

History of Western Political Thought (16-18th Centuries): Poli 433

Fall 2015
MW 2:35-3:55pm
Arts 150

Instructor: Arash Abizadeh
Office: Ferrier 472
Office Hours: W 4-5pm
Tel: 514-398-4400 x094754

****Please note:** This is a manual note-taking lecture course. The use or display of any mobile computing or communications devices (including computers, recording devices, phones, iPads, or iPods) is strictly banned during class, except with the explicit permission of the instructor in exceptional cases. See "Course Objectives" and "Mobile Computing or Communications Devices" below.

Subject Matter

This course surveys major thinkers in European political theory from the 16th to 18th centuries. Attention is given to the historical context of thinkers, their influence on one another, and the contemporary relevance of their thought. This year we will pay particular attention to the religious dimension of their thought. Topics addressed will include the relation between philosophy, language, and politics; the meaning and foundations of rights; property; the idea of social contract; state sovereignty; individual autonomy; the role of reason in politics; the role of nature and natural law in politics; liberty, equality, and justice; representation; the meaning of liberalism and the relationship between liberalism and democracy; toleration and the relation between state and religion; and the relation between identity, recognition, and politics.

Course Objectives:

This course has three main pedagogical objectives:

1. to become acquainted with key concepts, problems, and questions of early modern and modern political theory;
2. to develop the capacity to think critically in an analytically rigorous way, to give articulate oral expression to that thinking, and to give articulate written expression to that thinking in a thesis-driven, analytical essay format; and
3. to develop the capacity to focus on and listen to lectures, digest the main points on the spot, and effectively to take hand-written notes that *synthesize* (rather than transcribe) lecture content.

Required Texts Available for Purchase at Paragraphe Bookstore

Calvin, John and Martin Luther. *Luther and Calvin on Secular Authority*. Edited and translated by Harro Höpfl. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Cambridge University Press, 1991. (ISBN-13: 9780521349864 | ISBN-10: 0521349869)

Jean Bodin. *On Sovereignty*. Edited by Julian H. Franklin. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Cambridge University Press. Paperback ISBN-13: 9780521349925 | ISBN-10: 0521349923.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan: with selected variants from the Latin edition of 1668*, ed. Edwin Curley. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994. ISBN 0-87220-177-5

Locke, John. *The Political Writings*. Edited, with Introduction, by David Wootton. Hackett Publishing, 2003. (0-87220-676-9)/(978-0-87220-676-2)

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Discourses and Other Early Political Writings*, ed. Victor Gourevitch. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-42445-3 **[this translation only]**

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *On the Social Contract*, Translated by Donald A. Cress. Hackett Publishing, 1988. (0-87220-068-X)/(978-0-87220-068-5)

You are encouraged to read the texts in their original French; I welcome any class discussion based on the French text. You may either purchase the relevant texts in French yourselves (easy to do online), or you may access some of them online, for example at the following sites:

http://un2sg4.unige.ch/athena/html/fran_fr.html

<http://un2sg4.unige.ch/athena/rousseau/rousseau.html>

<http://gallanar.net/rousseau.htm>

Class Schedule:

****No Class Friday, Sept 4 (which follows a Monday schedule)****

**** Monday, Sept 7 is a holiday****

Martin Luther

1 (Sept 9) *On Secular Authority*

Note: students are expected to have completed the reading before coming to the first class

John Calvin

2 (Sept 14) *On Civil Government*

Jean Bodin

3-4. (Sept 16, 21) *On Sovereignty* [from *Six livres de la république*], pp. 1-15, 31-39, 46-52, 56-59, 64, 66-70, 73, 75, 78-81, 86, 89-105, 110-120

Thomas Hobbes

5-6 (Sept 23, 28) *Leviathan*, Dedication, Intro, Part I

7-8 (Sept 30, Oct 5) Part II

****Monday, October 12 is Holiday****

[Paper proposal on Hobbes due at beginning of class 10, W Oct 14]

9-10 (Oct 7, 14) Part III-IV: only chapters 32, 33 (pars 1-4, 21-25), 34 (pars 1-4, 16-19, 24), 35, 36 (par 1, 20), 37 (par 1-5, 7, 13), 38 (pars 1, 5), 39-40, 41 (pars 2-5), 42 (pars 1-14, 19-38, 41-43, 56-57, 64-81, 94, 121, 129-130), 43 (pars 1-5, 8, 11, 22-24), 44 (pars 1-4), 45-47 [English version of 46-47; translation of Latin version optional], and "A Review and Conclusion." [approx 132 pages total]

11 (Oct 19). Hobbes Seminar

[First paper due 4pm Friday Oct 23]

John Locke

12-13 (Oct 21, 26). *Second Treatise of Government*

[Locke paper proposal due beginning of class 15, M Nov 2]

14-15 (Oct 28, Nov 2). "Letter Concerning Toleration" and other essays

16 (Nov 4). Locke Seminar

[Second paper due 4pm Friday Nov 13]

J.-J. Rousseau

17-20 (Nov 9, 11, 16, 18). *Early Writings*:

Discourse on the Sciences & Arts, plus replies to critics (including the preface to *narcissus*)
Discourse on Inequality (including the notes, except notes 3, 5, 7, 8, 10)
Essay on the Origin of Languages

21-23 (Nov 23, 25, 30). *Social Contract*

24 (Dec 2). Rousseau seminar

25 (Dec 4). Review session

REQUIREMENTS AND COURSE POLICIES

DISTRIBUTION OF MARKS:

2 Paper Proposals	3% each
2 Papers (1900-2200 words each)	28% each
Final Exam	29%
In-class Participation:	9%

You must pass each of the six portions of the class to pass the class as a whole.

In the event of extraordinary circumstances beyond the University's control, the content and/or evaluation scheme in this course is subject to change.

STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

Paper Proposals:

Your paper topics must be approved by me beforehand. To acquire approval, you must hand in a paper proposal of 350-500 words by the proposal due date. The proposal must indicate (1) your overriding *thesis*, (2) what your main *arguments* supporting your thesis are, and (3) what objections you think you will consider. I will then inform you whether your proposal is approved.

Any paper submitted without an approved paper proposal will lose six letter grades (i.e., from A to C, A- to C-, B+ to D+, etc.)

Paper Assignments

In accord with McGill University's Charter of Students' Rights, students in this course have the right to submit in English or in French any written work that is to be graded.

Your papers must have:

1. an explicit thesis
2. explicit arguments in support of your thesis
3. good explicit objections to your thesis and/or arguments; you must of course deal with these objections and show that they do not undermine your thesis

For very basic guidance on how to write a good political theory paper, see my "Tips" sheet. That sheet is for an introductory political theory class, not for an upper level course, so I certainly don't expect you to follow the advice there mechanically, but it may help you organize your thoughts.

All papers must be in hardcopy, double-spaced, at least 11-point font, proper reference citation, with no separate title page but your title, name, TA name, and final word count (including footnotes) placed at the top of your first page. If you are using notes, use numbered footnotes (not endnotes, and Arabic not Roman numerals). I do not care which reference citation system you use, as long as you are consistent and complete. (You may wish to use the Modern Language Association (MLA) system.) Papers that fail to meet these criteria will be penalized by dropping to the next possible letter grade (e.g., from A to A-). Submissions by email will not be accepted unless arrangements have been made beforehand.

Your approved paper proposal must be attached to the end of your paper.

On the word count: you need to observe the word count. If you find yourself going over the word limit, go back and edit, trying to cut out every single sentence or word that is not absolutely necessary to make your point and to defend your thesis. At each point in the paper, you should honestly be able to answer “yes” to the question: is this bit here really necessary for the defence of my thesis? You will not be penalized if you go over the word limit only if it is clear to the reader that the extra length was crucial to your argument and so warranted. Otherwise, cut.

Late Work

Papers and proposals must be completed on time. Late work will be penalized by dropping each day (including Saturday and Sunday) by one third of a grade (i.e., from A+ to A to A- to B+ etc.), unless you have secured explicit permission in advance to turn in your paper late. Late make-up essays will not be accepted.

Be proactive. If there are any foreseeable problems, come talk to me early, rather than waiting until after the fact. I will not grant extensions a couple of days before the due date.

Mobile Computing or Communications Devices

To facilitate the realization of course objectives, this course is organized as a manual note-taking lecture course. Mobile computing or communications devices (including computers, recording devices, phones, iPads, or iPods) are not permitted to be used or displayed in class (unless a student has received explicit permission from the instructor). If you bring such devices to class, they must be off and out of view.

There are three basic reasons for why this course is structured as a manual noted-taking course:¹

1. There is increasing evidence that mobile computing and other devices pose a significant distraction for both users and fellow students during class, inhibiting the ability to focus on and digest classroom material.
2. There is increasing evidence linking the use of such devices in class to poorer overall course performance.
3. Taking notes by hand is generally slower than typing into a computer. While it may be possible to transcribe a lecture almost verbatim when typing, this is impossible by hand. To take effective notes manually, one must simultaneously digest and synthesize the main points of a lecture. Not only is digesting and synthesizing on the spot an important skill in its own right (the development of which is an objective of this course), the process can itself play a crucial role in learning the material.

¹ For evidence of the first two points, see, for example, C.B. Fried, “In-class Laptop Use and Its Effects on Student Learning,” *Computers & Education* 50.3 (2008): 906-914, available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2006.09.006> ; F. Sana, T. Weston, and N. J. Cepeda, “Laptop Multitasking Hinders Classroom Learning for Both Users and Nearby Peers,” *Computers & Education* 62 (2013): 24-31, available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.10.003>. For further discussion, see also Josh Fischman, “Students Stop Surfing After Being Shown How In-Class Laptop Use Lowers Test Scores,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 16, 2009), available at <http://chronicle.com/blogPost/Students-Stop-Surfing-After/4576> . For a more general discussion of the issue of computers in the classroom, see the interesting article by Laura Mortkowitz, “More colleges, professors shutting down laptops and other digital distractions,” *The Washington Post* (April 25, 2010), available at: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/24/AR2010042402830.html>

Exceptions: Explicit permission for the use of a computer may be granted by the professor in the case of a justifiable reason. Speak to me directly about this.

Participation: Readings & Talking Points:

Since this is a lecture/discussion course, it is essential that readings be completed before class, and that everyone participate actively in class discussions. Besides reading each assigned text, you are expected to prepare three sets of talking points on *each* assigned text for class:

1. be prepared to state and explain the key *concepts* used by the author
2. be prepared to state the main thesis (in the case of articles or excerpts) or main theses (in the case of a longer assignment such as a book) in two or three concise sentences
3. be prepared to give your own evaluation of the persuasiveness of the main thesis/theses

You are *not* expected to hand in your talking points in writing; you *are* expected to be able to speak about them orally in class.

Attendance

You get two free absences, no questions asked. Use them wisely.

(Please note that if you are absent from the first class, you are absent from the first class.)

For each class you are counted absent after the second, you will be required to write one 1000 word **make-up essay**, *due at the beginning the next class*, on the material from the missed class. Each time that you fail to hand in the make-up essay at the next class, or each time your make-up essay is of below B level quality, your final course mark will drop down by one third of a grade (i.e., from A to A- to B+ etc.), unless you have made arrangements with me beforehand. This is all your responsibility; I will not be chasing you down for make-up papers.

The **ONLY** exception to this is if you have a note from a doctor indicating you had a communicable disease. Please do not attend class if you have symptoms of swine flu etc.

Make-up essays are not “punishments” for missing class: you are adults and what you do with your time is really none of the professor’s business, and you will no doubt sometimes have extremely valid reasons for not coming to class. But it is the professor’s business to ensure a successful course, and this depends on all of us being on the same page. The purpose of the make-up essay requirement is to provide you the opportunity to digest the material for the class you missed. Our discussions in subsequent classes will build on our previous classes; it is absolutely imperative for a successful course that everyone be on the same page.

Academic Integrity

McGill university values academic integrity. Therefore all students must understand the meaning and consequences of cheating, plagiarism and other academic offences under the code of student conduct and disciplinary procedures. (See www.mcgill.ca/integrity for more information.)

MARKING CRITERIA

Papers will be marked according to the following criteria:

1. analytical rigour (logic, precision, clarity of argument, consideration of counterarguments, etc.)
2. originality / creativity

3. essay mechanics (structure of essay clear and logical, clear thesis, etc)
4. sentence mechanics (quality of prose, grammar, spelling, etc.)
5. scholarship (accurate representation of author's cited, other works engaged with when appropriate, quality of research if a research paper, etc)
6. miscellaneous (proper citation of sources, meets purposes of assignment, etc)

Each paper will be returned with a grade corresponding to each of these 5 or 6 items, in addition to your overall paper grade. Please note that (with the exception noted in the next paragraph) these 5 or 6 itemized grades are purely meant to provide you with feedback, so that you have an idea of what areas require improvement in future work. Your final grade is NOT an average of these itemized grades.

However, an F on any one of the six criteria will result in an F on the written assignment as a whole. In particular, a minimum level of originality (criterion 2) and knowing when and how to provide proper references to works that you have used in crafting your essay (criterion 6) are substantive requirements for all written assignments, without which the maximum grade is an F.

Explanation of Grades

Grades for papers will range from F to A+. Since I do not believe in grade inflation, and since I use the whole range of grades, to help you interpret your performance in the course, I provide here a very rough idea of what grades in the C to A ranges mean. A grade in the **C** range indicates some basic problems that require immediate attention and perhaps some pedagogic help. I take a **B-** to be a below average grade which suggests some problem that needs attention. A **B** reflects average work; it is a respectable though perhaps unhappy grade. It indicates a need for improvement in future work. Usually there are no major errors, and there is a good, above-average comprehension of the material – though there may be problems of written expression, or of precision, or the work amounts to a regurgitation of texts or class discussion, etc. I consider a **B+** to be a very good grade reflecting above-average and promising work. General qualities usually include an excellent comprehension of the material, excellent organization of paper, excellent written expression, no major errors, meeting all basic requirements of assignment, attaining a basic level of analytical rigour, and going beyond a mere regurgitation of texts and class work. Moving into the A-range requires not just comprehending the material and presenting it well, but a critical engagement with the material that captures its subtleties and displays some spark of creative originality and/or superior analytical rigour. (All of this means that an excellent paper that is also excellent because it was a “safe” paper to write will probably end up with a B+. And, in fact, sometimes, depending on where you are at with the material, that is exactly the kind of paper you need to write.) An **A-** is an excellent grade reflecting a paper that is almost flawless in the basic requirements (excellent comprehension of material, organization of paper, written expression, etc.); there is also a critical engagement that captures the complexities and subtleties of the material, and that displays some combination of superior analytical rigour and/or creative original insight. A grade of **A** reflects a top-notch work that is flawless in the basic requirements and that reflects an outstanding comprehension of the material in all its complexities and subtleties and displays a combination of superior analytical rigour and creative original insight. The writer had likely set themselves up with an intellectually challenging project (which of course sometimes carries with it some risk) and was able to pull it off. The very rare **A+** is similar; the plus comes from the fact that the reader was saying “wow!” while reading your paper.

What Grades are Not

Although it takes intelligence to write good papers, at the end of the day grades are NOT an evaluation of your intelligence. And grades are certainly not an indicator for how much the

professor or TA likes you or how smart he or she thinks you are. To write well, you have to take risks, and often those risks will not pay off. If you do poorly on your paper, remember that many very smart people write papers receiving poor grades. Sometimes it's simply because you have not learned the relevant skills yet. Sometimes it is a matter of sheer luck (you got unlucky and picked a topic or line of argument that turned out to be a dead-end, and you had no way of knowing in advance!) University is an opportunity for you to take risks from which you can learn.

Tips for Writing an Essay for your Intro Political Theory Class with Arash Abizadeh

1. Know the difference between a thesis, an argument, and the premises of an argument. A thesis is a claim that you wish to defend in your essay. An argument is what you say in order to defend the thesis; it provides reasons in support of your thesis. Premises are claims that are used in your argument.

For example, one of the key theses in Wolff's book is that there can exist no legitimate authority (except for unanimous direct democracy). An argument he gives for this thesis is the following:

- 1 (premise). Authority is legitimate only if it is compatible with the autonomy of those over whom it is exercised.
- 2 (premise). Autonomy is incompatible with being subject to authority.
- Therefore:
- 3 (conclusion). No authority can be legitimate.

Steps 1 through 3 all together comprise the argument for the conclusion 3. The conclusion 3 is the thesis Wolff wishes to defend. 1 and 2 are premises in the argument for his thesis.

2. State your thesis clearly at the beginning of your paper. The claim that you are going to defend in your paper should be clear to your reader at the very outset. You don't need to say, "I will defend the claim that XYZ". But you do need to state XYZ clearly. Your thesis is your view, the claim you want to defend. You need to take a position on the question you are addressing and state it clearly. "This paper explores issues related to..." is not a thesis.

3. Provide arguments for your thesis. Once you have decided on your thesis, you must defend it with arguments. How many arguments you provide will depend on how much space you have. But once you state your thesis, the next thing your reader expects is an argument for it.

4. Know what it means to critically evaluate an argument. Sometimes your thesis is about other persons' claims or arguments. For example, your thesis might be that Creon's arguments for the thesis that an individual has a duty to obey the law are better or stronger than Socrates's arguments for the thesis that an individual has a duty to obey the law. If that's your thesis, then you need to state clearly your thesis, state Creon's thesis and argument(s) for it, state Socrates's thesis and argument(s) for it, and then critically evaluate the arguments.

To critically evaluate an argument is to (a) determine whether the premises of the argument are true and (b) determine whether the conclusion follows logically from the premises.

Consider the following argument for the thesis that Socrates is a man.

- 1. Socrates is a philosopher.
- 2. All philosophers are monkeys.
- Therefore:
- 3. Socrates is a man.

This is an invalid argument: the conclusion does not follow logically from the premises. If 1 and 2 were true, then Socrates would be a monkey, not a man. Even if the conclusion 3 is true, this is not a good argument for it. Someone who was critically evaluating the argument could say "The argument is illogical."

Now consider a different argument for the thesis that Socrates is a man.

- 1. Socrates is a philosopher.
- 2. All philosophers are men.
- Therefore:
- 3. Socrates is a man.

This is a logically valid argument. If 1 and 2 are true, then 3 must be true too. But someone critically evaluating this argument could now dispute the truth of its premises. Someone might say, for example, that premise 2 is false, because some philosophers are women. If premise 2 is false, then the argument for the conclusion/thesis is not a good one. The thesis may still be true, but it has not been adequately defended.

In general, then, if you want to critically evaluate an argument for a thesis, you must state the thesis, state the argument, and then ask two questions: (a) does the conclusion follow logically from the premises? and (b) are the premises true?

5. Make sure the arguments for your thesis are good or strong arguments. This means that someone who critically evaluates your argument would not find obvious problems with it. (See 4 above).

6. Make sure your thesis is an interesting thesis. Let's say you read the *Apology* and came up with the thesis "Socrates is a man." I am very certain you will be able to provide very good arguments for this thesis, but it is a rather uninteresting thesis. The reason why it is uninteresting is that it is difficult to see what the counterarguments to your thesis would be. If you can't think of any good, strong counterarguments to your thesis or any objections to your own argument, *then it's not a thesis worth writing a paper about.*

7. In your paper, you must seriously consider (a) counterarguments to your thesis or (b) objections to your argument. This is what makes the difference between an ok paper and a good paper. The stronger the counterarguments or objections that you consider and refute, the stronger your own position. A weak counterargument or objection against your own thesis or argument will leave your reader wondering why you even bothered considering it. If you cannot think of any counterarguments or objections, pick a different thesis.

8. Use your limited space wisely. Any argument for a thesis relies on premises. In political theory (or political philosophy), some premises will be normative and some empirical/descriptive. Now, let's say that there is a claim that you want to defend in your essay – in other words, your paper's thesis. For a political theory paper, you must defend your thesis by providing an argument. The problem with providing an argument for your thesis is that the premises you use in your argument are *themselves* claims with which someone may or may not agree. A premise in one argument can always become the thesis of another argument. So, for example, recall Wolff's argument:

1 (premise). Authority is legitimate only if it is compatible with the autonomy of those over whom it is exercised.

2 (premise). Autonomy is incompatible with being subject to authority.

Therefore:

3 (conclusion). No authority can be legitimate.

If someone disagreed with premise 1, and provided a good argument for why it is false, Wolff would be forced to provide an argument for premise 1. But then the premise of the argument above would become the thesis of another argument.

This means that the potential length of your paper is infinity. Since you have word limits, you need to make some choices. For example, you may wish to provide an argument with premises that are relatively uncontroversial. Or if you employ a controversial premise, then you may want to briefly defend the premise too (i.e., provide an argument for it). But at some point you have to stop defending yourself and hope that the premises you use will carry your reader. There is no formula here; you have to exercise your own judgement.

9. Again, use your limited space wisely. Since you only have limited space to state your thesis, provide your arguments, and consider counterarguments or objections, you can't waste any words. Don't say anything that is not necessary to clarify or defend your thesis. Don't start off your essay, for example, with grandiose pronouncements about how important the question is or how many great thinkers have for

centuries and millennia thought about it. This is not a history class, so it's very unlikely that such claims would matter one way or the other to your thesis. Every sentence counts: with each paragraph, and with each sentence in each paragraph, ask yourself: why am I telling my reader this? If you can honestly say "because saying this is necessary for defending my thesis," leave it in. If not, think again.

10. Use the key concepts in your essay in a clear, precise, and consistent fashion. Key concepts in this course, for example, might be obligation, right, authority, etc. When you use a fancy word, make sure its meaning is clear to you and to your reader. For every word you use in your essay, be sure that you can define it. If you can't, either figure out what it means, or don't use it. If the meaning of the word is clear to you, but it's a word used in different ways by different people, then define it for your reader so that it's clear what you mean by it. (Words like "objective," for example.)

11. Spelling, grammar, and style count. For grammar, pay special attention to a common pitfall. You already know that nouns and verbs must agree with each other (so that if it's a plural noun, then you need a plural verb: not "they talks"). But don't forget that pronouns must also agree. This is ungrammatical: "One must always retain the right to make his own judgements." This is also ungrammatical: "One must always retain the right to make their own judgements." If your pronoun is "one" in the first part, it should be "one" in the next part. Thus: "One must always retain the right to make one's own judgements." On the one hand, for a similar reason, this is considered by many to be ungrammatical: "A person must never give up their own freedom." "Person" is singular, "their" is plural. The pronoun that goes with "person" should be third-person singular, i.e., either "she" or "he." On the other hand, it is good to avoid gender-specific language when gender is irrelevant to the point. To do this, you can often substitute the plural throughout: "Persons must never give up their own freedom."

For style, try your best to avoid the passive voice ("It has been argued that..."), in favour of the active voice ("Socrates argued that" or "I argue that..."). (It is perfectly OK to use the word "I" or "my" in your essays, especially since you will often need to assert *your* thesis ; you just don't want to distract your reader's attention from the matter at hand by unnecessarily and gratuitously inserting yourself into your essay.)

12. Take a look at the marking criteria outlined on the syllabus.

Addendum for your Upper Level Political Theory Class

For an advanced political theory class there are, broadly speaking, two kinds of papers you might choose from: papers that advance a philosophical thesis, and papers that advance an exegetical thesis. (The guide above assumes we are dealing with the first kind.) A philosophical thesis advances a substantive claim on some philosophical question: for example, that democracy is the best form of government, that Locke is wrong to think that there is a right to revolution, that tacit consent does not ground any political obligations, that there is a human right to subsistence, etc. An exegetical thesis, by contrast, advances a claim of interpretation about a particular text, for example, that Hobbes's theory of the social contract actually commits him to freedom of conscience, that Hobbes is a proto-liberal, that Locke would defend the government's right to redistribute wealth, that Rousseau is an enemy of participatory democracy, etc. Of course these two kinds of paper can overlap, but they are in principle distinct.

If you choose a substantive philosophical thesis, you can still engage texts in the history of political thought, by using these texts as a source of arguments, theses, etc., with which you may agree or disagree.

If you choose an exegetical thesis, you will need to pick a thesis about which there is some plausible controversy. For example, a paper defending the thesis that Hobbes is a social contract theorist is not very interesting at all. (The contrary thesis would of course be very interesting, but I'm not sure how you could possibly defend it.) A good source for exegetical (or interpretive) disagreement is obviously the secondary literature, and of course you are welcome to use it to deepen your understanding of a text. But you should always be sure that your paper remains a paper *about* the primary text, not the secondary

literature. You should never give a secondary piece of literature as a reference to show that Hobbes, Rousseau, etc. believe X. You need to give evidence from the primary text for that. Your reference to the secondary literature only serves as evidence for what such-and-such interpreter of the primary text believes.