The Creature from the British Isles: The Historical and Contemporary Importance of Thomas Hobbes's Political Philosophy

Nash Meade

ABSTRACT

Political philosophy is of central importance to much of the goings-on of a nation. Even though he is commonly addressed in those works at the forefront of political theory, one man often stands on the outside: Thomas Hobbes. Hobbes is often cited as too pessimistic or too intent on the necessity of authoritarianism. Although neither point is untrue, his work encompasses much more than these two characteristics, often having far more significance than many political theorists are willing to admit. This paper gives an account of Hobbes's historical importance and the reactions that he evoked, specifically in the work of John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, before progressing into an examination of his contemporary importance by using his work as a lens through which to analyze the Trump and Biden administrations' respective responses to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Hobbes believed that one of humanity's driving factors is fear and, with the current political and social situations being created by the pandemic, his fear-based political philosophy has become strikingly significant and prescient once again, which may point to a resurging importance of security—even of the authoritarian kind—in place of freedom when the world is faced with an uncertain future.

This piece was originally written in Spring 2021 and has since been revised to reflect more recent developments in responses to COVID-19.

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries marked an astounding shift in philosophy. Until that point, most philosophy had been commentary on the Greeks, who, in those centuries, were already over two millennia old. In fact, this system was so entrenched that the twentieth-century philosopher Alfred Whitehead famously observed that "the safest general characterization of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato" (39). Whether Whitehead's statement can be considered an accurate description of post-seventeenth century European philosophy is a subject for scholars and historians, but one thing is certain: the seventeenth century saw a dramatic rise in original and diverse thinking.

Among the explosion of newfound thinking in realms such as the philosophy of mind and mathematics was the ever-important development of political philosophy. In the seventeenth century, political philosophy took the form of social contract theory, which was spearheaded by three figures: John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Thomas Hobbes. Like the three Olympian brothers, these three thinkers would form a new foundation of political thought and practice that continues to this day; however, much like those three brothers, two of these figures—Rousseau and Locke—would continue to take precedence over the third, who was relegated to the shadows. Yet, like Hades in the original myth, Hobbes's importance in the establishment of the de-facto social contract system cannot be overstated, as his work is the origin point for much of the rest of social contract theory even if, by contemporary standards, his pessimism and authoritarian bent leave a bad taste in democratic society's mouth.

Hobbes's influence can reasonably be split into two historical sections. The first relates to his influence on social contract theory in the years after the publication of *Leviathan*. As one of the originators of social contract theory and prototypical modern political philosophy, Hobbes's influence is far-reaching and clear in many of the other works that political theorists hold dear. The second section relates to his modern influence. The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic gives us an incredible, present example of Hobbes's theories in action as governments exert additional authority for the sake of controlling fear, thus affecting notions of liberty and freedom. Unsurprisingly, in times of great turmoil, it is the work of the one who saw fear as a driving factor of humanity that becomes most relevant to the situation. Thus, we will see both the historical and contemporary value of Hobbes's work, as well as see how, despite the four centuries between its original publication and the present day, *Leviathan* continues to be a work that the majority of the population would prefer to dismiss as pessimistic than to accept as accurate in its description of fear-driven circumstances. Whether or not one agrees with the choices made regarding governance during the pandemic does not detract from the fact that those decisions were clearly influenced by fear, whether that fear be of the loss of political face, economic stability, or more lives than necessary.

The Leviathan Spotted

Thomas Hobbes was born in 1588 to a middle-class family in England (Duncan). He was educated at Oxford before becoming a tutor to the famous Cavendish family, a job he kept for most of his life while he penned his works (Duncan). Although a well-educated man, the majority of his philosophical work was not completed until much later in his life and was most likely prompted by a meeting and subsequent conversations with Galileo (Duncan). Much of his political philosophy was centered around the emerging British Civil War, which began the same year that he published his first work of political philosophy, *De Cive* (1642). Although Hobbes is now famous—or, perhaps, infamous—for his works of political philosophy, the reality is that he was an open thinker who dove into many subjects, including the emerging divide between empiricism and rationalism, the philosophy of language, and (as it would be now termed) the philosophy of mind. His work in these areas laid a foundation for many of the thinkers who would follow him, as they strove alternatively to refute his work or to build upon it.

Although all of Hobbes's work is incredibly important and worth discussing, his political views are the focus of this paper. As stated in the introduction, Hobbes was one of the first truly modern political theorists, and, as such, he influenced nearly every single one of those authors referred to as "social contract theorists." One of the starkest contrasts between his thought and that of other political theorists was in how he viewed the formation of government. Hobbes viewed government as something built out of fear and yet also inevitable. As he now famously decreed in his magnum opus, *Leviathan*, mankind finds itself, when not functioning in a society, in a state of "every man against every man" (76); that is, an individual's most basic instinct is to believe that everything in the world is out to get them, a belief which found its roots in Hobbes's own materialism. In a world based entirely in matter, the basic instincts of humanity would necessarily be animalistic, and humans would therefore resort to violence to get ahead and perceive everything other than themselves as a potential threat. If everyone is living in constant fear, then everyone wants to get rid of it. The way to get rid of that fear is to create a society bounded by rules that all persons follow; thus, Hobbes believed that civil society—or, rather, a government—is a natural consequence of this basic fear-instinct in man. Within this system, the "bounded by rules" is the most complicated part, as it raises a myriad of questions, such as, Who keeps the rules? Who makes the rules? How do societies agree on the rules? These questions led Hobbes to define two different fundamental structures of society: the contract and the sovereign.

The Social Contract

The social contract is, perhaps, the most important concept in all of Hobbes's work, as it formed the basis of an entire subset of political philosophy. The contract is derived from Hobbes's two fundamental laws of nature. The first law is that described above: the state of persons existing "all against all." Hobbes himself explains this law in

Leviathan as one "by which a man is forbidden to do that which is destructive of his life, or taketh away the means of preserving the same, and to omit that by which he thinketh it may be best preserved" (79). In more common language, this is a state of fear, in which every person will not willingly commit actions that are self-harming, yet simultaneously expects the intent to harm from others. Thus, people will act in a way which leads to their self-preservation. The second law of nature defines the contract within the terms of his natural law. As Hobbes writes:

> From this fundamental law of nature, by which men are commanded to endeavor peace, is derived this second law: that a man be willing, when others are so too, as far forth as for peace and defense of himself he shall think it necessary, to lay down his right to all things; and be contented with so much liberty against other men as he would allow other men against himself. (80)

Again, in simpler terms, the second law of nature is that people, in seeking a state in which they do not have to be afraid of everything, will attempt to arrive at a mutual agreement regarding what is "rightful" to each person. The contract, then, is whatever is mutually agreed upon to be restricted or granted to the general populace. However, a contract is fundamentally worthless without a type of enforcer, which necessitates the second aspect of government and society: the sovereign.

The Sovereign

In a radical shift from his contemporaries, Hobbes rejected any notion of "divine right" or patriarchal necessity in government. In Hobbes's view, the sovereign's powers are granted completely by the people and by their mutual agreement to the contract. However, Hobbes also recognized that sovereigns will often assume more and more power after their initial power and rights as sovereign are bestowed, becoming, as the name *Leviathan* suggests, a living beast. In his words:

> This [the giving up of natural rights in contract] is the generation of that great LEVIATHAN, or rather (to speak more reverently) of that *Mortal God* to which we owe, under the *Immortal God*, our peace and defense. For by his authority, given him by every particular man in the commonwealth, he hath the use of so much power and strength conferred on him that by terror thereof he is enabled to conform the wills of them all to peace at home and mutual aid against their enemies abroad. (109)

The sovereign—the body of government (an idiom that we trace back to Hobbes) and its person-head—is but an artificial being of great power, designated via contract to protect the citizenry through all forms of governmental action.

These two notions—the social contract and the sovereign—that Hobbes describes are the foundation of all other social contract treatises. Every other social contract thinker would either agree with or refute his initial definition of the contract, the laws of nature on which his contract is based, or the sovereign. This has, in turn,

lead to the modern branching concepts of good government that contrast with those theorized by Plato and Aristotle nearly two millennia before, even if some of these forms of government (such as democracy and tyranny) overlap. Although Hobbes delves into much greater detail regarding different modes of contract and the ways in which sovereigns act, this basic overview of the two terms serves as grounding enough for a discussion of how other contract theories differ from his original notions.

The Dissenters

Although Hobbes collected a multitude of dissenters during and after his time, his most important dissenters—within the realm of political philosophy—are other social contract theorists. Similar to how a distaste for Freud's theories of the unconscious led to much of modern psychology, distaste for Hobbes's work led to the formulation of a large swathe of modern political philosophy. Perhaps the most famous of Hobbes's dissenters is John Locke, whose name bears special significance within the conceptions of civil society held in the United States. His impact is such that he is almost directly quoted in the Declaration of Independence, which proclaims that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed with by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Locke himself asserted this idea nearly a century earlier in the second of his *Two Treatises of Government*, stating "… and Reason, which is that law [of Nature], teaches all Mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his Life, Health, Liberty, or Possessions" (271). Born forty-four years after Hobbes, Locke also found himself entangled in political turmoil across multiple nations thanks to his justification for the Glorious Revolution in England and the Netherlands (Uzgalis). While Hobbes was dealing with the internal turmoil of Britain and the question of how to prevent other nations from deteriorating into a state of civil war, John Locke was embroiled in the question—and ongoing political squabbles surrounding the question—of what qualified as legitimate government.

Locke's most distinctive features as a philosopher are also what radically separate him from Hobbes's work. Principally, Locke viewed authoritarianism with disdain, whereas Hobbes—though he never stated that he was pro-authoritarianism specifically—had fewer problems with authoritarianism as a form of government (Locke 276). Additionally, Locke argued for a fundamentally less centralized government, while Hobbes was in favor of a highly centralized government. These differing views are easily understood when each philosopher's historical context is recalled. Hobbes watched as a weakened monarch was overthrown during the chaos and destruction of the British Civil War, while Locke spent his years watching despotic kings do damage to England, an experience that led him to participate in working to overthrow England's king and having parliament established as England's primary governing body ("Glorious Revolution"). Given these respective experiences, each man's perspective is understandable.

In addition to their diverging views on government, Locke was very explicit in his disagreement with Hobbes regarding how the natural world operates. Locke was unwilling to accept that all of nature is particularly violent and instead believed the light of reason was strong enough to prevent such horror. As he phrases it in his *Two Treatises*, "The *State of Nature* has a Law of Nature to govern it, which obliges everyone: And Reason, which is that Law, teaches all Mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his Life, Health, Liberty, or Possession" (271). Most importantly, this perspective led Locke to dissent from Hobbes's view of how government is formed or what its role must be. Unlike Hobbes, Locke believed that the governance is not to be seen as absolute because it is impossible for it to be any less human than the citizenry that grants it its power. Locke explains that "*Absolute monarchs* are but Men, and if Government is to be the Remedy of those Evils [stealing, murder, etc.]. Which necessarily follow from Men being Judges in their own Cases, and the State of Nature is therefore not to be endured, I desire…" (276). Thus, he noted that even centralized government will be fallible and endeavored to prove that, by contrast, a government with less power and more participation from the citizenry is a better safeguard against the dangers of the "State of Nature." The social contract then, for Locke, is something that is much more participatory and volitional. Hobbes, on the other hand, although believing contract does require some volition, thought that contracts—and the governments that spring from them—will be necessitated by the state of fear endemic to human nature. In other words, Locke sees legitimate government as only coming about by reasoned contractual agreement by all parties, while Hobbes holds that government can come about by necessity.

Hobbes and Locke also held starkly different beliefs regarding what operates as a legitimate government. Specifically, Locke believed in the role of the majority, which is effectively non-existent in Hobbes's work. Again, Locke predominantly focused on decentralizing government power, while Hobbes wasinterested in the reverse (Uzgalis). In fact, Hobbes believed that there are situations where the sovereign or government must take additional power for the sake of the society, even if the citizenry has some objections to it (*Leviathan*, 127). Locke would see such assumption of power as a warning bell that the government is falling into despotism or tyranny. The two men do, however, agree that government—and that rational contract through government—is one of the best ways to prevent war.

Another major social contract theorist to distance himself from Hobbes was Jean Jacques Rousseau. Rousseau arguably marks an ideological midway point between Locke and Hobbes. Locke believed in the power of the people and in a limited form of government, while Hobbes attributed less power to the people and saw the sovereign as an acting figure that needed to be powerful. Rousseau threads the needle of this debate, agreeing with Hobbes on the laws of nature but rejecting the sovereign altogether, going

even further than Locke on the issue. Rousseau, like Hobbes, believed that people were naturally free and that this freedom could lead to common dangers, including the danger of giving up such freedom to the wrong ends, such as a despotic government (*The Social Contract,* 64-65). Although he is not nearly as adamant as Hobbes about this freedom leading to a situation of all persons being self-interested and violent, Rousseau does recognize that the freedom—and its attendant possibilities—are there.

Where Rousseau is unique among the contract theorists is in his borderline proto-Marxist conception of the role of government. Rousseau believed that it was of such importance for individuals to be a part of the legislative and executive operations that no sovereign or representative system of government could ever accurately portray the will of the people (Bertram). This directly contradicted Hobbes who was certain that the sovereign was the most important aspect of the social contract. Hobbes saw a contract without a sovereign as void, a state he believed would lead, eventually and inevitably, to the state of all against all once more.

Although both Locke and Rousseau held their own ideas of what the social contract should be, Hobbes's influence in their thought is clear. Hobbes invited thinkers into a full revolution of political and philosophical thought, leading to branches of the social contract theory and eventually the buds of current political theory. Of course, as nations have stabilized in the last couple of centuries and the "democratic peace," as it is called, has taken shape, the discussion of "fear" and "sovereigns" has fallen out of favor. However, Hobbes's theories, like the great Leviathan after which he named his book, are only resting deep beneath the surface of current discourse. With the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 to the now-slowing Omicron COVID variant of 2022, the Leviathan has awakened once more, and its serpentine body slithers across the entire world in the form of this invisible virus.

The Return of the Leviathan

The years 2020 and 2021 have given much of the world unprecedented experience with many of Hobbes's original political theories. Although not every nation has dealt with the COVID-19 pandemic in the same way or experienced a serious uptick in cases, many countries are continuing to deal with the pandemic on the political level. Everything from travel embargoes to the outright halt of economic trade have been put on the table, to varying degrees of success. What is most important in the context of our discussion, however, is how the actions of these various governments function within the context of Hobbes's theories. Although most of the Western world operates under a democratic system that more closely resembles the ideas of Locke and Rousseau, the growing pandemic caused a rapid, albeit subtle, shift towards a loss of democratic functions for the sake of allowing governments more active and overarching control to quell the virus and the fear associated with it.

As we have previously discussed, Hobbes—unlike his contemporaries—saw fear as the driving force of human action, political or otherwise. Thus, from a Hobbesian perspective, when a pandemic created by a highly infectious novel strain of a virus started to spread quickly, fear became the driving motivation of humanity once again. The push and pull of fear and security can be seen in nearly every societal and governmental response to the pandemic; however, that tug-of-war is particularly clear in the United States for one very important reason: Presidential succession. Unlike most nations during this time, the United States experienced a transition of power during the pandemic, which gave the world a display of two different approaches to the pandemic, approaches that illustrate a range of actions that can be taken in pursuit of balancing fear and security in cases such as these.

Indeed, the approaches of former President Trump and current President Biden create two intriguing responses to the political theories of Hobbes. Before progressing into a comparison of the features of those responses, it must be noted that President Biden has succeeded President Trump, meaning that his office is operating with not only more information concerning the virus but also plans that were set in motion by the previous administration, leading to an even more interesting discussion of the ideas of Hobbes. It is also important to note that this is a discussion purely of the governmental response; the response of the citizenry is a non-factor here.

The Trump Administration: The Only Thing to Fear is Fear Itself

The response of the Trump administration through the majority of 2020 was sporadic and unfocused. This, of course, is to be expected from an initial reaction to an unknown virus. What is most important to our discussion, however, is that the initial response was within the purview of powers of an American Presidential administration. Although a travel embargo was placed on China and a reduction of domestic and international travel was strongly encouraged, the hypotheticals were often downplayed, for better or worse (AJMC). Moving past some of the extreme rhetoric that arose from the political scene, the plan was clear: control the panic. The administration played it "cool," if you will, neither shifting between different measures each day nor overstating the clearly dangerous aspects of the virus. This strategy only partially worked, but the plan, seemingly, was to take each day at a time and then consider the next steps.

It was not until the two-week national lockdown in March 2020 that the actions of the administration expanded into any additional powers (AJMC; "Federal Response to Covid-19"). At this time, Congress imposed a national lockdown, which, although a reasonable move amid a pandemic, is beyond its purview as a governing body as it is not mentioned within the powers bestowed to it in the United States Constitution (Article 1, Section 8). As Hobbes expected nearly five centuries ago, fear showed itself to be a driving factor of the movement of government, causing it to behave in ways in which it

was not initially intended. The decision for the lockdown was informed predominantly by the perceived fear and danger of the virus, and much of the populace was willing to allow Congress to impose more control for the sake of security at the time.

After the lockdown, the discussion evolved into whether a national mask mandate should be imposed. Although this conversation is still ongoing with the Biden administration, the Trump administration decided not to impose one, instead giving it to the states to mandate (which then went to individual counties in some states). The reasoning was simple: it is not in the authority of the federal government to impose such a mandate. In this case, the administration stood *against* Hobbes, deciding not to take additional centralized power to thwart the threat, *even though* the populace seemed more than ready to agree to such a contract,[1] which is, perhaps, a rare occurrence in the history of politics.

The Biden Administration: Walking the Wire

Since the Biden administration began its work in January 2021, one thing has become abundantly clear: the virus is still a serious threat. Although vaccines have rolled out at a rapid pace and the virus itself seems to be weakening, it is still being regarded as something dangerous and to be feared. Whether such rhetoric is accurate or not, it has ignited conversations on two topics that are relevant to Hobbes's theories: mandatory vaccination and the release of power.

Mandatory vaccination has become a hot topic since the middle of 2021 with the rollout of more readily available vaccines. Like the Trump administration, the Biden administration (along with most major businesses) has recognized that making vaccination mandatory falls outside of its jurisdiction and has relied on "strongly encouraging" individuals to take the vaccine once it is available for their age group. As with a mask mandate, however, this action is entirely rooted in the question of whether individual freedom should be given up for the sake of national security. It may be safer for the entire nation if every individual took the vaccine, but from the standpoint of political theory, we must be concerned with questioning the type of action the government has taken against its people if safety measures are forced upon them in the name of security.

The release of power is, however, the more pressing and relevant question. Among some groups of people in the United States, conversations regarding the "eternal pandemic" have become mainstream (Greshko; Wallace-Wells). A mask mandate that will continue indefinitely, a vaccine that must be regularly reapplied for new strains, and other similar precautions are all slowly being mentioned in newspapers and on news sites (Cline). Although this question does not initially impress as being entirely on the political radar, these thoughts and ideas are among those that Hobbes saw as possible

1. Consolidated research from Pew over the last two years of the pandemic shows that the majority of American were in favor of restrictions and lockdowns (all things imposed by Congress beyond their official authority), which includes mask mandates, during the early months (i.e., Trump administration) of the pandemic (Pew).

several centuries ago. In situations where a government must take additional control for the sake of security, the promise of it giving back this power is never guaranteed. What will be done in the name of security? What will be done out of fear? These questions have become increasingly relevant as recent moves to crackdown on "vaccine misinformation" has led the government to consider censorship through social media platforms—a move that is, unquestionably, well outside of the federal government's legislative and executive authority.[2] However, as Hobbes would ask, is it governmental overreach, or a necessary breach of contract for the security of the citizens? Answering such questions as those posed in this paragraph is less important for the purposes of this paper than the single conclusion to which these questions point: Hobbesian philosophy has not lost its relevancy in the twenty-first century and, on the contrary, will continue to increase in relevancy as governmental responses to the pandemic continue.

Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted several of the cracks in America's political philosophy and the dominant democratic philosophies of Locke and Rousseau in more ways than one. From the incredibly slow process of representative government to the ever-increasing political divide between parties and their respective ideologies, the pandemic has made it clear that, as much as we want to consider ourselves as having evolved beyond or above such matters as those of which Hobbes spoke four centuries ago, we have not. As of early 2022, the political philosophy of Hobbes is still strikingly valuable to our discussions of government and its reach in the face of something which instills fear.

Although Hobbes's is a name that seems rarely to find its way into current conversation, his work is clearly imperative to many modern modes of thought. This paper has solely discussed his influence on political philosophy, but his work in multiple areas, including the philosophy of mind, still finds relevance today. His impact on early modern European thought cannot be overstated, but his current influence, especially during a pandemic, is also important. Even as politicians mull over the many possibilities that are presented to them in the face of this virus, their views, unwittingly, align or disagree with his work. This, perhaps, is the beauty of all philosophy—that one can unwittingly espouse a philosophical work in the name of something else. Every time a politician or pundit employs such catch-all phrasing as "for our safety," "for the security of the nation," or "to neutralize the threat," our minds ought to drift towards Hobbes and his great Leviathan coming out of the sea. The social contract theorists of centuries ago considered their words and the words of their sovereigns carefully for the sake of seeing whether the

---

2. Per the 10th amendment to the United States Constitution, any authority not explicitly given to Congress is given to the States. National lockdown, even in the case of a public health emergency, is not a power given to Congress, thereby making it beyond their purview as a governing body (The Bill of Rights).

Leviathan was real or simply a Loch Ness monster hiding beneath the waters of political philosophy. As the COVID-19 pandemic continues, we ought to consider the work of the social contract theorists and the words of our own governments carefully, lest we fail to see the attempted overreach of governments, leading societies to be carried into the sea in the *Leviathan's* unyielding, tyrannical tentacles.

WORKS CITED

AJMC Staff. "A Timeline of COVID-19 Developments in 2020." *American Journal of Managed Care*, 1 Jan. 2021, https://www.ajmc.com/view/a-timeline-of-covid19-developments-in-2020. Accessed 28 Apr. 2021.

Bertram, Christopher. "Jean Jacques Rousseau." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2020 Edition), https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rousseau/. Accessed 28 Apr. 2021.

Cline, Sara. "As Mask Mandates End, Oregon Bucks Trend with Permanent Rule." *Associated Press*, 17 Apr. 2021, https://apnews.com/article/oregon-general-news-government-and-politics-business-lifestyle-6f7f919d27644d02c330da5a8648af95. Accessed 28 Apr. 2021.

Deane, Claudia et al., "A Year of U.S. Public Opinion on the Coronavirus Pandemic." *Pew Research Center*, 5 Mar. 2021, https://www.pewresearch.org/2021/03/05/a-year-of-u-s-public-opinion-on-the-coronavirus-pandemic/. Accessed 20 Mar. 2022.

Duncan, Stewart. "Thomas Hobbes." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2021 Edition), https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hobbes/. Accessed 28 Apr. 2021.

"Federal government response to the coronavirus (Covid-19) pandemic, 2020-2021." *Ballotpedia*, last updated 28 Apr. 2022, https://ballotpedia.org/Federal_government_responses_to_the_coronavirus_(COVID-19)_pandemic,_2020-2021. Accessed 28 Apr. 2021.

"Glorious Revolution." *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 15 May 2020, https://www.britannica.com/event/Glorious-Revolution. Accessed 20 Mar. 2022.

Greshko, Michael. "COVID-19 Will Likely Be with Us Forever. Here's How We'll Live with It." *National Geographic,* 22 Jan. 2021, https://www.nationalgeographic.com/science/article/covid-19-will-likely-be-with-us-forever-heres-how-well-live-with-it. Accessed 28 Apr. 2021

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. 1651. Edited by Edwin Curley, Hackett Publishing, 1994.

Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. 1689. Edited by Peter Laslett, Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract*. 1762. Translated by Maurice Cranston, Penguin Classics, 1968.

"The Bill of Rights: A Transcription." *The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration*, last reviewed 19 Jan. 2022, https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/bill-of-rights-transcript. Accessed 24 Mar. 2022.

"The Constitution of the United States: A Transcription. National Archives." *The U.S. National Archives and Records Administration*, last reviewed 7 Oct. 2021, https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/constitution-transcript. Accessed 24 Mar. 2022.

Uzgalis, William, "John Locke." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2020

Edition), https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/locke/. Accessed 28 Apr. 2021.

Wallace-Wells, David. "What If Herd Immunity Is Out of Reach?" *New York Magazine: Intelligencer*, 5 Feb. 2021, https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2021/02/what-if-the-covid-pandemic-never-really-ends.html. Accessed 28 Apr. 2021.

Whitehead, Alfred North. *Process and Reality*. Free Press, 1979.