

the Most High, whose thoughts are not as man's thoughts but Jehovah is still his God, and the Christ is his Saviour.

Almost two hundred years after the publication of Hobbes' writings, a Utilitarian philosopher wrote as follows :—

"The reason for which government exists is, that one man, if stronger than another, will take from him whatever that other possesses, and he desires. But if one man will do this, so will several, and if powers are put into the hands of a comparatively small number, called an aristocracy, powers which make them stronger than the rest of the community, they will take from the rest of the community as much as they please of the objects of desire. They will thus defeat the very end for which government was instituted. The unsuitness, therefore, of an aristocracy to be intrusted with the powers of government, rests on demonstration." (Mill's *Essay on Government*, quoted by Macaulay.)

It is impossible to read this without being shocked with its complete accord with the teaching of Hobbes. "Might is right," is the sense of the natural morality of mankind, not of mankind whose original nature has become diseased by "The Fall," for Mr. Mill believed not in "The Fall," but man as he was, as he is, as apparently he ever will be ; the same man whom a later generation with M. Comte at its head, bids us fall down and worship.

Out of this natural state of warfare sprung the Commonwealth. This is the next step Hobbes takes. The Commonwealth does not, however, spring from a general desire for the common weal, but is merely the development of the love of self-preservation. It was manifest that the race could not exist if the principle of hate were to be ever active. From the Commonwealth spring laws, and from laws spring the conceptions of right which is merely the sense of power, and of duty which is but the necessity of obedience.

There is in this unfolding of Hobbes' doctrine logical consistency, so rigid and unbending, that we feel hatred of our race, hatred of ourselves springing up within us, as we contemplate the possibility of its truth. We learn that our conscience whose sting we have learned to love is a false witness, that the moral struggle which St. Paul describes, and which we by experience recognize as our own, is but a delusion, for there is neither good nor evil. Pity and sympathy also, are but forms of selfishness. We do but imagine we are sorry for our fellow men, but in reality it is not so. "Pity," says Hobbes, "is imagination or fiction of future calamity to ourselves, proceeding from the sense of another man's calamity." — (Whewell, *Lectures on Moral Philosophy*.) Depressing as this must be to anyone who with sincerity cries daily "Our Father," it is yet important, for Hobbes is the first of the modern Utilitarians, and we may add—the worst. Utilitarianism as we shall see has many strong points and an underlying truth, but in its barest form it is but

selfishness, and as we have seen, Mr. James Mill's idea of man was not much if any nobler than Hobbes'.

It is easily perceived how the speculations of Locke would lead to strengthen and systematize this theory of Hobbes. The repulsiveness of the theory was softened down, but not fundamentally changed. The doctrine that the pleasant is good and the unpleasant is evil, is the doctrine which under different names has prevailed down to our own times. It even found one of its doughtiest champions in the Church of England, viz., Paley. Its adherents at present declare that an action is right which tends to produce the greatest happiness of the greatest number. The promulgation of this doctrine which has a truly noble ring about it, has given a new lease of life to the theory. For it soon became manifest that to declare that action right which produced pleasure, was to proclaim the perfection of absolute egoism. So then the individual search after pleasure is not taught by any school to-day, but the general principle of self-denial, if thereby the general happiness of the community may be enhanced. But even so lofty a doctrine as this undoubtedly is, is far from complete. It can give no really satisfactory answer to the inevitable question, "Why must I seek the good of the greatest number, and not follow my own personal bent?" It has no Divinity who exercises rightful authority, and claims right action, because man is made in his own image, and must, therefore, conform to the law of the Divine Being. It tells us not that that same God is our Heavenly Father, and that in the light of that revelation we know that men are linked together by the ties of brotherhood, and that, *therefore*, our duty towards our neighbor is to love him as ourself.

Actions again, under the Utilitarian theory, are not right in themselves, or wrong in themselves, but only in their consequences, and man rightly feels his inability to tell what the last consequences of an action may be. Is there no standard by which I may know whether this that I am about to do is good in itself? Is there no such thing as truth to which I may conform all my utterances and so be able to say, "I know not what the consequences of what I speak may be, but I know they cannot be bad because they are true, and truth is good in itself?" These are questions which Utilitarianism is bound to leave unanswered, and hence we must look to some other theory which in opposing itself to it, shall ultimately be found to claim it as its supplement. For there is this great truth in Utilitarianism, the right action must in its last consequences produce happiness, because God is love, but apart from the belief in God such as Revelation declares Him, there is no ground for this assertion, though to the Christian it appears self-evident.

The first promulgation of the doctrine of Utility could not but be attended with evil results. It was to be expected that its influence would be disastrous upon men who from natural depravity would eagerly adopt