

Locke:

Hobbes says our equality is based on physical and mental capabilities

-Locke says it's a *moral* equality

-No one has a *natural* right to rule others

Hobbes says the Law of Nature commands us to treat each other well, but it's a prudential command, only applicable when we can reasonably expect others to be fair, too.

-Locke thinks the Law of Nature is based in something like Divine will.

-We're supposed to preserve Mankind to the extent that we can.

Hobbes says that liberty is compatible with attacking the innocent, if this will help us to secure the means of survival

-Lockean liberty is restricted to what the Law of Nature allows. You're *able*, but not *allowed*, to attack others (license/liberty distinction)

Suppose that we have moral duties in the state of nature. Does this guarantee our safety?

-No. Locke needs to show that we're naturally motivated to act morally.

He doesn't think it will work without enforcement. So who enforces? We all do.

-We have the "Executive Power of Nature", which allows us to punish those who violate the law of nature.

Can we motivate this view without a theological basis? Wouldn't that be nice?

So Hobbes and Locke differ on the existence of an enforceable moral law.

They also differ on the scarcity of goods—Locke thinks they're abundant in nature. We get into fights not because of the scarcity of goods, but because of the differences we'll have about when the natural law has been violated, etc. Also, the introduction of money leads to hoarding goods, which makes some of the symptoms of Hobbesian scarcity more apparent.

Is money really the root of all evil after all?