة الفرد السعيدة. بينما تعكس حيونة الانسان ذلك الجزء الوحشي في سلوكه عندما تبرر الضرورة الاخلاقية والسياسية. من وجهة نظر هوبز ان نفسية الانسان تتبع الذاتية في اعتبارات حاجات الانسان الطبيعية كالحب والكره والتي تؤخذ بنظر الاعتبار في عملية تشكيل ايدولوجيات الحياة للفرد والحكومات. ولذلك ، فان مصطلحات مثل الخير والشر لها معاني دقيقة عندما يتم تبنيتها من قبل مستخدميها وتكيف من قبل ميكانيكية العقل الاجتماعي. في المقابل فإن المصطلحات الاخلاقية يتم تطبيق مفاهيمها من خلال العائدية السياسية التي تميز نظرية هوبز للعقد الاجتماعي او مفهومه المتعلق بالانسان كذئب للانسان الاخر.

ولا يفوتنا أن كثيراً من النصوص الأدبية يسلط الضوء على موضوع الحيوانية الكامن في السلوك الإنساني وهو موضوع له دوره في تأسيس المكونات السياسية وحمائتها في المجتمعات الإنسانية، فالبحت الحالي سوف يناقش هذا الموضوع في بعض الأعمال المسرحية. يقسم البث الى مبحثين رئيسيين وخاتمة. يهتم المبحث الاول بالجانب النظري لنظرية هوبز من وجهة نظر سياسية والتي سبقه اليها الفيلسوف الاندلسي ابن عربي. أما المبحث الثاني للبحث فقد تناول تطبيقات درامية للنظرية من خلال أعمال مسرحية مختارة لحقب زمنية مختلفة.

Works Cited

- Carlson, Marvin. "Arab Political Theatre: Post-Arab Spring". In *The Routledge Companion to Theatre and Politics*, edited by Peter Eckersall, Helena Grehan. New York: Routledge, 2019.
- Carroll, Charles. *The Negro a Beast*. Ohio: The Ohio State University: Ayer, 1991.
- Claude Levi-Strauss. *Anthropologie Structurale Deux*. Paris: Plon ,1973.
- Haas, Birgit. *Modern German Political Drama, 1980-2000*. NY: Camden House, 2003.
- Hampton, Jean. *Hobbes and the Social Contract Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Based on 1651 print, Istanbul, Turkey.
- [https://www.ttu.ee/public/m/martmurdvee/EconPsy/6/Hobbes Thomas 1660 The Leviathan.pdf](https://www.ttu.ee/public/m/martmurdvee/EconPsy/6/Hobbes%20Thomas%201660%20The%20Leviathan.pdf)

- Hoffe, Otfried. *Thomas Hobbes*. Albany: University of New York Press, 2015.
- Izutsu, Toshiko. *Sufisy and Taoism: A Comparative Study of Key Philosophical Concepts*. California: London University of California Press, 1984.
- Kanes, Martin. *Germinal: Drama and Dramatic Structure*. Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press Journal. Vol.61, No. 1, pp.12-25, 1963.
- Loher, Dea. *Leviathan*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Autoren, 1993.
- Marston, John. *The Malcontent*. London: Ernest Benn Limited, 1967.
- McMahon, Chris. *Family and the State in Early Modern Revenge Drama: Economics of Vengeance*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Michel, Louise. *Memoires de Louise Michel. Ecrits par elle-meme*. Paris: Maspero, 1976.
- Palmer, Clare "Madness and Animality in Michel Foucault's *Madness and Civilization*". In *Animal Philosophy*. pp72-85. Edited by Matthew Calarco and Peter Atterton. New York: 2004.
- Riding, Alan. "Film; Does 'Germinal' Speak Across a Century?". Section 2, Journal. *New York Times*, 1994.
- Roberts, Mark S. *The Mark of the Beast: Animality and Human Oppression*. Indiana: Purdue University, 2008.
- Rohman, Carrie. *Stalking the Subject: Modernism and the Animal*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- Runciman, David. *Pluralism and the Personality of the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Smith, Carol H. *T.S. Eliot's Dramatic Theory and Practice: From Sweeney Agonistes To the Elder Statesman*. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Walker, Philip D. *Germinal and Zola's Philosophical and Religious Thought*. Volume 14 of Purdue University of Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University monographs in Romance Languages. John Benjamin's Publishing, 1984.
- Zola, Emile. *Germinal* Owc: Pb. *Oxford World Classics*. Trans. By Peter Collier. London: Oxford University Press, 2008.