

THOMAS HOBBS AND CONTINUAL WARS

Fatih YAŞAR*

ABSTRACT

According to Hobbesian view, there was no common power which could dominate human beings in the state of nature. As there was no authority, humans could get what they wanted. They gave some of their rights to the Leviathan. The condition was protection from outsiders. States are in state of war because there is no common authority. Unlike human beings, states do not give up their authority for protection because the conditions of human and states are different. As there is no common authority which can dominate all states, international sphere is anarchic. Many authors and scholars criticised his thoughts but the others accepted his ideas. This article seeks an answer of the question of whether continual presence of war proves Thomas Hobbes.

Key Words: Thomas Hobbes, Realism, The Leviathan (the state), state of war, international society

* The University of Sussex, UK.

Thomas Hobbes and Continual Wars

1. INTRODUCTION

War is and has been a regrettable feature of International Relations (IR) for all of human history. Many IR scholars have put forward theories to explain the workings of the international sphere and this essay will focus on Thomas Hobbes' definition of the international sphere as a state of war. While his definition has been criticised by others, his supporters have generally argued that the many international conflicts and disagreements prove Hobbes is right. It should be said that the future may be different but this essay will argue that the international sphere has indeed been in a state of war as Hobbes stated, despite the limitations of Hobbes's definition.

Hobbes' theories about IR are based on the conflict between individuals and states. According to him, humans existed in anarchy in the state of nature (before civilised society became established) because of an absence of a common power. As men were equal in the state of nature, a person can put in a claim for a resource which can be claimed by another (Hobbes 1996). He cites three reasons that led to humankind to conflict: competition for gain, diffidence, and glory (Donnelly 2000). Yet, the rationality of human beings united them under a common power which is the Leviathan (the state). The natural condition of the states is like the natural conditions of mankind after the formation of the Leviathan. In the natural condition of states, they are led to war by competition for gain, diffidence, and glory as they led people to quarrel in the state of nature. This situation of states is explained as a state of war or a war of all against all. According to the Hobbesians, there cannot be a global Leviathan because states are unequal, immortal and never sleep unlike humans in the state of nature who have to sleep, are equal, and are mortal (Vincent 1981; Williams 1996). Therefore, the natural condition of mankind and states is not completely comparable.

Many IR scholars accept Hobbes's thoughts; however, others disagree with his explanations about the conditions of international relations. This essay will argue that Hobbes' description of the international sphere as a state of war has generally been accurate despite its limitations, such as considering international society as a fiction and his interpretation of it within his own lifetime which has changed. In the first section, Hobbes' arguments which include the natural condition of humans, the Leviathan (the state), and international sphere as a state of war, will be examined. In the second section, views of the Hobbesians, the Kantians and the Grotians on international relations will be examined, followed by a general evaluation of their views. Additionally, in the second section it will be discussed whether nuclear weapons are a threat to the immortality of the Hobbesian state. Finally, in the third section, the Russian annexation of the Crimean peninsula and the rise of ISIS will be examined as cases in point along with a discussion of the limits of international society and its laws.

2. SECTION 1

The first stage in Hobbes' conception is the state of nature. It is comprised of three important parts: the equality of men, the rights of nature, and the laws of nature. However the inequality of men has its limits set by nature according to Rousseau (Navari 1982), Hobbes argues that

human beings had been made equal by nature (Hobbes 1996). Firstly, in *Leviathan*, the equality of men in state of nature is depicted by Hobbes -

Nature hath made men so equal, in the faculties of the body, and mind; as that though there be found one man sometimes manifestly stronger in body, or of quicker mind than another; yet when all is reckoned together, the difference between man, an man, is not considerable, as that one man can thereupon claim to himself any benefit, to which another may not pretend, as well as he. (1996, p.82)

Hence, equality of men causes the universal quarrel that pitches every man against every other man in the state of nature (Odysseos 2002). In the state of nature, there are three reasons which lead to men quarrel; competition for gain, diffidence, and glory (Donnelly 2000). According to Hobbes (1996), there is no place for the notion of right and wrong, justice and injustice in the state of nature. He (1996) adds that there is no common power or law in the state of nature, so there is no injustice. In the state of nature, there are two main virtues in war namely; fraud and force (Hobbes 1996). The necessity of a definition of the rights of nature emerges at this point, of which Hobbes writes-

Every man by nature hath right to all things, that is to say, to do whatsoever he listeth to whom he listeth, to possess, use and enjoy all things he will and can. For seeing all things he willeth, must therefore be good unto him in his own judge men, because he willeth them; and may tend to his preservation some time or other; or he may judge so, and we have made him judge thereof, sect. 8: it followeth that all things may rightly also be done by him. (Hobbes 2009, p.58)

The equality of men, and the rights of nature, and the restless and continual desire for power made the state of nature anarchic and in a constant state of war. There was a risk of death for everyone; there was no order because of an absence of a common power. According to Hobbes (1996), three passions motivated people then: fear of death, a desire of necessary things to commodious living, and a hope by their industry to obtain them, the tendency of men towards peace. While life was seen as 'mean, short, brutish, and nasty' (1996) in state of nature, it does not mean that all mankind was or is the same (Di Stefano 1983). Then, the laws of nature come which form the *Leviathan* in order to secure the right to a secure life. In *Leviathan*, the laws of nature and the difference between rights and laws are explained-

A law of nature, (*lexnaturalis*) is a precept, or general rule, found out by reason, 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. For though they that speak of this subject, use to confound *jus*, and *lex*, *right* and *law*; yet they ought to be distinguished; because RIGHT, consisteth in liberty to do, or to forbear: whereas LAW, determineth, and bindeth to one of them: so that law, and right, differ as much, as obligation, and liberty; which in one and the same matter are inconsistent. (Hobbes 1996 p.86)

Thomas Hobbes and Continual Wars

The second stage of Hobbes' argument concerns the Leviathan which is the sovereign power or the state. All of mankind is united by the capacity of men for rational comprehension of their circumstances, the fear of death, as well as for rational calculation to achieve security; however, these are not enough in order to guarantee commodious living, order, and peace (Williams 1996). For Hobbes, the absence of an authoritative sovereign to outline the material and ethical rights by which society functions is the source of the problem (Williams 1996). According to Hobbes (1996), people gave up their freedom to be governed by an assembly of individuals (or a single man) united in one body, the commonwealth. He (1996) adds that the commonwealth is the generation of the great Leviathan (Mortal God) (Leviathan). This superior power rules over all individuals and has significant power (Bull 1981). It thus never sleeps or dies (except in specific circumstances such as a revolution or coup d'état). The Leviathan overcomes the limitations that individual members of a society face in their efforts to survive in the state of nature (Williams 1996).

The last step of his theory is the state of nature at state level or the international state of war. Competition for material possession, mistrust or diffidence and glory lead states to war as they do in men under the state of nature (Bull 1981). What the state of nature means to individual man (a continual power struggle for survival), the international state of nature means to states. States are involved in a state of war because there is no international common power which can keep them all in check (Bull 1981). But if the international sphere is like natural condition of man why cannot they come together and form an international Leviathan? Men in the state of nature sleep, are equal, and are mortal, but states never sleep, are unequal, and are immortal (Vincent 1981; Williams 1996). Because of these differences between states and human beings, the natural condition of states is more tolerable than the natural condition of men. Hence, states do not establish a global Leviathan by giving up their privileges or sovereignties.

3. SECTION 2

3.1 THE HOBBSIANS, THE GROTIANS AND THE KANTIANS TRADITIONS

In this section, the first criticism from anti-Hobbesian perspectives to the Hobbesian tradition is about international society. If we ask that what international society to the Hobbesian tradition is, they are likely to answer: a fiction (Bartelson 1996). For the Hobbesian tradition, states conflict each other without legal or moral limit of any type that is international relations as state of war of all against all (Bull 1995, p.23-24), as a result of this, the international system lacks peace and order, or at least they can be found exceptionally in international life for the Hobbesian tradition (Bartelson 1996).

However, the conflicts of states are limited by institutions and common rules according to the Grotian's tradition (Bull 1996, p.25). According to the Grotians, the sources of tension concern the foundations of international law, the scope and legitimacy of legal rules in

international society, and the question of membership in international society (Bartelson 1996). Therefore, the Grotian tradition and the Hobbesian tradition hold opposite views, in the Hobbesian tradition the absence of the international system exists in the Grotian international society (Bartelson 1996).

The Kantian or Universalist tradition is opposite to the Hobbesian one as well. Firstly, contrary to the Hobbesian tradition, the Kantians argue that international politics does not lie in conflict among the states; it lies in the trans-national social bonds that link the individual human beings who are the subjects or citizens of states (Bull 1996, p.24). Secondly, for the Universalist tradition, the interests of all human beings are the same and one; international politics is a purely non-zero-sum game or a co-operative within the community of all human beings, which is opposite to the Hobbesian view (Bull 1996, p.24). Lastly, international morality refers to ethical rules which limit the action of states in the field of international relations, that order the fall of the system of states and 'its replacement by a cosmopolitan society' rather than 'coexistence and cooperation among the states'(Bull 1996, p.25) according to the universalist or Kantian tradition, this is opposite to the Hobbesian view.

International society is fiction for the Hobbesians (Bartelson 1996), however international societies exist. Unlike Kantians (Bull 1996, p.24), these societies are not strong and unified. Moreover, what international society means to one state is not the same to another. Thus, the Hobbesian tradition ignores the existence of international society and the Kantians exaggerate it. For instance, the Paris attack by ISIS was condemned by especially the West, but there was not a strong reaction from the West against the ISIS attack on Beirut, which happened just one day before the Paris tragedy.

Both the Kantians and Grotians believe that the conflicts among states are limited. Both views are optimistic, because the human history has seen so many conflicts which were not limited by anything. For instance, no moral imperatives could not stop Serbian militants raping Bosnian women during Bosnia-Serbia conflict, or the US soldiers who tortured Iraqi prisoners in EbuGureyb prison (Hersh 2004; Hettena 2005). Does torture fall outside of moral imperatives and international laws or not? The scope and legitimacy of legal rules in international society have been violated so many times. From the myth of the Peace of Westphalia (1648) until the present day, the sovereignty of states has been so often ignored by others. For example, Russia violated the sovereignty of Ukraine by annexing Crimea. The US claimed itself as a defender of democracy and invaded Iraq and Afghanistan. Neither democracy nor peace has come to Iraq or Afghanistan yet. If international politics is purely cooperative, how do the Kantians explain the failure of anti-terrorist cooperation? If there is a pure cooperation among the states, why cannot they stop the expansion of ISIS (Hassan 2015; Graham-Harrison 2015; O'Donnell and Babur 2015) or the other terrorist organisations even if all states are against them? The so-called "*Perpetual Peace*" of the Kantians, and the partial international laws and society of the Grotians do not work well in real world. Yet denial of international society by the Hobbesian view does not comply with the reality either. However,

Thomas Hobbes and Continual Wars

as the history of international relations has shown, the Hobbesian view of the state of war has been a much more accurately described international relation over time.

3.2 ARE NUCLEAR WEAPONS A THREAT TO THE IMMORTALITY OF THE LEVIATHAN?

Another criticism by the anti-Hobbesians to the Hobbesians is that the assumption of the immortality of the states in the Hobbesian view is flawed. The states are immortal unlike individual men are mortal for the Hobbesians, as a result of this the states and individual human beings are subject to different conditions (Williams 1996). Clausewitz says that a state may lose a war today yet it may win in the future; this is impossible for a human who has lost his life in a war (Bull 1981). The nuclear threat is on the list of potential catastrophes which includes the increasing scarcity of natural resources, escalating population growth and environmental pollution (Vincent 1981). Wiesner and York argue that the steady increase in military power, especially in regard to nuclear weapons, has weakened the national security of both sides of the arms race (Hardin 1968). The existence of nuclear weapons shows that the risk of annihilation of states are comparable to the danger of death individuals face in the state of nature; these weapons have equalised the situation of states to the condition of humans in the state of nature; therefore, the possibility of the establishment of an international Leviathan is now more likely than it ever has been (Vincent 1981).

It should be mentioned that there is an inherent inequality in the arms race and possession of nuclear weapons. Approximately 10,000 to 15,800 nuclear weapons are owned by nine countries namely: The USA, Russia, the UK, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan and North Korea (Conca 2014; ICAN 2015; FAS 2015). Another inequality is that one nuclear warhead may eradicate Luxemburg, but is one enough to destroy whole the USA? It is obvious that the geographically large countries would not collapse suddenly after a nuclear attack. For instance, Japan was able to continue after Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Yet it does not mean large countries are invulnerable to nuclear attacks, it means that some states are more able to tolerate a nuclear attack than others. Thus, the relative situations of states show that every state is neither totally immortal nor totally vulnerable to a nuclear attack. Consequently, the relative invulnerability of the states is the reason why they do not establish a global Leviathan.

4. SECTION 3

4.1 THE ISSUE OF ISIS

One of the most important global issues has been the rise of global terrorism in the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Many states and extremist groups have used or supported this kind of violence in order to achieve their goals. The method used by these groups or states seriously infringes human rights and *jus in bello* (the laws and customs of war). Underinternational law, civilians cannot be harmed by enemies even during war, but it is known that so many civilian men, women and children have been killed in terrorist attacks.

The preferred methods of terrorist organisations are guerrilla warfare or suicide bombings. Unless the financial, logistical and ideological resources of these terrorist groups are cut, these kinds of organisations will continue to spread fear and anarchy all around the world.

Nowadays, one of the most infamous terrorist groups is ISIS or ISIL (the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and Syria or Islamic State in Iraq). A decade ago, it was founded as a branch of Al-Qaeda in Iraq, an Islamic Salafist-Jihadi terrorist organisation (The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center 2014). Its founding father is Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, killed by the Americans in Iraq in 2006 (Gerges 2014). Its roots are hidden in the US invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan (Gerges 2014; Kumar 2015). According to Orton (2015), ISIS was born after the fall of Saddam Hussein's regime. The American and the British invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan escalated this situation because of their unlawful actions such as torturing or murdering prisoners, bombing civilian target or massacres.

Moreover, Baghdad and Washington did not pay attention to the protests of Iraqi Sunnis about the discrimination and marginalisation they faced. This was a perfect opportunity for ISIS which exploited this situation in order to instrumentalise their grievances. The same resentment occurred in Syria where the regime of Bashar al-Assad was dominated by the minority Alawite sect. Although Syrian and Iraqi Sunnis may not share the radical Islamist ideology of ISIS, thousands of these embittered people fight under ISIS's flag (Gerges 2014). Moreover, ISIS has easily found militant recruits in Iraq and Syria as authorities there are weak and because of resentment of Iraqis and Syrians towards the West. Furthermore, many Saddam Hussein-era officers joined ISIS, after which ISIS became much stronger and much more of a serious threat (Wyke 2015). ISIS has not only gained strength in Iraq and Syria, but has also gained ground in Afghanistan (O'Donnell and Babur 2015).

Its terrorist actions have spread across Asia, Africa, Europe, North America and Australia. 17 hostages were seized by a gunman who claimed he was acting on behalf of ISIS on 15th December 2014 in Australia. On 5 June 2015, more than 100 people who gathered for a peace rally in Ankara died in two explosions; Turkish officials said that ISIS was responsible for the attacks. In Tunisia, 22 people died after ISIS attack on a museum; ISIS claimed responsibility for this (The New York Times 2015). Especially after the recent ISIS attack on Paris in 2015, France intensified their air attacks on ISIS targets; the UK government took the decision to bomb ISIS target too; Russia has since joined in the bombing campaign, targeting almost 500 ISIS targets in Syria (Newton and Wyke 2015).

At this point, it should be asked what the differences are between the US bombing of Al-Qaeda and the French, Britain and Russian bombing of ISIS? Have they really been effective in working to eradicate terrorism? Removing Bashar al-Assad from the government of Syria was easier than annihilating ISIS. For instance, Saddam Hussein was an enemy of the US and its allies, he was a single man and has been eliminated, but the chain of terrorism is still alive. The name of terrorism was Al-Qaeda yesterday; it is ISIS today; it may be different in the future. Places or people can be bombed and destroyed but ideology cannot be and never dies

Thomas Hobbes and Continual Wars

until the fall of last person who believes in it. Bombing ISIS is not enough to eradicate terrorism from the earth unless the dangerous beliefs behind it are annihilated. This belief is that killing even innocent people is justified in order to reach their goal. At this point, it should be conceded that mankind does frequently violate the rules of conflict, despite the Grotians' protests. The scope and legitimacy of legal rules in international society and international laws have not been cared for by this kind of terrorist organisation and even by states like the US, as so clearly shown by the human rights atrocities committed against civilians in Iraq, Afghanistan and Guantanamo.

International society is an example of pure cooperative for the Kantians, however there is more than one society on the global scale and they are not in fact united. If they were united and cooperative, there would not be any global terrorism. International societies do not reflect the other's sorrow, as experienced after the 2015 ISIS attack on Paris. Just the day before the Paris attack, ISIS attacked Beirut resulting in the death of 43 people (The New York Times 2015); however, the Western media did not show much reaction to this terrorist action. On the other hand, Middle-eastern media has not reacted significantly to terrorist actions in the West. ISIS was born under anarchical conditions and it has spread anarchy all around the world like its predecessor, Al-Queda. Terrorist organisations and the lawless actions of states are spreading resentment and anarchy all over the world and have contributed significantly to the international sphere existing in an almost constant state of war.

4.2 THE RUSSIAN ANNEXATION OF CRIMEAN PENINSULA

For the Hobbesians, the race for gain, distrust and glory led the states to war with each other. Throughout history, states have been trying to take control of the other's lands. There have been many laws governing war (*Jus in Bello*) throughout history. The foundation of modern laws and customs dated to the First Geneva Convention in 1864. After this convention, new rules have been added to the old ones or else they have been replaced with new laws. Annexation of a piece of land has been considered as normal activity in terms of international relations and *jus in bello*.

There are the other ways of gaining or losing control of territory, such as referendums. A referendum is considered a democratic way of changing control over a country. Yet the consequences of referendums have been debated hotly by both the sides of referendums. The Russian annexation of the Crimean peninsula is the newest example of the annexation of a territory as a result of a referendum. It has been disputed like the results of many other referendums.

In 1783, the Russian Empire took the control of the Crimean peninsula under the order of Catherine the Great (1762-1796), when the Russian imperial army defeated the Crimean Khanate which was dependent on the Ottoman Empire. During World War Two, the Nazis occupied the peninsula between 1942 and 1944. In 1954, jurisdiction and authority over the

Crimean Autonomous Republic was transferred from the Soviet Russia to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic by Nikita Khrushchev. From 24th August 1991 to 18th March 2014, the Crimean peninsula was a part of Ukraine.

Especially during the last decade, the Ukraine has experienced many conflicts between pro-Russian and pro-Western groups. After the Ukrainian presidential election on 21st November 2004, Viktor Yushchenko, a presidential candidate, called a protest because he claimed there had been an infraction of the election rules. Viktor Yushchenko became the president of Ukraine after Ukraine's Supreme Court's decision on a revote on 26th December 2004. This hand over of presidency after revoting and protest is known as the Orange Revolution. The sides in this revolution were the pro-Western and the pro-Russian factions as Yushchenko was supported by the West and Viktor Yanukovich by Russia (BBC News Online 2014).

Just 9 years after the Orange Revolution, in March 2013, an Association Agreement which concerned Ukraine's eventual integration into the European Common Market was concluded between Ukraine and The European Union (Mantovini and Rickenbacher 2014). The Russian Federation opposed this event. Viktor Yanukovich, the president of the Ukraine between 25th February 2010 and 22nd February 2014, refused to sign this agreement with the EU (Salushev 2014). Protests started against Viktor Yanukovich and caused many problems in the Ukraine. The largest protest took place in Independence Square in Kiev (Maidan Nezalezhnosti), by the group known as the Euromaidan movement. In the Ukraine, these protests caused disorder that escalated Russian nationalism (Bidder 2015). Violence occurred between the pro-Russian and Ukrainian factions and as a result, many people died.

After this, the Crimean status referendum was taken by the legislature of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea. In the referendum held on 16th March 2014, over 95 per cent of Crimean voters accepted to be a part of Russia. Then Russian Federation annexed Crimea, which was a part of the Ukraine, on 18 March 2014. This annexation of Crimea was not recognized by General Assembly of UN (United Nations 2014). According to Robin Geiß (2015), the so-called status alteration of Crimea was not legitimate under international law. The annexation was condemned internationally, even by China which is Russia's closest ally. Yet Russia still does not recognize or obey the international laws which limit actions of states according to the Grotians. The so-called international society based on pure cooperation was weak on this issue. Moreover, it is said that Putin and his regime became stronger and more consolidated politically as a result of this situation (Geiß 2015). As a peninsula, Crimea is of course a very strategic territory, it has been handed over five times from one state to another since 1917. The Russian annexation of Crimea was a significant example of how states always consider their own interests and prestige above all else in global affairs. Even though many states imposed sanctions on Russia as a result of the annexation of Crimea, Russia has not retreated on this issue.

5. CONCLUSION

Thomas Hobbes and Continual Wars

Hobbes was one of the key thinkers in political science who attempted to explain international relations with his own interpretations of human nature and the nature of society. His views about international affairs have been much debated. Especially, his description of the international sphere as a state of war has been the target of the anti-Hobbesians. According to Hobbes, rational people in the state of nature came together and formed the Leviathan, which is the state, in order to live without fear. People voluntarily gave up some of their rights to a common power which could protect them from invasions and threat by others via the rule of law. After the formation of Leviathan, states find themselves in the natural condition of states which is nearly the same as the natural condition of men. Yet, upon closer analysis, states are not completely the same as individuals in the state of nature. The relative immortality of the states, inequalities between them and being in a state of constant awareness, mean that states are different from humans in the state of nature. These differences make the natural condition of states more tolerable than the natural condition of man. Hence, the states cannot form a permanent union or global Leviathan according to the Hobbesian tradition. For Hobbesians, international society, international laws, moral restrictions cannot limit the actions of states on global affairs.

Hobbes's description of the international sphere as a state of war has been valid to some extent to explain international relations until recently, however some of his arguments have been weakened as elements of international relations have changed since his lifetime. His view has been challenged by other IR traditions and many recent events such as the war on terror. His arguments have become more and more inadequate to explain the issues of modern times. So the future of the international sphere may be different from its past. Yet, it should be said that, in general, the international sphere has indeed been in an almost constant state of war up until the present day. For instance, the twentieth century saw two world wars and one Cold War in addition to many other regional and minor conflicts. Moreover, the international community has experienced a huge amount of global terrorism in the form of anarchy, violations of international laws and indifference to human rights over the last 15 years.

Hobbes's pessimistic description of human and international affairs paints an unpleasant view of humanity; however, a general state of war has indeed been a defining characteristic of international relations since the international community first came into being, mainly because of the selfish actions of leaders of states. The future may be different if all human beings become aware of their shared humanity and cooperate to live in peace. Thus, the future of the international sphere can hopefully leave Hobbes's state of war behind and herald a new era of peace and co-operation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bartelson, J. (1996) 'Short Circuits: Society and Tradition in International Relations Theory', *Review of International Studies*, 22 (4), pp.339-360.

BBC News Online (2014). *Profile: Ukraine's ousted President Viktor Yanukovich*. London: BBC News Online. Available from: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-25182830> (Accessed: 31 December 2015).

Bidder, B. (2015). *Russian Far-Right Idol: The Man Who Started the War in Ukraine*. Hamburg: Spiegel Online International. Available from: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/the-ukraine-war-from-perspective-of-russian-nationalists-a-1023801.html> (Accessed: 31 December 2015).

Bull, H. (1981) 'Hobbes and the International Anarchy', *Social Research*, 48 (4), pp.717-738.

Bull, H. (1995) *The Anarchical Society* 2nd edn. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.

Conca, J. (2014). *The Nuclear Weapons States - Who Has Them And How Many*. New Jersey: Forbes Online. Available from: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamesconca/2014/09/25/the-nuclear-weapons-states-who-has-them-and-how-many/> (Accessed: 30 December 2015).

Di Stefano, C. (1983) 'Masculinity as Ideology in Political Theory: Hobbesian Man Considered', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 6 (6), pp.633-644.

Donnelly, J. (2000) *Realism and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Federation of American Scientists (2015). *Status of World Nuclear Forces*. Washington D.C.: FAS Online. Available from: <http://fas.org/issues/nuclear-weapons/status-world-nuclear-forces/> (Accessed: 31 December 2015).

Geiß, R. (2015) 'Russia's Annexation of Crimea: The Mills of International Law Grind Slowly but They Do Grind', *International Law Studies*, 91, pp.425-449.

Gerges, F. A. (2014) 'ISIS and the Third Wave of Jihadism', *Current History: A Journal of Contemporary World Affairs*, 113 (767), pp.339-343.

Graham-Harrison, E. (2015). *How Islamic State is expanding its empire of terror*. London: the Guardian. Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/feb/21/islamic-state-empire-al-qaida-isis> (Accessed: 30 December 2015).

Hardin, G. (1968) 'The Tragedy of the Commons', *Science*, 162 (3859), pp.1243-1248.

Hassan, H. (2015). *Isis is expanding its international reach. That is hardly a sign of weakness*. London: the Guardian. Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/dec/06/isis-expansion-libya-not-sign-of-weakness> (Accessed: 31 December 2015).

Thomas Hobbes and Continual Wars

Hersh, S. M. (2015). *Torture at Abu Ghraib*. New York: The New Yorker. Available from: <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2004/05/10/torture-at-abu-ghraib> (Accessed: 30 December 2015).

Hettena, S. (2005). *Reports detail Abu Ghraib prison death; was it torture?*. New York: NBCNews. Available from: http://www.nbcnews.com/id/6988054/ns/world_news-mideast_n_africa/t/reports-detail-abu-ghraib-prison-death-was-it-torture/#.VocBs_nJxD9 (Accessed: 30 December 2015).

Hobbes, T. (1996) *Leviathan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hobbes, T. (2009) *The Elements of Law Natural and Politic*. Oxford: Dodo Press.

International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (2015). *Nuclear arsenals*. Geneva: ICAN Online. Available from: <http://www.icanw.org/the-facts/nuclear-arsenals/> (Accessed: 30 December 2015).

Kumar, C. (2015) 'Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) a Global Threat: International Strategy to Counter the Threat', *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1 (4), pp.345-353.

Mantovani, M. and Rickenbacher, D. (2014) 'Crimea going East – A Clash of Great Power Strategies', *The Military Law and the Law of War Review*, 53, pp.1-16.

Navari, C. (1982) 'Hobbes and the 'Hobbesian Tradition' in International Thought', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 11 (3), pp.203-222.

Newton, J. and Wyke, T. (2015). *France launches first attacks on Syria from Charles De Gaulle aircraft carrier after Russia takes out 472 ISIS targets in weekend bombing missions*. London: Daily Mail Online. Available from: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3330232/Russia-destroys-472-ISIS-targets-141-bombing-missions-Syria-weekend-intensify-campaign-airstrikes.html> (Accessed: 30 December 2015).

O'Donnell, L. and Babur, H. (2015). *ISIS is expanding its 'caliphate' to Afghanistan*. London: Business Insider UK. Available from: <http://uk.businessinsider.com/isis-is-expanding-its-caliphate-to-afghanistan-2015-12?r=US&IR=T> (Accessed: 31 December 2015).

Odysseos, L. (2002) 'Dangerous Ontologies: The Ethos of Survival and Ethical Theorizing in International Relations', *Review of International Studies*, 28 (2), pp.403-418.

Orton, K. W. (2015). *How Saddam Hussein Gave Us ISIS*. New York: The New York Times. Available from: http://www.nytimes.com/2015/12/23/opinion/how-saddam-hussein-gave-us-isis.html?_r=1 (Accessed: 31 December 2015).

Salushev, S. (2014) 'Annexation of Crimea: Causes, Analysis and Global Implications', *Global Societies Journal*, 2 (0), pp.37-46.

The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center (2014). *ISIS: Portrait of a Jihadi Terrorist Organization*. Ramat HaSharon: The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center. Available from: <http://www.terrorism-info.org.il/en/article/20733> (Accessed: 30 December 2015).

UN.org (2014). *General Assembly Adopts Resolution Calling upon States Not to Recognize Changes in Status of Crimea Region*. New York: The United Nations. Available from: <http://www.un.org/press/en/2014/ga11493.doc.htm> (Accessed: 31 December 2015).

Vincent, R. J. (1981) 'The Hobbesian Tradition in Twentieth Century International Thought', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 10 (2), pp.91-101.

Williams, M. C. (1996) 'Hobbes and International Relations: A Reconsideration', *International Organization*, 50 (2), pp. 213-236.

Wyke, T. (2015). *The secret to ISIS's success: Over 100 former Saddam Hussein-era officers run jihadi group's military and intelligence operations in Iraq and Syria*. London: Daily Mail Online. Available from: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3190314/The-secret-ISIS-s-success-100-former-Saddam-Hussein-era-officers-run-jihadi-group-s-military-intelligence-operations-Iraq-Syria.html> (Accessed: 31 December 2015).

Yourish, K., Watkins, D., and Giratikanon, T. (2015). *Recent Attacks Demonstrate Islamic State's Ability to Both Inspire and Coordinate Terror*. New York: The New York Times. Available from: http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/06/17/world/middleeast/map-isis-attacks-around-the-world.html?_r=0 (Accessed: 31 December 2015).