

197 2111 2002

THE

✓
PRINCETON
REVIEW.

By *Whom*, all things; for *Whom*, all things.

FIFTY-FIFTH YEAR.

JULY—DECEMBER.

NEW YORK

1879.

HERBERT SPENCER'S "DATA OF ETHICS."

HERBERT SPENCER commands our respect by his terrible earnestness. He has an end to live for and he lives for it. For it he has given up professional pursuits and profits (he was an engineer), and for many years immediate fame and popularity. For at least thirty years a grand system of speculative physics, founded on the recent discoveries in biology, has been developing in his brain, and he must unfold it and give it forth in spite of obstacles, with or without encouragement from surroundings in the world. He is to a large extent the author, and is certainly the organizer, and the very embodiment, personification, and expression of development; and he evolves it in the confidence that it, as the fittest, will survive, and as a force will persist till it brings all the environments into accord with it. It must be towards forty years since he began his literary work in articles chiefly in the dissenting organs of Britain, such as the *Nonconformist* and *British Quarterly*, which early discovered his talents; and since 1850 he has been combining his views into a system in a series of elaborate volumes, which will in the end amount to ten, of which seven have been published entire and the others in part.

All his previous speculations are regarded by him as leading toward the end of finding "for the principles of right and wrong a scientific basis." I am sorry to find him obliged to say that he has intimations that "health may permanently fail even if life does not end;" so he anticipates the proper evolution of his scheme and publishes the work before us, "Data of Ethics," instead of others which should have come before it in logical order, that the world may know, even though he should be laid aside from labor, what has all along been his end, and to which

all the preceding parts are subsidiary. I am happy to find that later accounts speak more favorably of his health, and encourage us in hoping that he may live to finish his structure, of which we will be better able to judge when we see it standing before us complete.

We have now presented to us the basis of his ethics. Bacon has shown that science is to be tried by (not valued for) its fruits; and the English-speaking race have a keen disposition to inquire of every theory what is its moral tendency. It was at this point that the weakness of Locke's theory of the origin of our ideas, which he derived from sensation and reflection, was first detected, and this by the grandson of his patron, Lord Shaftesbury, who showed that our ideas of moral good cannot thus be drawn. Many inclined to follow so far Spencer's development, as containing (as Locke's theory of the origin of ideas did) much truth, are anxious to know what morality it has left us. Thinking men see that if development cannot meet the requirements of ethics, which are quite as valid and certain as heredity or any other laws of physiology, evolutionists will have to modify their theory, and allow that, while it can do much, it cannot accomplish everything, and that it leaves many important facts to be explained by other, and I may add higher, laws.

Our author is sensitively aware that there is great danger in a period of transition from an old faith to a new one. "Few things can happen more disastrous than the decay and death of a regulative system no longer fit before another and fitter regulative system has grown up to replace it." He assumes and asserts, without deigning to give any proof, that "moral injunctions are losing the authority given them by their supposed sacred origin." This is no doubt true of the school of which Mr. Spencer is the head, and of the *set* associated with him in London, and of his correspondents in various countries. But it may be doubted whether it is true of men in general, even educated men, or of Americans in particular, who I believe have as firm a faith in a morality prompted by an inward power and sanctioned by a Divine Power as they ever had, and are not likely to part with it readily. But there is a danger—not, it may be, to our old men whose beliefs and habits are formed, but to the youth in our colleges, and especially in our scientific schools

and reading only evolutionary books and magazines, and who are told that all things proceed from evolution, which needs no God to guide it—that in throwing off their religion they also throw off their morality, which has been so intimately joined with it. Mr. Spencer will help them to part with their religion, which he consigns to a region unknown and unknowable, which has attractions to nobody; but he would not have them part with their morality. He would not have them part with their religion too speedily; but if positive religion, that is religion with a God, be found untrue, as he tells them, then intelligent youths cannot any longer believe in it, and must by a necessity of their nature part with it, whether evil follows or not. Mr. Spencer is evidently alarmed about this transition period when the old has lost authority and there is no one to take the place of the deposed king. So he hastens, ere he is rendered unfit for the task, to give a new and scientific basis to morality, and this independent of God and of any inward law, both of which have been set aside. I have now to examine this new ethical theory, I trust candidly and impartially, and this, in the first instance, not upon its supposed tendency, which may be looked at subsequently, but upon the evidence advanced in its behalf.

It is now many years ago, and at a time when Mr. Spencer was not appreciated as he now is, I had occasion to give my estimate of him ("Intuitions of the Mind," Part III., b. i., § 8): "His bold generalizations are always instructive, and some of them may in the end be established as the profoundest laws of the knowable universe." I find that the American publishers of his works have been using this testimony of mine in their advertisements, and I have no objections that they continue to do so. But it is proper to state that I represented Mr. Spencer as a Titan making war against the gods that rule in Olympus, to which he seeks to rise not by slow and gradual steps, but by heaping Pelion on Pindos. His system of science and philosophy is a vast structure, professedly and really, with broad if not deep foundations in natural, especially biological, science, and towering into jurisprudence and ethics. This is its excellence, this is its defect.

His method is deductive rather than inductive. He sets out

with an hypothesis—that of development—containing much truth, but it may be guilty of some omissions and requiring to be limited on all sides. He then gathers facts to verify his hypothesis, and sets them forth in order. He examines these facts by the old Greek methods of analysis and synthesis, very sharp instruments, but somewhat perilous because they are so sharp. A great part of his work is described by him as synthetic, the synthesis being facts cut, joined, compressed, and compacted by his own comprehensive mind. His method is not just that enjoined by Bacon, who recommends us not to anticipate but follow nature, to let the facts suggest the laws (axioms, he calls them), and not to neglect noticing the apparent exceptions, which are to be entertained as Abraham entertained the strangers who turned out unawares to be angels. "We shall have good hope of the sciences," he says, "when by a true ladder and steps not broken or gaping we rise from particulars to minor axioms, and thence to middle axioms, rising higher and higher, and thence to the highest of all." Bacon shrewdly remarks that "a cripple on the right road will beat a racer on the wrong," adding language which might at times be applied to Spencer: "This is farther evident that he who is not on the right road will go the farther wrong the greater his fleetness and ability." In his eagerness of thought, our author is not very much inclined to submit to this slow but sure procedure. Possessed of great speculative ability, he is apt to leap from mountain-top to mountain-top without even looking upon the plains or examining the valleys below, in which, after all, are to be found the connections of these lofty ranges which he is so fond of tracing. We may have occasion to call attention to some of these lower facts, obvious to the common observer, but which he has overlooked. He feels that he has a special aptitude to interpret facts. Give him facts and he will explain them. Others, however, without denying his facts, will feel themselves justified in interpreting them otherwise.

At this present time Spencer occupies much the same place among the English-speaking peoples as Hegel did among the pan-Germanics an age ago. Both are characterized by speculative abilities of the very highest order. Both would bring all nature, mind and matter, under their all-embracing systems.

which are as wide as the horizon and as undefined. Both have their minds so filled with their own grand views that they are not inclined to look at the views taken by others, or at the facts which seem inconsistent with their generalizations. Both have had mighty influence over young men bent on having everything explained, by the dogmatism of their assertions and the comprehensiveness of their theories, which seem to explain what cannot otherwise be accounted for. In other respects they widely differ. Hegel had an extensive, though by no means an accurate, acquaintance with the philosophies of ancient Greece and modern Germany; but when he criticised Sir Isaac Newton's discoveries, he simply made himself ridiculous. Spencer, on the other hand, has a large knowledge of the late discoveries which are bringing organisms under the dominion of law—more, however, as an amateur than a practical experimenter; but has not, so it appears to me, studied the actings of the human mind as revealed to consciousness. His apprehension of these and his account of them are commonly given under conceptions and in language derived from matter and motion. Hegel's sun has now set, leaving behind only the glow of a mighty reputation. I believe that you could now count all the thoroughgoing Hegelians in Germany on your ten fingers, and all the eminent Hegelians out of Germany, including those in Naples, Oxford, Glasgow, and St. Louis, on your ten toes. Some do not scruple to call him a pretender and a charlatan. Spencer's sun is now at its zenith. What may be the estimate of his philosophy at the end of this century I will not take upon myself to predict. As embracing so many established facts, I believe that there is much in his system which will abide, and I adhere to the opinion that "his bold generalizations are always instructive, and that some of them may, in the end, be established as the profoundest laws of the knowable universe." It is one of the offices of thinking men in this age carefully to examine the structure which he is rearing, and while they admire its massive walls they may come to discover rents in it, indicating an unsettled and unsettling foundation.

His ethics is professedly an evolution from his development theory. It will be necessary, therefore, to begin with taking a brief survey of the present state of this question. The word

“development” has become one of the most universally employed, and one of the vaguest terms of our language. We hear not only of the development of plants and animals, but of what is considerably different, the development of worlds out of star-dust. Both applications may be legitimate, but taken to embrace both processes, all that the term denotes is that both worlds and animated beings come out of previously-existing materials. We read now of the development of science, of the development of literature, of the development of art, and of the development of trade and commerce. I believe we will soon hear of the development of the tin trade and the oil trade, and I suppose also of our manufactured articles, of our temples, our ships, our houses, our shirts and shoes and toys. The like vagueness attaches to the term “evolution.” The looseness of the language tempts confused thinkers to attribute anything and everything to development and evolution. Now the one common truth involved in the language is that one thing comes out of another, and that all things come out of pre-existing materials. It implies, what has been known for ages, the universal reign of causation. I have said in an earlier number of this REVIEW that “since Mr. J. S. Mill showed that there are always two agents in causes, and especially since the discovery of the conservation of energy, or of the *persistence* of energy as Spencer calls it, the whole subject of causation (objective) needs to be carefully reviewed by some one combining scientific knowledge with philosophic comprehension.” But it is not necessary for our present purpose to enter farther into this tempting subject. I have said this much simply to show that many are glibly using the phrases development and causation without knowing precisely what is contained in them.

Confining the phrase to the production of plants and animals, it is clear that development or evolution is not a single agent, property, or cause. It implies a combination of a number of forces, mechanical, chemical, electric, magnetic, vital as they used to be called, cosmic as they are now called, the panzoism of Spencer and the physiological units of Darwin; in fact, so many, so varied and complicated, that science at its present stage cannot specify them or determine their nature. When we describe a plant or animal as developed, we mean that it comes from a

combination—I believe a prearranged and adjusted combination—of forces, which cannot as yet be untwined and exposed separately to the view. The grand business of science in the age to which we have now come is not to satisfy itself with loose general processes, but to determine the exact nature of the powers involved in heredity and the evolution of plants and animals. This will clear the way for settling the question of what development can do and what it cannot do.

No one has shown more clearly and conclusively than Mr. Spencer that animate nature has risen from a lower to a higher state. But neither he nor any one else has been able to specify the causes by which this has been produced. If it is said to be by heredity, this is only avoiding the question; for we ask, What are the causes acting in heredity which ever improve the races, which make the streams rise higher than the fountains?

The vulgar account of development is that it starts with atoms and rises to molecules, and masses, and plants, and animals with sensation, and thence to higher and higher intelligences; and now it is supposed to moral agents. Mr. Wallace, the co-discoverer with Darwin of the doctrine of natural selection, has been obliged in a late paper to refer this rise in a crude manner to spiritual agency. For this he has been exposed to ridicule by his school, perhaps justly. But his desire is somehow to fill the gap. Mr. Spencer, marching on with his seven-leagued boots, can step over these chasms without noticing them. Any one may see some of these fallen stitches (fa'en steeks, as Hugh Miller used to call them) in the fabric. The latest science has not been able to find that the inanimate can produce the animate, that there can be a *vivum* without an *ovum* or some kind of protoplasm. Huxley and Tyndall have honestly avowed this; Spencer, so far as I know, has uttered no sound on the subject.

Other chasms lie gaping before us. Can the un sentient produce the sentient? Can the unconscious develop the conscious? Spencer's attempt to explain the origin of consciousness in his "Principles of Psychology" is about the greatest philosophic abortion of our day. He first describes the nervous system in a very elaborate manner. Then he brings in consciousness in the stealthiest manner, without even attempting to explain how

this mental quality can arise out of the soft pulpy substance, the nerves. He speaks of separate impressions received by the senses, and of the need of some centre of communication, "so that as the external phenomena become greater in number and more complicated in kind the variety and rapidity of the changes to which the common centre of communication is subject must increase—there result an unbroken series of these changes—there must arise a consciousness" (vol. ii. p. 403). *There must arise a consciousness!!* From changes and a centre which has no consciousness!! He does not even acknowledge the difficulty, apparently does not see it in the eagerness of his march. He fails to notice the like difficulty as it presents itself in the rise of consciousness into the higher attributes of mind, such as judgment and reasoning, emotion and will. As might be expected, he now in the work before us sees no difficulty in developing morality from accumulated experiences of sensations become hereditary.

Those who would account for the rise of the lower natures into the higher, say the ascidians into the fish, of the fish into the monkey, and the monkey into man, are shut up between the horns of a dilemma if they follow the acknowledged principles of causation. This power to rise from the original molecules up to man was either in the original molecules or it was not. If it was in the molecules, then there must have been in it all the mechanical, the chemical, the cosmic forces; in fact, it must be a power only a little lower than the infinite,—of all of which we have no evidence whatsoever. If the other alternative be taken, and it is supposed that in order to produce the higher qualities and beings new powers have always to be introduced, the question arises, Whence did these powers come? If it be said by constant small increments, it removes the difficulty only in appearance. For the increments could only give what they have, and which they have got from the original powers. In fact, the law of development with heredity is after all merely a wide empirical law. A law, as I understand, does not rise beyond the empirical state and become a rational law till the causes operating have been determined. For the present there might be a truce in the war between religion and science as to development. The religious man believes that all the operations of nature, whether coming

by development or otherwise, are from God. Let both the religionist and the scientist acknowledge that at present we do not know what are the causes which have brought in these higher powers, such as sensation, consciousness, intelligence, that have appeared as the ages advance.

Mr. Spencer calls his work the "Data of Ethics." He does not look on himself, and does not wish others to regard him, as a sceptic; on the contrary, his philosophy demands a large amount of faith. In particular he admits, as all profound men do, certain truths as incapable of being proved, but which must be accepted by all. He started as a speculator when Hamilton and Mansel were the reigning metaphysicians of Britain, and he takes his views of the character and marks of first truths largely from them, modifying but not improving them. "The inconceivableness of its negation is that which shows a cognition to possess the highest rank—is the criterion by which its unsurpassable validity is known." "If its negation is inconceivable, the discovery of this is the discovery that we are obliged to accept it. And a cognition which we are thus obliged to accept is one which we class as having the highest possible certainty."

This criterion of first principles is so far a sound one, and may serve some good purposes. But it is mutilated, and has not been put in the proper form. I cannot give in to the maxim that a man should believe a proposition simply because he cannot conceive or act otherwise. This is a kind of fatalism against which the heart, if not the head is apt to rebel. I hold in opposition to the prevailing agnosticism, founded by Hume and favored without their intending it by Kant and Hamilton, that man can so far know things and the relations of things. He knows self as thinking and feeling. He knows body as extended and resisting his energy. He perceives at once certain relations in things thus known, as, for example, that these two straight lines cannot enclose a space, and that these two things *plus* other two things make four things. He knows all this because he perceives things and what is in things. This gives us a criterion not only of "unsurpassable validity," which "we are obliged to accept," not only of the "highest class" and the "highest possible certainty" *to us*, which is avowedly all that is

done by Spencer's test, which might not hold good or apply in different circumstances; but as we know the thing, a certainty which cannot be set aside in any state of things. The primary mark of primitive truth thus comes to be, not necessity, as Kant maintains and as Spencer, following Hamilton, maintains, but self-evidence: we perceive things to exist and to be what they are by looking at them. Necessity follows from self-evidence, and is the secondary and not the primary criterion of first truths. Universality that is of the conviction follows as a tertiary test, because all men are so constituted as to know so much of things by barely perceiving them. It is most perverse to argue as Spencer does in answering Mill, that the external world exists because we cannot conceive the opposite; whereas the simpler and true statement is that we know the external world as existing, and so cannot conceive it not to exist. I call this "intuition," because it is looking immediately into things. It is not a form imposed on things by the mind out of its own furniture, as Kant maintains, but a perception of things. I perceive objects in space, and in looking at them I perceive and decide that the shortest distance between two points is a straight line.

This may be the most appropriate place for doing what, so far as I know, has never yet been done—that is, narrowly sifting Spencer's famous theory of the formation of what metaphysicians call first or fundamental truths, such as the axioms of Euclid, the principle of universal causation, and moral maxims. From the time of David Hume down to that of Mr. John S. Mill, it was the fashion of the sensational school to account for the formation of these by the principle of association of ideas. We have seen cause and effect associated in our experience from our earliest years, and so when we see an effect we are led irresistibly to look for its usual concomitant. I have done my best to expose this theory, which has now fallen to pieces from its own instability. These principles appear so early that there is not time for their being produced in the mind of the individual. And so Spencer has introduced a new theory which has superseded that of Hume and Mill. It is that these primordial or fundamental principles are the result of all the ancestral experiences which have accumulated from age to age, these experiences beginning, it is supposed, with the ascidian and coming

down to man. This is an hypothesis which supports itself on agencies which are very much unknown. We know nothing of the processes by which the virtue has come down from one individual and one race to another. The mystery of the virtue supposed to descend in apostolic succession is nothing to this. We cannot tell what was the experience laid up by the ascidian and descending down through the fish to the ape and early man. Was it conscious or unconscious in the ascidian? If not, when did it become conscious? What form did it take? It is an hypothesis which it is impossible to refute because it is an hypothesis which cannot spread out its proof. As an hypothesis it does not explain the whole phenomenon. We have in fact no anticipation of mathematical or metaphysical or moral truth among the lower animals.

I admit that heredity may explain so much : it may account for the formation and the action of the nervous system. But some of us deny that nervous action is mental action. I deny that mere nervous action can become moral action. The great body of our scientific men are proclaiming that bodily action and mental action are entirely different. The brain and nerves are not the mind, they are merely the organ of the mind. It is altogether gratuitous to assume that the heredity which can fashion our nervous structure can also form our fundamental laws of knowledge and belief. In an earlier number of this REVIEW (March, 1878), I asserted that it would be difficult to prove that the brain is anything more to the mind than an organ of sensation and locomotion.¹

Supposing that the cerebro-spinal mass is the organ of the mind, it may be able in a great variety of ways to modify mental actions. It may constrain them to go in certain ways, and restrain them in others. The mind may be led to act in a particular manner by the ready concurrence of the nerves. On the other hand, when the organism does not co-operate, the thoughts and feelings may be greatly hindered. In this way a nervous structure may give tendencies which become hereditary. But this does not prove that the primary principles of reason are the product of brain or nervous action.

¹ Prof. Calderwood's recently published work, "The Relations of Mind and Brain," is clear, judicious, and free from hypotheses and fancies.

All this is the more evident when we consider what is the nature of our intuitions. They are of the nature of perceptions, of perceptions of things and the relations of things. We perceive that if two straight lines go on for an inch without coming nearer each other, they will go on forever without doing so; and that from the very nature of a breach of trust, it must be evil. There is no proof whatever that there is any apprehension of such truths or any approximation towards them on the part of the dog, the horse, or the highest of the animals.

Even on the supposition that these cognitions and beliefs and judgments have been generated by the experiences of ancestral races, it might be argued that they are valid, and this on the principles of Spencer. They have all the authority of the lengthened and uniform experience. They can stand his criterion of truth. We cannot conceive that hypocrisy should be good, and so we argue that this truth has "unsurpassable validity," and is of "the highest possible rank." I claim for it another validity. These truths, however generated, have the authority of the God who produced them, whether by development or otherwise. So in this article I feel myself at liberty to appeal to these first truths of our reason, whether speculative or moral.

When I found Spencer calling his work "Data of Ethics," I fondly wished (though I scarcely expected) that he would have exhibited and expounded what we see when we look directly on moral or immoral actions, say on mercy or cruelty. I half expected that, using his own test of necessity or inconceivability, he would show us what "we must accept as true" as to certain voluntary acts, as, for example, that we cannot conceive deceit to be good or benevolence evil. This would have formed a good basis to ethics, and thereon a goodly structure might have been reared. But instead of this he reaches his data by a long process, in which he takes in the conduct of "all living creatures," including the brutes, lower and higher, from the earliest monad up to man.

He opens his work with declaring that moral good is a relation of means and end. I simply put in a caveat here. By our higher moralists virtue is represented as an end rather than a mere means. It is commonly spoken of as consisting in an

affection of the mind, which is good in itself, say love or benevolence, and not a mere means towards something else, say happiness, which is with Mr. Spencer the only good. But let this pass for the present, that we may consider his account of moral good as a means.

"Morality," he says, "has to do with conduct," which he defines as "acts adjusted to ends, or else the adjustment of acts to ends." Conduct is good which accomplishes its end. "Always acts are called good or bad as they are well or ill adjusted to ends." A weapon is good when it inflicts an effective blow or wards off a blow. I have simply to interpose here that according to this view a robber's pistol, or a burglar's key, or a draught of poison, or a forged bank-note is good. There is certainly nothing morally good in the mere adjustment of means to end. We have not yet got a scientific basis to ethics.

"If from lifeless things and actions we pass to living ones, we similarly find that these words, in their current applications, refer to efficient subservience. The goodness and badness of a pointer or a hunter, of a sheep or an ox, ignoring all other attributes of these creatures, refer in the one case to the fitness of their actions for effecting the ends men use them for, and in the other case to the qualities of their flesh as adapting it to support life." Surely we have not yet come to ethics. But he proceeds to show that from this initial adjustment, "having intrinsically no moral character, we pass *by degrees*" (mark the language) "to the most complex adjustments," which are moral.

Looking to sentient life, he shows that it is good or bad according as it does or does not "bring a surplus of agreeable feelings;" that "conduct is good or bad according as its total effects are pleasurable or painful;" and concludes that, "taking into account immediate effects on all persons, the good is universally the pleasurable." By these gradual steps he has led us up to ethics, declaring "that conduct with which morality is not concerned passes into conduct which is moral or immoral by small degrees and in countless ways."

The non-moral conduct is now developed into moral, and we see what his ethical theory is. He does not make moral good an affection or a voluntary act, or even, so far as I can see, a mental operation or state; it is whatever as a means on the

whole promotes pleasure. We are not yet prepared to criticise this doctrine. It is enough for the present to indicate the objections that may be taken to it. I maintain moral good is a mental act or state, and that it implies intention. I admit that pleasure is a good, and that it is to be promoted as an end, but I deny that it is the only good, or even the highest end. In particular I deny that whatever as a means promotes happiness is necessarily a virtue. In order to be morally good it must be intended to promote happiness by an agent. A machine, such as a telescope, or electric telegraph, or a telephone, may greatly increase the resources and the happiness of the race. But surely we do not regard it as a virtue like honesty, and temperance, and righteousness, and self-sacrifice. But instead of pursuing this farther at present, let us notice what he makes of the progression of happiness, in regard to which he has established, as I think, a most important truth.

He is successful in showing that as geological ages have run on there is a constant increase in the general amount of happiness. He cannot, indeed, tell us by his development theory how sensations of pleasure were produced; but having got these, he shows by that theory how they have become greater and greater, by the multiplication of the organs, as the animals become more special and more complex. Then there is the lengthening of the life of living creatures and its extension over wider regions. He thus summarizes:

“We saw that evolution, tending ever towards self-preservation, reaches its limit when individual life is the greatest both in length and breadth; and now we see that, leaving other ends aside, we regard as good the conduct furthering self-preservation, and as bad the conduct tending to self-destruction. It was shown that along with increasing power of maintaining individual life, which evolution brings, there goes increasing power of perpetuating the species by fostering progeny, and that in this direction evolution reaches its limit when the needful number of young, preserved to maturity, are then fit for a life which is complete in fulness and duration; and here it turns out that parental conduct is called good or bad as it approaches or falls short of this ideal result. Lastly, we inferred that the establishment of an associated state both makes possible and requires a form of life, such that life may be completed in each and in her offspring, not only without preventing completion of it in others, but with furtherance of it in others, and we have found above that this is the form of conduct most emphatically termed good. Moreover, just as we

there saw that evolution becomes the highest possible when the conduct achieves the greatest totality of life in self, in offspring, and in fellow-men, so here we see that the conduct called good rises to the conduct conceived as best when it fulfils all three classes of ends at the same time."

I have quoted this passage for *two* purposes: one is to show how he is developing his theory of morals, which I am about to examine; and the other and present purpose, to exhibit the process by which he shows, I think successfully, how the means of happiness have been multiplying and intensifying on our earth as the ages roll on. He unfolds in his best manner the provision (he would not use the word) which has been made for securing this end, and also to prepare the way for the introduction of morality.

PHYSICAL operation tends towards this end. "To-day's wanderings of a fish in search of food, though perhaps showing by their adjustments to catching different kinds of prey at different hours a slightly determined order, are unrelated to the wanderings of yesterday and to-morrow. But the higher animals, and especially man, display more coherent combination of motions; and all tends towards the increase of pleasure. There is produced by the advance a balanced combination of external actions in face of external forces tending to overthrow it, and the advance towards a higher state is an acquirement of ability to maintain the balance for a longer period by the successive additions of organic appliances, which counteract more and more fully the disturbing forces." BIOLOGICAL arrangements have the same tendency. There is a pleasure attached to the healthy exercise of the body thus securing an attention to that exercise, which secures an increase of happiness, and with him what promotes happiness is morality.

PSYCHOLOGICAL laws have the same influence. He gives here an epitome of his psychology, making it very much a department, not of the science of mind, as revealed by consciousness, but of the physiology of the nerves. He speaks of the three controls which restrain men—the political, that is government; the religious, or fear of the supernatural; and the social, or the influence of public opinion—and shows successfully that all these lead men to subordinate proximate satisfaction to ultimate good. He here comes in sight for the first time of what is

entitled to be called moral good. "Now we are prepared to see that the restraints properly distinguished as moral are unlike those restraints out of which they evolve and with which they are long confounded; in this they refer not to the extrinsic effects but to their intrinsic effects." If he had said intrinsic character which makes them end in themselves and truly moral, he would have been in the region of ethics. But he merely carries us to the portal of the temple and does not enter. SOCIOLOGY brings the same issue. Here he shows that the universal basis of co-operation is the proportion of benefits received to services rendered. He concludes: "The sociological view of ethics supplements the physical, the biological, and the psychophysical views, by disclosing those conditions under which associated activities can be so carried on that the complete living of each consists in and conduces to the complete living of all."

I have allowed our author to expound his argument in his own way. I accept his statement of facts as to the progression of nature. I admit that he thus establishes two very important truths. The first is that nature, as it progresses, makes for happiness. The means of enjoyment become higher as animated nature advances; is higher in the period of fishes than in that of mollusks, in the period of mammals than in that of fishes, and in that of man than in the times of the lower animals. This is a very interesting point, though it is not an ethical one. But he, so I think, establishes another point equally if not more important. It is that nature prepares for the introduction of morality. I hold, indeed, that till man appears with a conscience pointing to a moral law, there is and can be nothing either moral or immoral. We do not morally approve or condemn the acts of the reptile or the bird, of the dog or the cow. But there is a preparation made for man and for morality; a scene in which man can live, with the food needful for him, and in which he has opportunities of doing good, encouragements to do good, machinery to shut him up to good, and checks laid on the commission of evil.

I believe he has done good service by establishing these two truths. But he has not in all this entered the proper domain of morality, and least of all found a scientific foundation for the principles of right and wrong; he has merely constructed a

basement and has not laid a basis. Proceeding on his statement of facts, and interpreting them after the same manner, I discover other truths which furnish a foundation on which ethical science may rest securely.

First, I discover design in these arrangements made to promote happiness and moral good. The tendency which he has so acutely detected implies very many and very varied adjustments of one thing to another, and of all things to a beneficent end. To what are we to ascribe these? Mr. Spencer is too much of a philosopher to attribute them to such meaningless things as chance and fate. He is ready to admit that beyond the known phenomena there must be an unknown power to produce them. At this point I close in with him. This combination of adjustments producing a tendency towards an end, being an effect, implies a cause. From the effect we can argue, and so far know the cause. These arrangements towards an end point to an arranging and therefore an intelligent cause. Not only so, but as the end is happiness, they give evidence of a benevolent cause. As the effect is a reality, so must the cause, the intelligent and benevolent cause of an effect implying intelligence and benevolence. These grand laws of beneficent progress revealed in biology seem to me to argue as clearly as the special adaptations of bones, joints, and sinew adduced by Paley, that there is an intelligence organizing and guarding them towards discoverable ends. The circumstance that God proceeds by development in so many of his ways does not entitle us to shut him out from his works. It has been shown again and again, as by M. Janet in his work on "Final Cause," that in development as an organic process there is as clear proof of design as in the frame of the animal. I see purpose in the arrangements which produce the beneficent tendency which Spencer has traced quite as much as I see it in the constitution of a good society or a good government. I carry this truth with me as I explore the various compartments of nature, always keeping it in its own place, and I find it as a torch illuminating many places which would otherwise be dark.

Second. I discover another end in nature. I discover a moral end, or rather I discover that moral good is an end. I admit that the promotion of happiness is one end, the highest among

the lower creatures incapable of appreciating anything higher. But when a certain stage is reached I discover this other end, like happiness, a good in itself and an end in itself. Mr. Spencer mixes up the two ends, and they are often mixed together in the economy of nature; nevertheless they are distinct, and should be seen to be separate. The one end, happiness, is visible from the beginning. There seem to be anticipations of the other end, preparations for it in the animal reign, just as there were preparations for man in the cattle and cereals which preceded him and made it possible for him to appear. But the other end does not actually come forth till a morally endowed agent appears on the scene. The adjustment of means to end is a good thing, but before we regard it as morally good we have to see that the end is good, and that morally. A sword may be fitted to slay an enemy, but in order that the man be good who uses the sword he must employ it in a good cause. Happiness is good, but is there not also another good, and that is the love that promotes happiness, and the justice that guides and guards happiness and secures an equal means of happiness to all and each? Misery is an evil, but so also is the cruelty or deceit that produces evil. Benevolence is good, but is there not also a right and a wrong, and a justice which demands that every one has his due?

Third. At a certain stage there is the appearance of a being to know and appreciate the moral end. We have here an advance on what has gone before: an advance on the brutes, which had a love of pleasure, but not, therefore, a love of good; an aversion to pain, but not, therefore, an aversion to sin.

For our present purpose, which is not historical but ethical, it is not needful to determine how man appeared on the scene, and how he came to have a conscience to know the good and discern between it and evil. The advance is of the same kind as that which took place in the earlier ages from the inanimate to the animate, from the insentient to the sentient, from the unconscious to the conscious, from the uninstinctive to the instinctive. Spencer and his school will no doubt account for this by development. The old alternative immediately steps in and requires us to make our choice between the horns. If it be answered that the morality was potentially in the original matter,

I answer that there is really no proof that the moral power which led to the martyrdom of Socrates and the labors of Howard or Livingston was originally in the primitive molecules and thence passed through the flaccid mollusk and the chattering monkey. I add, for argument's sake, that even on this supposition we might infer that all this must have been arranged by a prearranging and therefore an intelligent power foreseeing, or rather planning, the end from the beginning, which power must be a moral power lending its sanction to the whole results, and so to the moral monitor with its precepts and prohibitions. If the other horn is preferred, and it is asserted that man and his moral nature have come from a superinduced power, then I claim for that power the sanction of that Higher Power who has superinduced it. Some of our savans seem to be very anxious to prove their descent from the brutes. I admit and maintain that man's body is formed of the dust of the ground, and that he is so far after the image of the lower animals, or rather that the lower animals and he are after the same type. "My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned when as yet there was none of them." But I am anxious to claim for man in general and for our profound thinkers in particular another ancestry. I claim that in respect of their mind they were made in the image of God. We can discover traces of this even in the most degenerate of mankind, particularly in their capacity to ascend, as in the rise of the Britons from the days of Cæsar to their present state—a rise to which we can produce nothing parallel in any race of animals. Discovering it in the germ even among savages, I see it taking its full form in our poets and philosophers, among our patriots and philanthropists.

It is enough for me that man has a reasonable and moral nature, no matter whence derived. Whatever may have been its historical growth, that conscience is now an essential part of my being. The higher state may have grown out of the lower, as the fruit out of the seed; but the fruit is valued for its own sake, and not because it has come from the seed. Whether

man has come from the fish or no, he is no longer a fish but a man with a moral nature containing certain perceptions and prerogatives, and if he murders a fellow-man I treat him in a way very different from that in which I would treat a fish which had seized and destroyed another fish. That moral nature declares that there is an essential and indelible distinction between good and evil. Its decisions can stand even Spencer's criterion of truth which "must be accepted." We believe that the man who suffers rather than tell a lie, that he who risks his own life to save a neighbor's, is right; and that the man who betrays a cause committed to him, or who murders a fellow-man, is wrong. I am as certain of all this as I am of the existence of an external world, as I am of my own existence; I cannot be made to believe otherwise. I am as certain that I reprobate the cheat and the seducer as I am that there is a cheat and a seducer, and that I live to reprobate him. Let speculators, I may say, wrangle about the historical antecedents of all this as it suits. I know what I perceive, and I follow, and must follow, my conviction, or rather I follow it not because of any external compulsion, but because I perceive it. Having such a moral nature, I inquire into its data and find it declaring that happiness is an end to be aimed at, but also declaring that moral good, love, and reverence for what is good is an end and a higher end.

Fourth. There is an intuitive principle prompting to the performance of moral good. It has been shown again and again that the utilitarianism under all its forms—and Spencer's ethics is a form of utilitarianism—requires an intuitive principle and motive to carry it out. It proceeds on the principle not only that I may but that I *ought* to promote the happiness of others as well as my own, that I am bound to promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number. There is no need of an intuitive moral principle to lead me to look after my own pleasures; though our sense of duty comes in to strengthen my purpose to sacrifice present pleasure for greater ultimate happiness. But why am I bound to promote my neighbor's good as well as my own? So far as I can see, the utilitarian theory, and the development theory as a form of it, has no answer to this question. You may prove to me that, upon the whole, there would be a greater sum of happiness in the universe were I to content myself with being the husband of one wife, but there would be a

greater pleasure to me, so I think, to have another whom I love more: what is there in the theory of development to lead me to lay restraint on myself? But at the stage at which morality comes in there comes in an intuitive conscience which insists that this ought to be done because it is right, and points to a God who sanctions the whole. We have thus and here a motive which leads us to promote the happiness of all, and prompts us to do good as we have opportunity.

Fifth. It should be farther noticed that intuitive morality requires us as a duty to promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number. This is as much a precept of the intuitional as of the utilitarian or hedonist theory of morals, with this very important difference that the former carries within itself and with it a motive to induce us to do good to others.

It should be noticed of this intuitive conscience that it looks to a law above it and to which it is subordinate. This law is, "Do unto others even as ye would that others would do unto you." It follows that love is the grand, the essential virtue. I prefer the phrase "love" to altruism, the Comtean one, which the school is seeking to introduce, inasmuch as the former demands an inward affection, whereas the latter might be satisfied with the outward act. Now, the possession of love is the best, the only certain means of promoting happiness. Being a fountain, it will be flowing out and watering all. It prompts to the promotion of the happiness of all sentient beings, including the lower animals. Being regulated by law, it will flow out in furthering the happiness of those with whom we come in contact, by pleasing manners, by obliging acts, by honoring all men, by sympathy with distress, by relieving the wants of the poor, by securing the education of the young, and the spread of literature and the arts, and the propagating of truth and love all over the world. The greatest-happiness principle is as much a part of intuitive as of utilitarian morals. My inward law and the God who planted it there require me to labor to promote the good of all mankind. But the intuitive theory requires other duties. It enjoins that we love and revere and worship God, and that we promote the moral excellence as well as the felicity of our fellow-men.

Sixth. It is needful to expose a fallacy running through his whole argument that moral good has respect to happiness as its

end. It is that of making the conclusion wider than the premises, that of supposing that he has established the whole when he has proven only a part. He tries hard to show that all theories of virtue imply that happiness is the final end. With this view he examines the theory of perfection, as held in a general way; he says by Plato, and more distinctly by Jonathan Edwards, and argues that the perfection of man, considered as an agent, "means the being constituted for effecting complete adjustment to acts, to ends of every kind," and as the justification for whatever increases life is the reception of more happiness than misery, it follows that conduciveness to happiness is the ultimate test of perfection." Now, I admit that the happiness and the promotion of happiness is one good. But I am sure that the love which prompts to the production of happiness is another good, and perfection aims at both.

He also examines the theory of those moralists who suppose themselves to have conceptions of virtue as an end underived from any other, and who think that virtue is not resolvable into simpler ideas; he thinks that Aristotle held this view. He takes the virtues of courage and chastity, and argues, on the supposition that virtue is primordial and independent, no reason can be given why there should be any correspondence between virtuous conduct and conduct that is pleasurable in its total effects on self or others or both, and if there is not a necessary correspondence, it is conceivable that the conduct classed as virtuous should be paingiving in its total effects. The answer is easy and at hand. Virtue being regulated love, or at least containing love as its highest element, the effect of it as a whole cannot be paingiving. In the case of the two virtues named, courage and chastity, they need more stringent whet than merely the promotion of happiness, and this is to be found in a rule like the Christian one of doing to others as we would that others should do unto us. We thus see that in the end which we should contemplate there is not only happiness but an end in itself which promotes and so secures happiness.

He next examines, with the same view, the intuitional theory of morals. This theory has often been so stated as to make it indefensible. Properly enunciated it contains a truth which must have a place in a true theory of morals. Mind has a power of knowing and discerning things. In particular its

moral sense has a power of perceiving good and evil in certain voluntary acts, good in gratitude and evil in ingratitude. In particular it sees good in love under its various forms. This love does look to the happiness of sentient creation. The law to which the conscience looks guides and guards this love. It announces the objects to which it should flow and those from which it should turn away. It contains within itself a motive to the performance of the act; a compulsion, not a physical but a moral one, to act.

These six propositions can be drawn from the body of facts furnished by Mr. Spencer quite as validly as the two which he draws. With them we are now in a position to examine his own system. He rejects "(1) those theories that look to the character of the agent; (2) to the nature of the motives; (3) the quality of his deeds." In doing this he has set himself against the great body of our moralists in ancient and modern times, who maintain that one or the whole of these should be looked at in approving an action as good. An ethically good action is the act of a good agent (so far) swayed by good motives and doing a good act. If the man is a robber swayed by revenge, and doing a bad deed even of a useful tendency, say murdering another and more malignant robber, we do not give him our approbation. We always, in judging of moral acts, look and feel that we ought to look to the act, the agent, and the motive. We declare that act of charity to be good which is done by a man good at least for the moment with a benevolent motive. However we may admire his talents, we do not regard that man as specially virtuous who from money motives invents a machine which may add immeasurably to the resources and therefore the pleasures of humanity. We do not give credit to one who gives alms to be seen of men. It is the grand defect of this new moral theory that it does not demand a pure motive, and does not require or entitle us to look for one in judging of conduct.

We are now in a position to understand and to judge of this new and considerably pretentious theory which is to give a scientific basis to ethics. Conduct is acts adjusted to ends. Conduct is good when it accomplishes its ends. Conduct is morally good when it promotes the greatest happiness. There are passages which leave upon us the impression that mechani-

cal acts may be regarded as good when, on the whole, they favor the production of pleasure, and this without at all looking to an agent. "Beyond the conduct commonly approved of or reprobated as right or wrong, there is included all conduct which furthers or hinders in either direct or indirect ways the welfare of self and others." There may certainly be good in organic acts, in all vital acts. The lower animals certainly commit good acts when they do deeds which add to happiness. "There is a supposable formula for the activities of each species of animal which, could it be drawn out, would constitute a system of morality for that species"! Surely we have here a new ethical code. It seems the doctrine of the whole school. Darwin speaks deliberately of its being the duty of the hound to hunt. The morality of animals is supposed to rise insensibly and by degrees into that of man.

He makes the biological progression with its controls generate the conscience. "The intuitions of a moral faculty are the slowly-organized results of experience received by the race." In fact, the conscience seems to be merely a nervous structure. "I believe that the experiences of utility organized and consolidated through all past generations of the human race have been producing corresponding nervous modifications which, by continued transmission and accumulation, have become in us certain faculties of moral intuition." *Our moral intuitions are thus nervous modifications become hereditary!* Is this the highest product of development? this the keystone of the new philosophy?

He gives to this conscience a certain impulsive and guiding power. "That the intuitions of a moral faculty should guide our conduct is a proposition in which truth is contained, for these intuitions of a moral faculty are the slowly-organized results received of the race while living in presence of these conditions." The conscience thus generated evidently cannot furnish a standard or an ultimate criterion. In different circumstances and with a different heredity its decisions might have been different. In opposition to all this, I hold that conscience is an intuition looking into certain voluntary acts and declaring them to be good or evil in their very nature. This conscience can stand the tests of intuition, even that of Spencer. It is self-evident, and its negation is inconceivable; we cannot con-

ceive that hypocrisy, say religious hypocrisy, should be good. The culmination of our philosophy is thus Hamilton's favorite maxim: "On earth there is nothing great but man, in man there is nothing great but mind;" and I might add, in mind + there is nothing great but love guided by law.

This carries with it Moral Obligation. Spencer takes much the same view of obligation as Bain. He supposes it to arise from a restraint imposed by force, such as a ruler, a government, or supernatural agency—in which Spencer does not believe. Interpreting the revelations of conscience as an intuition, I claim for it a higher place. It is an obligation to obey a law involving, as Kant powerfully argues, a law-giver, being evidently the very governor who has presided over organic development, as it contends with its environments, and causing it to make for happiness. The obligation is laid upon us to do what is right, and in doing so to give every one his due, and as much as within us lies to promote his welfare. This gives the idea of justice, and our obligation to attend to it.

Of the same character is the idea, the sense, and the obligation of Duty. Spencer argues that as morality advances from an act to a habit, the feeling of duty becomes less and less and may disappear. There is some truth here, but it is only partial truth. When the habit of good is completed, the work is done without restraint. But then the felt obligation of duty is necessary to form the habit. It is best when the sense of duty and love go together in the performance of an act. When the feeling of obligation is withdrawn, the feelings will be apt to waver and the conduct to become inconsistent. It is not necessary that people should always be thinking of the restraint; the habits and sentiments will often act best when they follow their own generated nature. But it is important that the law should ever be there, even as the horse will go all the steadier because of the curb in his mouth, though the rider may not always be using it.

His theory is avowedly a form of the utilitarian. But he thinks he can give it a better form than it takes in the systems of Bentham and Mill. He calls his own system rational utilitarianism, as distinguished from empirical. He sees the vagueness of the principles of the common utilitarianism, and the uselessness, for practical purposes, of the precepts derived from

them; it being so difficult to tell as to many acts whether they are or are not, upon the whole, fitted to produce a greater amount of happiness or misery. He tells us, however, "I conceive it to be the business of moral science to deduce from the laws of life and the conditions of existence what kinds of action necessarily tend to produce happiness, and what kinds to produce unhappiness. Having done this, its deductions are to be recognized as laws of conduct." We will look with interest to his promised work, the "Principles of Morality," to see if he is able to accomplish this. If he can he will greatly benefit true ethics, which must always embrace the greatest-happiness principle. Meanwhile he has not done much to relieve the utilitarian or hedonist theory from the objections to which it is obviously liable: such as the difficulty of determining consequences, and its incapacity of supplying a motive to lead the great body of mankind to undertake to promote the greatest happiness of the greatest number. He is evidently in difficulties in gendering benevolence out of self-love, or, as he expresses it, in getting altruism out of egoism. His method of reconciling the self-regarding and the altruistic virtues is very vague and unsatisfactory.

He has an Absolute Ethics, and thinks it of great moment that he should have. But it is like the meeting of the asymptotes of an hyperbola at an infinite distance. It will be reached when the external circumstances are brought into harmony with the internal life. "The coexistence of a perfect man and an imperfect society is impossible." I hold, on the contrary, that it may be, nay, that it has actually been, the work of a perfect man to labor to make society perfect. He tells us, farther, that "conduct which has any concomitant of pain or any painful consequence is partially wrong." With my views of morality I cannot coincide with this. I do not know that it is partially wrong to cut off a limb when by doing so life is preserved, still less to conquer a vice by an exertion which may be painful. "Actions of a kind purely pleasurable in their immediate and remote effects are absolutely right," and "they only." It is allowed that it must be unnumbered ages before there can be such actions. "Ethics has for its subject-matter that form which universal conduct assumes during the last stages of evolution," "these last stages in the evolution of being when man

is forced, by increase of numbers, to live more and more in presence of his fellows." We are told "that the conduct to which we apply the name good is the relatively more evolved conduct; and that bad is the name we apply to conduct which is relatively less evolved." It is clear that his absolute ethics can be reached only when development has advanced hundreds of thousands or millions of years. An old fisherman who lived eighteen hundred years ago knew somehow that this world was to be burned with fire; and it is a part of Spencer's philosophy that this must be so, and I suspect that this conflagration may be kindled before his perfect ethics are reached,—and then will not be reached, for then there will be intolerable pain. And, after all, what interest have the men and women now living, and anxious, it may be, to know what is their present duty, in this inconceivably remote state of things? After all, his perfect ethics do not consist in love, or in any voluntary acts or dispositions, but, to all appearance, simply in an advanced zoological concretion in which there will indeed be no pain (though how it is to be got rid of is not explained), but at the same time no room for heroism, self-sacrifice, and devotion.

He has also a Relative Ethics, but not, so far as I can see, of a high character. "It is the least wrong which is relatively right." His statements on this subject leave morality in a very uncertain and loose state, and might open the door to all sorts of excuses for the neglect of what is, after all, paramount duty.

"Throughout a considerable part of conduct no guiding, no method of estimation enables us to say whether a proposed course is even relatively right as causing proximately and remotely, specially and generally, the greatest surplus of good over evil."

How much room is left here for the crooked casuistry of the heart!

"As now carried on, life hourly sets the claims of present self against the claims of future self, and hourly brings individual interests face to face with the interests of other individuals, taken singly or as associated. In many such cases the *decisions can be nothing more than compromises.*"

What an encouragement in all this to compromises, to favor personal aggrandizement or sensual gratification! He gives the case of a farmer whose political principles prompt him to vote in opposition to his landlord.

"The man in such a case has to balance the evil that may arise to his family against the evil that may arise to his country. In countless such cases no one can decide by which of the alternative courses the least wrong is likely to be done."

Is this safe morality? And yet I believe it is the only morality that can result from the balancing of pleasures and pains. Call in a moral law, and it will decide the question at once and declare that the man ought to follow his principles and leave the issues to God.

Mr. Spencer has an ideal. All great men have. He thinks that there is a development now going on which must produce a better state of things. In this respect his system is, in my view, superior to that still more pretentious one of pessimism which has been gendered in disappointed and diseased minds as in a marsh, and after which some speculative youths are wondering. But I have doubts whether the agencies which he calls in can effect the end he is expecting—the removal of all evil. Hitherto the advance of intelligence and civilization, while it has removed certain evils, has introduced others, and apparently must continue to do so. Amidst all ameliorations of outward estate moral evil abideth—sin which Spencer has never ventured to look at. The happy close to our world's history which so many are looking for will not be brought about except by causes that remove the moral evil. I do expect that "at evening time it will be light." But I believe that it is to be brought about by a higher power superinduced on all that has gone before. Were such a power to appear, it would be in correspondence and analogy with all that has preceded. Just as Agassiz perceived in the lower animals the anticipation of man, so in man's intellectual and moral nature we may discover a prognostic of a spiritual character. At present the moral is very often immoral. I know no power in nature fitted to meet and overcome the moral evil; but I can conceive of such being superadded. I believe all that Spencer has established as to the progression in nature: of the animate being superinduced upon the inanimate, of the sentient upon the insentient, of the conscious upon the unconscious, of the intelligent upon the unintelligent, and of the moral upon the intellectual. But I may and I do cherish the expectation of a higher advancement coming in, as all the others have done, I know not how. "Thou

hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth ; so is every one that is born of the spirit" in this coming dispensation.

I have written the article which I am now to close with a deep sense of responsibility, being awed at once by the masterly ability of my opponent and the vast interests, speculative and practical, at stake. I have endeavored to examine Mr. Spencer's philosophy, as in former years I did that of Mr. Mill (when his fame was the highest), fairly and candidly. My labor has been stiff because the book I review is a stiff one and presupposes a number of preparatory elaborate volumes. I see no difficulty in answering our author, provided I understand him. I believe I see his meaning and can estimate the drift of his speculations. I have followed the development of his system from his "FIRST Principles" onward to this the beginning of the consummation of his work. I have cheerfully accepted his scientific statement of facts and some of his interpretations of them, but have superadded others quite as important and quite as certain. I am aware that the little work published does not unfold his full ethical views, and if, in further unfolding his plan, he brings in truth fitted to fill the wide gaps which we see yawning before us, I will have more pleasure in withdrawing the objections I have taken than I have had in advancing them.

I am constrained to conclude that the work does not furnish a scientific basis to ethics. Had it been described as a *Præparatio Ethica*, I might have much to say in its behalf. He does show that in the earlier animal ages there was an advance in happiness, and that there was a preparation for morality to appear, and that there are aids to human virtue in prearrangements to call it forth and sustain it. This is what he has succeeded in. But he has not entered the subject of ethics, which has to look to character and to voluntary acts of human beings. The system sketched implies a morality without a God, or at least without any God known or knowable. There is no obligation provided requiring us to love, to revere and worship God. The morality recommended has its sanction from a long process of development which has gone on for millions of years, carrying a mysterious power with it, but this not from a guide, governor, or law-giver—of whom, I believe, nature gives evi-

dence as conducting the development orderly and beneficently. It has sanctions from organic agencies working unconsciously, I believe for a purpose, but implying no responsibility to a ruler or a judge. It is not supposed to carry with it, as Kant maintained that the practical reason did, the necessity and certainty of a world to come and of a judgment-day. So far as I comprehend, it does not require or enjoin that virtue should be voluntary. It does not give love or benevolence a place, as I believe it ought to have the highest place, in all good conduct. It declares that morality is that which promotes happiness, but it has no constraining motive, such as the intuitive conscience supplies, for leading men to feel that they ought to labor for the welfare of others.

Our new ethics thus withdraws many of the motives which were supplied by the old morality. And it does not supply others likely to take their place and to sway the great body of mankind—men, women and children, civilized and savage—in joy and in sorrow, in prosperity and in adversity, in the hour of temptation and at death. I can conceive that some persons who have mastered the development theory, who believe in it enthusiastically, may be moved by it to high exertion, as feeling that they are thereby falling in with the whole evolution of nature. But what motive does it supply to the peasant, the laborer, the young man and maiden, to lead them to resist evil and follow the good? And what are we to do with our reading youth entering on life who are told in scientific lectures and journals that the old sanctions of morality are all undermined? What are we to do for them, and what are they to do in that transition period which Mr. Spencer acknowledges to be so perilous? You may say, Read Spencer's elaborate volumes and fill your mind with his system. But this is what the great body of mankind will not and cannot do, and if they did would any one thereby be interested or moved? Our author does not believe that "his conclusions will meet with any considerable acceptance." I believe the deluge of fire will come before they cover the earth. In these circumstances it is surely wisdom to rest on the old foundations, on an inward monitor guaranteed by God, till new ones are supplied on which we and others can rest.

JAMES McCOSH.