

THE FURTHER
EVOLUTION OF MAN

W. HALL CALVERT, M.D.

arv

11555

Cornell University Library

BOUGHT WITH THE INCOME
FROM THE
SAGE ENDOWMENT FUND
THE GIFT OF
Henry W. Sage
1891

A.288271

27/11/14

Date Due

MAR 30 1949

JUN 1 1949 J

~~JAN 14 1970~~

~~JUN 2 1970 B R~~


~~JUN 2 1971 E~~

Cornell University Library
arV11555

The further evolution of man,



3 1924 031 322 658



Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

The Further Evolution of Man

The Further Evolution of Man

A Study from Observed Phenomena

By

W. Hall Calvert, M.D.

London

A. C. Fifield, 13 Clifford's Inn, E.C.

1913

amv

11555

A.288271

WILLIAM BRENDON AND SON, LTD.
PRINTERS, PLYMOUTH

TO
MY WIFE

Preface

I WISH to record that the thoughts and ideas expressed in this work owe their origin largely to the stimulation and encouragement received through association with the fine intellectual vigour and acumen of the minds of the Shakespeare Club of Melrose (where I practised for many years the profession of medicine) from the year of its origin in 1884-85 until I ceased active membership in 1912. It is not intended to convey the impression that all the members did or do agree with the general trend of this book, or with individual expressions of opinion contained in it. What I do wish to convey is that but for association with such minds it would never have been possible for me to produce this volume, and that if there is any merit in it I desire to express my grateful thanks to one and all of the members past and present. I desire to thank especially the Rev. John L. King, M.A., for a long time the able Secretary, for his views on "good and evil," "punishment," and "imprisonment."

My indebtedness to Paulin is apparent throughout. His masterly attack on the Darwinian hypothesis

provided the basis of the argument. Chapters III and V may be said to be wholly his.¹

W. HALL CALVERT, M.D.

“THE LAURELS,”

MELROSE.

¹ “No Struggle for Existence; No Natural Selection.” George Paulin. Edinburgh, T. T. Clark, 1908.

Contents

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	II
II. DARWINISM	19
III. THE CANNIBAL HABIT IN THE MALE	31
IV. "NATURAL SELECTION"	43
V. MALTHUSIANISM AND THE LAW OF POPULATION	69
VI. HEREDITY AND ENVIRONMENT	101
VII. THE LESSON OF HISTORY	127
VIII. THE SPIRITUAL EVOLUTION OF SOCIETY	151
IX. THE IDEAL STATE	210
X. THE FINAL GOAL	315
INDEX	321

The Further Evolution of Man :

A Study from Observed Phenomena

Chapter I

Introduction

BEING a disciple of Æsculapius, my thoughts have been constantly directed towards such matters as the evolutionary process in nature, the science of biology, the laws which regulate the relationship of the various species, and the origin and destiny of Man.

After much study and thought I have been forced to the conclusion that the Darwinian hypothesis, like many other creeds of science which have held the minds of men for generations, can remain an article of faith no longer, and must wane before the searchlight of truth. There are many arguments and discoveries which have told against it, and which will be examined in detail ; but the most potent is the discovery by Paulin of the applicability of the law of the "cannibal habit in the male" to all prolific species of carnivora and herbivora, and his complete exposure of the fallacy of the doctrine of Malthus, which Darwin homologated, and said "applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdom."

If the former is true, there can be no "survival of the fittest," depending upon a "struggle for existence"; natural selection no longer operates as a law of nature; and its inapplicability to the "genus homo sapiens" becomes evident. Moreover, the downfall of the Malthusian doctrine has shaken Darwinism to its foundations, and we are assured that its collapse is certain and cannot be long delayed.

Darwin attempts no explanation of how life originated on the globe; he does not boldly say, like Haeckel, that certain atoms of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, under the influence of sunlight, combined fortuitously to form living protoplasm. As he could not account for it, he ought logically to have admitted a special creative act in order to explain the origin of life. Pasteur's law of "omne vivum ex vivo" holds the field. As Professor Bergson says: "chemical synthesis has never succeeded in reconstructing anything but the waste products of vital activity." As living protoplasm has never been produced from its organic elements, Darwin was bound to admit that life could not exist without a special creative act. The more particularly do we realise this since Pasteur's demonstration that life does not exist except from pre-existing life. It may be said that Darwin should not be asked to say how life originated. All he knew was that life began on the earth some time, and he had only to deal with living matter as he found it. But it ought to be remembered that, without demonstration of any kind, he assumes the evolution of man upwards through all the intermediate forms directly from the primeval protoplasmic unit or cell by the operation of a law which he calls natural selection. We hold that this law cannot be proved to rest on established and observed phenomena. Surely if he is allowed this much of a hypothesis, we are

entitled to ask for some proof of the primeval origin in the form of this protoplasmic unit. He must satisfy us as to the beginning; this he makes no attempt to do; he assumes the *Amœba* without any account of its origin, and then postulates the theory, that by means of the struggle for existence, and the survival of the fittest, natural selection produced a graduated scale of beings which, by a process of evolution, gives us every variety of species from the one-celled protozoon up to "the beauty of the world—the paragon of animals"—the supreme and complicated "genus *homo sapiens*."

In regard to the latter we can look forward to a brighter outlook once we discard the dread influence of Darwin and Malthus upon his fate. The teaching of the former meant that existence for him must ever mean a struggle, constant and unvarying, wearing out his "little life" in toil and pain, until its "fitful fever" ends in death; that of the latter, that only by means of war, pestilence, and famine, and "all causes, whether of a moral or physical nature, which tend prematurely to weaken the human frame," can the population be prevented from outrunning the means of subsistence. As he said, it would be difficult to name any check that did not come "under some form of vice or misery." If this were true, woe betide the fate of man. It could only increase his misery as the ages roll, and of necessity all hope of a brighter and happier future would have to be abandoned. Every benefactor of the race, such as Lord Lister, "the great Life-Saver," as he has been so appropriately named, could only be considered a traitor to humanity. No doubt Malthus and his followers would so consider him, but to-day we take a different view. Lord Rosebery lately delivered an oration on the science and art of medicine, and among other things

is reported to have said : " Let them take the great names of history—the great conquerors, the Cæsars, the Charlemagnes, the Napoleons, the Wellingtons—the names before whom they all bent the knee. They, willingly or not, unconsciously or not, had been banes and injuries to the generations in which they lived. Let them take one single name from their profession, that of Lister, and balance it against those great historical figures who had devoted their lives and energies to conquest and to bloodshed. Did any intelligent human being hesitate to which side of the balance the universal gratitude of mankind was due ? " In this connection it may not be inappropriate to recall the fact that Mr. Gladstone, in one of his inspired moments, looked forward with prophetic eye to the time when the medical man would be the prime factor in the State.

Believing that Darwinism, Malthusianism, and natural selection—so long the accepted creeds of science—have been weighed in the balances and found wanting, our next endeavour was to look for some hope of a brighter future for humanity, and this we found in the study of history, which revealed a spiritual evolution, of slow advance certainly, and found its origin among men, with the advent of the altruism of the teachings of Jesus.

When we recall the words of Huxley, probably in himself the finest combination of scientific attainment, logical faculty, and honesty of purpose, the world has ever known : " I do not hesitate to express the opinion that if there is no hope of a large improvement of the condition of the greater part of the human family ; if it is true that the increase of knowledge, the winning of a great dominion over nature, which is its consequence, and the wealth which follows upon that dominion, are to make no difference in the extent

and intensity of want with its concomitant physical and moral degradation among the masses of the people, I should hail the advent of some kindly comet, which would sweep the whole affair away, as a desirable consummation"; when we recall these words, and realise "the sorrow and the sighing of the world," it is time to investigate the laws which are said to allow of no escape from the present misery and to test their infallibility or otherwise.

The question at once arises: "Is a higher evolution possible to man? If so, how is it to be obtained? Is it actually in process now?" We all know that in our Western civilisation, notwithstanding the awfulness of the condition of the "submerged tenth," or, as we might more justly say, the submerged third, a social amelioration is going on, slow it is, to be sure, but it is there; and the standard of living is rising almost imperceptibly. The movement in this direction is gaining strength, and, without fear of contradiction, we are entitled to say, will gain momentum of such force that ere long it will prove irresistible.

In regard to the evolution of man, we think history teaches that physically and intellectually he cannot be said to have reached a higher development than he had attained between two and three thousand years ago, during the period of the great Greek civilisation when Plato, Socrates, Sophocles, Phidias, and many other great names too numerous to mention, enriched that marvellous age. If that is so, is there any further form of evolution possible? We are of opinion that Mr. Benjamin Kidd, in his book "Social Evolution," has proved that since the dawn of the Christian era a process of evolution has been going on which has moulded the history of our Western civilisation, and is now, more markedly than ever before, influencing the social welfare of humanity. In other words, a spiritual

evolution is now operating, affecting not only the relationship of man to man, but directing the State in the devising of measures for the betterment of society, and this in spite of man's primeval instinct of self-preservation, which he has understood hitherto was the only operating force, the only motive which weighed in men's minds, under the teaching of the laws of Darwin and Malthus. Since men's minds have become permeated by the altruism of Christianity, the whole history of legislation, more particularly recently, in this our Western civilisation, has demonstrated the gradual negation of this prime motive.

We have then every reason to believe that this altruistic spirit—this spiritual evolution—will increase with overwhelming force as time goes on, and must, by means of a gradual amelioration of the condition of the people, more particularly the poor and needy, end in the "ideal state," where the aim and the reward of each will be to work for all to the best of his ability, and at the same time never forgetting the interests of the generations which are to follow. A most necessary part of this social betterment of the race will be the security for every member of the State of sufficient leisure in which he may cultivate to the highest his physical, intellectual, and spiritual development.

We hold that it must be evident that this "ideal state" is impossible without the negation of individual wealth or property, and inherent in this is the annihilation of the gold standard. That this is capable of accomplishment is evident from the self-abnegation of many men of "great possessions," in helping the cause of the poor, the wretched, the overwrought, and the overstrained with the "weary bitterness of life"; and from the lives of self-sacrifice of the "millions who, humble and nameless, the straight hard pathway trod," and have died—following the example of the

Founder of our religion, that others might live. And we must not forget that the whole trend of modern legislation is in the direction of raising all round the standard of living of those least able to help themselves.

No doubt it is essential to such a change in the body politic that men's views of property and "many possessions" must undergo profound alteration. They must come to a realisation of the brevity of human life and the futility of purely material things: "I made me great works; I builded me houses; I planted me vineyards: . . . I gathered me also silver and gold. . . . Then I looked on all . . . and, behold, all was vanity and vexation of spirit."¹ Nothing can be more conducive to the development of this aspect of truth than a study, deep and constant, of the thoughts of the great minds of the past, for it is these that impress us forcibly with the sublime wisdom of the scriptural teaching: "The things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are unseen are eternal." No doubt such a proposition as is here given forth will meet with much scorn and derision, but we must never forget that "God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty."

Many may be inclined to believe that such ideas are inappropriate and inconsistent in a work pretending to proceed on scientific lines. I can only say that in this volume I have never consciously departed from what I believe to be the scientific method in the consideration of the observed phenomena of nature, and I only ask to be judged without prejudice and in a spirit of toleration.

In conclusion, I wish to state that the aim of this volume is to prove that the social amelioration of mankind is a necessity of the spiritual evolution in

¹ Ecclesiastes ii. 4, 8, 11.

process in our Western civilisation, and that from a consideration of scientific data in regard to the laws which regulate the universe and the world of living matter, and more particularly the history of mankind, we are justified in believing, or rather compelled to the belief, that the plan of the universe and the graduated scale of living organisms upon the earth is the result of design on the part of an eternal, all-wise, intelligent, omnipotent, directing Power, "who maketh for righteousness."¹ And further, we are forced to adopt the logical outcome of this position—the teleological view of the universe, which means an evolutionary plan pointing to the final goal so beautifully expressed in the noble lines of the late Laureate :

" That God, which ever lives and moves,
One God, one law, one element,
And one—far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves."

¹ Matthew Arnold, " Literature and Dogma."

Chapter II

Darwinism*

DARWIN stated that, in nature, "individual variations were constantly being produced"; some of these were successful or permanent; others not so, and evanescent; some injurious, and therefore also transitory. He called this process "natural selection"; it is a necessary complement of the "survival of the fittest." The process, to put it briefly, is this: In nature the struggle causes the weak to die and the strong to live in virtue of greater strength, or cunning, or greater power of flight whether on land, water, or air. Each species acquires some attribute which enables it to overcome another and thus secure the food by which it lives; the constant struggle forces nature to make special efforts to endow its various forms with attributes which will make them more certain of survival. The forms acquiring these attributes unite and perpetuate themselves—the others are slain or starved and disappear. Natural selection by means of the struggle for existence brings about the "survival of the fittest," and as a result we have the evolutionary process in nature.

It cannot be admitted that Darwin has any right to claim the evolutionary process as his own. It had been anticipated by other men of science, notably by Lamarck, but until the publication of the "Origin of Species" it had never seized the public mind. His theory and processes were accepted almost unani-

* The Editor of the "Westminster Review" has kindly given his consent to the incorporation in this work of the article on "Darwinism" published in his Journal in April, 1911.

mously by the scientific men of his day. There is no doubt he was a man of the very greatest powers of observation, of wide culture, fine literary style, and of a high and noble character. These all combined to aid greatly the acceptance of his views.

In this country they have met with little opposition. The Church at first stood out, but unfortunately its ministers did not possess the scientific knowledge necessary to defend their position, and the result has been that the theory has been largely absorbed by the ecclesiastics. In Germany alone, so far as I know, have scientific men actually been bold enough to attack this established scientific creed. Professor von Hartman is reported to have said: "In the first decade of the twentieth century it has become apparent that the days of Darwinism are numbered." Amongst its latest opponents are such savants as Eimer, Gustav Wolf, De Vries, Hoocke, Von Wellstein, Reinicke, and many others. Professor von Fleischmann maintains that "the Darwinian theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature, that it is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of the imagination."

In this country I do not know of any men of science who do not agree with Darwin—at least there are none who have openly dissented. Some years ago I read an article by the Reverend Professor Henslow which was decided in its opposition. Among other things he wrote: "'The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection' was published in 1859. Up to the present day it is an indisputable fact that not a single variety or species of any wild animal or plant has ever been proved to have had its origin by means of 'natural selection.'" In 1908 a book was published in Edinburgh entitled "No Struggle for Existence; No Natural Selection," by George Paulin. I believe this

to be the only strong onslaught on Darwinism which has been produced. Although Paulin is not by training a scientific man he has a strong logical faculty, and I am of opinion that his arguments are of such force as to destroy the basis on which the theory rests. He admits a "struggle for existence," but not in the Darwinian sense, and maintains that there is no such thing as every individual of every species fighting continually with its neighbour in order to secure sufficient food by which to maintain life; and that nature has made special provision for the elimination of all excess of reproduction. Darwin supposed they were slain in internecine strife; Paulin proves that no such state of things exists; that, in fact, as far more are born than ever can or do survive, the process of elimination takes place long before the individual reaches maturity or can propagate his kind. He proves also that individual variations play no part in this process, and that nature does not make use of individual variations to originate new forms.

Darwin admits his ignorance of the method of elimination of excess of reproduction. He writes: "A struggle for existence follows from the high rate at which all organic beings tend to increase. Hence as more individuals are produced than can possibly survive, there must in every case be a struggle for existence, either one individual with another of the same species, or with the individuals of distinct species, or with the physical conditions of life." Now, when we look around, do we find starvation working havoc among creatures unable to find food from being less fitted than their fellows to struggle for it? Do we find the reign of tooth and claw everywhere prevailing, as it must if Darwin is right. Darwin left out of account that Nature might have some means of eliminating her superfluous numbers without suffering and without

internecine strife. He supported his belief in the struggle for existence by bringing forward the fact that the various carnivora are very prolific, and that the means by which their numbers are kept within due bounds are so "obscure" that in no single instance have they come within the scope of man's knowledge. Darwin admits his ignorance of the method, and formulates a hypothesis to get over the difficulty.

Before going further at present in the direction of showing how nature eliminates her excess, we may point out that Paulin altogether denies that there is such a thing as the "survival of the fittest"; that what we find is really the survival of the average, as all variations tend to be destroyed by the potent influence of marriage.¹ Man can by a process of selection originate new breeds, but he cannot make them permanent. He must be unremitting in his selection, otherwise the strong generic influence will be too much for him. Man by selection has produced many varieties of pigeon. In regard to this Darwin writes: "With pigeons, however, we have another case, namely, the occasional appearance in all the breeds of slaty blue birds, with two black bars on the wing, white loins, and a bar at the end of the tail, with the outer feathers externally edged near their bases with white. As all these marks are characteristic of the native stock pigeon, we presume no one will doubt this is a case of reversion, and not of a new yet analogous variation appearing in the several breeds." Now we think it will be agreed this is not a case of reversion at all; the explanation is that the generic characters have overcome and replaced the individual variations, which have by man's accumulation become the characteristics of a breed derived from a form still extant,

¹ Marriage is here used in the scientific sense, meaning the union of the sexes.

and from which their derivation has been of very recent date. Individuals belonging to different breeds, such as the Tumbler, the Runt, the Carrier, the Bart, the Pouter, the Turbit, the Jacobin, the Trumpeter, the Laugher, and the Fantail, come into the world devoid of their proper characters as such, and differing in no respect from the wild wood-pigeon, their common ancestor. There is nothing so evanescent as these individual variations; in a state of nature they are immediately destroyed by the potent influence of marriage. Let us take another instance: man has by careful selection been able to produce on the one hand the race-horse, on the other, the heavy and powerful draught-horse. If the process of selection is not most carefully guarded in either variety, their particular characteristics disappear very rapidly and nature at once brings back the average type. The same is true of the various classes into which man is artificially divided. Mr. Galton has pointed this out in regard to the heredity of genius. Remarkable sons succeed remarkable parents, and nephews of the first distinguished man display as great, if not greater talents than himself. But of many cases adduced, in none is the inheritance carried beyond the fourth generation, and he also points out that the highest display of genius is found in the first or second generation, after which decadence sets in.

Again, Darwin founded his theory largely upon the geological record, but out of his own mouth we think this particular argument may be confuted. He especially insists upon the minuteness of the developmental accretion which occurs when each new variety is produced, and upon the great number of these necessary to the formation of a new species and upon the long lapse of time required for each infinitesimal change or variation. The same process is gone through

with every evolutionary variety, until in the long result of time a form emerges so far modified from the original as to take rank as a new species. Thus a measureless gulf of time has been traversed before one species has succeeded to another, and numberless have been the intermediate varieties which have been extinguished. That no intermediate forms had appeared among the many distinct specific forms was a surprise to Darwin, and he could only account for their absence by showing the imperfection of the geological record. As these intermediate forms must have been infinitely more numerous than the permanent forms, we think it may be held that the absence of the intermediate is truly most remarkable and is alone sufficient to confute Darwin's explanation of how the evolutionary process works.

In the geological strata a true fish is sometimes found in the midst of molluscs and crustaceans. The first fish that so appears is, in regard to its external form and internal structure, as perfectly developed as the later fish forms, having no correspondence with any antecedent type and preceded by no half-way form, prophetic of its emergence. Then we may ask how were mammals developed from fish forms? How did the earliest mammalia come into being without father or mother, without having their appearance on the stage of organic life heralded by a series of forms in the making from the fish to the mammal? It would be not less than miraculous that while finished forms were yielded to geological research in large and growing numbers, not a single series of intermediate forms, pointing to the origin of a perfect generic type, should emerge.

In this connection we may consider for a moment the Neanderthal skull—the most brutal of all known human skulls—found near Düsseldorf in the valley of

the Rhine. This was held to be the veritable missing link between the higher apes and man. But Huxley, that most accurate and honest of scientists, declared it to be human, and Wright, an American, in "Man and the Glacial Period," declared it to be a skull which still has representatives among all nations, and as a matter of fact was a close reproduction of that of Bruce, the Scots king. As was said in an article in the "Scotsman" of 22nd December, 1908, on this subject: "This is, of course, very unpalatable news for us, and just like the impudence of these Americans."

Recently there has been discovered another of these so-called links with our anthropoid ancestors at Chappelle-aux-Saints in France. But the oldest remains yet found cannot be said to be the precursor of man; they are only man himself. Such is the opinion of all scientific men capable of judging, and as, according to Darwin, there must have been millions upon millions of intermediate forms bridging the abyss between the anthropoid and the "genus homo sapiens," are we not entitled to cry, "Lo! where are they?" And the only answer to our enquiry is, "No one knows."

Professor Arthur Keith in the Hunterian lectures, delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons, in dealing with the evolution of man, says: "At what point of geological history these two kinds of 'Man' had been evolved from a common stock there is as yet no evidence, but a good deal of light can be thrown on the problem by a study of the African anthropoids—the gorilla and the chimpanzee. Although these modern anthropoids did not stand in the way of human descent, there could be no question that their ancestral stock did, for the resemblance between man and the African anthropoids were so many and so close that they could only be explained by a common origin."

Judging this statement from the purely scientific standpoint, one is warranted in describing it as most unwarrantable. It is one thing to say the skeleton of the anthropoids and man closely resemble one another and suggest to the mind the possibility that the one might have been evolved from the other, but to boldly postulate a common ancestor, without a single transmission form, where the variations from the one to the other must have been innumerable, and continued through long ages, shows an assurance which, with all due deference, we are entitled to consider proceeds more from a desire to bolster up a theory sadly lacking support from the observed phenomena of nature than from belief in the evidence. Further, we are entitled to state that observations of this kind eventually do no good in supporting prevailing creeds, and in the long run bring discredit upon the work of those whose aim is to extend the province and beneficence of science.

Dealing with this point, Huxley writes ("Man's Place in Nature"): "The granting of the polygenetic premises does not in the slightest degree necessitate the polygenetic conclusion. Admit that the negroes, the Australians, the Negritos, and the Mongols are distinctive species or genera, and you may yet with perfect consistency be the strictest of monogenists and even believe in Adam and Eve as the primeval parents of all mankind," and adds: "it is to Mr. Darwin we owe this discovery." This we can accept in so far as it admits that all races of mankind have probably come from one common stock. But we can get no further back than the ancestral stock of "genus homo sapiens." There is no geological evidence of transition forms, which must be demonstrated before we can accept the evolution of man from the anthropoids. If there is no such demonstration of a past evolution,

and we know none ever occurs as a phenomenon in nature, from the standpoint of science we are bound to conclude, and entitled to say: "We cannot accept a hypothesis which is a mere inference and is devoid of support from the observed phenomena of nature."

In regard to the different types of men upon the earth, we, as Huxley says, have every right to assume their descent from a single pair, and the modification of different types through the force of environment. Further, we make bold to state from the study of observed phenomena that man remains "man," but he differs in appearance and in mental and moral characteristics, according to his environment. Once he has acquired the necessary qualities suitable to the climate and special features of the country he is living in, he remains the same physically from age to age.

The most recent pronouncement on this question is that of Professor Keith at the annual meeting of the British Association. He said: "The problem of man's antiquity is not yet solved. The picture I wish to leave in your minds is that in the distant past there was not one kind but a number of very different kinds of men in existence, all of which have become extinct, except that branch which has given origin to modern man." He makes this "scientific" statement on the evidence of two forms—the Heidelberg man and the small-brained man of Java, the size of whose brain is said to be one half of that of a well-developed modern man. This description would not be very exaggerated in regard to that of many types of African negroes—the pigmies and bushmen, for instance. We think most thinking men will agree that again Professor Keith draws unwarrantable conclusions from insufficient data. In fact there is no support for his statement whatever. He can adduce no evidence to prove that men of a different type existed then than do now, or

may appear in our midst as sports. They are forms typical of the "genus homo sapiens," even although the one may have been brutal in aspect and the other low in intelligence.

Moreover, as he tells us, Professor Ragazzoni discovered in the same strata—the Pleistocene—remains of a man of quite a high and modern type, and his discovery is accepted as authentic by Professor Sergi, of Rome. So that on the evidence we are entitled to conclude, as was stated earlier, that the oldest remains yet discovered cannot be said to be the precursor of man, they are only man himself. Again we ask where are the millions of intermediate forms between the anthropoid and man? And we decline to accept as truth the statement as to the existence at any time of different kinds of men, if by "different kinds" is meant that they were of so specific a character as to make it impossible to include them within the species as we know it to-day of the "genus homo sapiens."

Darwin insists upon the causes which check the natural tendency of each species to increase beyond the means of subsistence being "most obscure." "We know not," says Darwin, "what the checks are, even in a single instance." In the animal kingdom the individuals of each species reproduced in each generation far exceed the number that could, if they all survived, find maintenance. In the antelope and other grass or herb-eaters it is easy to account for non-increase, as they produce only one offspring at a time and afford sustenance to the carnivora or flesh-eaters, to whom they supply the necessary amount of food. If the carnivora became too numerous it is surely evident that very soon the herbivora would be exterminated, while on the other hand if the carnivora are too few, the herbivora would increase to an undue extent. Thus nature maintains a uniform ratio

between the carnivora and the creatures on which they prey.

The carnivora hold the key to the situation ; they do not make war on each other in their native haunts ; they prefer the succulent flesh of the antelope, of which there is always plenty ; and thus a certain comity prevails among the purely carnivorous tenants of the jungle. Moreover, they are careful of their skins, and prefer to get their food with as little danger as possible. For example, the lion and leopard will not face an adult wild boar or a full-grown buffalo as a rule, but readily carry off a stragglng pigling or an infant buffalo. Battles ending in the death of one of the combatants are rare indeed.

From these considerations it would seem that we ought to pause and consider whether the theory of Darwin rests on proved scientific data or otherwise. In case this may be considered unwarrantable assumption on our part, it may be well at this stage to give evidence that even some of our scientific men of eminence are beginning to grow restive under the domination of this law. Messrs. Dewar and Finn, zoologists of high standing, in their book " The Making of Species," give the following judgment in regard to it : " We think we may safely assert that scarcely ever has a theory which fundamentally changed the prevailing scientific beliefs met with less opposition. *It would have been a good thing for zoology had Darwin not obtained so easy a victory.* . . . Sir Richard Owen, a distinguished anatomist, certainly attacked the doctrine in no unmeasured terms, but this attack was anonymous, and so cannot be considered very formidable. Far more important was the opposition of Dr. St. George Mivart, whose worth as a geologist has never been properly appreciated. His most important work, entitled the ' Genesis of Species,' might be read with

profit even now by many of our modern Darwinians. For some time after the publication of the 'Origin of Species' Mivart appears to be almost the only man of science fully alive to the weak points of the Darwinian theory. The great majority seem to have been dazzled by its brilliancy. The main attack on Darwinism was conducted by the theologians and their allies, who considered it to be subversive of the Mosaic account of the creation. . . . They confounded 'natural selection' with 'evolution,' and directed the main force of their attack against the latter, under the impression that they were fighting the Darwinian theory. . . . Had the theologians admitted 'evolution,' but denied the ability of 'natural selection' to explain it, the Darwinian theory would not in all probability have gained the ascendancy which it now enjoys."

We can now go on to consider nature's methods for keeping down the excess of reproduction, which Darwin acknowledged in his own words to be "most obscure."

Chapter III

The Cannibal Habit in the Male

AS has been already stated, the carnivora hold the key to the situation, and we must therefore consider the applicability of Darwin's law to this species more particularly. Let us take a certain area of the jungle enclosing approximately one hundred pairs of tigers. A tiger on the average lives thirty years, breeds seven times during that period and gives birth to three at a time. In each generation, therefore, 2100 are born, and of these only 200 individuals or 100 pairs survive to replace their parents and to procreate their kind. The Darwinian believes that 200 survive by virtue of superior variations, which give them some slight advantage over the others, who to the number of 1900 perish from the non-possession of these or from less advantageous variations. The weaker, as happens all through organic life, have gone to the wall and perished. How did the 1900 perish? It is well known to those familiar with their haunts that they don't attack or kill one another in the struggle for sustenance; such events are of the rarest occurrence. However, let us strike off 100 killed in internecine strife—a number which would be considered much too large by all travellers and hunters of big game. There remains 1800 to be eliminated before they have reached the age at which they can propagate their kind. They don't destroy each other, and they have no enemies which can destroy them, for when the young are old enough to come forth from their dens, their parents protect

32 The Cannibal Habit in the Male

them most effectively. How, then, does the elimination take place? The Darwinian would state positively that it is the result of starvation. The food supply is only sufficient for 200, and this number survive by means of their superior variations, which enable them to get their food and live. This infers that in the limited area of the jungle which can comfortably maintain in the aggregate 400 adults and cubs, there perish from inability to get the necessary food 1900 in each generation. Yet the young that appear as food-seekers are as well preserved and have their maintenance assured to them, as long as they are feeble and immature, by the protecting guardianship of their parents, and are only left to their own resources when able to hunt and kill for their own subsistence. The limited tract of jungle certainly does not contain enough food for 2100, or half of that number, for any lengthened period, but it would certainly maintain them for a space, until all available supplies were reduced to the vanishing point. If such a multitude of devourers were let loose their natural prey would be exterminated and the end would be the extinction by famine of all the tigers themselves—parents and progeny. We hope this argument will be duly weighed, as it is most important and seems irrefutable.

If the 1900 enter into the competition of feral life, it must be admitted that very few are destroyed by their own, or individuals of other, species. Internecine warfare does not cause any considerable thinning of their numbers, as testified by numerous hunters of big game. While again, if all the progeny became food-seekers, the only result would be a famine-stricken existence, but not until they had made an end of their natural prey. It is not possible to escape from this conclusion. Ignoring this, however, let us assume that 1900 are doomed and unable to find food, and die of

starvation by reason of possessing inferior variations. It will surely be admitted that in this case three out of every four would be in a starving condition, yet no traveller has ever encountered young tigers that were not robust and in good condition of lusty health. No sportsman has ever killed an emaciated tiger unless it had become mangy and lean from old age.

If, as Darwinians hold, nine out of every ten perish in the struggle for existence, either from starvation or by the claws and teeth of their own and other species, we must suppose that every haunt of the carnivora would exhibit manifold traces and signs of such dire and continuous slaughter, and yet, as has been stated, the testimony of all travellers in the forest, the jungle, and the desert is that they find no cases of famished animals, and only very few carnivora done to death in battle. If true, every mountain tract, jungle, and desert home of feral life would abound in visible evidences of the demoniac struggle for existence, such as would make it impossible for an acute observer of the phenomena of nature to say that the causes which check the increase of carnivorous animals were "most obscure." This is a purely logical statement of the case and cannot be confuted.

The only possible conclusion seems to be that the offspring of the great proportion of the carnivora perish in their immaturity. Adopt this explanation and the causes which check the natural tendency of each species to increase are no longer "most obscure." Darwin found them so because he began to look for them after they had fully operated. Nature would be vastly more cruel if she sent her enormous reproduction into the struggle to be starved, or mangled to death by tooth and claw in their youthful prime. It is to prevent such a struggle for existence and to preserve her offspring from such a fate that she painlessly eliminates

34 The Cannibal Habit in the Male

them in the earliest stage of existence. Nature produces her offspring in numbers that appear unnecessarily large for a very practical and important end, namely, in the event of any sudden calamity falling upon the species to provide the means of speedily recovering its numbers, while the waste is of no moment and entails no suffering or misery. We do not exclaim against the waste of life when we see Nature producing from a plant or tree thousands of seeds, "of which she brings but one to bear." The same principle exists in the animal as in the vegetable world, and its action is attended with as little pain in the one case as in the other.

In beginning the investigation of the deletion of immature offspring, two problems require solution: first, the method of elimination of the excess of reproduction, and secondly, the method by which the necessary number of young, and no more, are preserved to take the place of the parents. Paulin describes how an accidental circumstance put him upon the track of the first problem. He possessed two cats; the female from time to time showed signs of pregnancy; suddenly she would appear lean and lank, but there was never any brood. After a time and while the female was pregnant the male happened to be killed, and before long the female became a happy mother. This made him ask, more in jest than in earnest, if this were nature's method of getting rid of the excess of reproduction among the carnivora. He made further enquiries as his curiosity was excited, and he found that in every house where a tom-cat was tenant along with a tabby, the litters were sure to be devoured by the former. He also had observed and had been informed that, when the female is pregnant, the male, some days before parturition, follows her about persistently wherever she goes, while often in an access

of rage she flies upon him and drives him off for the time being. He argues, if this behaviour is representative of the carnivora, there must be some odour about a female advanced in pregnancy which provokes the male to keep her close company in expectation of a feast to be shortly provided, and points to a provision of nature in order to secure that the elimination of young shall be sufficient for her purpose. This method is at once the most direct and is effected with the smallest amount of misery or suffering, for the process of deletion, so far as the young are concerned, is an absolutely painless one. Nature separates the interests of the males and the females—the one to bring forth in safety, the other to devour. In the conflict the majority of litters perish, while a sufficient number is preserved to ensure continuance of the species. It has been pointed out by other observers that the males of the rat, the rabbit, the cat, the guinea-pig, the weasel, the pig, and other wild species so act when they have opportunity. While on a visit to a friend, and while this subject was occupying his thoughts, it was announced that a sad mischance had occurred. The gamekeeper had discovered a pair of ferrets ; while the female was in the act of parturition, the male was swallowing the infants as soon as they appeared ; after the removal of the male one young ferret was born, and was the sole survivor.

He asks naturalists to give this method some consideration, and goes on to aver that if they can prove a single instance in which the male remains with the female at the time of delivery without devouring the young he will at once abandon the hypothesis ; and adds that he is possessed of irrefragable evidence of this instinct of the males, embracing every prolific carnivorous and herbivorous species without exception. He points out that Darwin is at a loss to account for,

36 The Cannibal Habit in the Male

the huge pachyderms not increasing beyond measure, even although they are non-prolific and breed slowly. He writes: "The elephant is reckoned the slowest breeder of all known animals, and I have taken some pains to estimate its probable rate of increase. It begins breeding when thirty years of age, and goes on until ninety, bringing forth six young in the interval and surviving to 100 years; if this be so, after a period of 750 years there would be nearly 19,000,000 elephants descended from the first pair." "Again," he says, "on the other hand, in some cases, as in the elephant, none are destroyed by beasts of prey." How then did Darwin imagine the increase of the elephant was checked? Did he suppose that "natural selection" was all-potent to arrest its increase without material means being employed? Some of the young are undoubtedly destroyed by beasts of prey, notwithstanding Darwin's statement to the contrary, for it has often been reported by Anglo-Indians that elephant babies are not infrequently swooped off by the rush of a great cat, even from the presence of the protecting parent. This is, of course, a rare occurrence, and is of no avail in limiting the numbers of this wild species. It is therefore impossible to come to any other conclusion than that the young are destroyed in their immaturity, and a uniform ratio survive to continue the species. In the light of Paulin's discovery we can understand that which Darwin acknowledged was an inexplicable phenomenon of Nature.

He once asked a gamekeeper if the fox was aware of the particular den where the vixen brought forth, and he replied that he did not think it was so at the beginning, but that he frequently carried game and other supplies to the vixen and cubs when quite young. This means that the vixen does not reveal the cubs to the fox until the danger period has passed.

The Cannibal Habit in the Male 37

In the autobiography of Faimali, the great lion-tamer, we learn that the lioness must be allowed to bring forth her young in total darkness, and if within nine or ten days light be admitted to the cage the fierce mother at once devours her own cubs. Boys know this danger in regard to rabbits in the first fortnight. The limit of time in which light is excluded must coincide with that during which there is danger to the cubs from the male. We see in this the beneficence of nature. A great work of elimination is required, therefore the appetite of the male is excited by some odour from the callow offspring. This passes off after a few days, as partial elimination and not extermination is what is intended. Then the mother goes forth to seek her mate and install him as protector and provider. Faimali's account recalls an incident in his father's house when he was a child. The family possessed a cat, a great favourite on account of its gentleness; it was nursing a litter of kittens in an outhouse, when, to everyone's horror, it appeared one day its jaws dripping with blood—that of its own offspring. A large tom-cat had found its way into the outhouse, and she, seeing their doom could not be averted, had shared in the feast with the intruder.

Faimali's statement as to the effect of light in the lair is full of significance and suggestion as to what takes place in the haunts of the carnivora. The lioness steals away from her mate, most likely when he sleeps, reaches her den or cave, makes her lair in the deep darkness, and brings forth her whelps. She lies in dread of her wandering lord; the darkness alone imparts security; whenever this is broken instinct impels her at once to devour them; when the dangerous period is successfully passed she goes forth to find the male and install him as protector.

When he got thus far in his investigation he deter-

38 The Cannibal Habit in the Male

mined to put it to a test which would prove its truth or falsehood. He consulted Mr. Bartlett, superintendent of the Zoological Gardens in London, who was then alive. He informed him that in the case of every prolific carnivorous and herbivorous species the male was always removed at the time of delivery; if not, the brood was straightway devoured. Paulin denies that there is any reason to think that this is due to confinement rendering them savage beyond their wont in the free state. He has proved that internecine strife and starvation do not exist among them to any appreciable extent in the wild state. Again, if all the young, protected as we know them to be by their parents during their early youth, should appear as devourers of their natural prey, what would happen? Their increase would be prodigious; their natural prey would shortly be exterminated. But the latter never undergoes diminution, so long as they have no other enemies than their carnivorous destroyers. Therefore the enormous reproduction of the carnivora do not all appear as food seekers; by far the greater number are eliminated before they go forth to hunt the antelope, the zebra, or any other grass-eaters. This habit accounts for the fact that the young carnivora found in their native haunts never appear to be more numerous in proportion to the adults than are required to continue the species in undiminished numbers. The absence of all knowledge of this process explains how Darwin found the causes which check the increase of these vigorous kinds, which ought otherwise to swarm in great numbers, to be "most obscure." This elimination Paulin showed to be not an argument of Nature's cruelty, but of her kindly care and regard for her offspring, and is the mode by which she averts the horrible fate contemplated for them in Darwin's "struggle for existence."

He goes on to point out a curious result of his enquiries at the gardens. Darwin had observed that as a singular result of confinement, while the carnivora, even from the tropics, breed freely there, the bear family breed very seldom. Paulin reasoned that this must be due to her organisation, and that in all probability she bred seldom in the free state. Nature had provided this as a check upon the bears increasing unduly, and consequently the male would have no propensity to devour the young. He asked Mr. Seth, who had charge of the bears, and his reply was that they seldom breed in the gardens, and that the male never touches the whelps when they are born, nor afterwards, and he is therefore allowed to remain all the time. He was then asked if all the different kinds of bears produced young in the gardens, and his reply was that they did, "but they bred very seldom." Even among the bears, however, there is one exception to this rule. We are able to state on the reliable authority of a hunter of big game in the Rocky Mountains that the "grizzly" male does devour the young.¹ And this is readily explained by the fact that the "grizzly" is a prolific animal, whereas the common brown bear breeds seldom and brings forth only one at a time. The bear is as savage as the lion, but all the difference lies in the one being prolific and the other not.

Paulin goes on to state that important as these observations are to students of natural history, he has never met a naturalist or a believer in "natural selection" who was cognisant of the facts imparted by Mr. Bartlett, and he observes that it is a curious fact that Bartlett never refers to them in his various publications, even when it seemed difficult to avoid doing so.

¹ I was informed of this by Mr. Daly, an American, on his way to shoot big game in British East Africa.

40 The Cannibal Habit in the Male

For example, in his book "Wild Animals in Captivity," he mentions that the male wolf takes an active interest in rearing the young; as soon as they begin to run about, the male throws up a considerable portion of the contents of his stomach for the young to devour. But who would imagine that "begins to run about" means "the male wolf after having been excluded from the cage until the danger to the cubs has passed is restored to the company of the female"? A very different tale indeed! The male has been transformed from a creature ravening to devour its young to the kind parent, feeding them with the contents of its own stomach.

We must now ask what principle can be supposed to govern the amount of elimination so that it shall cease before the living broods become too few to continue the species in due numbers? And also the means of recuperation when some sudden catastrophe has reduced the species to the vanishing point? Nothing is left to chance; in nature's arrangements the element of chance can never enter. Aberrations from the normal are as surely the product of unvarying law as the normal itself. The very conception of "chance" argues the limitation of the human mind. To go on with the problem: the individual pairs have each their own territory, out of which they seldom travel, as if they were kept within their bounds by some physical constraint. The roaming ground is more or less extensive according to plenty or scarcity of prey, and nature has adjusted its prolific species numerically to the capacity of their several coursing grounds to maintain them comfortably, and thereby has arranged that a certain unvarying proportion of the broods shall escape the ken of the male. Nature has adjusted to the finest issues the instinct of the male of prolific species, so that the proportion saved to the proportion

destroyed is a fixed determinate quantity—constant and unvarying.

Next, recuperation after decimation by forest fires, organised battles, pestilence, or famine, is brought about by the surviving females having a larger space and greater ease in concealing their broods. The consequence is that more broods are saved, and consequently the gaps are quickly filled up. It thus becomes evident that Darwin's "checks" are not checks at all, but only mere temporary calamities, which are soon overcome and result in a return to the normal population very shortly after the cessation of the cause. It will be seen that nature had a great economic end in view when she endowed her species with such power of procreation. Nature's checks are not the same for all species; there is one for man, one for unprolific another for prolific herbivora and carnivora, another for raptorial birds, and many others. The destruction of spawn and small fry by adult fishes is Nature's method in this domain. There is here no concealment on the part of the females, or a special instinct on the part of the males, in devouring the spawn, for the females take as active a part as the males in this, whether of their own or other kinds. But Nature has provided against the annihilation of her finny species from this universal propulsion to devour the spawn by endowing them with enormous procreative powers. The spawn of a cod amounts to the enormous total of 9,000,000 eggs. Assuming a cod produces in its lifetime 50,000,000 eggs, of these only two may be hatched and come to maturity. But the enormous destruction of the cod in the various seas in which fishing is carried on does not, from age to age, seem to affect their numbers. The continual destruction of adults by fishermen permits a multitude of young cod to grow to maturity, which otherwise would have perished, and

42 The Cannibal Habit in the Male

the annual destruction by the fishing-net, great as it is, is balanced by the number of young cod saved from death.

The potentiality of increase of prolific species shows its actual power in a startling manner when the conditions of life by man's intervention are altered. Take, as an illustration, the introduction of the rabbit into Australia. Its fecundity is so enormous that man would find it difficult to keep its number within due bounds, even in Great Britain, were it not that the far greater number of the broods are destroyed by the males, as all schoolboys know by bitter experience. When this animal was introduced into Australia the conditions of life were wholly changed; there were few carnivora to destroy them, while illimitable space was afforded by the female on every side to enable her to hide her brood from the ken of the male. Accordingly it multiplied and spread with the rapidity of wild-fire, causing disastrous results to the agriculturists.

From a consideration of these observed phenomena of nature we are now able to state that the theory of Darwin does not rest on proved scientific data, and are entitled to say that his "checks" upon increase of population can no longer be held to be, in his own words, "most obscure."

Chapter IV

“Natural Selection”

MR. BALFOUR made some illuminating remarks on this subject at the opening of the first international Eugenics Congress in London in 1912, under the presidency of Major Leonard Darwin. He said: “I read, for instance, as almost an ordinary commonplace of eugenic literature, that we are suffering at this moment from the fact that the law of natural selection is, if not in abeyance, producing less effect than it did when selection was more stringent, and that what we have to do is, as it were, to go back to the good old days of natural selection. I do not believe that to be scientifically sound. I say nothing about its other aspects. The truth is, that we are very apt to use the word in two quite different senses. We say that the ‘fit’ survive. But all that means is that those who survive are fit. They are fit because they survive and they survive because they are fit. It really adds nothing to our knowledge of the facts. *All it shows is that here is a class of a race or species which does survive and is adapted to its surroundings,* and that is a definition from a strictly biological point of view of what ‘fit’ means.” I have reproduced this portion of his speech in order to demonstrate the attitude of one of the most astute intellects of our time towards the Darwinian hypothesis. “Fitness” and “survival” are by no means one and the same thing,

and yet Darwin's whole theory of "natural selection" rested upon the "survival of the fittest." Mr. Balfour proves that this law does not operate, and that in fact the only law in nature is the survival of those races or species which are adapted to their surroundings. In other words, environment is the sole agent determining the evolution of species, and the Darwinian hypothesis of "natural selection" is totally devoid of support from the observed phenomena of nature. Mr. Balfour proceeds to pour forth satire upon this already discredited law; he continues: "Those who are interested in the subject will read constantly that in certain cases the biologically fit are diminishing in number through the diminution of the birth-rate, and that the biologically unfit are increasing in number because their birth-rate is high. But, according to the true doctrine of 'natural selection' as I conceive it, that is all wrong. The professional classes, we are told, have families so small that it is impossible for them to keep up their numbers. They are biologically unfit for that very reason. Fitness means—and can only mean from the naturalistic point of view—that you are in harmony with your surroundings. And if your numbers diminish you are not in harmony with your surroundings, for there is not that adaptation which fitness in the naturalistic sense implies. In the same way I am told that the number of feeble-minded is greatly increasing; that can only mean, from a naturalistic point of view, that the feeble-minded are getting more adapted to their surroundings." The supreme logical faculty of Mr. Balfour is here used to slay mercilessly the already discredited hypothesis of "natural selection." It reduces the conclusion to which it would lead us to a veritable travesty. If present-day science is to remain logically sound, it must perforce discard this theory, which has held sway too long,

and has proved a barrier to the advance of scientific investigation in so far as the laws of biology are concerned.

Messrs. Dewar and Finn in their recent work, “ The Making of Species,” have gone far to show the insecure position of much of the Darwinian hypothesis, and especially of the hitherto accepted infallibility of the law of natural selection, and as a necessary consequence of the dogma of the “ survival of the fittest.” But their lack of knowledge in regard to the operation of the cannibal habit in nature has proved a stumbling-block. Had they been aware of it, their arguments would have been much more heavily weighted, and their conclusions more trenchant and positive, and would most certainly have altered absolutely their views of the accepted creed of science in regard to evolution, biology, and the whole Darwinian hypothesis.

Yet, unaware as they are of the existence of this habit as a law in nature, they mention, in one short paragraph, that in some animals, as for example the hyæna, the male occasionally devours his young ones, and they state it as “ a check on multiplication not mentioned by Darwin, which is sometimes imposed by the individuals of the species on one another.” Now here we have a glimmering of the operation of that universal law which prevails in all prolific species. One would have thought that, reflecting on the non-increase of the elephant, and particularly of the lion, which inhabits the same regions as the hyæna, they would have extended the operation of this law to the king of beasts, which certainly is never destroyed by its enemies. But their explanation of the non-increase of lions in Africa is “ teething troubles in the whelp.” Surely this is absolutely futile : such an explanation can only be given when one is forced to attempt to explain the unexplainable. It is

an insult to nature. It amounts to this : that nature—in order to prevent the earth being overrun by lions, and the consequent destruction of the antelopes on which they live, and thereafter of all other animals not capable of withstanding their onslaught, later, the extinction of the human race, and finally, their own annihilation through want of the means of subsistence—was forced by some means of which we are entirely ignorant to formulate an agency, operating in a fatal manner during the process of dentition upon the young of the greater cats only. This is our safeguard against the war of species, the wreck of nature, and the crack of doom !

Is it not pitiable in such able and competent observers? But they are not to blame—they were ignorant of the real facts of nature in this instance. It is true that a little of the divine gift of imagination would have helped them much. It argues to a demonstration the limitation of the human intellect, of which we omit to remind ourselves as frequently as we ought. Dewar and Finn are always fair to every argument, and it is something that they should say : “ Men of science not infrequently charge the clergy with adhering to dogma in face of opposing facts ; it seems to us that many of the apostles of science are in this respect worse offenders than the most orthodox of churchmen.” “ The average scientific man of to-day makes facts fit his theory ; if they refuse to fit he ignores or denies them.” On page 27 we find : “ Like Darwin, we welcome all factors which appear to be capable of effecting evolution. . . . We recognise the strength and weakness of the Darwinian theory, we see plainly it has the defect of the period in which it was enunciated. The eighteenth century was the age of cocksureness, the age in which all phenomena were thought to be capable of simple explanation.” Again

(page 28): “ The theory of Natural Selection is no more able to explain all the varied phenomena of nature than is Ricardo’s assumption that all men are actuated solely by the love of money capable of accounting for the multifarious existing economic phenomena.” “ We think (page 7) we may safely assert that scarcely ever has a theory which fundamentally changed the prevailing scientific beliefs met with less opposition. *It would have been a good thing for Zoology had Darwin not obtained so easy a victory. . . .*

“ Darwin thus became a dictator whose authority none durst question. A crowd of slavish adherents gathered round him, a herd of men to whom he seemed an absolutely unquestionable authority. Darwinism became a creed to which all must subscribe.”

It is interesting to note that just fifty years ago Huxley wrote an article in the “ Westminster Review ” from which Messrs. Dewar and Finn quote: “ After much consideration and with no bias against Mr. Darwin’s views, it is our clear conviction, that as the evidence now stands, it is not absolutely proven that a group of animals having all the characters exhibited by species in nature, has ever been originated by selection, whether natural or artificial.” Fifty years later I had the honour to write, in the same monthly, an article on “ Darwinism,” which proved, I believe, the truth of Paulin’s law of the prevalence of “ the cannibal habit in the male ” of all prolific species of carnivora and herbivora, and, consequently, of “ no struggle for existence, of no survival of the fittest,” of the obliteration of all variation by the potent influence of marriage, and of the survival of the average. That which Huxley found could not be absolutely proved was the cope-stone of the Darwinian structure, and it is only now that we are able to appraise thoroughly the fact that Huxley was—what Darwin unfortunately

was not—a great logician, and had detected the weak point in the arch, which would eventually give way and thus shatter the entire construction. In fact, we now know that the bridge is without a cope-stone, and natural selection, being non-existent, has no power over the forces of nature, and is not a determining factor in evolution. It is a very striking fact and attention must be drawn to it here, that Darwin himself must have had grave doubts as to the operation of this law, because Messrs. Dewar and Finn write, on page 89 of their book, of “ *the difficulty urged by Darwin, that isolated sports must be swamped by continual crossing of the normal type.*” If isolated sports are swamped, which they must be by the continual crossing of the normal type, we surely are able to demonstrate that in nature Paulin’s law of the survival of the average through the potent influence of marriage is universal. By continual crossing of the normal type, all variations must be destroyed. Therefore, out of Darwin’s own mouth we can prove that natural selection is inoperative as a natural law. But apart from that Darwin would require to prove that sports were double, that is, male and female. If not, how otherwise could the particular sport become permanent? This Darwin has never attempted to explain. This statement proves the innate honesty of the man, but there remained the difficulty of accounting for the elimination of the excess of reproduction. Had he only understood how this was accomplished, and that the “cannibal habit of the male” was a law operating in such a manner throughout nature as to regulate exactly to the needs of nature the numbers of all species, we should have been to-day nearer to a full understanding of the laws so far as living matter is concerned.

We now proceed to examine further some of the statements in Messrs. Dewar and Finn's very able work. On pages 348 and 349 they say: " We are inclined to think that neither the food limit nor the beasts of prey are a very important check on the multiplication of organisms. The lion, for example, was never so numerous as to reach the limit of its food supply. Before the white man obtained a foothold in Africa, vast herds of herbivores were to be seen in those districts where lions were most plentiful." As was pointed out earlier, it ought to be patent to everyone that if the lions were not kept at uniform numbers, the antelopes would be bound to be gradually exterminated by the excessive progressive increase of the carnivores which feed on them. It is the food limit which determines the numbers which shall survive in any one area of the jungle. The number of the antelopes is determined by the supply of vegetable food. After prolonged droughts the number of the antelopes is greatly reduced by famine and pestilence. The lions at once begin to suffer from starvation; and numbers die in greater or less proportion, according to the extent and severity of the famine. Whenever the food supply becomes limited, the male about the time of parturition has to go much further afield, and thus gives his mate a rare opportunity for bringing forth in her secluded lair, and ere long the reduced numbers of the tribe, with the return of the food supply, come back automatically to the average. When the lions are in average numbers and food supply abundant, the female has great difficulty in finding concealment, and the young are destroyed in numbers sufficient to keep the tribe at a fixed ratio. If " teething troubles in the whelp " were the cause of the limitation of excess of reproduction, how could the losses through famine, pestilence, and the rifle be made up? If this

were the cause, the tribe would soon disappear ; but the balance of nature never varies, and nothing is left to chance. But now that we know the law, there is no difficulty in understanding the unvarying proportion of all species. Darwin adopted Malthus's doctrine to prove the survival of the fittest, but as it is now established that mankind or nations never do outrun the means of subsistence and that the birth-rate depends primarily upon the demands of the labour market, so we know that animals maintain a direct ratio to their means of subsistence, the antelope to the amount of vegetation, the lions to the number of antelopes. So much is this the case that the ratio is constant and unvarying. As already pointed out, the undue increase of the lions would shatter the “ scheme of things entire,” but this is impossible under the operation of the law regulating the cannibal habit in the male.

It is very striking to observe how Wallace never hesitates to contradict Darwin as to the workings of “ natural selection,” and “ sexual selection.” For example, in regard to the gaudy plumage of male birds, he explains that the females are plain and non-attractive in order that while sitting on eggs they may not attract attention. Surely this is far-fetched and shows the straits to which Darwinians have been driven in order to maintain their hypothesis. As Dewar points out, in some species, e.g. the Paradise Fly-catcher, where the male bird is brilliantly coloured, we find him sitting on the eggs quite as much as the hen. Again, in the Indian Sunbirds the cocks are brilliantly coloured and the hens not so, but as the nests are well covered in, the latter might have possessed all the colours of the rainbow.

On pages 340 and 341 they give instances of marked variations which occur in the genus homo : (a) Colour

blindness, which has been recorded, through the males only, of seven generations, (b) similarly, cataracts in the males of four generations, (c) “ Edward Lambert, born 1717, is said to have been born covered with spines. In his children this abnormality persisted for five generations, and in the males only; this peculiarity began to be manifest from the sixth to the ninth month after birth.” Now, it must be evident to everyone that these abnormal qualities never persist: in other words, there is a return to the average through the potent influence of marriage, just as in eight generations all trace of the negro can be eliminated by constant inter-marriage with the white. These instances give additional support to Darwin’s own dictum that “ isolated sports must be swamped by continual crossing of the normal type.”

On page 347 Messrs. Dewar and Finn deal with the “ struggle for existence.” Their remarks are so novel in any present-day work on Zoology, that I feel impelled to quote the passage *in extenso*: “ As usual, Darwin’s disciples have failed to improve upon the accounts he gave of the nature of the struggle for existence. This is set forth in Chapter III of the ‘ Origin of Species.’

“ ‘ The causes,’ writes Darwin (new edition, p. 83), ‘ which check the natural tendency of each species to increase in number are *most obscure*. Look at the most vigorous species; by as much as it swarms in numbers, by so much will it tend to increase still further. *We know not exactly what the checks are, even in a single instance.*’ This is perfectly true,” say Dewar and Finn, “ nevertheless, elaborate theories of protective and warning coloration and mimicry have been built up on the tacit assumption that the *checks* to the multiplication of all, or nearly all, species are *the creatures which prey upon them*. Possibly no Wallaceian asserts this in so many words, but it is a

logical deduction from the excessive prominence each one gives to the various theories of animal coloration ; for, if the chief foes of an organism are not the creatures which prey upon it, how can the particular shade and pattern of its coat be of such paramount importance to it? We shall endeavour to show that there are checks on the increase of a species far more potent than the devastation caused by those creatures which feed upon it.” They then proceed to set forth some of the checks on the multiplication of organisms mentioned by Darwin in the “ Origin of Species ”—the destruction of eggs and very young animals which seem generally to suffer most, and showing that once the average animal becomes fully grown its survival is much enhanced. This deduction is positively certain, and is a necessary corollary of the cannibal habit of the male.

Darwin’s second “ check ” is *the limitation of the food supply*. This must of necessity regulate everything ; but it has been clearly proved that the numbers of a species never increase beyond the means of subsistence. As we have demonstrated already, if the vegetation, for example, in a certain area of the African jungle keeps uniform, the antelopes do not increase beyond the number which can comfortably feed thereon ; and similarly the ferocious and unconquerable lion does not increase, but bears a uniform ratio to the numbers of the antelopes, which are its chief means of subsistence. We have already pointed out a strange fact : that the first effect of a diminished food supply is an increase in the number of young which survive and escape the all-devouring male parent. This is nature’s means of restoring the loss among the adult members of the tribe caused by starvation. Most famine periods are temporary ; if by any chance the famine were long continued, after a time the gradual extinction and final extermination of the race would of necessity

begin. And it is quite easy to understand how the numbers would soon be restored after they had been reduced to nearly the vanishing-point, if eventually the famine came to a conclusion. At first the males would have to roam far in order to secure food, and the female would have ample time and opportunity to see that her young were secluded in safety for the necessary period. And thus in a comparatively short time the population would come back to its former standard and continue in direct ratio to the means of subsistence.

But it must be said that Dewar and Finn have shown far more insight in regard to the Darwinian hypothesis than any other British naturalists. For instance, in regard to this very matter they write: “ We are inclined to think that *neither the food limit nor the beasts of prey are a very important check on the multiplication of organisms,*” and they point out that the lion was never so numerous as to reach the limit of its food supply, and that “ vast herds of herbivores were to be seen in those districts where lions were most plentiful.”

Moreover, they have the courage to attack the generally accepted theories of animal coloration, which are really ingenious devices to uphold the foundations of a stronghold now, at last, showing signs of collapse.

Climate, damp, pestilence and parasites, all mentioned by Darwin as “ checks,” are next dealt with by Dewar and Finn, and in regard to these all that can be said is that the discussion by these scientists would have been very different if only they had understood the operation of the cannibal habit and its universality. But, as we have already pointed out, they do show a glimmering of the light, and we have no doubt in time would have discovered it, for it is mentioned on page 353, and deserves to be fully quoted: “ A check on

multiplication, not mentioned by Darwin, is that which is sometimes imposed by the individuals of the species on one another. Thus, in some animals, as, for example, the hyæna, the male occasionally devours his own young ones.” Paulin worked at his discovery for ten years and published his book in 1908, and it is surely a great triumph to his marvellous power of logical deduction that in the following year a great and illuminative work by scientific investigators of the very first order, full of original observations and arguments, attacking and subversive of the very foundation of the Darwinian hypothesis, should mention a check on the increase of species in one tribe of carnivora—which Paulin had demonstrated applied in the case of all prolific herbivora and carnivora. “ The whirligig of time brings in his revenges,” and he, who was attacked by nearly all the careless and ignorant reviewers of the various journals which pretend to deal with scientific matters, whether daily or weekly, popular or scientific, has proved his case and come into his own. He died in the following year, but fully persuaded that at some not far-off date truth would prevail. And he has not had to wait long, for already, in the very year after, come these most brilliant investigators and philosophers in matters zoological with the positive assurance that in one tribe and in others his law does operate, and one has little hesitation in believing that in time they will appreciate its universality and its application to all the prolific carnivores and herbivores.

We have already pointed out that Dewar and Finn have exploded the hitherto accepted views of “ natural selection ” in bringing about protective mimicry and warning. They attack it also as the means of survival of favourable variations, and point out that natural selection “ may indirectly cause the survival of un-

favourable variations, or of variations which are of no utility to the organism,” because they happen to be co-related with organs or structures that are useful. They point out the great importance of the co-relation of organs, and that this phenomenon has been quite neglected by zoologists who have followed Darwin, and add significantly: “ This is an example of the manner in which the superficial theories which to-day command wide acceptance have tended to bar the way to research.” After such a statement—a direct attack on the accepted creed of science, and the sole basis of the “ survival of the fittest ”—surely we have every right to expect due consideration of that which explains the hitherto unexplainable, and relegates the Darwinian theory to the position of a mere hypothesis which has proved a barrier, although only a temporary one, in the way of scientific discovery.

Dewar and Finn in discussing what Romanes calls prototypic evolution, quote Darwin (“ Origin of Species ”), showing that he was of opinion that natural selection is able to bring this about. They write: “ Darwin tacitly assumes, in the illustration he gives, that the various races of the carnivorous animals are in some way prevented from intercrossing ; for, if they breed indiscriminately, these races will tend to be obliterated.” This is the first time, so far as we know, that scientific men have pointed out the impossibility of the survival of variation. We have only to use our powers of observation in regard to the human race to assure ourselves of this. We have diversities of races produced through environment. Sports of all kinds appear from time to time, but these particular characteristics, whatever they may be, are not perpetuated ; they may be passed on for one, two, or three generations ; but the inevitable always happens, and back we come, as Paulin pointed out before any other observer,

to the “ survival of the average, under the potent influence of marriage.” And this is supported by Professor Morgan Lloyd, who writes in “ Animal Life and Intelligence ”: “ That perfectly free inter-crossing between any or all of the individuals of a given group of animals is, so long as the characters of the parents are blended in the offspring, fatal to divergence of character, is undeniable.” Man, by selection, can bring about varieties of pigeons and horses, as everyone knows, but nature never does this. As soon as man ceases to select and protect most carefully, we get our pigeons back to the common rock, and our horses, race and draught, similarly returning to the average.

Dewar and Finn deal with this matter with clearness and certainty. They quote Romanes in “ Darwin and after Darwin ” to the effect that “ divergence between the average qualities of a species, and those of an isolated section, if the isolation continues sufficiently long, differentiation of type is necessarily bound to ensue.” Their comment on this is most illuminating (p. 374): “ This assumption is unfortunately not founded on fact. If we were to take one hundred racehorses and shut them up in one park, and one hundred carthorses and shut them up in another park, and prevent the inter-breeding of the two stocks, we should, if Romanes’ tacit assumption be true, see the two types diverge more and more from one another. We know that as a matter of fact they will tend, generation after generation, *to become more like one another.*” In support of this, they bring forward Galton’s Law of Regression, and they show forth the second fallacy in Romanes’ reasoning, which is “ based on the assumption that there is no limit to the amount of change which can be effected by the accumulation of fluctuating variations ; but, as we have already

seen, there is a very definite limit, and this limit is quickly reached.”

Now, what does this mean? In the first place that variation is a rare thing, and that when it does occur, it is very soon extinguished, and secondly, that there is no such thing as “ natural selection,” as all variations are destroyed by the potent influence of marriage.

Dewar and Finn conclude: “ Isolation, then, is a very important factor in the making of species, for without it, in some form the multiplication of species is impossible.” Here we come to a crux, because if true, then mutations must constantly occur and “ natural selection ” must be the dominant law, which accounts for the enormous number of species existing on the earth. But where does isolation occur? Is it not another way of saying that environment does affect species? or, that species do adapt themselves to their surroundings, such as climate, food supply, danger of attack, and so on? If so, that is a very different thing from the suggestion in their conclusion, which means that isolation prevails after mutations have occurred, and these occur independently of environment and are perpetuated in some mysterious way, when, as a matter of fact, we know that all variations not induced by environment are submerged by the influence of marriage and the consequent return to the average.

Dewar and Finn close their book with a very able and interesting summary of the methods in which new species are made. They say: “ We have studied the various factors of evolution—variation and co-relation, heredity, natural selection, sexual selection, and other kinds of isolation. How do these combine to bring new species into being, and to establish the same? ” In reply to this as regards natural selection they say that “ it is an important factor in evolution, but not an indispensable one. Suppose there is no

such thing ; that numbers are kept constant by the elimination of all individuals born in excess of those required to maintain the species at the existing figure, and that the elimination of the surplus is effected not by natural selection, but by chance, by the drawing of lots.” Is it not remarkable that these able observers should talk of *chance* in regard to the operations of nature? we constantly say that “miracles do not happen,” because the Deity never violates the laws which he has established, such as gravitation, conservation of energy, “*omne vivum ex vivo*,” etc., and yet these most competent zoologists actually suggest chance to explain the phenomenon which Darwin admitted, of the method of which he was ignorant, and said was “most obscure.” It is surely evident at last without fear of contradiction, after all the evidence culled from the best authorities on the subject, from men of practical knowledge of all animals in captivity and in the wild state, that the cannibal habit in the male is the means of the “elimination of all individuals born in excess of the numbers required to maintain the species at the existing figure.” Dewar and Finn go on to say : “Under such circumstances there may be evolution ; existing species may undergo change, but the evolution will be determined solely by the lines along which variations occur. If mutations take place only along certain fixed lines and tend to accumulate in the given direction, evolution will proceed along these lines quite independently of the utility to the organism of the mutations that occur. An unfavourable mutation will have precisely the same effect as a favourable one. If, on the other hand, mutations occur indiscriminately on all sides of the mean, then these mutations which happen to occur most frequently will have the best chance of survival, and they will mark the lines of the evolution. Under such circumstances there

will be no evolution, unless, by some cause or other, portions of the species are isolated, because, in the long run, the mutations will neutralise one another.” They then suppose “ that natural selection comes into play,” and endeavour to prove that in this case “ the result of natural selection would be to accelerate evolution, by weeding out certain classes of individuals, and preventing them breeding with those it has selected.” On the other hand, they point out that “ natural selection would tend to diminish the number of species which have arisen through mutation, inasmuch as it weeds out many mutants which would not have perished had their survival been determined by lot.” This is very interesting, but inconclusive ; surely it is not unjust to say it is more metaphysics than science ; it is speculation, and not fair deduction from the observed phenomena of nature. They admit that “ natural selection does not make new species. These make themselves, or rather originate in accordance with the laws of variation,” and finally we have the following assertion : “ The real makers of species are the inherent properties of protoplasm and the laws of variation and heredity. We seem to be tolerably near a solution of the problem of the causes of the *survival* of any particular mutation. This, however, is merely a side issue. The real problem is the cause of variations and mutations, or, in other words, how species originate. At present our knowledge of the causes of variation and mutation is practically *nil*. We do not even know along what lines particular mutations occur. *We have yet to discover whether mutating organisms behave as though they had behind them a force acting in a definite direction.*”

No one can dispute that “ the makers of species are the inherent properties of protoplasm.” That is a truism—an axiom of science. But we are still at the

“How?”—the cause of mutations; the survival of mutations; whether these are slow and progressive or sudden and extensive. If natural selection is discredited—and Dewar and Finn have relegated it to a very inferior place in the evolutionary process—what are the determining factors in evolution? Within the dawn of history, although we know of species becoming extinct, do we know of a single new species having arisen? It is here open to any Darwinian to say: “You admit that a species has become extinct. How could that occur except through the operation of “natural selection”? That question at once takes us back to the Darwinian hypothesis, which was founded upon the “struggle for existence” owing to the excess of reproduction and the growth of the species beyond the food supply. “It is the doctrine of Malthus applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdom,” said Darwin. This must never be forgotten. The excessive numbers had to “struggle for existence.” This brought about the “survival of the fittest.” The struggle caused “favourable mutations” to appear, these were perpetuated; new and stronger, swift or more cunning species arose, and thus the method of evolution was proved. But we know now that the excess of reproduction is never allowed to reach the adult stage or to come into competition for food with the rest of the species. “The cannibal habit of the male” has regulated and controlled the vast excess which nature has always in reserve in order to replace any sudden or gradual elimination of the parents which may be brought about by famine, pestilence or hostile attack of any kind.

A species may become extinct through a hostile environment. This was known long before Darwin’s day, and environment was the explanation given

before he propounded “ natural selection,” in order to show the working of the evolutionary plan. As Dewar and Finn point out, the great mistake of the early opponents of Darwin was in confounding evolution with natural selection. As in men’s minds evolution became more and more an established belief, unconsciously, natural selection came to be accepted simultaneously.

We are compelled, then, to come to the conclusion that our knowledge of the process of evolution is much as it was before Darwin propounded his now exploded hypothesis. No doubt he did much to stimulate research, and it may even be admitted that he has helped the advance of human thought; but the fact remains that his hypothesis is not established, and after all these years we are pretty much where we were as to the method of the evolutionary plan.

If we endeavour to sum up our knowledge in this matter, to what conclusion do we come? Firstly, that of Dewar and Finn: “ *The real makers of species are the inherent properties of protoplasm.*” We do not think we ought to add, “ and the laws of variation and heredity,” as we are too profoundly ignorant of these; and secondly, that we are carried back, through the force of pure reason, to the argument of design, having its origin in a Great First Cause, which alone has given laws to matter, method to the universe, and life upon the earth. And surely it is time to accord the meed of praise to Paulin, who, more than any thinker since Darwin, has brought to the knowledge of men’s minds the actual phenomena of nature in regard to the control of the excess of reproduction, and consequently how unnecessary is the proposition of a “ struggle for existence ” and a “ survival of the fittest,” which formed the basis upon which rests the central structure of the Darwinian Theory—Natural Selection.

It is indeed no small gain to present-day thought that such an astute and accurate observer of the phenomena of nature as Henri Fabre should unhesitatingly state his disbelief in the theory of natural selection. He resembles Darwin in the possession of the greatest gifts of precise and detailed observation ; unlike him, however, he has no theory to establish. His observation of nature's facts and methods are so minute that he is able positively to demonstrate the absurdity of the conclusion that natural selection could have brought about the phenomena which he has been able to elucidate. As he says : “ *Voyez d'abord, vous argumenterez après.* ” After the most minute observation and study, he is able to declare unhesitatingly that the animate world cannot be explained by chemical and mechanical formulæ. “ The facts that I observe are of such a kind as to force dissent from Darwin's theories. ” And in a noteworthy passage he affirms that “ variations are superficial ; they never affect essentials. ” This declaration is one of the greatest importance, and requires serious consideration in that it is an affirmation of the truth of our thesis of the obliteration of all variations and the return to the average type as the generations proceed. And it is with intense satisfaction from the point of view of science and the cause of truth that we receive the pronouncement of this marvellous observer, whose knowledge of living matter and instinctive processes is *facile princeps* : “ The more I observe, the more this intelligence shines out behind the mystery of things—a sovereign order, controlling matter. ”

In his account of the sand-wasp and the wonderful process by which it slays its prey—the caterpillar—in such a manner that it will be rendered motionless but still retain its vitality, and so provide a fitting nutrient for the egg deposited upon it, he is able to demonstrate

the absurdity of the idea that natural selection could have produced this instinct. It quietly stings the larva in the three nerve centres of the thorax and in the abdomen, and then is able to squeeze in the head, further resistance being now impossible. A complete paralysis is produced from which it cannot recover. It is then carried to a convenient spot and there the egg is deposited and finds a suitable pabulum until such time as it has developed to maturity. Fabre compares the skill of the sand-wasp to that of the “desnucador” in South America, who, by means of a method acquired by instruction and constant repetition, is enabled to kill the cattle previous to deportation, one after another, with enormous rapidity. Fabre comments on this comparison in the following manner :¹ “ Now here is the sand-wasp, a slayer of caterpillars by a far more cunning process. Where are the professors of the art of stinging ? There are not any. When the wasp rends her cocoon and issues from under ground, her predecessors have long ceased to live : she herself will perish without seeing her successors. The sand-wasp is born a finished ‘desnucador,’ even as we are born feeders at the mothers’ breast. The nursling uses her suction-pump, the sand-wasp her dart, without ever being taught, and both are past masters of their difficult art from the first attempt. Here we have instinct, the unconscious impulse that forms an essential part of the conditions of life and is handed down by heredity in the same way as the rhythmic action of the heart and lungs.”

The mechanist school, with their blind dogmatism, have a rough time at the hands of this keen observer : “ Given half a dozen cells, a bit of protoplasm, and a diagram for demonstration, and they will account to you for everything. The organic world, the intellectual

¹ “ English Review,” December, 1912.

and the moral world, everything derives from the original cell by means of its own energies. Instinct, roused by a chance action that has proved favourable to the animal, is an acquired habit ; and on this basis they argue, invoking atavism, the struggle for life, the survival of the fittest. *I see plenty of big words, but I should prefer a few small facts.* These little facts I have been collecting and catechising for nearly forty years, and their replies are not exactly in favour of current theories. You tell me that instinct is an acquired habit, that a casual circumstance (chance), propitious to the animals' offspring, was the first to prompt it. Well, I avow in all sincerity that this is asking a little too much of chance. When the difficulty becomes too pressing, you take refuge behind the mist of the ages, you retreat into the shadows of the past as far as fancy can carry you. You call upon Time, the factor of which we have so little at our disposal, and which for that very reason is so well suited to hide our whimsey. Then how did the series of nine stings (the sand-wasp's) at nine selected points emerge from the urn of chance? When I am driven to appeals to infinity in time, I am very much afraid of running up against absurdity. But, you say, there was a weeding-out through natural selection, and instinct, as we know it, developed gradually, thanks to the accumulation of individual capacities added to those handed down by heredity. The argument is erroneous ; instinct handed down by degrees is flagrantly impossible—*the wasp must excel in it from the start or leave the thing alone.* Two conditions are, in fact, absolutely essential : that it should be possible for the insect to drag home and store a quarry which greatly exceeds itself in size and strength ; and that it should be possible for the newly hatched grub to gnaw peacefully in its narrow cell a live and comparatively enormous

prey. The suppression of movement in the victim is the only means of realising these conditions, and this suppression to be complete requires sundry dagger thrusts, one in each nerve centre. If the paralysis and the torpor be not sufficient, the grey-worm will defy the efforts of the huntress, will struggle desperately on the journey, and will not reach the destination ; if the immobility be not complete, the egg fixed at a given spot on the worm will perish under the contortions of the giant. There is no mean admissible, no half-success. Either the caterpillar is treated according to rule and the wasp's family is perpetuated, or else the victim is only partially paralysed and the wasp's offspring dies in the egg.

“ Yielding to the inexorable logic of facts, we will therefore admit that the first sand-wasp on capturing a grey-worm to feed her larva operated on the patient by the exact method in use to-day. She seized the animal by the skin of the neck, stabbed it underneath, opposite each of the nerve centres, and if the monster threatened further resistance munched its brain, for an unskilled murderess, doing her work in a perfunctory and haphazard fashion, would leave no successor, as the rearing of the egg would become impossible. Save for the perfection of her surgical powers, the slayer of fat caterpillars would die in the first generation. What chance has the operator of striking that one particular spot were her lancet wielded without method ? The chance is ludicrous. It is one against the countless number of points whereof the caterpillar's body is made up. And yet, according to the theorists, it is on this chance that the sand-wasp's future depends. What an edifice to balance on the point of a needle ! . . . The egg, laid on its (the larva's) flank then, will develop without risk. It is at most but a half of what is absolutely necessary. Another egg is indispensable

to complete the future couple and ensure offspring. Therefore within a few hours a second sting must be given as successful as the first. The sand-wasp does not know, does not suspect, that she inserted a sting opposite a nerve centre rather than anywhere else. As there was nothing that led her to choose, she acted at random. Nevertheless, if we are to take the theory of instinct seriously, we shall have to admit that this fortuitous action, though a matter of indifference to the animal, left a lasting trace, and made so great an impression that, henceforth, the wily stratagem, which produces paralysis by injuring the nerve centres, is transmissible by heredity. *The sand-wasp's successor, by some prodigious privilege, will inherit what the mother did not possess.*

“ If on her side the wasp excels in her art, it is because she is born to follow it, because she is endowed not only with tools, but also with the knack of using them. And *this gift is primal, perfect from the outset*; the past has added nothing to it, the future will add nothing to it. As it was, so it is, and will be. If you see in it naught but an acquired habit, which heredity hands down and improves, then *at least explain to us why man, who represents the highest stage in the evolution of your primitive plasms, is deprived of the like privilege.* A paltry insect bequeaths its skill to its offspring and man does not. What an immense advantage it would be to humanity if we who belong to it were less liable to see the worker succeeded by the idler, the man of talent by the idiot! And why has not the protoplasm, evolving by its own energy from one being into another, kept also for us a little of that wonderful power which it has bestowed so lavishly upon the insect? The answer is that apparently in this world *cellular evolution is not everything.*

“ For these reasons among others, I reject the modern

theory of instinct. I see in it no more than an ingenious game, in which the observer, the man grappling with reality, fails to find a serious explanation of anything whatsoever that he sees.”

This long extract from the works of the master of instinctive processes was necessary in order to arrest the attention of the reader to the fact that Fabre refuses to be hide-bound by any theory, however great its author may have been or numerous its supporters. It is no small matter, indeed, it is of prime importance, that such an observer should pinion the Darwinian fallacy, and hold it up to public view. The belief in natural selection has endured a long time, but the end is in sight. It cannot withstand such onslaughts for a much longer period. The complete study of the phenomena of nature is shattering the foundations of the very theory by which the various species of animate life were believed to have their form and being, their instincts and their faculties. We are at last coming to see that the religious concept of the universe rests upon scientific data, while that of the mechanist school is being gradually undermined through the persevering study of those very phenomena on which it was supposed to be established. Strict mechanical sequence of cause and effect no doubt operates in the sphere of inanimate nature, and our mechanist philosophers have endeavoured to extend its sphere over the entire universe. Indeed, Professor Schäfer would have us believe that there is no division, that the animate world, even up to the highest intellectual and physical manifestations of humanity, is but a further modification of energy and matter in the inanimate world. Fabre alone, were no other authority to speak, has demonstrated that instinct is something *given*, which cannot be explained in physico-chemical terms. Similarly, Bergson has shown that

the simple cell can do things inexplicable by any law, e.g. a living cell in a root fibre selects what it chooses as nourishment *while living*: as soon as life goes, that power goes. In other words, life has made a new beginning in the world—it can do things that mechanism and chemistry will not account for. And there will be few of unbiased mind who will not agree with this Nestor among naturalists that instinct was never the result of experience, and that natural selection could not possibly have been the cause of its origin. Instinct is there from the first, let the mechanists explain it how they may. Certainly the disciples of Darwin have failed to do so. And this conclusion helps us on towards the spiritual evolution of humanity. As Fabre himself has said in one grand forecast: “ Mankind, alone capable of emerging from the slough of the instincts, is bringing equity into being, is creating it slowly, as its conception grows clearer. Out of the sacred rushlight, so flickering as yet but gaining strength from age to age, man will make a flaming torch that will put an end among us to the principle of the brutes, and, one day, utterly change the face of society.”

Chapter V

Malthusianism and the Law of Population

WE have proved that in all prolific herbivora and carnivora the checks upon increase of population are known positively. We must now go a little further and ask if there are any checks to the excess of reproduction in the case of the "genus homo sapiens."

We must recall again Darwin's words in defining his struggle for existence: "Hence, as more individuals are produced than can possibly survive, there must, in every case, be a struggle for existence, either one individual with another of the same species or with the individuals of distinct species, or with the physical conditions of life. It is the doctrine of Malthus applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdom; for in this case there can be no artificial increase of food and no prudential restraint from marriage. . . . The causes which check the natural tendency of each species to increase are most obscure. Look at the most vigorous species: by as much as it swarms in numbers, by so much will it tend to increase still further. We know not exactly what the checks are, even in a single instance."

As we have shown in a former chapter, we know positively the checks in the prolific species, and that they act automatically and without internecine strife, and that necessarily the theory of natural selection can be supported no longer. But we must now consider how the prolific "genus homo sapiens" is affected

by these considerations. It is quite evident that the checks of the prolific herbivora and carnivora cannot apply to man. From the quotation given above it is evident that the "doctrine of Malthus" was adopted by Darwin and extended, in that he applied it mistakenly to the "whole animal and vegetable kingdom."

The doctrine of Malthus, to put it briefly, is simply that the growth of population tends to outrun the means of subsistence. He compared the potential increase of population with the potential increase of food supply obtained from the production of the soil; and enunciated the famous formula: that whereas the food production of the soil, even under the most favourable circumstances, cannot be supposed to increase in successive generations in more than an arithmetical ratio, or as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, population is able to increase in successive generations in a geometrical ratio, or as 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, doubling itself in the course of each generation; and deduced the general conclusion that population tends to increase faster than the food supply. If this were true, then ultimately there could be nothing in store for the race but extinction. Paulin deals with this matter, and proves to a demonstration that the population does not tend to outrun the means of subsistence, and that the accomplishment of such disaster as Malthus forecasts is impossible—just as impossible as in the case of the carnivora.

War, famine, and pestilence have been great destroyers of large numbers of men, and were believed to be the checks which had operated in the prevention of excess of population in the past history of mankind. Experience and observation abundantly testify that where population has increased, the means of living have increased in an equal degree, and in almost every case in a much greater degree. That this must neces-

sarily be the case will be clearly demonstrated in accordance with the universal law which governs the movements of populations, and by means of which Paulin has been able to confute absolutely the theories of Malthus.

He deals with the case of Ireland and India, which followers of Malthus had adduced as specially supporting the dogma that population tends to increase faster than the means of subsistence. They regard the rapid increase of the population of Ireland between 1690 and 1846, and the poverty of the people at the close of that period, as exemplifying the operation of the principle of Malthus, whereas a knowledge of the facts would show that the truth lay in the opposite direction. In the course of a century and a half the numerical growth of the Irish people far exceeded that of any other nation in the old world in a similar period of time. In 1846 it was eightfold that of 1690, but abundant evidence can be got to prove that the people were much better off at the end than at the beginning of that period, or indeed at any previous period of Irish history. In 1690 the brief dream of Celtic independence and predominance was for ever dispelled, and the serf was returned to his serfdom and his potato patch; and the hand of his Saxon master pressed cruelly and heavily upon him; but the establishment of a settled peace led to the resumption of agricultural industry. There was much agrarian outrage and disturbance, but the people began to multiply, and continued to do so in an unexampled manner. At the beginning Ireland was, for the most part, waste land, but, as a result of the settled peace, room was constantly being made for new inhabitants by the reclamation of the disused land and the extension of cultivation. Ireland was mainly pastoral to begin with, but when the great natural fertility of the soil

was discovered the people increasingly applied themselves to tillage, and this change in agricultural method—from pastoral to tillage—combined with the continual accretion from waste land, increased largely and rapidly the means of subsistence. As the area under cultivation was extended it was portioned into farms, so that the young peasants had no difficulty in making homes for themselves, and were thus enabled to marry at an early age. The superabundant population of Ireland was in no way due to the operation of the theory of Malthus. There took place in Ireland what almost invariably happens where population is increasing, an exemplification of the fact that the means of living tends to increase faster than population; for, whereas in a century and a half the population had grown eightfold, the means of subsistence had grown from twelve to twentyfold.

In dealing with India, the disciples of Malthus and all who believe his theory as the impregnable rock of the doctrine of natural selection speak of it as a striking instance of the evils wrought by a systematic attempt to thwart the operation of the checks by which nature prevents over-population. They lament the mischief caused by the benevolent British régime—first, in attempting by sanitary means to lessen the mortality from smallpox, cholera, and plague; secondly, by preventing inter-tribal wars with their consequent depopulation; thirdly, by the stamping out of such customs as Suttee, Thuggism, and infanticide. They submit that these measures have prevented the due working of the laws ordained by nature to act as checks upon the increase of population, and accordingly, in the course of a century, the census has grown from 150 to 300 millions.

Without doubt the British Raj has diminished the mortality of the inhabitants in many ways. This is

very true, but the increase is due much more to the fact that the *pax Britannica* has given security to the gains of agricultural and mechanical industry. The resources of the country have been developed by railways and canals and vast irrigation works. The latter fertilise large districts which were formerly waste lands and secure large and populous districts from seasons of desolating drought. By this development of industry the average condition of the native has been raised to a much higher standard than ever before. This is the testimony of all competent and intelligent observers who have spent years in our great Dependency. The greater ease of living is shown in the improved quality of their clothing, of their domestic furnishings, and every necessary article of daily use. So much is this the case that we are warranted in saying that if, under the shelter of the *pax Britannica*, the population has grown twofold, its wealth has increased not less than threefold. An increasing population is ever an indication that man is energising in an increasing degree, with the general result that each generation surpasses its predecessor in the relation of the means of subsistence to the population.

We must now consider the positive checks which Malthus assumed to be nature's ordinance for the prevention of the undue growth of population. It is not necessary to discuss the preventive or prudential check of moral restraint which consisted in a man's abstention from marriage until he had attained a reasonable prospect of maintaining a wife and family in the future, for Malthus states that he saw little trace of the action of such a check ; and whatever hopes we may entertain of its action in the future, it has undoubtedly in past ages operated with inconsiderable force. He says : " The immediate check may be stated to consist in all those customs and all those

diseases which seem to be generated by a scarcity of the means of subsistence, and all those causes independent of this scarcity, whether of a moral or physical nature, which tend prematurely to weaken or destroy the human frame." . . . "The positive checks to population are extremely various, and include *every cause, whether arising from vice or misery*, which in any degree contribute to shorten the natural duration of human life. Under this head, therefore, may be enumerated all the unwholesome occupations, severe labour, and exposure to the seasons, extreme poverty, bad nursing of children, great towns, excess of all kinds, the whole train of diseases and epidemics, war, plague, and famine. . . . On examining these obstacles to the increase of population, which I have classed under the heads of preventive and positive checks, it will appear that they are all resolvable into moral restraint, vice, and misery."

In his reply to Mr. Godwin, who differed from his view, Malthus writes: "I believe that Mr. Godwin would find it difficult to name any check which in past ages has contributed to keep down the population to the level of the means of subsistence that does not fairly come under some form of vice or misery"; and, thereafter, he eliminates, as I have already shown, the theory of moral restraint as an operative check.

Here we must remember that Darwin incorporated this part of the Malthusian theory and extended its operation over the whole field of animated nature. As he said, and as has been already quoted: "It is the doctrine of Malthus applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdom"; and this he called the "struggle for existence," resulting in the "survival of the fittest," or "natural selection."

Unfortunately Malthus did not possess the means of ascertaining the movements of population and their

causes ; the relation of the death-rate to the birth-rate, which makes a high mortality in a community to be accompanied by a high birth-rate, and a low mortality by a low birth-rate. He perceived misery and miserable conditions of life everywhere, and causes hostile to human existence, and he concluded that by these conditions alone was mankind prevented from overpopulation and outgrowth of the means of subsistence. The immorality of this theory drew many fierce attacks, but the writers of these, like the clergy in their original denunciation of the Darwinian theory of natural selection, wanted the scientific data with which to support their statements, and thus it was that ere long the public settled down to the belief that it was founded on an irrefutable basis. Thus it was that Macaulay, voicing the opinion of his contemporaries, wrote : " The question is not, is the doctrine immoral, but, is the doctrine true ? " If it were indeed true that by only " vice and misery " can the population be kept in check, and that this constitutes the ordinance of nature by which alone the human race can keep within the limits of the means of subsistence, and to which alone we must look for its preservation, then would the lot of humanity be most deplorable, deprived as it would be of all hope of a brighter and happier future ; and the man who has endeavoured to ameliorate the conditions of human life, in the way of improved sanitation and building, supply of open spaces, creation of garden cities, shorter hours of labour, the removal of all conditions noxious to life in many trades, the arrest of disease and pestilence, could not be considered to be a benefactor of the race. Lord Lister, whom all the world honours as the greatest saviour of the race from disease and suffering and death—if the Malthusian theory were true—could only be considered a traitor to humanity in

attempting to counteract and neutralise the beneficent and necessary ordinance of nature. It is well known that the younger Pitt, under the influence of this theory, was actually dissuaded from carrying out a poor law scheme which he had prepared.

During the last century the positive checks of Malthus have been gradually eliminated, with the result that there are few European countries in which the average duration of life has not been doubled. In Sweden, since Malthus wrote, the average has lengthened twofold, so that, while to a given population 200 died annually, each year only 100 die now. The nineteenth century has witnessed a marvellous change in improved conditions of life generally—in comfort, food, and clothing; and this has been invariably accompanied by a lengthening in every country of the average span of life. This is due not only to a reduction in infantile mortality, but vital statistics show that this applies to all ages of life in a corresponding proportion.

I will now submit a table drawn up by Paulin which gives for each country the average life of its people in the decennium 1876–85, and also in the eight years 1896–1903; this latter year being the last which was available to him at the time of writing. The table will show the remarkable increase in the average span of life in so short a period, which would be almost incredible if it were not attested beyond question. The forces of civilisation have undoubtedly operated with greater intensity than ever before, and resulted not only in increased duration of life but in improved sanitation, greater comfort, and material well-being. In this way the social significance of the table can hardly be over-estimated. It will be a revelation to many that such differences should exist between the average life-terms of the different countries. There are few who would believe it possible that the average life-

term of one European people could exceed that of another by a quarter of a century.

1000	1876-1885.		1896-1903.		Addition made to life-term 1880-1900.			
	Deaths per 1000 annually.	Average life-term 1876-1885.	Deaths per 1000 annually.	Average life-term 1896-1903.	Years.	Days.		
England ..	20.1	49	17.1	58	175	8	286	
Scotland ..	20.1	49	17.6	56	299	7	25	
Ireland ¹ ...	—	—	18.1	55	91	—	—	
Denmark ..	18.9	52	16.4	60	55	7	68	
Norway ..	16.7	59	15.3	65	131	5	176	
Sweden ...	17.9	55	15.9	62	326	7	10	
Austria ...	30.37	32	25.2	39	172	6	199	
Hungary..	34.6	28	27.1	36	329	8	—	
Switzerland	22.3	44	17.9	55	316	11	8	
German Empire	25.9	38	22.2	47	309	9	87	
Prussia ...	25.4	39	94	20.5	48	285	9	191
Nether-lands	22.2	45	16	17.8	56	65	11	49
Belgium...	21.1	47	83	17.9	55	318	8	223
France ...	22.3	44	308	20.2	49	184	4	241
Italy	28.3	35	122	22.5	44	162	9	40

In the half-century previous to 1903 the decline in the mortality of children under five years of age has amounted to 19.2 per cent, while the decline in the general mortality of the country is 28.7 per cent, showing that the former has not kept pace with the reduction in the general mortality of the country.

It must surely now be evident to every intelligent observer that the heavy mortality in the past from war, pestilence, and famine in no way operated in the direction of keeping down or decreasing the population of any country. Populations were not kept down or

¹ Up to 1881 the registration of Ireland was very defective.

restrained in their increase by all those causes " which tend prematurely to weaken and destroy the human frame." As Paulin remarks: " Even in Europe the checks of Malthus have since his day undergone an elimination, and where not an elimination a loss of energy that consigns the conception of them as nature's ordinance for keeping down and within due limits the population of the globe to the limbo of baseless and mistaken theories."

We must now deal with Paulin's " Law of Population "—a universal law, which governs every movement of population, whether of retardation or progression. It is neither intricate nor abstruse. To put it briefly, it depends upon the ability of the individuals of the community to marry, and this again depends on the state of the labour market. When there is stagnation in the labour market, there are no new posts being created which young men can fill. There are only those rendered vacant by the death of their seniors, so that very few acquire sufficient means to enable them to marry, and in these circumstances we find that the population does not increase, the birth-rate doing no more than keeping pace with the death-rate.

When industrial activity is at its height things are very different. New posts of employment are being constantly created, which enable young men entering into occupation of these to marry. Soon the birth-rate goes up and keeps well ahead of the death-rate. Thus it is that cycles of trade activity,¹ which occur with periodic regularity, and are believed to be the result chiefly of excessive industrial competition—have, as accompaniments, an increased marriage and birth-rate. When the sources of industry are being sapped by permanent causes, the effect

¹ Good and bad harvests would seem to directly affect trade for good and evil respectively.

is demonstrated more certainly still. Many posts of employment are rendered vacant by employers being unable to maintain them. The demand of the labour market is thus reduced and, year after year, fewer labourers are employed. Accordingly, the number of young men who are enabled to obtain employment by succeeding to posts rendered vacant by death tends to grow smaller, and thus the marrying power of the community is curtailed 'until the birth-rate actually falls below the death-rate, and the population dwindles ; the standard of living tends to deteriorate ; employers are no longer able to offer the large wages they did, while labourers compete with each other to obtain such wages as employers can afford.

A man cannot enter into the wedded state unless he possesses means of subsistence which suffice for himself and his wife, and this subsistence must come in some form or another from the labour market. Accordingly, whoever is in possession of means to enable him to marry—from the King to the humblest labourer—whether he obtains these from the labour of his own hands or by the industry of others, may be said to occupy a post of employment that places marriage within his reach. Even thieves and burglars must be placed in this category, for if they marry it is because their gains suffice for the married life. Now and again imprudent marriages do occur. The means of subsistence are not visible. But the percentage of these is so small that it does not affect the general law nor interfere with the general result. What is sufficient means upon which to marry for one man may be quite insufficient for another. It all depends upon the social scale in which he finds himself. *The law is that a man does not marry until he has acquired means which will enable him, in his degree, to marry.* This law must not be confounded with Malthus's check of moral restraint. It is a law

that must be obeyed, to whose dictates the non-moral as well as the moral must conform.

Malthus, however, not perceiving the operation of this law, which is manifoldly visible to any present-day student of the statistical information supplied by the bureaux of Christendom, entertained the belief that the majority of marriages which took place were unaccompanied by due reflection on the part of those marrying as to whether they had a reasonable prospect of being able to maintain a wife and family in the future. Accordingly he held that the neglect of this check of moral restraint was the main cause of the tendency to over-population, which called for the action of his positive checks to overcome it ; for, as he said, " Moral restraint, whatever hopes we may entertain of its action in the future, has acted in the past history of the race with inconsiderable force."

The young working-man marries when his wage suffices, as a matter of experience, to maintain a wife and family. This necessarily implies maintenance of average health in order that his wage may be constant. This, however, cannot be assured to him, but on the average he has a fair prospect of securing it. Were it otherwise he could never face marriage at all. But the working-man, justified as he is, in the light of experience, of cherishing this confidence, is nevertheless incapable of contemplating marriage until he is actually in receipt of a living wage and has assurance of its continuity. The labour market is supported by a constant succession of young men to posts vacated by death, debility, and age, or by those who have emigrated ; and in addition there are always sufficient young men to fill posts created by the expansion of industry.

Most young men marry as soon as they attain a position which enables them to do so, but it generally

happens that marriage is deferred for some time after the necessary post has been secured owing to the necessity of saving enough to pay for furniture and wedding expenses. The first three years after entry into such posts are those in which the greater number of marriages occur. This fact is revealed to the statistical expert by the marriage returns of the years following the outbreak of a devastating pestilence or a sanguinary war. In 1866 the mortality of Austria was raised to a great height by a visitation of cholera and a war with Prussia: from 29·5 per 1000 in the preceding decade, the mortality rose in that year to 40·9 per 1000. The total increase of deaths above the normal was 230,000. Consequently, a large number of posts of employment were vacated, and immediately filled by young men, with the result that the marriage-rate in the four years following rose from an average of 82·5 per 1000 to 97·5, the largest number being in the third year after the pestilence, and amounting to 103·5 per 1000 of population.

Some men defer marrying for several years after they become able to do so; some never marry at all; but the principles of human action are much the same everywhere, and the result is the established ratio between the number of marriages, births, and deaths in a community. Such questions as illegitimacy, the relative fecundity of different peoples, and the marrying ages of different classes have no effect on the general movement of population. The number of illegitimate births in a community lessens, in its degree, the number of marriages. Thus, in Vienna, where the proportion of illegitimate births is excessive, the marriage rate is correspondingly low. But the labour market is unaffected thereby, as the illegitimate children enter it in the same proportion as the legitimate, and it is found that the birth-rate bears the same proportion to the

death-rate that it would if all the births were legitimate.

Where the fecundity of the average marriage is greater the proportion of marriages is lower than in a country where the fecundity is less, supposing the demands of the labour market to be similar in both countries. This can be clearly demonstrated by a comparison of English and Scotch statistics for a period of thirty-three years (1871-1903). The average number of births annually in 1000 persons was in England 32.0, in Scotland 32.2. The equality, as he points out, is surprising when we perceive that throughout the period the number of marriages per 1000 persons amounted in England to 7.8, in Scotland to 7.0 only. In order to discover the relative productivity of English and Scotch marriages we must take into account the relative illegitimacy of the two countries. In Scotland it was 8 per cent of the births, while in England it was only 4.5. Deducting that from the sum total of the births, we find that 78 English marriages produced 306 children, while 70 Scots produced 296 children. The resulting difference in the fecundity of the marriages of the two countries is that in Scotland 100 marriages produce 423 children, in England they yield only 392, or 7.4 per cent fewer. The labour market of the two countries called for an equal birth-rate, and this was accordingly obtained, regardless of illegitimacy or fecundity.

The ages at which men marry in different classes only proves that, as a general rule, men marry when they are able to do so. Men who labour with their hands can marry at an early age, while men who live by their brains, and require to establish a position before they secure a sufficient income, are perforce compelled to defer marriage to a later period of life. Mr. Benjamin Kidd, in Appendix I to his "Social Evolution," gives

an interesting table from which the following figures may be quoted. The numbers are those out of every 1000 males in each class.

Marriages.	Artisans.	Shopmen.	Farmers.	Professional or Independent Classes.
Under 25 years .	598	467	284	151
Between 25 and 35	351	451	566	648
Above 35 . . .	51	82	150	201

With the improved social position, which means increased annual expenditure, we see a gradual diminution in numbers of those who marry before 25 years, a gradual increase in those between 25 and 35, and the most marked gradual increase in those above 35 years. Among the professional classes we find that one-third more marry over 35 than under 25. How different from the artisan, in which class 50 only marry over 35 in proportion to 600 under 25.

The limitation which the demands of the labour market place upon the power of forming marriages prevents the growth of a surplus population, for the reason that where the demand for labour is not increasing no new posts are created, and the population remains without material increase or decrease. But whenever an abnormal demand for labour is created, say by a decimating pestilence, it is always found that there is sufficient reserve of young men to fill the vacant posts. These young men are called upon, earlier than was anticipated, to occupy them, and are enabled to marry at an earlier age; and thus in a few years the fruit of these marriages raises the population to its former level; for the ravages of pestilence never act as more than a mere temporary check upon population. The dread scourge of cholera, within living memory, swept away one-third

of the inhabitants of Mysore in India, but this proved no permanent check, for within fifteen years, by the natural increase of its people, the population was greater than it had been before this visitation.

A community may suffer great reduction in its numbers owing to a constant stream of emigration such as is at present taking place from the Mother Country to Canada, or as did take place in former times to the Australian goldfields. But there is no permanent reduction of the population. The labour market insists on a certain marriage and birth-rate for its own necessities ; the stream of emigrants increases these as long as it lasts, but in no way depletes the rates in each case necessary to supply the home-labour market. The emigration from Ireland to the United States in the last three decades of the nineteenth century has been of a different character, as the emigrants were compelled by distress to leave the soil owing to the enormous depreciation that had taken place in the pecuniary value of agricultural produce. The margin of profit in the smaller farms had been so reduced that it was no longer sufficient to maintain a family, even in the low standard of comfort that satisfies the wants of the Irish peasant. The result has been that the small farmers have been forced to emigrate, and a redistribution of soil has taken place, so that, as the holders of farms have become fewer the farms become larger. It is a curious fact that this is attended by a marked improvement in the standard of comfort of those who remain. If emigration had not been available to relieve the distress, the remedy must have come, and assuredly would have come from a reduction, to the amount required, of the number of marriages. The marriage-rate of Ireland since 1845 has been greatly below that of any European country. Whereas in the years when its population was going up by leaps and bounds its

marriage-rate must have amounted to 10·0 or 12·0 per 1000 of the population ; from 1873 to 1883 it was only 4·5 ; from 1883 to 1894 it was 4·4 ; from 1893 to 1903 it was 5·0. The numbers for England, similarly, were 7·9, 7·7, and 7·8. This is a striking illustration of how the demand of the labour market in determining the marriage-rate is imperative and must be obeyed. But for emigration the power to marry would have suffered a much more severe restriction. It is very easy to demonstrate how this law operates in an agricultural community such as that of Ireland : the small farms cease to pay and the tenants have not sufficient means to marry ; as depreciation continues larger farms are affected similarly, until a large proportion of the farming class is forced to remain single. The farms are vacated in the course of time, and, not being occupied, are used to enlarge neighbouring holdings. Marriages, perforce, become fewer and fewer, as has already been demonstrated in the case of Ireland ; deaths become more numerous than the births, and the population must needs decrease.

In a stagnant community emigration acts as a means of stimulating the marriage and birth-rate, as the existing posts of employment are vacated by the emigrants, and young men acquiring these are enabled to marry much earlier than otherwise. As long as this continues the marriage and birth-rate will keep up correspondingly to fill the gaps made by the removals from the community.

Emigration does not, therefore, tend to depopulate. The only cause of this is a declining labour market. " We therefore reach the inevitable conclusion," says Paulin, " that England is not by a single family less populous than she would have been if she had not sent forth the men who peopled the vast continents of North America and Australia."

We must now consider the vital statistics of Europe, drawn from the annual reports of the Registrar-General of England. Malthus had no reliable statistics upon which to argue or found his case ; for example, in regard to Russia, he culled, from the St. Petersburg authorities, statistics showing forth the average span of life in the Government of Veronesch to be 79 years, Tver 75 years, Novgorod 58 years, etc., the average span of life made to work out at not less than 58 years ; and this at a time when Sweden, which all along has been foremost in the longevity of its people, could only boast of 30 years. The reports of the Registrar-General show conclusively how misinformed Malthus was. The vital statistics he furnishes in his annual reports prove that in the twenty-one years, 1879-99, the death-rate of Russia transcends that of any European country, and that necessarily the birth-rate is also very much higher.

		Death-rate per 1000 Persons.	Life Term.	
			Years.	Days.
Russia	{ 1879-88	34·3	29	56
	{ 1889-98	34·6	28	137
Hungary	{ "	33·5	29	305
	{ "	30·7	32	309
Roumania	{ "	28·6	34	352
	{ "	29·5	33	328
Sweden	{ "	16·9	59	62
	{ "	16·37	61	32
Norway	{ "	16·9	59	62
	{ "	16·3	61	127

It must be remembered that the birth-rate is, more directly than the marriage-rate, affected by the death-rate. Illegitimacy is more prevalent in some countries than in others ; and where it is so the marriage-rate is diminished. Again, where the limitation of the family

is a recognised practice, we find the birth-rate does not bear its due proportion to the marriage-rate. Moreover, the difference in the fecundity of different peoples renders it advisable to measure by the birth-rate rather than by the marriage-rate the movement of population.

We shall see now from the study of the following table the effect of the high death-rate of Russia, Hungary, and Roumania upon the birth-rate, and be able to compare the results thus obtained with those of other countries in which the death-rate is much lower.

1879-98.	Death-rate per 1000.	Birth-rate per 1000.	Natural Increase in two Decades.	Actual Increase.	Excess of Emigration.
			%	%	%
Russia	34·5	48·7	—	—	—
Hungary	32·1	42·2	25	22·3	2·7
Roumania	29·6	40·7	30	25·9	4·1
Norway	16·8	30·5	29·8	13·8	16·0
Sweden	16·7	27·5	24·8	11·7	13·1
England	18·8	31·3	28·9	25·9	3·0
Prussia	23·6	37·2	30·2	24·5	5·7
Netherlands ...	20·2	33·7	30·9	27·4	3·5
					Excess of Immigration.
France	21·9	23·3	3·0	4·4	1·4
Belgium	20·2	29·9	21·1	2·1	80·7

No scientific statement can be made from the Russian registration statistics as they are quite unreliable. The chief fact to be derived from these statistics is, as has been pointed out over and over again, that when the mortality declines from decade to decade, as it tends to do in all civilised communities, the birth-rate experiences a corresponding decline, but

this is not always apparent, owing to its elevation by the demands of the labour market and the process of emigration. According to the degree in which these factors operate is the visible effect of the declining mortality upon the birth-rate neutralised. This is well exemplified by the following table:—

	England.		Scotland.	
	Annual No. of Deaths per 1000.	Annual No. of Births per 1000.	Annual No. of Deaths per 1000.	Annual No. of Births per 1000.
1864-1873	22·4	35·3	22·2	35·0
1874-1883	20·7	34·8	20·9	34·4
1884-1893	19·2	31·6	19·2	31·7
1894-1903	17·2	29·1	17·8	29·8

In the four decades in England the death-rate declined 23·2 per cent, and the birth-rate only 17·5 per cent: in Scotland correspondingly 19·8 per cent and 14·9 per cent. This is explained at once by the two factors mentioned above—first, the extension of the labour market, shown by an addition in England of 62 per cent to her population in these forty years, and in Scotland 46 per cent. The numerical increase was accompanied by an enormous addition to the national wealth, and corresponding elevation of comfort in all classes. And secondly, both countries have poured forth a steady stream of emigration to all the colonies, more particularly to Canada and Australia, and also to the United States, not driven by want or difficulty of gaining a livelihood, but impelled by the spirit of adventure and the prospect of greater opportunity for improved material well-being in young and rapidly developing countries which are calling out for an increased labour supply. These two causes have elevated

the birth-rate in that proportion in which its decline has failed to equal the death-rate.

In Sweden and Norway the continuous stream of emigration to the United States has been mainly the elevating factor in the birth-rate. As the annual reports of the Registrar-General go no further back in the case of Norway than 1871, the period of thirty-three years, 1871-1903, is divided into four parts, the first three consisting of eight years, and the fourth of nine years.

NORWAY.

	Marriages per 1000.	Deaths per 1000.	Births per 1000.	Natural Increase.	Actual Increase.	Excess of Emigration over Immigration.
				%	%	%
1871-1878	7.2	17.3	30.9	11.1	8.3	2.8
1879-1886	6.6	16.5	31.0	11.9	4.7	7.2
1887-1894	6.3	17.1	30.3	10.7	3.3	7.4
1895-1903	6.8	15.3	29.9	12.6	10.2	2.4

SWEDEN.

The Swedish table begins with the decade 1854-63, which preceded that in which the tide of emigration began to flow, which has prevailed ever since in Sweden.

	Marriages per 1000.	Deaths per 1000.	Births per 1000.	Natural Increase.	Actual Increase.	Excess of Emigration over Immigration.
				%	%	%
1854-1863	7.6	20.9	33.3	13.2	12.4	0.8
1864-1873	6.5	19.3	30.6	11.8	7.0	4.8
1874-1883	6.6	18.4	30.1	12.3	7.4	4.9
1884-1893	6.1	16.9	27.7	12.1	4.8	7.3
1894-1903	6.0	15.9	26.8	11.6	8.2	3.4

Attention must be called, firstly, to the great fall in the marriage-rate in the first decade from 7·6 to 6·5, and then to 6·0 in the last ; secondly, to the apparent retardation in the general prosperity of the country after the first decade, as shown by the lower decennial actual increases from 12·4 per cent to 7 per cent, on to 4·8 per cent in 1884-93. As the labour market is always satisfied whatever the rate of emigration may be, the numerical increase obviously shows forth the commercial prosperity of a country ; thirdly, to the fact that, although the labour market was calling for constantly diminishing numbers, the natural increase did not tend to fall, e.g. in decade 1884-93 the labour market only required an increase of 4·8 per cent, the natural increase amounted to 12·1 per cent. Thus we see that the birth-rate made provision both for the labour and emigration demand ; fourthly, to the rise of Swedish emigration from the almost immaterial amount of 27,000 for the decade 1854-63, till it reached 332,000 for the same period, 1884-93, equivalent to 7·3 per cent of the population.

The decade 1854-63 was one that seemed to be of unexampled prosperity, due to an inflated industrial and commercial activity, fostered to a great extent by the contemporaneous introduction of railways into the country. Emigration during this decade was of the slightest. In the three that followed the aggregate excess of emigration over immigration was equal to 47 per cent of the natural increase, and amounted to 730,000 persons. This large number of emigrants left their several posts to be filled by younger men, who, then being able to marry, brought about such an increase in the number of births to replace the numbers who had departed. In the last decade of the table the emigration movement suffers a very severe check, the bulk of the natural increase being retained for the home

labour market. The same phenomenon is visible in Norway. The population of Sweden, which in the previous decade added only 4·8 per cent, made in this an increase of 8·2 per cent, while the actual increase of Norway was raised from 3·3 to 10·2 per cent. Whereas in the eight years 1887-94 the emigration from Norway amounted to 147,000 persons, it amounted for the nine years 1895-1903 to 47,000. These figures prove that a season of prosperity had come to both countries, marked by a great home-labour demand, accompanied by an increased standard of comfort that neutralised to a great extent the attractiveness of a settlement in the United States.

In the second decade, 1864-73, Sweden suffered from five disastrous years, during which the proportional number of marriages fell from 7·6 per 1000 persons to 6·5. In 1867 there fell upon Sweden and Norway a terrible commercial crisis, such as happens after a course of over-production and over-trading, the effect of which, in throwing great numbers out of employment, was continued throughout a series of years. This was accompanied by agricultural depression. In that period began the great efflux from Scandinavia to the United States of America which has gone on continuously up to the present time.

We next deal with Prussia, the Netherlands, and Belgium, which show, as a common feature, a decline in the birth-rate exceedingly small compared to the death-rate—in each case due mainly to the expansion of the labour market, and in a small degree, comparatively, to the effect of emigration.

As the boundaries of Prussia were largely extended in the decade 1864-73, Paulin was not able to give the natural and actual increases until after that period.

PRUSSIA.

	Population at Beginning of Decade.	Natural Increase.	Actual Increase.	Excess of Emigration over Immigration.
1864-1873	—	—	—	—
1874-1883	24,948,000	3,548,000	2,798,000	750,000
1884-1893	27,746,000	3,875,000	3,084,000	791,000
1894-1903	30,830,000	5,174,000	4,995,000	179,000
Population in 1903	35,825,000	—	—	—

The next table contains the number of marriages, deaths, and births annually in 1000 persons, with the rates per cent of the natural and actual increases, and in the last column the proportion of emigrants to the natural increase.

	Marriages.	Deaths.	Births.	Natural Increase.	Actual Increase.	Proportion of Emigrants.
1864-1873	8·8	27·0	38·2	%	%	%
1874-1883	8·2	25·5	38·9	14·2	11·2	3·0
1884-1893	8·1	24·1	37·3	13·9	11·1	2·8
1894-1903	8·2	20·8	36·2	16·7	16·2	0·5

The death-rates and marriage-rates were quite abnormal in the first of these decades. In 1870-71 the mortality was greatly raised by the war with France: in 1872 it was elevated in an almost equal degree by the numbers dying at home from the effects of wounds and exposure during the campaign. In 1873 came a visitation of cholera, from which Prussia suffered severely. The mortalities of these four years produced

an abnormal number of marriages, bringing the average of the decade to the high figure of 8·8 per 1000 persons. In 1871, 1872, and 1873 the number of marriages per 1000 persons were respectively 10·4, 10·1, and 9·7. The explanation of the birth-rate being somewhat higher in the decade 1874-83, which had no abnormal mortalities notwithstanding that the marriage-rate fell from an average of 8·8 to 8·2 per 1000 persons, is found in the fact that the large number of marriages in the last four years of the first decade yielded the greater number of their resultant births in the second.

The excess of emigration over immigration did not amount to more than 5 per cent of the natural increase before the war. But the access of militarism after it, the stringency of the conscription, and the accompanying burdens were the inciting causes of a vastly increased emigration. In place of an annual departure of 100,000 before the war, the excess of emigration over immigration rose to an annual average of 750,000 in the decade 1874-83, and 791,000 in the next.

There was great extension in the Prussian Empire of industrial and commercial enterprise between 1893 and 1903, and one result was that while the death-rate declined nearly 14 per cent, the birth-rate declined only 3·5 per cent, and the decennial increase of the population bounded from three millions in the decade 1884-93 to five millions between 1894 and 1903, the rate of increase having risen from 11·1 to 16·2 per cent.

From 790,000 in the previous decade, the annual excess of emigration fell to less than 180,000. This decline in the amount of emigration was consequent upon the great material betterment that had accrued to the working-classes, and rendered them more content with their surroundings in the home country. Although few posts were vacated by death and by emigration, the multitude of such created by the vast

94 Malthusianism and the

development that took place in the industries and trade of Prussia called forth a continually greater number of men to supply them, and thus an increase of population proportionally greater than had been made in any past decade was called into being.

NETHERLANDS.

	Marriages per 1000.	Births per 1000.	Deaths per 1000.	Average Life Term.		Children to 100 Marriages.
				Yrs.	Days.	
1854-1863	7.9	33.6	25.9	38	222	425
1864-1873	7.3	35.5	25.7	38	332	485
1874-1883	7.8	36.0	22.7	44	19	464
1884-1893	7.1	33.7	20.6	48	198	476
1894-1903	7.5	32.2	17.2	57		432

	Actual Increase.	Excess of Emigration	Actual Increase.
1864-1873	310,000	44,000	9.0
1874-1883	458,000	69,000	12.2
1884-1893	502,000	82,000	12.0
1894-1904	688,000	69,000	14.6

It is to be observed that the second table tells us of a country whose labour market is constantly expanding. Though the Netherlands have extensive possessions beyond the seas, yet the emigration has always been on a modest scale. Scotland, with a smaller population, has greatly exceeded her in the number of emigrants from her shores. That the last decade has been singularly prosperous is evidenced by the larger natural increase of 16.1 per cent and actual increase of 14.6 per cent.

These tables show to a demonstration the fluctuation of the marriage-rate as affected by the state of the labour market and also by the decline of the death-rate. Where a heightened marriage-rate is not caused by a pestilential mortality or increased emigration, it invariably signifies a greater degree of prosperity.

What is most noteworthy in the table is the small drop of the birth-rate compared to the large fall in the death-rate. In the forty years, 1864-1903, the average life in the Netherlands has been lengthened by no less than eighteen years, and if we compare the decade 1864-73 with that of 1894-1903, we find that in the former 25.7 per 1000 died annually compared to 17.2 in the latter. But while the posts of employment made vacant by death were reduced greatly in numbers, those created by the expansion of trade and industries of Holland had become so much more numerous as to raise the natural increase of the population from 10.3 per cent decennially to 16.1 per cent; the actual increase from 9 to 14.6 per cent. The commercial and industrial development of Holland may be estimated from the fact that to a population of 3,431,000 in 1863, she, in the space of forty years, added no fewer than 1,958,000 persons, an increase of rather more than 57 per cent, while the standard of comfort of the people had been greatly elevated. If neither trade nor industry had developed since 1864, but had remained in *status quo ante*, the birth-rate would have fallen in commensurate degree with the death-rate, and in 1894-1903 would have amounted to 22.0 births annually to 1000 persons, instead of being, as it was, as high as 32.2, showing clearly to how great an extent the birth-rate has been kept up and prevented from falling by the commercial and industrial expansion of the country.

BELGIUM.

	Marriages in 1000 annually.	Births in 1000 annually.	Deaths in 1000 annually.	Average Life Term.	Births in 100 Marriages.
				Yrs. Days.	
1864-1873	7.5	32.0	24.1	41 29	427
1874-1883	7.0	31.4	21.4	46 266	444
1884-1893	7.2	29.5	20.4	49 7	407
1894-1903	7.1	28.7	18.0	55 203	354

In this table there is only one feature requiring notice—the continuous decline of the birth-rate since 1874 in face of the continual elevation of the marriage-rate. In the last decade the birth-rate makes an extraordinary decline, the births per 100 marriages falling from 407 in the previous decade, and from 444 in the decade prior to that, to 354. The only possible explanation is the adoption by a considerable proportion of the population of Belgium of the system which prevails in France, of married people limiting the number of their children. Were it not for its adoption by the French people, the proportion of marriages to population, which is as high in France as in the Netherlands, would yield an increase far beyond what there is room for in the labour market of France.

It is now impossible to doubt that Paulin has proved the famous Malthusian doctrine to be one of those creeds of science which holds the minds of men for one or even several generations, but which ultimately melts away before the accumulating light of truth. He has proved that population never tends to outrun the means of subsistence; that population recedes when industry and commerce do, and rises again with a period of commercial prosperity. He has shown that war, pestilence, and famine do not limit population;

that, in fact, they act at once automatically as an incentive to an increased birth-rate. At last we realise that the doctrine of Malthus in regard to the "genus homo sapiens," which Darwin adopted and said "applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdom," has been proved to be contrary to fact, to be unsupported by scientific data, and to have been a mere temporary illusion whose "ineffectual fire" has faded and finally disappeared before the searchlight of truth.

One has heard it argued that it is all very well to theorise, but that war, pestilence, famine, vice, and misery are absolutely essential; otherwise, in the process of the ages, the population must of necessity outrun the means of subsistence. Even in the "ideal state," which I hope to prove later is a necessary consequence of the social evolution of humanity, men will always desire to marry, and as it is presumed that the individual struggle to acquire the means of subsistence will become less and less as time goes on, the marriage-rate will correspondingly rise, and, ere long, over-population must become an accomplished fact. Moreover, this process would be hastened by the gradual diminution of the death-rate. We are told that not so very many years ago the population of the world was given as fourteen hundred millions; now it is stated to be over two thousand millions. The increase is easily accounted for: it is due to fresh tracts of alluvial soil on the earth's surface being thrown open to the pioneer and the cultivator, and thus more food is being constantly produced: this brings about increased trade and commerce, and consequent augmentation of the world's wealth; and it necessarily follows that the marriage-rate rises, with a corresponding increase of the birth-rate.

It is further argued that every acre of fertile soil

must ultimately come under cultivation, and then the population will increase to the utmost possible limit. It is asked what is to happen then, with the natural impetus towards still further increase? We are entitled to take the evidence of history in regard to this point. The facts and figures given in this chapter prove to a demonstration that the population never does outrun the means of subsistence, and that this law would operate just as effectually when the earth had reached its limit of production. We have seen that in some countries the population which at one time had risen markedly had begun to recede from year to year, notwithstanding the fact that the death-rate had diminished progressively owing to improved hygiene, sanitary laws, better housing, and preventive medicine. We have proved that in these countries there was abstention from marriage—"the prudential restraint," which Malthus said "operated with inconsiderable force"—caused by the inability of the young man to "acquire means which will enable him in his degree to marry." It is surely quite fair to argue that if the prudential restraint is of such potency now, it will act no less powerfully when we have reached the limit of production of food supply, and that it will operate with even greater force in the days of the "ideal state," when men, trained by self-denial, and influenced by a desire to benefit their fellow-men and the unborn generations which are to follow, shall have acquired a self-control which will effectually keep the marriage-rate within the bounds required, just as surely as it is now controlled by the demands of the labour market.

In France the birth-rate has gone consistently down, until quite recently it reached even a lower level than the death-rate, so that the population for the time being was actually receding. The labour market

demanded a smaller population than the country possessed, and this was immediately granted. If such a state of affairs can be demonstrated in a modern European State—one of the great Powers in the van of civilisation—surely we are entitled to argue that the same laws will operate in the world as a whole once it is fully cultivated and yielding its maximum of the means of subsistence. The world will be able to allow a certain number of marriages, resulting in a fixed birth-rate, and automatically this, and no more, will be supplied.

No doubt other forces will come into play. The prevention of marriage on the part of the feeble-minded will be an absolute necessity of the higher evolution of the race, and this measure alone will have no small effect in limiting the birth-rate. Moreover, man, in increasing proportions under the influence of the altruistic spirit, will tend to sacrifice his own personal inclinations to the good of the race and the unborn generations who are to come after. With a higher spiritual evolution we cannot imagine men imbued with the altruism of Christian ethics bringing children into the world, knowing that their fate must be of a most uncertain nature owing to the fact that the population has outgrown the means of subsistence.

The Eugenics Congress—the first of its kind—held recently in London, brought prominently before the public mind the question of the increase of the feeble-minded, and the corresponding decline in rate of increase of the professional classes. The explanation is of the simplest. The feeble-minded are not of necessity feeble-bodied. Physically, as a rule, they are at least of average health, and they reproduce their kind in large numbers because they are possessed of no thought of “prudential restraint”; in fact, their feeble-mindedness is the sole cause of their excessive fecundity.

100 Malthusianism & Law of Population

The professional classes are, on the other hand, so overwhelmed with prudence that they marry late as a rule, and do everything possible to limit the number of their families.

Of the various plans suggested, the Bill for the segregation of the feeble-minded is the only possible. Such measures as sterilisation are absurdities—the emanation of faddists and undeserving of consideration. The prevailing spirit of altruism would never permit the attempt to cure a social disease by the production of mutilation and further extension of abnormality in the individual. Moreover, it must be remembered that the so-called feeble-minded individual is often a “sport.” I have known more than one family where the brothers and sisters of these were much above the average in intelligence and mental capacity. So that we do not know all regarding this subject. I feel convinced when once we have attained to a perfect environment for all the members of the State, from infancy onwards, and for the mother previous to the advent of the child, that ere long we shall eliminate the causes which induce “feeble-mindedness,” and that before many generations are over the Act shall have become a dead letter owing to the complete elimination of the “unfit.”

[*I am greatly indebted to Messrs. T. and T. Clark for their kind permission to quote the foregoing tables from Paulin's work : “No Struggle for Existence.”*]

Chapter VI

Heredity and Environment

THE law of the survival of the average of necessity compels a remodelling of our ideas in regard to heredity. The prevalent belief, particularly in schools of conservative thought, was that there were good families and common people, clever and stupid, smart and dull, energetic and lazy, rich and poor, thrifty and careless, and that these diversities were produced through heredity or strains of blood. The same was believed in regard to criminality or vice. Now we know both by investigation and experiment that it is not so ; that Man, like the ordinary animal, inherits certain physical characteristics and instincts which he cannot get over or depart from, otherwise he would not be a normal type ; each individual man or animal has certain characteristics apart from those of the genus to which he belongs which make up what we call his individuality, e.g. shape of nose, colour of eye or hair, particular manner of walking, or speech, or conduct, some of which are hereditary, some the result of imitation or environment. But the really important characteristics are entirely the result of environment, which includes not only the class into which a man is born, but every possible influence which surrounds him as a child, whether of nature, home, temper, culture, criminality or goodness of parents, the education which he receives, and the religious influence and guidance which is brought to bear upon him. A child is often remarked to look, to speak, to act, to

102 Heredity and Environment

walk like his father or mother ; even these acts are not necessarily hereditary at all ; they are the result of environment ; the love and admiration of the child causes him unconsciously to imitate every motion and manner of the loved parent. A child is reared in a slum, surrounded by vice and instigated from day to day towards crime—it may be theft, this being the means by which the family into which he is born survives. Can it be expected that in such surroundings anything else can happen than that the child shall become a member of the criminal classes, with no other possibility but a career of crime ? And yet in regard to these we actually talk of the impossibility of eradicating a bad heredity ! It has become axiomatic, and yet it is becoming daily more evident that heredity has nothing to do with it. The State itself is to blame for allowing such an environment to exist, and by its negligence in regard to insanitary conditions, slum dwellings, bad land laws, overcrowding, and *la misère*, which are all preventable, and which are the potential causes of drink and crime. “ Ah,” you say, “ what about one son in a large family, all brought up in a healthy and good environment, who lapses, succumbs to drink, and ends in crime ? How is it this one failure occurs ? Is this not a reversion to some evil strain in a remote or near ancestor ? ” The answer is that it cannot be called the result of heredity ; the parents and the other sons and daughters have lived good lives and done their duty in this world ; this case is exceptional and can only be treated from the standpoint of disease. We have every right to assume that science will yet demonstrate that in such cases there is impairment of some of the higher centres of the brain, probably of the inhibitory nerve cells which control the lower animal instincts, and in such a case we can only conclude we are not dealing with a normal individual.

These abnormal cases will tend to become less and less under wiser methods of living, a healthier environment, and a higher ethical evolution of the race as a whole.

Insanity has always been held to be a hereditary disease, but we know that very few families have not had some relative who has been peculiar, or has required restraint under medical surveillance. From personal experience in cases where it has appeared to be hereditary, I am of opinion that it is mostly evidenced in regard to women, and has been due to the daughters being reared by a mother with insane characteristics, which has created an atmosphere strongly predisposing to nervous breakdown on the part of the children. They live in constant dread of sudden ebullitions of the mother's mental excitation, and the nervous strain is severe.

You may ask, what of the epileptic? Epilepsy can be inherited, but its original cause is undoubtedly preventable. Insanitary conditions, bad air, and especially alcohol, produce a diseased condition of brain which so affects the individual generally that it would be absurd to expect that he could generate a normal or average member of the race. And I have no doubt that epilepsy will disappear when better methods prevail.

I hold, therefore, that we are justified in coming to the conclusion that the palmy days of the theory of heredity are over: a child inherits very little more from its parents than the characteristics of the genus homo: in other words, any healthy, normal, or average child can, by means of a sufficiently early environment, be so moulded as to be efficient: in one case, as an emperor, in another as a scavenger, as a saint, or a devil.

The subject was very thoroughly gone into at the annual meeting of the British Medical Association at Oxford some years ago, and the majority of the mem-

bers who took part in the discussion agreed with the view which we have given. It was very well put by Dr. A. T. Schofield, who said he rose "to emphasize the statement of Dr. König, that of all hereditary tendencies that of alcohol was the most subject to the forces of environment. They must remember that the public followed with the keenest interest their remarks on this subject. They long to be delivered from the dead hand of heredity, and so eagerly did they welcome any door of hope that he noticed last year when one speaker pointed out that, after all, what was inherited was merely a tendency which could be resisted and overcome, and therefore there was no need for fatalism, that statement was copied into most English papers. He therefore was very glad to emphasize Dr. König's statement that inherited alcoholism followed the law of Herbert Spencer, that *a man was more like the company he kept than that from which he was descended*. But this force of environment applied not only to alcohol, it applied to crime. Those who knew anything of Mrs. Meredith's work at Addlestone (now carried on by Miss Lloyd) would bear him out that children in these village homes were taken from their mothers with four generations of hereditary crime, and that these children were so acted on by their perfect environment that those tendencies which became criminal in their parents were directed into good channels, so that they grew up into good, honest, and moral men and women. This led him to mention one more point of hope in which he believed all present would agree, and that was, that what was inherited was not 'vices,' or 'virtues,' or even 'diseases,' but 'tendencies,' which by bad training and surroundings could be degraded into vices or diseases, or by good could be elevated into virtues or health."

And we are glad to be able to call to the support of

our ideas on this subject one of the greatest reputation in the medical and scientific world, not only in the field of the practice of physic, but a most able teacher and thinker—the late Sir William Gairdner, of Glasgow University. The “British Medical Journal” of November 30th, 1912, quoted from a letter from Sir William to the “Scotsman” newspaper (September 3rd, 1896) to the effect that he had sent a young clergyman, one of the ablest and most open-minded men he had ever known, to Tasmania for health reasons, and suggested to him that he might keep his eyes open and find out if the descendants of the criminal colony (which was unquestionably the British stock inhabiting Tasmania or Van Diemen’s Land) had retained in any degree the criminal or otherwise undesirable taint, as it was reasonable to suppose on the “necessarian atavistic theory,” as one might call it, that the traces or “stigmata,” or whatever a modern criminal anthropologist might call them, of persistent “degeneration” and criminal tendencies might still be found among such a population. The information he received was on the contrary that the Tasmanians were remarkably free from such apparent “reversions” of inherited instincts; and that, whether judged by their actual criminal record or by the number and quality of the insane in their asylums, the race now inhabiting the oldest and probably the worst of our penal settlements was as orderly, flourishing, and well-to-do as any other colony, and altogether bore most favourable comparison with any other portion of the British stock at home or abroad.

Mr. J. D. Shaw, Editor of the “Tasmanian News,” writing to the “Scotsman” of November 21st, 1912, recalls this incident and letter. He mentions that he had a correspondence with Sir William on this subject, and that the latter wrote to the following effect: “I

106 Heredity and Environment

look upon the case of Tasmania as one of the most hopeful and animating barriers to oppose to that kind of quasi-scientific pessimism which tends to look upon all criminal and insane tendencies as an ineradicable taint, and thus to circumscribe the actions of free-will in the individual, and discourage reformatory and punitive measures alike on the part of the State."

From the scientific standpoint it is impossible to secure a more positive demonstration of the non-heredity of crime and of the benefit of a new environment. This one instance alone would show that our ancestors were not lacking in wisdom in dealing with criminals by the method of transportation. Not only was it wise in regard to the criminal and his descendants, but it resulted in no evil of a direct or contaminating kind to the people among whom they were sent. An observed phenomenon of this kind ought to make the Eugenists pause. "Facts are chiefls that wanna ding," and it ought to be realised that what is wanted for the higher evolution of the race is not breeding from a select few—of individuals or classes—but a better environment for the people as a whole. Degenerative tendencies of all kinds will soon be eliminated by this means alone, and the "quasi-scientific pessimism" of the Eugenists will be heard no more. It is indeed cause for joy that such an authority can be called to our aid in annihilating the prevalent idea that "all criminal and insane tendencies are to be looked upon as ineradicable taints and thus circumscribe the actions of free-will in the individual."

Mr. Owen Seaman has emphasised this idea in his beautiful poem on the late Dr. Barnado :

" Naked, he clothed them ; hungry, gave them food ;
Homeless and sick, a hearth and healing care ;
Led them from haunts where vice and squalor brood
To gardens clean and fair.

“ By birthright pledged to misery, crime and shame—
 Jetson of London’s streets, her waifs and strays,
Whom she, the mother, bore without a name
 And left, and went her ways—

“ He stooped to save them, set them by his side,
 Breathed conscious life into the still-born soul,
Taught truth and honour, love and loyal pride,
 Courage and self-control.

“ Till of her manhood here and overseas
 On whose supporting strength her state is throned
None better serves the Motherland than these,
 Her sons—the once disowned.”

We think we may say that most good people who read this poem would agree with its purport and yet consider themselves justified in the same breath, almost, in denying that the theory of heredity was exploded; but if the facts are as stated in regard to alcohol, and if the results of a better environment are as good as has been proved in the case of the noble work inaugurated by Mrs. Meredith and now carried on by Miss Lloyd at Addlestone, and at Dr. Barnardo’s Homes, then it is not only absurd, but unscientific to uphold any longer the “dead hand” of heredity. Moreover, our reformatories, and asylums, and schools are regulated nowadays in such a manner as to indicate that, consciously or unconsciously, we do approve of a good environment, and that we do not believe heredity to exert the fatal influence with which it was credited until recently. Would that our jails and penitentiaries were conducted on similar lines! An attempt is being made to improve these institutions, but a great deal ought to be done in the way of moulding the criminal, by a more beautiful and cultured environment. The inmate of these places of detention has it rubbed into him every hour of the day that he is the enemy of society, and this is the treatment to be meted

108 Heredity and Environment

out to him to the end. Unfortunately, the altruism of Christianity has not penetrated so far as the interior of our prison-houses, but once it does it will be better for the criminal, and for the world to which many of them will return. Is it not the height of folly to treat the man who has lapsed in such a manner as to make him, as long as he lives, the enemy of society, with his heart full of hatred and desire of vengeance, when he might by wise means be made contrite in heart and consumed with a wish to do better? When will men overcome their prejudices in regard to this important question? They believe experience has taught certain methods to be the only available; unfortunately, the limitation of the human intellect causes only a repetition and perpetuation of their own errors; the only hope is that in time they will give ear to scientific investigation and act accordingly. Of man's folly in this regard we are tempted to say with him who "was not for an age but for all time":

"Man, proud man, dressed in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assured,
Plays such fantastic tricks before high Heaven
As make the angels weep."

The Mendelian theory has given a fillip to the already tottering position of this law of heredity. Messrs. Dewar and Finn, in the "Making of Species," from which we have already quoted, are of opinion that Mendel's experiments are of great importance, but, they add, "as is usual in such cases, his disciples have greatly exaggerated the value and importance of his work. They apply only to a limited number of cases. . . . The phenomena of inheritance seem to be far more complex than the thoroughgoing Mendelian would have us believe." We are content to leave it at that, as it would be quite impossible for us to elucidate anything further from the experiments. We are quite prepared

to argue, however, that they do not controvert any of our previous statements, as, in any case, they prove nothing more than we have admitted: that the individual inherits only the characteristics of the genus from which he was propagated, plus some physical features of his parents or grandparents, which allow of that slight individual variation which exists amongst the different members of every species. In the case of Man, the qualities of mind make the study of this question immeasurably more intricate, but the fact remains in equal degree for him that he inherits the characteristics of the "genus homo sapiens," with some special features, such as colour of eye or hair, shape of head or nose, height or breadth of body, but his ultimate condition physically, intellectually, and morally depend entirely upon environment. Dewar and Finn have an illuminating passage which bears on this subject. Writing on the fertilised egg, they say: "Our conception is that it is composed of a number of entities, to which we have given the name 'biological molecules,' because in certain respects their behaviour is not unlike chemical molecules. The units which compose these molecules, being made up of protoplasm, are endowed with all the properties of life, including the inherent instability which characterises all living matter." This inherent instability must always be borne in mind in explaining isolated cases of genius on the one hand, or of degradation on the other. We are too often inclined to use the word "reversion," and thus give undue importance to the idea of heredity, when the designation "sport" would be more appropriate—one of those unstable productions which is characteristic of all living matter. As we have pointed out already, nothing is so evanescent as these individual variations; in a state of nature they are immediately destroyed by the potent influence of marriage.

110 Heredity and Environment

Let us recall an instance already given: man has been able by careful selection to produce on the one hand the racehorse; on the other, the heavy and powerful draught-horse, such as the well-known "Clydesdale." If the process of selection is not most carefully guarded in either variety, their particular characteristics tend ere long to disappear, and nature brings back the average type. It is also a striking fact, as Dewar and Finn have pointed out, that if you isolate the race- and draught-horses, keeping them entirely apart, you will find that instead of diverging more and more as time goes on, which we would naturally expect, they tend to become more and more like one another. This is not reversion: it is the strong generic influence destroying the mutations and bringing the different varieties back to the average of the genus. That is what heredity means and what heredity can do.

The same is true of the different classes into which man is artificially divided. Mr. Galton has dealt with this matter in regard to genius. Remarkable sons succeed remarkable parents, he says, and nephews of the first distinguished man display as great, if not greater talents than himself. But of many cases adduced, in none is the inheritance carried beyond the fourth generation, and he also points out that the highest display of genius is found in the first or second generation, after which decadence sets in, or, as we may say, the return to the average, which is what we would expect.

If that is true of the aristocracy of intellect, it can be proved to be as true of what is known as the "aristocracy of birth," implying, as the phrase does, that the "breed" or "blood" can only be continued by the heredity of the upper classes, who claim to be the ruling classes, and until recently asserted their belief in the possession of a special legislative instinct which

Hereditv and Environment 111

came solely by heredity. To the scientific and logical mind it must always have been apparent that the particular manners and attributes of this class were solely the result of environmental influences brought to bear upon the child born into these privileged families, and that any legislative capacity of which a scion of any great house might give evidence was either the result of very careful training in this particular direction, or appeared as a "sport," just as great ability or genius may appear in any class of the community. But the striking fact remains that great literary ability and genius appear in less proportion among the aristocracy than any other; they are more likely to appear in the middle or poorer classes. A few examples will serve, such as Burns, Shakespeare, the Elizabethan dramatists, Thomas Carlyle, Tennyson, Keats, Wordsworth, and many others. Indeed, with the exception of Lord Byron, it is difficult to recall men of high literary attainment who have come from the aristocratic class. The truth of the matter is that the atmosphere of luxury in which they live tends to produce a gradual loss of virility. The members of this class tend to become effete, and die out sometimes in a few generations. They require constant resuscitation from the lower orders, from those who have remained more in contact with nature, and are thus better fitted to continue the species. This is evident every day from the constant influx into the second Chamber of the most brilliant intellects of the House of Commons. They are sent to another place in order to reinvigorate a chamber which would die of inanition if its legislative capacity depended solely on hereditary gift.

The same applies to the mere survival of this class as a whole. A writer in the "Contemporary Review" some years ago stated—apparently on the authority of Burke's "Peerage"—that since 1840 thirty peers or

eldest sons of peers have found wives in America, and of these thirteen are childless; other five have no sons, and the remaining twelve have only thirty-nine children, whereof eighteen are sons; and that of other forty-four titled Americans (excluding wives of knights) seventeen have no child, and eight only one. Thus of the seventy-four titled Americans (excluding wives of knights) thirty are childless, fourteen have only one, and the children of the seventy-four number only 107—an average of less than one and a half per family. The writer points with satisfaction to the superior fertility of the colonials, for of the wives of twenty-three peers or eldest sons of peers who married in the colonies, four have no children, but the remaining nineteen have sixty-three, of whom twenty-nine are sons; while seventy-two colonial wives of Englishmen with courtesy titles or of baronets have 203 children. The ninety-five colonial wives have 266 children—an average of two and three-quarters per family. The estimated average English family in the same period was over four, but probably the families in the corresponding classes in England were no larger than the colonial. The article goes on to ask if President Roosevelt or the Bishop of London dare say that the failure of the eighteen American peeresses to have heirs was wilful, or deny them an eager desire to have the glory of presenting their husbands with an heir to the title. Nature, to ensure maintenance of the species, has deeply implanted in woman's nature the maternal instinct, and in some cases at least it is as potent as self-preservation. It may be defeated, as suicides defeat the instinct to live, and perhaps the cases where a healthy childless wife seeks, without some special reason more or less excusable, to evade maternity, may compare in number not very favourably with those of suicide. The frivolities and follies of a small section of wealthy

society are not a cause of infertility but a consequence. A wife, without intellectual resources, disappointed in her natural instincts, seeks distraction in society that she would gladly exchange for motherhood and home. Perhaps this ought to be stated as a general rule, for there are no doubt mothers of children who prefer a life of folly to that of duty, but we know that in such a case we have to do with a form of morbidity induced by a life of luxury, or it may be individual weakness of the nerve centres with feeble power of inhibition, permitting the disregard of the maternal functions, which are the desire of the average woman, who, fortunately, is the good woman.

The loss of the power of child-bearing in this class is due to two causes—inbreeding and the effect of an environment of luxury. An aristocratic family in which marriage is stringently limited to members of other families of the same class is believed not to survive longer than 200 years, and therefore requires constant renewal from the more virile class which comes next in the social scale. The middle classes are constantly receiving members from the workers; so that in this way a constant cycle goes on, and is very necessary if the upper classes are to survive. It is not only money that attracts the scions of our aristocracy towards the daughters of wealthy Americans: it is prompted, in addition, by the desire to preserve or resuscitate the virility and energy of the family which they represent.

We are therefore driven to the conclusion that, as Dr. Schofield said, "the palmy days of heredity are over"; that a man inherits only the characteristics and instincts of the genus homo, plus a very few attributes of form and feature. His higher attributes and power for good and evil, his evolution physically, intellectually, and spiritually depend entirely on environment.

114 Heredity and Environment

We have proved that the environment of the "submerged third" of the British nation is the worst possible environment for the evolution of the individual and the race, and that of the privileged aristocratic class is even worse, as it produces—what that of the lower orders certainly does not—an incapacity for the propagation of the species. So much is this the case that but for its constant renewal from below, as pointed out already, the aristocracy would become increasingly sterile, and finally disappear. This argument shows how fallacious it is to try to continue the constitution of society on its present lines, and that the first thing to do is to alter the environment of the poor, not in the first place in their own interest, but in order to improve the general stamina of the nation. If society is constantly renewed from below, it follows that at present we are doing our utmost to keep down the general physique, because it is poisoned at its source by bad air, filth, insufficient clothing and food. We start society with a weak strain, which is bound to be felt in the upper strata. If we wish to benefit the nation as a whole, and particularly the unborn generations which are to follow, it is clear that we must give the children of the workers of the nation the best possible environment, so as to secure them a good start and the opportunity of steadfast progress in well-being from infancy to manhood, and not forgetting to surround them with the accumulated culture of the ages in the shape of education on the best lines, and a wise selection of the best thought of the best minds of the past. Before many generations were over the impetus towards a higher order of things would be felt; society would be regenerated from below; the physique of every class would benefit, and health, happiness, and all-pervading culture would be the order of the day.

We have already quoted what Huxley has said in regard to *la misère*; and the Scots poet Burns, who has been justly called "the poet of democracy," and whose heart was full of love to all mankind, indeed to all nature, was well aware from personal experience of the misery of the poor, and the struggle required to "breast the force of circumstance, and break his birth's invidious bar," and this it was that made him write "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn." Tennyson has given expression to the same thought:

"Ah yet, we cannot be kind to each other here for an hour;
We whisper, and hint, and chuckle, and grin at a brother's
shame;
However we brave it out, we men are a little breed."

Again:

"Peace, sitting under her olive, and slurring the days gone by,
When the poor are hovell'd and hustled together, each sex,
like swine;
When only the ledger lives, and not only not all men lie;
Peace in her vineyard—Yes!—but a company forges the
wine."
(*"MAUD."*)

While things are so in our midst it would seem quite impossible to realise or even approach to the Christian ideal. We hope to prove later that this is in progress even now, and will be accomplished with the evolution of a higher ethical development. At one extreme we have the aristocracy without work—real work, beneficent work—of any kind to perform, only, as a rule, a life of luxurious ease and the selfish grab for wealth which labour alone creates; at the other extreme, poverty, misery, excess of labour, and no leisure or comfort in which to develop the higher qualities of the mind. As at present constituted, it is only among the middle class that anything approaching the ideal life is possible. In this class there is work, but not too

116 Heredity and Environment

much, and there is freedom from poverty and carking care, and from the constant temptation towards excess and vice, and there is leisure which can be devoted to the higher development of each individual, physically, intellectually, and ethically.

It is evident that it is no less necessary to alter the environment of the "idle rich," "who toil not, neither do they spin," than that of the millions in poverty, whose hours of labour are much too long. No doubt many of them work and do not spare themselves; some are philanthropists and statesmen, who "scorn delights and live laborious days" in order to benefit their fellow-men. These, who are the exception, do not require any change in their surroundings as far as they personally are concerned. But we have to do with average men and women, who cannot thrive in an atmosphere of luxury. It is bad for the individual and for the race, as the tendency is towards extinction in process of time unless rejuvenated from the lower orders. Until society ceases to have castes or orders, and every man has sufficient for his needs and leisure to develop his higher nature, there can be no improvement or rejuvenation of the race. A healthy environment for all men, without distinction of rank or wealth, is an absolute necessity if this is to be attained. As we have said, we hope to prove that the attainment of this ideal is in process now and will reach complete fulfilment in course of time. It will doubtless be a long process, for the mills of God grind slowly. But there must be few who, once they have grasped the possibility of the realisation of the ideal state, would wish to preserve a system of evil environment for both the workers and the privileged class, and an atmosphere of misery and pain for the great majority of mankind.

We all know, as a matter of experience, that as a rule the worst thing that can happen to a man is to attain

great wealth. Very often he succumbs to luxury and shortens his days. Every man of years and experience must have known cases of this nature, and the sad thing is that often these are valuable lives, which can ill be spared—men of strong intellectual vigour and kind hearts, who, losing the stimulus of work and succumbing to the so-called joys of external things, suffer the inevitable Nemesis of all departure from nature and duty. Again, we have known many instances of misery to both parents and children from the same cause. The sons of fathers who have acquired wealth soon discover that work is not necessary to livelihood, for money is plentiful, and they soon yield to temptation; ere long they are wallowing in the sensual mire; they are soon cut off, and the place that knew them knows them no more. We think without fear of contradiction we may assert that it would be a good thing for humanity and the world if the attainment of great wealth were denied to all men, even in the present circumstances.

All the religious bodies of the world understand the power which environment gives them in maintaining and increasing the numbers of believers in their respective creeds. One and all take care that, either directly through the priest or indirectly by means of the parent, the dogma of the Church shall be taught to the child from its earliest years, and that its ritual shall environ him. It is recorded that a great Cardinal of the Roman Church once said: "Let me instruct the child up to seven years and I will let who will endeavour to mould his thoughts thereafter." Doubtless this is an exaggerated statement of a great truth—that the early environment of the child moulds the whole course of his life.

And not only the Church, but mankind as a whole realises the power of environment. The old proverb,

118 Heredity and Environment

“She who rocks the cradle rules the world,” proves this. Of its truth and universal application there cannot be the slightest doubt ; and the mothers know their power and exercise it, according to their lights, for what they believe to be the greatest advantage of their sons and daughters. It can be said, without fear of contradiction, that it is they who have preserved the ideals of Christian ethics in our Western civilisation, and in this way more than any other they can be said to rule the world, because it is the pervading altruism of Christianity in the minds of men which is regenerating society, and is the motive force of that social legislation which has as its aim the gradual amelioration and elevation of the poorer classes of the people.

In this connection we may refer to the modern movement of the emancipation of women. There seems little doubt that the mothers of the nation have little desire to depart from their own sphere and interfere with the duties of man, who has hitherto in the world's history always regulated, controlled, policed, and defended the nation by land and sea. Woman physically and intellectually is unfitted for such work, and by interfering in legislation—for which she has no faculty—will only damage the State which she has done so much to build and elevate by means of her maternity and influence upon the child. The scientific position has been clearly and emphatically stated by Sir Almroth Wright. There can be no doubt the women who are forcing this movement and smashing the windows of harmless tradespeople who have shown no hostility to their cause, and who assault Ministers of the Crown who are giving the best of their lives in the service of the people, cannot be considered responsible for their actions. If they claim that they are responsible, then clearly they belong to the criminal classes and must be treated as such without fear or

favour. In any case their mental state is a diseased one, and in the present constitution of society it is no doubt a very difficult problem to discover means to remove this morbid development. No doubt in time this will be done, but in the meantime we must take care that this movement shall not abrogate the true function of woman, which gives her the privilege of ruling the world by means of her influence upon the mind of the child.

Environment, then, we are entitled to consider is the chief force in moulding the lives of men and influencing their thoughts and the future of the race for good or ill. It is our duty to see that it is for good, and never to forget that what is a good environment for one is good for all. That is why we must act always in order to benefit not one sect, one class, one tribe or nation, but humanity. In this way only can we hope to bring about that environment which shall eventually accomplish the highest possible development of each unit of the race physically, intellectually, and spiritually.

The Eugenics Congress brought prominently before the public mind many interesting points in regard to heredity and environment. We have already quoted Mr. Balfour's opening address, and it is with much gratification that we again recall some of his statements. "The Eugenist thinks that he ought deliberately to consider the health, the character, and the qualities of succeeding generations. That is a characteristic of domestication that is totally absent from animals in the wild state. It is not a problem of the individual, but of society. We sometimes see it stated that, after all, society is the sum of the individuals that compose it. In a sense that is true—the whole is always the sum of its parts, but in that sense it is quite an unmeaning and useless proposition. In the only sense in which it means anything it is not true; and whether we shall

ever know exactly how a complex society should be composed, and how we ought to lead up to its proper composition—whether we shall ever get that degree of knowledge I know not ; but the idea that you can get a society of the most perfect kind by merely considering questions about the strain and ancestry, and the health and physical vigour of the various components of that society—that, I believe, is a most shallow view of a most difficult question.”

Mr. Balfour has fathomed the shallowness of the views in regard to heredity which have held sway too long. Strain and heredity will trouble us no longer, for the reason that we know the species only requires a perfect environment to secure the best possible individual units physically and intellectually, and, at the same time, by conceding full play to that spiritual evolution which is working and will continue to work with ever-increasing power, to enable it to accomplish marvels in its operation upon the sum of those units which we denominate society. All we require to seek after is the evolution of a better and better environment, and all other things, such as the “ elimination of the unfit,” will be added thereunto.

A good deal has been written in regard to the Galton Laboratory conclusions from the Edinburgh statistics, endeavouring to prove that the children of parents in slum surroundings are not prejudicially affected by the heredity of alcohol. It is not endeavoured to prove that the alcoholic habit in the parent is beneficial ; it only suggests that most probably the parent who can take alcohol in large quantity is of stronger physique than the parent who cannot. But, as a rule, the alcoholic propensity is one absolutely regardless of consequences—the sole desire of the alcoholic is to secure the pleasures of approaching intoxication, which is craved for just as often by the weakly as the strong. The real

point, however, where the Galton school have gone astray is their failure to perceive that the environment of all the children is so essentially bad that the addition of alcoholic heredity is incapable of making it any worse. To adopt the deductions of these observers is to interrupt the process of social amelioration and the attainment, ultimately and progressively, of a perfect environment. Scientifically their conclusions are devoid of support from observed phenomena, and are undeserving of consideration from all imbued with the scientific spirit. Altruistically they can only be classified as deplorable, and ought to be a warning to all sociologists to beware of the deductions of the Galton Laboratory.

The observations of the same school on tuberculosis, which seem to prove that a congested population and limitation of the free air of heaven are not deleterious to cases of phthisis, are opposed to all experience of those best able to judge. Their observations upon this subject must be treated as proceeding from too limited a field of study. We must attend only to the advice of experienced students of tubercle and its treatment, and never cease to seek after the attainment of a perfect environment for every member of the human family.

The Eugenics Congress as a whole proved most instructive. The trend of opinion of those best able to judge was that the sole requirement of the human family was a perfect environment. Hereditv was relegated to its proper place, and put out of account in race progress. The stock of the human family will always be strong and virile if it gets a fair chance, whatever its origin of race or class may be. Given the environment best suited to the race, and a continuance of the best conditions, it will be found impossible to have anything but a continuously perfect physical strain.

122 Heredity and Environment

Sir John Macdonell's remarks on the report of Mr. Van Wagenen on the results of the law authorising or requiring sterilisation of certain classes of defectives, degenerates, and criminals in eight of the States of the American Union were of the greatest importance, and ought to arrest the attention of all students of sociology. He protested against the habitual or even the confirmed criminal being treated in this manner. The criminal, he said, was really a by-product of the slums or other forms of poverty, and there was no warrant for the theory that he was the victim of certain mental or physical defects which he could transmit to his progeny. The criminal had in him the potentiality of good things.

Professor Smith, of Minnesota University, voiced the true scientific attitude in regard to heredity and environment by his striking assertion that he would prefer to have as father a robust burglar rather than a consumptive bishop, *though he should be glad to be adopted into another family very soon after birth*. With a proper environment, consumption would soon cease to be thought of from the hereditary standpoint. In the past it was the compulsory environment of the tubercle bacillus which created the widespread belief in the heredity of phthisis. In all probability he would be as well off as the son of a consumptive bishop if he were at once adopted into a healthy family after his birth. It is quite as necessary to remove him from the consumptive bishop from the physical point of view as to separate him from the immoral influence of the burglar parent from the ethical standpoint. But the statement, as a whole, is an emphatic vindication of the view advanced for the physical, intellectual, and ethical evolution of Man—the progressive ultimate achievement of a perfect environment, and of the exploded influence of the “dead hand” of heredity, which is void of influence except in so far as it perpetuates

Hereditv and Environment 123

the characteristics of the "genus homo sapiens." There is continuity of the germ-plasm—which Weismann fathomed was the means by which continuity of type was secured, and is the explanation of the fact that variations are not perpetuated, but are quickly submerged and a return to the average necessitated.

It establishes heredity as an unalterable entity, limited in its operation to the anatomy and physiology of the species, and conceding full play to environment, which, for good or ill, so potently affects his health, intellect, and morals.

Professor Smith's statement gives strong support to Mr. Balfour's contention that you cannot get a society of the most perfect kind by merely considering questions about the strain and ancestry, the health and physical vigour of the various components of that society. He points out that although parents of talent were able to give exceptional advantages to their children, and ought to show a greater number of successful offspring, yet we find not the slightest evidence that any particular talent is ever inherited. Luther, Napoleon, Abraham Lincoln, Beethoven, Mozart, Wagner, Shakespeare, Burns, Keats, Shelley, Michelangelo, Hogg, Carlyle were all "sports," or, what he aptly terms, "biological surprises." Sainthood comes under the same category as genius; St. Francis d' Assisi, Catherine of Sienna, Florence Nightingale had no ancestry calculated to produce their character and work. He points out, moreover, that many of the most efficient were in early years so weak and diseased as to be classified as "unfit," and if the views of some eugenists were to prevail, ought to have been eliminated in the interests of society and of the race. Immanuel Kant was warned of the danger of study at the university; he ignored his weak chest, studied philosophy, and became the great teacher of

124 Heredity and Environment

the modern intellect. Herbert Spencer was so delicate as to be unable to receive a regular education, yet he became one of the most potent forces of his generation. Sir Isaac Newton similarly was one of the frailest of children. The conclusion of this epoch-making address is deserving of continual repetition: "Nearly all children are well born. *With a wider knowledge of hygiene, a better distribution of wealth and leisure, and a higher sense of personal responsibility on the part of the parents, the problem of heredity from the physical point of view would practically vanish.* The tragedy of the world was spoiled babies."

Dr. Devine, of New York, strongly supported his compatriot. What was wrong, he said, with those who were giving trouble to society was not that they were of a defective ancestry, or had some evil in their blood, but that they had not had a fair or decent opportunity.

Prince Kropotkin poured a wealth of satire upon the crude idea of the sterilisation of the unfit. Who were the people they proposed to sterilise? he asks. The idlers or the workers? The women of the working classes who suckled their children, or the women of the upper classes who, by neglecting to do this, showed their unfitness for maternity? Those who produced degenerates in slums, or those who produced them in palaces?

On the whole, the impression left on the mind by the trend of thought of the Congress fills one with deep satisfaction. In addition to the views expressed as to the all-importance of a perfect environment and the cessation of the undue preponderance formerly conceded to heredity, there is evidenced on the part of men of the widest thought, culture, and scientific attainment a recognition of the lesson of history, and the spiritual evolution underlying all advance, and compelling the steady march on to the city of God. It was with the

deepest satisfaction that one detected this influence in the opening address of the president ; two passages are well worthy of record. " It was true," he said, " that they could not but glory in this saving of suffering, for the spirit which led to the protection of the weak and the afflicted was, of all things, that which was the most worth preserving on earth. . . . The end they had in view—an improvement in the racial qualities of future generations—was noble enough to give them courage for the fight. Their first effort must be to establish such a moral code as would ensure that the welfare of the unborn should be held in view in connection with all questions concerning both the marriage of the individual and the organisation of the State." We have here a complete vindication of Benjamin Kidd's law of the spiritual evolution of man, the main theme of whose thesis is that man is every day becoming more and more religious, as evidenced by the growth of self-denial and altruism, this being shown more particularly in regard to the perfecting of the environment of the generations of men who are to succeed those already existing. We may now say with confidence that our thesis is no longer tentative ; it is an established fact, proved by the study of observed phenomena, and must continue to mould the thoughts and actions of men with ever-increasing power from generation to generation.

Mr. Hector Macpherson in summing up the conclusions to be drawn from the Conference says some striking things well worthy of attention. " Man, unlike the lower animals, is not completely at the mercy of material laws. We attribute the vast difference between the man of to-day and his savage ancestor to civilisation, but, after all, *what is civilisation but a colossal environment as a check upon his hereditary animality.* We hear talk of the great work of natural selection when not

126 Heredity and Environment

interfered with leading to survival of the fittest. Why, in the long ages of conflict, it was oftener the best that were killed and the unfittest that survived. Complaint is sometimes made that by our humanitarian methods we are keeping alive numbers who in early times would have been exterminated. It is forgotten that in earlier times disease killed men of the highest type, men of genius, who, had they been born in our day, would be saved for the benefit of civilisation. By all means let eugenists grapple with the problem of heredity, but do not let them overlook the vast importance of environment." This is exactly what Professor Karl Pearson and Miss Elderton have done in regard to the Edinburgh statistics. They are so obsessed by "heredity" that they cannot see the real factor—environment. They want associated with them in such work a medical man of experience and wide outlook who would be able to point out their fallacies and direct them to the true cause of our social evils.

Humanity has therefore every reason to hope, "to greet the unseen with a cheer," for who can limit the summit of attainment when a perfect environment has become possible to all members of the species, by means of the operation in men's minds of the sublime thought and altruism of the New Testament, directing the progressive spiritual evolution of the race? May we not in its completion be able to say of the whole human family, to borrow the sublime apostrophe of Hamlet: "What a piece of work is Man; how noble in reason; how infinite in faculty; in form, in moving, how express and admirable; in action, how like an angel; in apprehension, how like a god; the beauty of the world; the paragon of animals!"

Chapter VII

The Lesson of History

THE history of humanity, scientifically considered, is not of very ancient date. The geologists tell us that the remains of man which have been found take one back very long periods of time ; so long that the generally accepted idea of six thousand years, which had been fixed by the theologians, is discredited from the point of view of established scientific data. But this is quite immaterial in so far as the ethical evolution of man is concerned. The Old Testament is a historical account of the Jewish race, which is most valuable from this point of view, and Matthew Arnold deserves especial praise for his elucidation of the lesson it teaches in his work "Literature and Dogma." He shows that there we have the evolution of the idea of God, which will remain to the everlasting credit of the Jewish people. Beginning with a purely anthropomorphic conception, it develops by slow steps and sure until we reach the exalted thought of "the Eternal—not ourselves—that maketh for righteousness," which, as a definition of the spiritual idea of God and His relationship to man, has never been surpassed. This concept has been the most potent influence in the history of the Jewish people and of all peoples who have come under the sway of Christian ethics. The same author goes on to elucidate the teaching of the New Testament, and elaborates the idea of the "sweet reasonableness" of Jesus, which has moulded the

thoughts of men and totally altered the history of our Western civilisation. Nowhere has this influence been more lucidly considered than in Mr. Benjamin Kidd's "Social Evolution," published in 1902. He there deals with the great Greek civilisation and the rise and fall of the Roman Empire. He shows that notwithstanding the immense intellectual vigour of the ancient Greeks and their ethical philosophy of a very high order there was no permanence; like a great meteor, it vanished into the empyrean, never again to reappear. The Roman civilisation—with its colossal military organisation, with its great inherent force and energy, possessed of a succession of rulers of extraordinary intellectual gifts—passed away like a dream of the night. This rise and fall of empires has created a caste of thought which prevails at the present day among nearly all civilised and intellectual men, and has established firmly as an axiom of history the idea that all nations from small beginnings come to maturity and, after a career of glory and conquest more or less prolonged, decline and pass into that obscurity whence they came, in obedience to an immutable law. All great states in the world's history which have attained to pre-eminence have, in the process of the suns, as surely declined and suffered eclipse. It is therefore at the present time an article of faith with the vast majority of mankind that just as a man is born into this world, attains to full physical and mental vigour, and with advancing years suffers decay and eventually death, so it is with nations and empires; and none may escape this unalterable decree. It is permissible, however, at this stage of the world's history to doubt the absolute necessity of the continuity of the operation of this law, for the reason that these ancient civilisations were founded on a purely military organisation which necessitated the total subordination of the masses of the people to the service of

the state. Thus it is that in all of them a system of slavery is a necessity of its existence. There was no thought on the part of the rulers of raising the mass of the people to a higher plane of comfort or culture ; the idea of social amelioration was unthought of, and would have been abhorrent. The " State " meant the interests of Empire, of military organisation and conquest, and of the aristocracy who governed, and who held the " plebs " as slaves. These existed for the sole purpose of fulfilling the behests of those above them ; they were pawns in the game, deserving no consideration but such as was necessary to keep them alive, and efficient when battles had to be fought or luxuries gratified. The individual personal satisfaction of the members of this caste was an idea unthought of, and would have been scouted as absurd and subversive of all discipline and continuity of government. This attitude of mind has never received better expression than in the lines put by Shakespeare into the mouth of Coriolanus when incensed by the shouts and execrations of the plebs and their demands for his expulsion from the city. In indignation and scorn he hurls back their taunts and demands, and with the recklessness of the true aristocrat replies : " You common cry of curs, whose breath I hate as reek o' the rotten fens, . . . I banish *you* ! "

The idea of patriotism was exploited in the same way. It was only a call to arms addressed to all good Romans to maintain the integrity and increase the greatness of the Empire, which existed for the benefit of the few ; its expansion was no help to the hewers of wood and drawers of water ; no attempt was ever made or could be made in such a civilisation to elevate the mind and soul of the common people. The state was concerned only with present-day material interests, and possessed of no desire to benefit society as a whole or the generations to come ; the future was no concern of theirs, as

it is in all governments to-day in the van of progress in our Western civilisation.

We think it will be acknowledged that thus far we are dealing with historical fact. Benjamin Kidd has dealt with these points in such a fascinating way that, after a study of his book, one feels impelled to advise every one desiring further and detailed evidence to read and absorb the facts and ideas contained in "Social Evolution." It is he who has discovered and revealed the true lesson of history, and without his teachings on this subject the study of the past and the present would have been impossible from the scientific standpoint; it is therefore necessary to borrow from this most interesting and suggestive volume, if the teaching of the lesson of the events and epochs of past ages is to be satisfactorily expounded. He shows how the creation of this caste of slaves, who were utilised to the utmost limit without consideration of any kind, and being born into this lot remained there without hope and without freedom as long as life lasted, resulted ultimately and of necessity in the disintegration of the state. This caste of slavery was considered a vital element of the continuance of power and empire, but eventually like a canker it sapped the vigour of the body politic; it was like "a goodly apple, rotten at the core," and ere long passed away as a thing of naught.

In our Western civilisation as it exists to-day it is evident that a different conception of the state—of the body politic—pervades men's minds. Slavery as such has been abolished in all countries which can be described as leaders in the van of civilisation, acknowledging the sway of the Christian religion, and enlightened by the great liberating movement of the Reformation. And it will be observed that it has been abolished only as part of, and in consonance with, the progressive social amelioration of all classes of the community, and

herein lies the force which has secured permanence, and we are entitled to believe will continue in our Western civilisation. And why? Because for the first time in the history of the ages we are approaching to a form of government which "maketh for righteousness." Governors and statesmen are endeavouring to rule the people after the pattern of the conception of the "Eternal," which has been evolved in the Old Testament. The Eternal was the "not ourselves who maketh for righteousness"; conjoined with this great idea of the Supreme Power, under whose control and guidance they lived and moved, we have the altruism of Christianity. The teachings of Jesus, inculcating the suppression of the purely selfish element in human nature and the idealisation of love towards all men, regardless of class or power or wealth, has so permeated the minds of men that all governments have been compelled, consciously or unconsciously, to yield to this new influence. This has resulted in the admission of the masses of the people to the electorate which selects the government and moulds the laws of the nation, and has brought within near distance the consummation of the idea of "equality of opportunity" for all. The abolition of slavery, the extended franchise, the gradual concession of the rights of man as man have been granted by rulers possessed of power and every means of maintaining their autocracy; the "haves," from time to time, have resigned their rights and privileges to the "have-nots," notwithstanding the fact that there was no compelling force urging them so to act; they could quite well have refused, and used the means at their disposal in order to retain their wealth and power. The instinct of self-preservation would have led them to act solely in their own material interest, but they have been led to disregard it, and to act in a manner unknown hitherto in the world's history; a new in-

fluence has arisen, and the motive is not now self-aggrandisement, but the betterment of the condition of those of our fellow-men who are in need of food, of clothing, and better conditions generally. And thus it is that within recent times we have witnessed great amelioration of the lot of the people ; we have only to think of the factory laws, those regulating employment in mines—entailing shorter hours and better conditions—controlling the employment of women and children, enforcement of sanitation, better housing, garden cities, small holdings, fever hospitals, state insurance, the minimum wage, and the prevention of disease, and now we are contemplating an adult franchise, conceding even greater power to the toiling millions. No such measures were ever dreamt of in the civilisations previous to the dawn of Christianity ; then there was only one thought on the part of the “haves,” and that was the maintenance of the institution of slavery ; now the “haves” have abolished this mark of degradation in all countries under the sway of the nations to which they belong, and their chief idea is the betterment of the “have-nots.” In our Parliaments the opposing parties vie with one another in making further and further concessions to the workers whom they govern. Our Western civilisation has been in existence now for about a thousand years, and its main feature has been the gradual amelioration of the lot of mankind ; at first the efforts in this direction were feeble and slow of accomplishment ; they were mostly concerned with certain rights of man as man, and the assertion by slow stages of the principle of the liberty of the subject. It is only in more recent times, with the rapid progress of our civilisation, that reforms in the direction of improving the lot of humanity have progressed by leaps and bounds. We must now endeavour to give some explanation of this new development in Western civili-

sation in contrast to those of ancient times. We survey the face of history and can discover no reason why the aspect of things should have changed, and why our civilisation should not have fallen into decay like all those which have preceded it, excepting the increased respect paid to the liberty of the subject and the gradual improvement of the lot of the people as a whole. It would appear that a new era has dawned, characterised by humanitarianism, and accompanying this the desire to lift the burden from and increase the happiness of our neighbour. We are now driven to an investigation of the cause of this marvellous change in the history of mankind, and it is not long before we discover that coincidentally we have the rise of the Christian religion. It is now nearly two thousand years since the dawn of Christianity, and even now it is not yet shining with its full effulgence, but it is nearing the meridian, and it will not be long ere its light-giving and fertilising power regenerates the whole earth. The altruism of the teachings of Jesus is the very essence of Christian ethics, and has appealed directly to the heart of man, and so permeated his mind that quite unconsciously in the early stages it affected his conduct towards his fellow-men and compelled him to adopt measures to ease their burdens and improve their lot ; and thus it is that the amelioration of society became the outstanding mark of all countries where Christian ethics prevailed. The social betterment which has arisen has enabled all the individuals of the body politic to act in concert, and has brought nearer to every one the accumulated culture of the ages, and hence the enormous strides in modern times in the region of mechanical science and discovery. This rapid advance is often explained as being due to increased intellectual vigour and power ; no doubt the intellectual capacity of the average man has been raised to a higher level, and will be extended

until that of all men shall be elevated to a higher plane ; but it must be insisted on once again that the human intellect *per se* can never evolve to greater heights than it has done in the past history of humanity. We have only to consider how far behind we are even now to the great Greek period and the Elizabethan Age. The great point is that the average culture is improving and is having its effect in stimulating, in a manner hitherto unknown, mechanical invention and discovery, and it becomes evident more and more as we study scientifically the trend of human affairs that this is the direct result of the social amelioration which exists to-day, and has its origin in the altruism of Christian ethics, inculcating as they do the suppression of the purely selfish element in human nature and the idealisation of the duty of love towards all men, regardless of rank or wealth or power.

As the workers are in the majority in all great societies or states, it follows now that it has been recognised that every normal, every sane man has an equal right with every other in the election of the rulers, and, in framing the laws, that they as a class are the dominant factor in the state. The most recent catch-word of politics—that “Labour is realising its power”—shows the trend of things. Many hear this with alarm and fear, and no doubt it does mean eventually a more even distribution of wealth and better conditions generally, but it is a grievous mistake to suppose that “labour” means to bring pain or misery to any other class. From what we know of the leaders of the Labour party we are entitled to believe that their demands will be in accordance with the Will of the Eternal, “who maketh for righteousness,” and especially as shown forth in the teachings of Jesus, who proclaimed the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man—the gospel of sweet reasonableness.

It may be asked how, if this is so, the Church, which was the means whereby the influence of the Christian religion was perpetuated and handed down from one generation to another, did not inculcate laws on such lines as those which are now devised for the amelioration of the lot of humanity? The answer is that the Church considered its duty was to inculcate attention to its rites and sacraments in order to secure for the individual the reward of material present-day interests. It never seemed to occur to it that it might exert its great power and influence to improve the general conditions of life and make the lot of humanity better. Notwithstanding this attitude of the Church itself, in the course of the ages the altruism of Christian ethics pervaded the minds of ordinary men and distilled its sweet influence there, ultimately inaugurating a movement which has resulted in new methods of rule unknown hitherto in the history of human affairs. Gradually under this influence men by slow degrees have come to feel that each has a duty towards his fellow-man—that he is in truth “his brother’s keeper.” Some great souls have felt it to such an extent as to be able to overcome even the primeval instinct of self-preservation, and actually give their own lives to save others, or in order that their fellow-men might realise the secret of the revelation of the life of the Saviour of mankind, who gave His life in order that all men through His death might realise the necessity for a life of righteousness, of reverence for the Eternal, and love of one’s neighbour, whatever his race, caste, colour, belief, or civilisation. The Church deserves credit for keeping the lamp of Christian truth burning, but the permanence of this faith can only be ascribed to its own inherent merit and the responsiveness of the minds of men to the teachings of love and self-sacrifice. This would tend to show that there is implanted in man an

136 The Lesson of History

ideal which may be said to be more of the heart than the head, and was only awaiting an appeal such as Christian ethics supply to arouse it to life and action. There is no doubt this ideal is gaining strength day by day, and is the chief agent in the making of history at the present time, and must enter more and more into every measure affecting the welfare of men and their relation to one another.

In regard to what has been said on this subject of the attitude of the Church, it is not uninteresting to find the view upheld by Lord Hugh Cecil, one of the most intellectual members of that party in the state which has endeavoured to run counter to the new order of things: that the Church and religion have nothing to do with the welfare of mankind as a whole; they have only to do with the personal salvation of the human soul. It is difficult to understand how this attitude can be maintained when we consider that the Author of our religion inculcated the lightening of the burden of the poor, the sad, and the afflicted. His gospel, if it meant anything, urged the salvation of humanity by means of all measures which could be devised to remove the load of misery, emphasising this as the Will of the Eternal—"your Father, which is in heaven," to quote the words of the New Testament; and His thought, much as it was of the poor, was not confined to this class; His love extended to all men. To the young man "of many possessions" He says: "Go and sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and ye shall find treasure in heaven." It is clear He did not consider His gospel to mean only an individual life of righteousness which pointed the pathway to eternal bliss. No; He meant it to include every possible effort which could be made to ease the burdens of a sad and downtrodden humanity. And hence the all-pervading influence of the altruism of His teaching in every social ameliora-

ing development of our time. And therefore it is that the Church has failed to keep the hold which, as the depository of the faith and dogma of the Christian religion, it ought to have maintained upon the minds and hearts of men. Fortunately the heart and mind of the Master was one of such charm and attraction that His teachings remain the greatest "power unto salvation" among men, notwithstanding the failure of the Church to apprehend the magnitude of its mission. But at last it is awakening, and fortunately the youth of the Established Church of England at any rate has been aroused, and with all the energy of "eager hearts and strong," by means of Students' Conferences on all the needs of the times, are doing their utmost to arouse the Church¹ to a full sense of its duties and responsibilities.

Lord Hugh Cecil, in a volume entitled "Conservatism," adheres to the view that Christianity has to do with the individual soul, and that states and governments are outside its jurisdiction. Their business is doing justice, respecting the rights of property, without investigating the methods of their acquisition. He wants the individual rich man to respect the Gospel injunction as regards his wealth, but the state has no right in its own capacity to apply the Christian standard or require sacrifices of the rich man which can be said to penalise. A critic of this volume in the "Westminster Gazette" gets to the root of the matter. He says: "No state has adopted or ever can adopt the non-ethical idea of property. So far as religion enters into a community, it will enter into its state policy. In some form or other the idea that the state in the last resort has the right of controlling the property

¹ By "the Church," I mean the Church as by law established—the Anglican Church in England, the Roman Catholic in Austria, the Greek Church in Russia, and so on. Nonconformity has always been much more alive to the needs and sufferings of the poor.

of its members for the public well-being must enter into public policy, whether it is a policy of a conservative party or a liberal party; but the idea of a non-ethical state becomes the more difficult when advocated by a writer who is a strong upholder of the state establishment and endowment of religion. What is his ground? Not that the Church established is necessarily the one depository of religious truth, for two different churches are established, in England and in Scotland; nor that it represents the religion of the majority, for the Irish establishment clearly did not do that. What remains? Simply that the establishment of a Church is the recognition of religion by the state—the national affirmation of the existence of God and the moral responsibility to His judgment, which attaches to men in their national no less than in their individual acts. We may ask of what essential value is this formal and public affirmation by the state if it is to be attached to a doctrine that ethical considerations are irrelevant to the greater part of the operations in which the state is engaged? The argument which pins the state to the individualistic, competitive, non-ethical view of its functions can be defended on many good logical grounds, but it does not go well with a passionate defence of establishments as the recognition of a principle which is *ex hypothesi* excluded." This is the philosophy of the old style of Conservatism, but it is already a thing of the past. And it is perhaps the most striking evidence of the influence of altruistic Christianity that, willingly or unwillingly, the Conservative party is already committed, whenever it has opportunity, to a programme of social, housing, and poor law reform on the lines of the "Minority Report." The fact is that the church or the state in a Christian country which does not mould its practice on the lines of the social improvement of the community, showing forth

thereby the compelling force of the altruism of its gospel, is doomed, and this will become more and more evident as time goes on.

The author of this volume makes another astounding statement worthy of attention: "The championship of religion is the keystone of the arch upon which the whole fabric of Conservatism rests." If he had said "the championship of the Church," he would have stated the case as it exists to-day. Unfortunately the Church only champions a creed inculcated by authority; the true religion is in the hearts of men, quite apart from the Church. The world is being saved by the practical results of the teachings of Jesus, which both the Church and Conservatism have done and are doing their best to oppose. The practical results of these teachings are all measures devised to ameliorate the lot of the toilers below the poverty line, and these have been consistently opposed by Lord Hugh Cecil and Conservatism and the Church.

Lord Hugh's dissertation is only "window-dressing," which cannot bear investigation, and that is why Conservatism *per se*, as a potent force in the community, is as dead as Queen Anne. The main object of Conservatism is to "dish the Whigs" by the presentation of Acts of Parliament previously suggested and elaborated by the liberal party, and some of their measures are actually drawn on exactly similar lines to those which have been thrown out by the Second Chamber while their opponents were in office. His cry that Old Age Pensions and State Insurance should be secured to all, rich and poor alike, to those earning over one hundred and sixty pounds a year as well as those below, is absurd at the present time, as it would only throw fresh burdens on the community. To argue that those who by greed, stealth, or unscrupulous disregard of their fellow-men, or who, apart from such methods,

find themselves endowed with great possessions, are to receive monetary benefits from the state, such as are required as necessities of ordinary existence by the poor, is to show a total incapacity for comprehending the present-day condition of affairs, or the bearing of true religion upon the social amelioration of the people. Lord Hugh Cecil will do well to look into this matter from the historical standpoint, and throw off the mantle of the old Conservatism, which, after all, is concerned only in the maintenance of present-day conditions. No party can hope to endure which does not mould its policy on the altruism of Christian ethics. Its main thought must always be the betterment of the general body of the people and of the future of the race; otherwise it is sure to be left out of account, stranded on the bank and shoal of time.

It has been argued that there are countries in Europe, in which the Christian religion has been established for centuries, which, like the ancient civilisations, have risen to greatness, and just as surely, as did Rome, having reached the zenith, sunk again into eclipse. Portugal and Spain are both striking examples. What is the explanation? It is simply that the Church in these countries chose to keep the people in ignorance, and, dominating the state for its own advantage, prevented that social amelioration of the masses which is a necessity of all progress in art and science, and of that prosperity upon which all advancing civilisation must be founded. The Church maintained the personal view of religion, dominating the individual, who was made to find his present-day material interests by the observance of its rites and sacraments: it prevented anything like the enlightenment of the masses, and succeeded by these means in maintaining its ascendancy in the state. Instead of helping the people to lighten their burdens and attain by degrees to a life of comfort

and culture, it held them down, and in this manner kept its control of their entire existence and of the policy of the government as well. The social condition of the people, like slavery in ancient Rome, remained a canker in the body politic, and in both states was the one cause of failure to retain their position as world-powers. The Spanish Main is a thing of the past, and the glory of Portuguese colonial expansion has failed to preserve its grandeur. Only recently the Government of Portugal, which it must be remembered was supported by the Church, has been overthrown. And one cannot forget that France has disestablished the Church of Rome, and is, I believe, the only great European power which refuses to recognise state religion. The Church has wrought its own destruction ; it endeavoured to dominate the lives and thoughts of the most intellectual people in Europe, with the only possible result that in the end it was rejected with scorn. It failed to convey the message which the Author and the Finisher of our faith came to preach—" Peace on earth and good will to men " ; and the people, through the force of their strong intellectual faculty, recognised this failure of duty and rejected the establishment of the Church as a useless incubus on the state. Notwithstanding, social amelioration has not fallen behind in that country, because the altruism of Christian ethics has permeated the minds of the people. France is an object-lesson to the effect that the establishment of a State Church is not a necessity of a great world power either in the direction of its maintenance or the comfort and culture of the people. The real necessity is the establishment of the teachings of the Founder of our religion in the hearts and minds of men, which brings about social amenity and well-being, and thus gives the state a stable foundation, securing permanence, and preventing decadence.

The United States of America is another great power which has no Established Church, yet it advances by leaps and bounds, and without fear we can prophesy its continued prosperity and greatness, because its policy is founded on the high principle of Christian ethics and acts in the interests of the welfare of the body of the people. And this is the secret of the continued greatness and power of all those European states who have come under the sway of the great movement of the Reformation. Historically viewed and scientifically considered, the only explanation of this movement was the rebellion of the forcible intellects of these peoples against the dominion of a Church which had failed to keep the lamp of truth—which lightens the darkness of the world—shining, to show the way of peace and happiness and further spiritual evolution to suffering humanity. The progressive countries, the leaders in the van of civilisation to-day, are those who have evolved a Reformed Church truly interpreting the altruism of Jesus, under the watchful guiding eye of the Eternal, “who maketh for righteousness.” This is the lesson of history. These states must endure because, through the power of Christian ethics, they are “broad-based upon the people’s will,” and act in a progressive manner solely with the view of improving the lot of the masses of mankind; and that is why we can afford to prophesy, realising as we do, in the light of the past, that Britain and the United States will not pass away like the ancient empires, because they are founded on the impregnable rock of Christian teaching, which inevitably includes the social amelioration of the masses of the people. Germany is one of our foremost world-powers to-day, due to the influence of the Reformation upon the minds of men, and consequently the increased operation of the altruism of our common religion. But one cannot help regretting the dominance

of militarism and the consequent retardation of social betterment which exists at the present time. Germany is not broad-based upon the people's will, as is proved by the autocratic power of the Emperor ; the franchise is extensive, but it is effete ; the socialists are admitted to number about half of the electorate, and yet they do not have one-third of the representation in the Reichstag. There are two elements of disintegration here—militarism on the one hand and the autocratic opposition of the will of the people on the other. Fortunately for the continued existence of the State, that wise, far-seeing statesman, probably as great as the world has yet seen, Bismarck, thirty years ago passed laws of State Insurance and other measures for the social improvement of the masses, which are bearing fruit now, and are doubtless the chief bulwarks of the Government against the disintegrating forces at present at work. The people are groaning under the burden of excessive taxation, required to maintain the enormous military organisation necessary to the greatest of European powers. History tells that here we have a house founded upon the sand, and doomed to inevitable disintegration unless its rulers are wisely guided and concede to the masses of the people "equality of opportunity," a lessening of the burdens which bear upon them, and a gradual betterment of their condition. Thus only can the masses learn to be proud of the greatness of their country as a world-power ; otherwise they come to loathe the Government and all its works, and mutter "revolution" until it becomes an accomplished fact. And thus history repeats itself. Let Germany take warning in time.

The state of things in the "Fatherland" is disconcerting to her neighbours as well, for this reason, that one can never be assured that the Government will not declare war on the slightest of pretexts in order to

endeavour to resuscitate the patriotism of the masses and direct their thoughts into other channels, and for the time being, at any rate, break the strong socialistic wave which is flooding the country from one end to the other. There can be no doubt that such a policy would effect its purpose for a time, but ultimately it would be disastrous, and recoil with ten-fold force upon its authors whenever the people once again began to feel the still greater burdens of excessive taxation and military exaction. If the Emperor is wisely guided, he will forthwith concede true representative government to the toiling millions over whom he holds sway; otherwise the consequences must be of a very disastrous kind.

One word must be said in regard to Mr. Norman Angell's theory of war. Every day he is gaining adherents to the idea that military conquest is a "great illusion." In the early phases of human existence the supremacy of the purely physical was not to be wondered at, and as men combined fortuitously into tribes and nations through the accident of geographical conditions such as mountain ranges, wide rivers, or ocean barriers, this spirit continued to prevail. The "sensus gregis," however, differed in this way: that while the peoples fought as a whole against one another, they were often possessed of hatred and division among themselves, and thus, as Mr. J. M. Robertson shows in a work of profound learning and deep insight, "war is precisely the blindest, the least rational, the least human of all the forms of human conflict."¹ And he has little difficulty in proving that without fail it brings its own Nemesis, and most assuredly accomplishes the ruin and decay of the state. The history of every past great civilisation shows it. In ancient and mediæval Rome we have the same result as obtains in Turkey to-day as a

¹ "The Evolution of States,"

direct result of the operation of continuous warfare upon the condition of the people. It must always mean the frustration of democracy. "Ethics must needs worsen throughout the State when the primitive instinct of strife developed into a policy of plunder; and worsened ethics means a positive weakening of a society's total strength."¹ Similarly with the Greek civilisation. "Even the sinister virtue of uniting a people within itself was lacking to the perpetual warfare of the Greek; the internal hatreds seem positively to worsen in the atmosphere of the hatreds of the communities."² That Aristotle had realised the danger of continuous conflict he shows by an apt quotation from his "Politics." "As he (Aristotle) profoundly observes, the training of a people to war ends in their ruin, even when they acquire supremacy, because their legislators have not taught them how to rest."³ In a chapter on "Feudal England," Robertson asserts that "nothing can hinder that foreign wars shall in the end aggrandise the upper as against the lower classes, developing as they do the relation of subjection, and setting up the spirit of force as against the spirit of law. . . . No nation, from Rome to Napoleonic France, ever helped its own higher culture by destroying other States."⁴

The case of Turkey lends ample confirmation if any were needed to the position taken up by Robertson, and Angell has made striking use of it in demonstrating the evils of continuous conflict. For four hundred years it has lived on this alone, extracting tribute from the subject Christian populations without any pretence whatever of government, administration, or protection, while the Turkish people themselves, unfit for anything but physical conflict, degenerated in every

¹ Robertson, "Evolution of States."

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

higher element of their being. Of organisation there was none, and social betterment was impossible. In fact, the whole process has been one of social anarchy and confusion, which must inevitably accompany tyranny, exaction, and oppression. And to-day the Nemesis attending such processes is proved to a demonstration. We rejoice in the present war, and there is no inconsistency in such rejoicing, because it is the only means by which the reign of force can be brought to an end. And we rejoice for the further reason, as Mr. Angell says, that "if it is good for the Balkan States to abandon conflict as between themselves in favour of co-operation against the common enemy, it can only be good for other Christian nations to abandon such conflicts in favour of co-operation against their common enemy, which is wild nature, and human error, and ignorance, and passion." Dr. Winslow Hall has given beautiful expression to this idea in a wonderful poem—"More than Conquerors"—from which the following lines are taken :

" Trust will spread, trust will spread,
If we flout misconceptions and dread ;
We'll make head, we'll make head,
When the love-lighted lead the misled.

" Nevermore, nevermore,
Shall the nations be darkened with gore !
We shall soar, we shall soar,
On the wings of the wrath we forbore."

As intelligent beings, appreciating the phenomena of history, we are bound to agree with Norman Angell and J. M. Robertson. It is only those who have an axe to grind, or who are prejudiced by a military environment, who can defend warfare, or continue to recommend a policy of compulsory military training or service. Nothing more disastrous to the higher evolution of the human race could happen than that the United

Kingdom should change its policy in this matter. It has hitherto shown the world the way ; and while in this transitory period it is necessary to be prepared to defend itself against attack, it must continue to maintain its present position of opposition to further conquest. It must continue to oppose the military spirit *per se*, which is incompatible with social amelioration or with the higher evolution of mankind, and is in direct opposition to the teaching of Christian ethics.

Mr. Kidd always maintains that the basis of action and feeling under the altruism of Christianity is ultra-rational. He holds that when a man acts against his own self-interest in order to benefit those around him who are in need of food and housing and necessary comforts, and particularly on behalf of the generations which are to come, he is acting contrary to "pure reason." Reason so interpreted means simply self-interest, but, as a present-day concept, has come to mean something entirely different ; pure reason appeals to the very ideal which the Christian religion shows forth. Self-abnegation is self-realisation ; if, then, by self-denial the true self is realised, reason cannot mean self-interest ; it must mean its direct opposite. As Lord Haldane showed in the Gifford lectures delivered at St. Andrews, the "Pathway to Reality" is by means of a life of self-denial towards the realisation of the God in man—the immanence of the Divine.¹ And this brings us to a further stage in this chain of thought. How are we to explain the gradual uplifting of the human race ever since the dawn of Christianity, the changed attitude of man to man, of ruler to subject, of government to people, of the submission of individual self-interests to that of the state, or "the unborn generations which are to come after,"

¹ "The purpose of the religious man is to die to self in order to live in God."—"The Pathway to Reality," 1904.

148 The Lesson of History

as Mr. Kidd has it? The only explanation which is at the same time logical and consistent with the facts of history is that in all men there is an element to which the Divine appeals; that this appeal, although felt now and then dimly, was only realised in its full intensity with the advent of Christian altruism, and that now this element is gaining the ascendancy in the thoughts and actions of men, and will ultimately influence all things more and more in accordance with the Will of the Eternal, and moulded by the "sweet reasonableness" of the teachings of Jesus.

Man has evolved by slow but sure steps from a very dim and distant past. Morrison has given expression to this idea in his poem on "the Evolution of Man":

"With never a spark in the empty dark
To hint at a life to come.

 .
 .
 .
 .
There came a time in the last of life
When over the nursing sod
The shadows broke, and the soul awoke
To the strange sweet dream of God."

And Mr. W. Herbert Carruth gives us a similar thought:

"And caves where the cave men dwell,
Then a sense of law and beauty
And a face turned from the clod—
Some call it evolution,
And others call it God.

"A picket frozen on duty,
A mother starved for her brood,
Socrates drinking the hemlock,
And Jesus on the rood;
And millions who, humble and nameless,
The straight hard pathway trod—
Some call it consecration,
And others call it God."

We are entitled to believe that physically and intellectually he has attained to the acme of his capacity

for evolution, but now that "equality of opportunity" is becoming increasingly more and more possible for every member of the state, we shall certainly have a marked and general rise in physique, intelligence, and culture. The point is that we are not at all likely to attain a higher physical or intellectual evolution than has been possible to man in the past, but the remarkable fact is now demonstrable that man is becoming, as Mr. Kidd has proved, "more and more religious." You may take leave to doubt this and assert that the contrary is the case; that men who formerly attended church service with the utmost regularity have ceased to do so, and nowadays play golf instead. No doubt this has occurred in many instances. But that does not alter the fact that what was known as pure materialism is dead; that scientific men have departed from what was considered a purely logical standpoint and are enquiring into the secret and power of ethical and spiritual agencies. Professor Urwick, in his book "A Philosophy of Social Progress," which is a searching plea for idealism in collective action, referring to the mystical side of human life, insists upon it as a reality, which men of science or practical men will ignore at their peril. Moreover, the general mass of the people of all classes act more and more from day to day, consciously or unconsciously, under religious influences, and every man in his heart of hearts knows that he has a duty to humanity. It ought again to be acknowledged that Mr. Kidd has been the first to demonstrate that man is still in process of evolution, not in the acquisition of greater physical or mental power, but in the attainment of a higher ethical or spiritual nature. The present evolution of man is spiritual, and in this direction only lies the path of further advance for the human species.

150 The Lesson of History

- " For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;
.
- " Till the war-drum throb'd no longer, and the battle flags
were furl'd
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.
.
- " There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm
in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law.
.
- " Yet I doubt not thro' the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widen'd with the process of
the suns."
(" Locksley Hall.")

Chapter VIII

The Spiritual Evolution of Society

“ But heard are the voices, Here eyes do regard you
Heard are the sages, In eternity’s stillness ;
The worlds, and the ages : Here is all fulness,
‘ Choose well, your choice is Ye brave, to reward you ;
Brief and yet endless : Work and despair not.’ ”¹

I T may be asked why we have been made to wade through pages of discussion as to the truth of Darwinism, Malthusianism, Natural Selection, Heredity and Environment in order to arrive at the beneficent influence of Christian ethics and their practical application in the conduct of human affairs. These subjects are no doubt interesting in themselves, but what have they to do with such matters as spiritual evolution in the ideal state? It has been demonstrated already that humanity has cried for long to be removed from the “ dead hand ” of heredity on account of its blighting influence upon the minds of men which has obstructed any movement in the direction of improving the environment. This sufficiently explains why we discussed these subjects: but why Darwinism, Malthusianism, and Natural Selection? For the reason that if these theories are true, it is quite useless for man to attempt to attain social betterment or a higher spiritual evolution. If the “ survival of the fittest ” were the fundamental law, and “ vice and misery ” the only bulwarks against the extinction of the race, then,

¹ Carlyle’s translation of Goethe’s hymn, “ Mason’s Lodge.”

152 Spiritual Evolution of Society

indeed, the world is a vain show, the teaching of the New Testament a sham and a delusion, and poor humanity need only "eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow it dies." The law of righteousness makes no appeal to those doomed to die without hope, and self-denial can have no power among men who only survive by means of a selfish struggle, resulting in the destruction of other members of their own species who are less well-equipped for the conflict.

It must be clear that we had excellent reasons for the discussion of these subjects. The demonstration of the falsity of these doctrines became a necessity if we were to believe in the possibility of the continued progress and betterment of mankind, and of the truth and permanence of Christian ethics, and the gradual uplifting of humanity to a higher spiritual evolution and a realisation of the immanence of the Divine in all peoples, and nations, and tongues.

Under the sway of the Darwinian hypothesis all educated men were very easily induced to accept as the creed of science the law upon which they had moulded their lives: that life was a struggle with one's neighbour, and that in the end the fittest must survive. This was called "Natural Selection." Having been established by experience in the past and found true in the present among all sorts and conditions of men, animals, and plants, it became an immutable law of nature, and even among the orthodox it acquired the authority of the law of God, by which He regulated the conditions of existence of all living matter. The moral which man drew was that only he who had the greater power of struggle could attain to the acquisition of the means of subsistence and survive; and with smug complacency he proceeded with the approval of science to acquire all the wealth and property he could lay his hands on. The animals, we are told, act in this way; we hear

of nothing but "nature, red in tooth and claw," as if the world were a vast charnel-house. Doubtless some species do prey more or less on others, but no further than is necessary to maintain the balance of nature. We have proved that the "survival of the fittest" is only a catchword, and that any evolution as a result of such law has never been demonstrated and never will, as all species refuse to perpetuate their "sports," and by the removal of all variations through the influence of marriage, in a few generations return to the average.

Darwin called Malthus to his aid and accepted his law of population ; he believed with him that only by means of war, pestilence, famine, vice, and misery could the human race be kept within due bounds, that is, within the limits required by the means of subsistence. It is surely one of the strangest of facts in regard to the domination of the human mind by a hypothesis of this kind, that the educated men of his generation accepted all Darwin's statements as immutably true at the very time they were demonstrating their disbelief by acting in such a way as to prove their adherence to the very opposite. They introduced measures into Parliament to lessen or remove the miseries of men ; they built hospitals and asylums to cure disease and keep the wretched and feeble alive ; they prevented famine by the abolition of the Corn Laws ; they regulated sanitation and removed slums and filth of all kinds ; they took preventive measures against infective diseases, so that now preventive medicine is one of the most potent forces in increasing the happiness of mankind ; they have built the Great Palace of Peace at the Hague, and are pushing forward all means to secure arbitration and prevent war. How long will it be before men come to see that in "turning their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks,"

154 Spiritual Evolution of Society

they are proving their disbelief in the hypothesis of Darwin and Malthus, and by their thoughts and actions have declared their entire rejection of the basis on which these theories were founded? We do not think we have had a better instance of the limitation of the human intellect than in this particular history of an exploded theory; "man, proud man," asserts from generation to generation his particular theory of the working of the Universe, only to find it wanting when weighed in the balances. In the latter half of the nineteenth century all men of scientific attainment were of necessity materialists, and woe betide the reputation of any who did not conform. To-day, how different! No doubt there will be many reactions towards it, but there is every indication that we are at the parting of the ways; we see ahead "the fair beginning of a time," the beliefs and theories of which shall be founded on the impregnable rock of Truth, all the more firm and sure that man has come to doubt the absolute greatness and finality of his own very imperfect intellect.

Nietzsche may be said to be the great philosophic protagonist of the Darwinian standpoint. He regrets bitterly the changed condition of things—the world no longer ruled by the "Uebermensch," the supermen, who had gained their ascendancy by pure force and fitness and are fast losing their predominance. This drives him to despair; he rails against the relinquishment of power by the ruling caste, who have been seduced by the beliefs and sentiments of our civilisation into conceding their domination to a democracy of whom they are the natural superiors. That is to say, he looks upon Christianity as the absolute negation of natural law, and therefore the most malign influence among men, which can only result in the destruction of the human race by a process of degeneration which

must progressively increase. Benjamin Kidd, in a most illuminating chapter in his book "Western Civilisation," points out that Nietzsche's philosophy is founded entirely on what he calls "the ascendancy of the present in the economic process," and in this respect the two phases of modern thought, represented by Marx on the one hand and Nietzsche on the other, appear as complementary. The principles of Marx represent, as it were, only the extreme socialistic expression of the views of which Nietzsche may be said to represent the extreme individualistic interpretation. For in each case the principle which is held before us is the same, viz. the ascendancy of the present in the social process in history. In modern Germany Nietzsche, equally with the Sozial Demokrat and Arsène Dumont, anticipates the day when "*l'hypothèse Dieu*" shall be expelled from human affairs. "The great European narcotic of Christianity" is associated with the existing order of things. Only too true, asserts Nietzsche in effect. It has enabled the serf population in our midst to invent a "slave" morality, to enlist sympathy to obtain votes, to slowly gain predominance over their destined superiors. What is this ideal of sympathy and brotherly love? Mere contemptible consideration for the inferior; mere lack of self-consideration in the natural superior. What is democracy? A declining type of the state in which the natural superior is enslaved with sympathies so that he may be kept out of his own. "The best things belong to me and mine, and if men give us nothing, then we take them—the best food, the purest sky, the strongest thoughts, the fairest women." "A new table, O my brethren, I put before you: become hard."

All these ideas proceed from the materialistic conception of history—the ascendancy of the present in the ruling process. Mr. Kidd's argument in regard to

156 Spiritual Evolution of Society

the principles of Marx being merely the socialistic expression of the same views of which Nietzsche represents the extreme individualistic interpretation is undoubtedly sound. Both Marx and Nietzsche founded their philosophy on pure materialism, which has been proved to be a false concept and of necessity doomed to destruction, as all such have been in the past history of mankind; they are both unaware of any ethical evolution in the upward path of man, and of the need of such if there is to be any permanence in human affairs. In other words, as long as governments, or states, or parties proceed on purely selfish lines, they become hopeless as permanent forces and must finally disappear. Militarism, feudalism, capitalism have all suffered on this account, and disaster awaits the socialist party if they do not take warning and see to it that in the rapid advance which they are making they leave the path indicated by Marx, and think not only of the ascendancy of their own caste, but of the permanent good of all mankind. To take an instance: in the coal strike of 1912 there was no thought given to the millions below the poverty line who were forced to suffer far more than the miners themselves—poor people in sweated industries, who had no reserves and no trade union funds to fall back upon, were thrown out of work, without a penny to buy coal to warm them or food to feed them. The strike was unjustifiable, as they could not take action without causing much misery, and should have been delayed until they made provision for the poorer and less able body of workers who were compelled to suffer so terribly. Until the present methods are remedied, the strikers will never receive the sympathy of the people as a whole. And, moreover, the strike will always collapse without the attainment of all the demands of the strikers, just as it did in this case. Their actions must be as just as are

the demands they make of their employers. We are not condemning the action of the miners in demanding a minimum wage for all workers in their own trade ; it was a noble deed on the part of many who had to live on union funds and give up good wages for the time being ; but if they had shown that all-round forethought and " sweet reasonableness " in regard to those still lower among the wage-earners who were forced to suffer in a way none of their own class did, the moral force of their action would have been augmented a thousandfold. This supplies a powerful illustration of the ethical influence which is operating in society, and it is only when we give it full play and yield to its influence that we can help to bring about the betterment and increase the happiness of mankind. As long as men are blinded by philosophies of the materialistic school, such as Nietzsche, Marx, and Arsène Dumont, or are tempted to join in the cry demanding the expulsion of "*l'hypothèse Dieu*" from human affairs, there can be no advance whatever. The phrase " the great European narcotic of Christianity " is an absolutely false cry ; history has proved that by its influence alone man has been aroused, trade and commerce stimulated, the culture of the ages brought within the reach of all, mechanical invention advanced and encouraged, society generally ameliorated and put upon a permanent basis, with advance all along the line. It has brought about the ethical evolution which is saving mankind, and will yet raise him to heights and possibilities hitherto undreamt of. But for its advent civilisation would have followed civilisation in a dreary round, with no advance, no hope. "*La misère*" would have been the one certainty, and the only hope for man the " friendly comet " of Huxley to blast the scheme of things entire into nothingness.

Fortunately we can await the future with confidence,

158 Spiritual Evolution of Society

for the reason that it has been proved as clearly as anything can be that all things are ruled by the Eternal, who maketh for righteousness, and that He has ordained for man not only a physical and an intellectual, but a spiritual evolution. The latter has been an operating force since the advent of Christianity, which has influenced men so that history has taken new shape and departed from the evanescent military state to one founded on the "sweet reasonableness" of Jesus, establishing equality of opportunity for all, with gradually increasing social betterment and the security of permanence.

One word more must be said in regard to "Labour." The subject has been treated in no party spirit. I think it may be said without fear of contradiction that every subject considered in this volume has been dealt with from the strictly scientific standpoint, the only object sought after being to ascertain from observed phenomena what is the path which man must follow and to forecast as nearly as is humanly possible his final goal. It may be supposed that because we observed that the present labour movement dealt hardly with those confined within its own sphere who were least able to take care of themselves, that the attitude taken up was hostile to this new power. By no means is this so, because no one can or has any right to deny the vast amount of good it has accomplished in the past. At present it is undoubtedly imperfect, and that for two reasons ; firstly, it is not thoroughly organised so as to serve the interests of all the workers of all grades down to the victims of sweated industries ; secondly, its organisers have not fully realised the fact of the spiritual evolution in process in society and the necessity in all its methods of that spirit of altruism which has come to us through the teaching of Jesus, towards all men, if its power is to progressively increase and be

of permanent value. It seems as certain as that to-morrow's sun shall rise, that this will be accomplished, and when it does act in harmony with the will of the Eternal, its progress and power of amelioration of society will be apparent.

Society as a whole is only now realising the power of "Labour," and Labour itself has only now awakened to its own commanding position. In the present state of things it could not be expected that it would act in any other way than it has done. But the more powerful section in the party must give up the purely materialistic attitude and extend their horizon not only to every section of the workers, but to the interests of the unborn generations which are to follow. The evolutionary process is a slow one, and the ethical part of it must of necessity be the slowest of all when we consider that it has opposed to it the primeval instinct of self-preservation. But what is possible for the individual is possible for the race, and as certainly as men have given up their worldly possessions for their fellows, so surely will the race as a whole devote its thought and energies to the improvement of the lot of the generations who are to succeed.

One word more must be said in regard to Nietzsche's philosophy. It is often argued that Nietzsche is right, and that England is in the process of decay through failure to maintain the supremacy of the "Uebermensch," of the principle that might is right. Few go so far as to appraise his negation of "*l'hypothèse Dieu*," or his gospel of "Become hard," or that logical outcome of the Darwinian principle—"The weaker go to the wall, and we shall help them to"; but we are all conscious that day by day such an attitude becomes more and more of an impossibility. It is only the cynic, whose God is Mammon, or the so-called scientist, who, forsooth, refuses to recognise the mystical side of man's

160 Spiritual Evolution of Society

nature, to whom the ideal is a myth, and whose mind remains unpermeated by the teaching of history in regard to the advent of a spiritual evolution among men, who are still willing to be fed on the husks of such dead philosophies. Contrast for the moment this attitude with one of the sayings of the Master : “ It is not the will of your Father that one of these little ones should perish.” Try the effect of this contrast upon men and women brought up under Christian influences, and mark ! all, without exception, members of the strongest and most forward races at the present day shout the Nietzscheian doctrine—“ the weaker go to the wall, and we shall help them to,” and listen to the howls of execration : whisper the other, revealing the love of the Father for “ these little ones,” and behold the tears rise in the heart and gather to the eyes of the fathers and mothers of the generation to be ; and why ? Because in their inner consciousness they realise intuitively they have listened to a truth transcendent in its appeal, not only to their paternal and maternal instincts, but full of that love which is a law of the Eternal, and which is moulding all the generations of men wherever the influence of the teachings of Jesus has reached directly or indirectly. It is the power and universality of this appeal which gives us proof of the fact that in man there is the germ, awaiting the fertilising power of Christian altruism to awaken it to full vital vigour and activity ; and demonstrates to us the method designed by the Eternal for the accomplishment of the higher spiritual evolution of humanity. It is proof also of the immanence of the Divine, requiring only “ the light which has enlightened the darkness of the world ” to enable it to shine forth with ever-increasing lustre until its radiance illuminates all within its orbit. It would be well if the mechanistic philosophers—those who still remain—would direct

their attention to this matter. They may rest assured that from the point of view of science it is an absolute necessity they should do so, otherwise they are open to attack, in that science to them is not a study of the observed phenomena of all nature, but only of that limited field in which are the things they can see, and taste, and feel, and smell. They refuse to recognise the most potent force in the world's history in moulding man's thought and accomplishing his further evolution ; in other words, we are justified in believing them to be partisans, a designation which ought to be unknown in the field of science and unworthy of men who profess to be our guides in regard to the observed phenomena of nature.

In a criticism of the " Church Missionary Review " (May, 1912) of Bishop D'Arcy's " Christian Ethics and Modern Thought," we get some illuminating ideas on this matter. The editor quotes from an article by Mr. Winston Churchill, the American man of letters, communicated to the " Atlantic Monthly," entitled " Modern Government and Christianity," in which he says : " What I claim is that Christianity is both social and individualistic ; that it is a sublime blending of two anomalous and antagonistic principles. What shall Nietzsche's superman do with his power ? If he be really a superman he will use it for the benefit of humanity, because that spirit of God, of Christ within his soul, will prevent him using it otherwise, whether he will or no." The editor of the " Churchman," in criticising this article, had understood Mr. Churchill to assert that Christianity is individualistic and not social. Mr. Churchill replies : " Christianity is individualism, yet individualism that freely enters into sacrifices for the common good. Just as it is the essence of Christianity that the submission of our wills to God must be a free admission (for only thus paradoxically do we

162 Spiritual Evolution of Society

develop our own strength of personality), so also is it the essence of Christianity that the submission of ourselves to mankind must be free, and not servile, compelled. Submission to the Will of God is, in fact, submission to the service of man." This is very able writing, but with all deference I submit that it shows a certain amount of confusion of thought, and the reason is that the writer is imbued with the ideas which govern that portion of society at the present day which may be said to have "great possessions"—the middle and the aristocratic classes. They desire to see the amelioration of the lower orders, but at the same time they will not lose hold of their property. They desire to do good to humanity as a whole, but on the lines of the conditions which have hitherto prevailed in the past, which means the ascendancy of the present in the conduct of affairs. As long as man retains his individualistic strivings and acquisition of great possessions it is quite impossible for him to "submit himself to the Will of God, which means submission to the service of man." The Founder of the Christian religion was able to say: "I have overcome the world." But how was this done? By absolute self-sacrifice, by the submersion of His personal individualism in regard to acquiring wealth, property, or possessions of any kind, and by the greatest of all sacrifices—that of His own life—in order that in far-off days the world might come to realise that love of one's neighbour was the true service of God, was the ultimate goal of the law of righteousness proceeding from the Eternal. Mr. Churchill's statement is only one of many transition phases in the evolution which is proceeding towards the "final goal," and which will only be reached when all men come to view "possessions" with the contempt necessary on the part of all who "have overcome the world," and have realised the truth of the words of the

Master: "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

If it were not for the traditions and influences of the past we would soon realise the truth of this. We all know it to be true, but we cannot act upon it. The animal within us, the "original sin" of the theologians, chains us to earthly things. How difficult it seems for mankind to understand the truth of the most profound of the teachings of the New Testament: "The things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are unseen are eternal." The master poet of all time had an inkling of this great conception; at least he realised the futility of all earthly things when he wrote:

"The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,
And like this unsubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a wrack behind."

One other passage proves his knowledge of the thought that the things which are unseen are eternal:

"There's not a single orb which thou beholdest
But, in his motion, like an angel sings,
Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubim.
Such music is in immortal souls,
But that the muddy vesture of decay
Doth rudely close it in we may not hear it."

Does not this convey to us that the greatest intellect of this world recognised the God in man—the immanence of the Divine—that eternal element which is unseen, too much concealed hitherto by the covering of the flesh, the "carnal mesh" of Browning, "the muddy vesture of decay," and which only awaits the discarding of the "cloak of self" to manifest itself and, in the beautiful words of Scripture, allow "the spirit to return unto God who gave it," when it becomes capable of enjoying the music of immortal souls?

164 Spiritual Evolution of Society

“Man, proud man,” acquires great possessions: they become his idol; he lives for them; his only satisfaction is in acquiring more and more, yet he knows full well in a few short years he must leave them all behind.

“Earth goeth upon earth glistening like gold;
Earth goeth unto earth sooner than it wold;
Earth buildeth upon earth castles and towers;
Earth sayeth unto earth, ‘All shall be ours.’”¹

He does not even know if those who succeed shall use them wisely or benefit by them; he is often haunted by a fear that the inheritance may prove their destruction. How often do the sons of rich men show an utter incapacity to use these possessions even for their own benefit or comfort. As Scripture bluntly puts it, they are “sweet in the mouth, but bitter in the belly”; they are left as a blessing, but prove a curse. It is no rare thing to see a family of young men end in disaster in their youthful prime for the reason that an industrious and loving parent had left behind possessions to which the sons had a thousand times better never have succeeded. These young men might have seen a green and happy old age if only they had been compelled to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. How long will it be ere men come to see the truth, and learn that in mere wealth and aggrandisement is no satisfaction, that very often it proves but bitter fruit, leading to ill-health, the unquiet mind, and premature death? And yet, whenever measures are devised which tax the riches of the “haves” in order to lighten the burden of the “have-nots” and increase the happiness of their hard lot, the cry is ever—“Confiscation!” But does this confiscation not, like mercy, bless both him that gives and him that takes? Are we

¹ Inscription on an old tombstone in the churchyard of Melrose Abbey.

not coming to see that men will only be happy when they all can have the necessaries of life without excess of labour, but only as the reward of *some* labour expended in the service of society, with sufficient leisure to be devoted to the highest physical, intellectual, and spiritual development of each unit therein. The cry is always that individualism cannot be suppressed, that man must have a motive for exertion, and that his only motive is gain. No doubt that has been the rule hitherto on the average, but there have been many instances fortunately in which "the only way" has been the "path of honour" and has proved the "path of glory," and has involved the renunciation of all that the world holds dear—wealth, possession, and even life itself. The only way for heroes like W. T. Stead, Colonel Astor, Isidore Straus and his wife, Captain Smith, and many others who, "humble and nameless, the straight hard pathway trod," in the recent terrible disaster, was to help the helpless, and, when no more could be done, give up their lives that others might live. Their worldly possessions have gone to others; they have parted with the seen and temporal, but theirs is deathless fame and everlasting glory; theirs is the unseen and the eternal.

Canon Horsley, writing lately about the "Factors of Happiness," gives the result of his experience in regard to the acquisition of wealth: "I have known people in all ranks of society come into money by legacies and cannot recall an instance of their being morally or spiritually improved—usually the contrary." This is valuable evidence, and accords with the experience of all accurate and unprejudiced observers. Mr. Arthur Machen also has written recently a series of articles on the "Secret of Happiness," and in the first of these the following sentence occurs: "Men can only be happy and enjoy a state of well-being through the exercise

166 Spiritual Evolution of Society

of that faculty which is peculiar to man ; that is, the faculty of imagination." There is no doubt an element of truth in this somewhat categorical statement. No doubt it is true of the man of many possessions who has not solved the secret of happiness by the aid of accumulated riches, but it cannot be said to be so in dealing with the case of the poor man who from the cradle to the grave is forced to live, as are one-third of our population, below the poverty line. The right use and ordering of the imagination cannot bring true happiness and joy and peace when he has ever before him the spectre of ill-health, of starvation for his wife and family. Is it not the very travesty of consolation to talk to such a man of the right use and ordering of the imagination ? No doubt the exercise of this faculty universally will be of the greatest benefit to humanity when once society has been reorganised, so that there is sufficient for all men's wants and no one need suffer the horrors of anxiety with regard to those they love when illness cuts off the means of subsistence.

When such matters are discussed we constantly hear the reiteration of the phrase : " As long as human nature is what it is, the thing is impossible." But human nature has altered and is altering ; the outlook has widened ; men have got away from " self " to a very large extent ; the process is one of evolution, and is therefore slow. To be lasting it must be so, and, as pointed out already, it could not have originated nor continued without a fundamental change in the nature of man. This came with the advent of Christian altruism ; it grew at first very slowly and imperceptibly, but latterly with greater and greater force, until now it may be said to be the main factor in human affairs, affecting as it does the relation between man and man, master and employé, capital and labour, all legislation for the betterment of humanity and

amelioration of society generally, and even international relations, and decisions as to peace and war. It must be admitted that there remains much room in human nature for the exercise of self-sacrifice and the submersion of the old instinct of acquisitiveness, the domination of the law of righteousness, and sweet reasonableness, but we are consoled by the fact that the spiritual evolution is in process, and can see no reason why all the influences of the desire for happiness for oneself and others, combined with the ideals of the highest development for each and every unit of society, should not augment the force of this ethical development, so that before many generations have passed we may behold the ideal man in the ideal world.

Mr. H. G. Wells has been writing lately on "Labour Unrest." He says some wise things conjoined with some unwise ones; we fear he lacks profound insight into the lesson of history and into the fact that the "unrest" and demands of labour are due entirely to an advance in the process of ethical evolution, and represent a phase which was bound to take place if further development were to be a possibility. "We are caught short of scientific men," he writes, "just as in the event of war with Germany we shall almost certainly be caught short of scientific soldiers and sailors. You cannot make that sort of thing to order in a crisis." Before proceeding further with this extract one must point out here the limitation of mental vision, evidenced sometimes in the minds of men of even considerable brain power. One is inclined to call this literary small talk, but admitting that Mr. Wells believes what he writes, does it not show that he has not yet really studied the matter? He wants scientific men, but he refrains himself from dealing with this important subject from the scientific standpoint. The lesson of history is that our navy has always known its work, that it has never

168 Spiritual Evolution of Society

failed to defend our shores and maintain our supremacy, that it is the one service in the State whose motto is "efficiency," that British lads make the finest type of sailor the world can produce, that their target practice with big guns is as nearly perfect as can be looked for, that all other countries stand in awe of our sea power, that the country demands of all Governments efficiency in this service, and therefore the attempt to raise a panic of fear among our people is unwarrantable and wrong. We ought never to cease to be proud of our ships and sailors, and show our appreciation as long as they may be necessary, and we ought to be thankful that we have one department of the State which remains efficient, and which will tend to grow more so as time goes on. We have dealt with this passage not because it bears on the theme of this chapter, but simply to point out that all processes of thought which are not guided by accuracy of observed phenomena are sure to lead one away from the truth; and thus it is that Mr. Wells's further remarks on this subject of "Labour Unrest" are in the same manner devoid of potency or guidance in this present-day difficulty in our social organisation. He goes on: "Scientific education, and more particularly the scientific education of our owning and responsible classes, has been crippled by the bitter jealousy of the classical teachers who dominate our Universities, by the fear and hatred of the Established Church, which so very largely controls our upper-class schools, and by the entire lack of understanding and support on the part of those able barristers and financiers who rule our political life. Science has been left more and more to men of modest origin and narrow outlook, and now we are beginning to pay in internal dissensions, and presently we may have to pay in national humiliation for this almost organised rejection of stimulus and

power." Now it is no doubt true that the Universities, the Established Church, the barristers and financiers who rule our political life, are all on the side of property and the maintenance of present-day materialism, which has caused and is causing "*la misère*," against which "Labour" has quite rightly rebelled. He must know that the present condition of the masses is unparalleled, and that nearly one-third earn less than the minimum required to keep them in the necessary amount of comfort. He declares himself a Socialist; the designation is strange, since talk of this kind is a contradiction to such an appellation; he "breathes the word of promise to the ear, and breaks it to our hope!" The present state is one of "national humiliation," and is much more to be ashamed of than the fear of foreign conquest. If he is a Socialist, should he not greet the present unrest with a cheer, and join in the demand for higher wages and a universal minimum wage for all workers, so that no household in the land could be said to be in poverty, for improved conditions of life all round, and equality of opportunity universally? Mr. Wells, we fear, has no appreciation of the lesson of history, or of the evolutionary process at present operating in the "*genus homo sapiens*." Had he understood, he would have realised that the present unrest is only a phase of the gradual change which is being accomplished in the organisation of society and must result in "equality of opportunity" of happiness for every member of the State. He continues: "It is to the independent people of some leisure and resource in the community that one has at last to appeal for such large efforts and understanding as our present situation demands." This is indeed a lame conclusion; people of leisure under present-day conditions are of necessity people of great possessions, whose interests are entirely those of the present time

170 Spiritual Evolution of Society

and are concerned solely with the maintenance of present-day conditions. They are entirely opposed to any drastic changes, and do not desire, even if they understood, any ethical evolution which is destined to remodel before long the face of society and the conditions of human existence. Mr. Wells shows a want of knowledge or study of the scientific phenomena existing in history and of the evolutionary process so clearly delineated in the development of human affairs.

Mr. Machen follows Mr. Wells in attempts to diagnose the cause of the disorder and point the remedy. But although it may be admitted that he comes a little nearer the truth, there is still observable the same lack of the scientific study of observed phenomena and a want of appreciation of the teaching of history. Let us listen to him for a moment. "By all means let us put an end to vile conditions and slave conditions in our labour market. . . . What is the great remedy? . . . The cure for our malady is contained in the words: 'Seek ye first the kingdom of Heaven, and all these things shall be added unto you.' There is the beginning and the end of the whole matter; and the medicine must be taken by rich and poor alike if any good is to be done. What is wanted is not the extra bit of comfort there, the extra bit of luxury there, but a radical change in the interior man. . . . The search for the kingdom of Heaven no doubt sounds vague and unsatisfying to people who are in search of the minimum wage, but, as I say, there is no help for it, there is no other way; simply because happiness is a state of the soul or spirit, and not of the body; and spiritual maladies cannot be cured by material means. Man can only be happy and enjoy a state of well-being through the exercise of that faculty which is peculiar to man, that is, the faculty of the imagination. This is the true stone of the philosophers, transmuting all it touches to

fine and pure and glittering gold. Having this, a man will be in the state of bliss in the midst of all manner of external and bodily miseries ; without it he will be an unhappy wretch, though he possess a wilderness of motor-cars, a covey of aeroplanes, and a house in Park Lane. The body of man can never be well off unless his spirit is engaged in the contemplation of the mysteries and the beauties of the Universe ; unless he knows something of the Bread of Heaven and the wine of angels, his cottage loaf will be as ashes in his mouth, and his beer will be a sour drench. . . . Man, by his very constitution, is not made to do mechanical work ; and the doing of it makes him wretched ; and for the evil I can see no cure.

“ Secondly, in the sixteenth century England underwent a process which is called the Reformation—in my opinion the most frightful disaster that ever overtook the race of man. Frightful because its whole work and tendency were to deny the mysteries, to take the logical understanding out of its place and set it on the throne of the imaginative faculty, to deprive the spirit of the Bread of Heaven and the wine of angels, which are the true meat and drink of us, without which we perish.” We do not apologise for this lengthy quotation, because Mr. Machen here and there does show some glimmering of the truth, the points are well put, and the diction is of a high order ; but the perversion of ideas on the part of this man of strong literary faculty, through the unscientific study of history and humanity, calls for examination. As we previously remarked, what is the good of talking of the faculty of the imagination, the true stone of the philosophers, to men who are actually suffering physical and mental pain through no fault of their own, as the result of a bad social system ? Is it not absurd to talk in this way to men who have been brought up in a miserable environment

172 Spiritual Evolution of Society

so that good health is an impossibility, and who are suffering mental torture from the dread of unemployment or the sight of their loved ones gnawed with hunger? Would not imagination in this case add to the misery? It cannot be too strongly insisted that until you create a healthy and comfortable environment for the toiling millions, with leisure to devote to intellectual pursuits, it is hopeless to talk of the exercise of imagination.

Again, what profit can it be to tell a man whose wife and family are starving, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of Heaven and all these things shall be added unto you"? If the subject were not so painful, the advice would be positively laughable! The first thing to do is to feed him and those dependent on him, and see to it that such circumstances cannot occur again; then when his mental anguish as well as physical pain have been relieved, talk to him of the Bread of Heaven and the wine of angels. But not till then; otherwise one can expect and will receive nothing but curses upon this hypocritical cant. The sympathy he feels for his brother-man and the determination to stand together until something like comfort is secured is a far nobler and grander thing under the circumstances than the study of the imagination.

In regard to the kind of work Mr. Machen is in error again. No doubt the ideal work for man is the tillage of the soil and the reaping of the fruits of the earth. But mechanical work can be most interesting and become a real pleasure provided the wages are sufficient to supply all necessary comforts and the hours of labour not too prolonged. These are the two cardinal mistakes in industrial life hitherto; and they must be remedied, so that for every man there shall be comfort and leisure. Then only will he come under the full influence of the spiritual evolution operating in

society, and be willing to sacrifice himself more and more in the interests of his fellow-men and with the view of improving the lot of the generations yet to come.

When Mr. Machen comes to deal with the Reformation, which he drags in quite unnecessarily, it becomes yet more evident that he has never attempted to apply the scientific process to the study of history. If it were "the most frightful disaster that ever overtook the race of man," how is it that the only races leading now in the van of civilisation and the most advanced in the social amelioration of their peoples are those who were most affected by the great movement and who threw off the thralldom of the Church? Who are the backward nations of Europe to-day? Are they not those who remain under the domination of the priesthood and maintain their allegiance to the Church of Rome? How different is Benjamin Kidd's interpretation of this great historical movement! And that he is right will be acknowledged by all men trained to a scientific study of the phenomena of history. Mr. Kidd writes ("Social Evolution," p. 189): "If we are to regard our civilisation as a single organic growth, and if, for the seat of these vital forces that are producing the movements in progress around us we must look to the ethical development which has projected itself through the history of the Western races, it is evident that it is from the epoch of the Renaissance and the Reformation that we must, in a strictly scientific sense, date the modern expansion of society. From the point of view of science, the pre-Reformation and the post-Reformation movement is an unbroken unity seen in different stages of growth. But it is in the period of the post-Reformation development that it became the destiny of the religious system upon which our civilization is founded to release into the practical

174 Spiritual Evolution of Society

life of the world the characteristic product which constitutes such a powerful motive influence enlisted in the cause of progress. The development which took place at this stage in the life of the social organism could only take place then. The time for it can never recur. The subsequent course of social development must be different amongst the peoples where it was retarded or suppressed, and amongst those where it was allowed to follow its natural course. The nature of this difference caused by the greater development of the humanitarian feelings and the greater extent to which the deepening and softening of character has proceeded amongst the peoples most affected by the Reformation will be dealt with at a later stage." Mr. Kidd continues (*ibid.*, p. 301-2): "The character of the people had in fact not only been deepened and strengthened, it had been softened to an extent hitherto unknown. It is probable that the changes in doctrine which had principally contributed to produce this result were those which had tended to bring the individual into more intimate contact with the actual life and example of the Founder of Christianity, and therefore with the essential spirit that underlay our religious system and served to distinguish it from all other systems. As has been frequently pointed out, the characteristic feature of Latin Christianity was different. This form has always tended as it still tends to treat as of the first importance, not the resulting change in character of the individual but rather his belief in the authority of the Church, and of an order of men, and in the supreme efficacy of sacramental ordinances, which the Church has decreed itself alone competent to dispense. On the other hand, the central idea of the Reformation was the necessity for a spiritual change in the individual, and the recognition, in virtue thereof of the priesthood in his

own person. As Professor Marshall states: 'Man was, as it were, ushered straight into the presence of his Creator with no human intermediary; life became intense and full of awe, and now, for the first time, large numbers of rude and uncultured people yearned toward the mysteries of absolute spiritual freedom. The isolation of each person's responsibility from that of his fellows rightly understood was a necessary condition for the highest spiritual progress.' Thus, on the one hand, individual character tended to be greatly strengthened by the isolation of individual responsibility, and on the other, to be deepened and softened by being brought into close and intimate contact with those wonderfully moving and impressive altruistic ideals which we have in the simple story of the life and acts of the Founder of Christianity.

"The resulting difference in character, however, assumes profound importance in the eyes of the student of our social evolution. The fact must be kept in view, which has been throughout insisted on, that it is this softening and deepening of character with the accompanying release in our social life of an immense and all-pervading fund of altruistic feeling which has provided the real motive force behind the whole onward movement with which our age is identified. It may be noticed, consequently, how much further the development of the altruistic feelings has progressed in those parts of our civilisation most affected by the movement of the sixteenth century, and more particularly among the Anglo-Saxon peoples."

He goes on to show that the power-holding classes are in full, conscious retreat before the in-coming people, that they have lost faith in their own cause, and either openly or in their hearts are on the side of the masses: and "the only fighting policy of the party is one of

176 Spiritual Evolution of Society

temporising defence. The practical consequence is of great significance. It is that the development in which the excluded masses of the people are being brought into the competition of life on a footing of equality of opportunity, is proceeding and will apparently continue to proceed in Great Britain, not by the violent stages of Revolution, but a gradual and orderly process of social change. . . . The great process is proceeding as a natural and orderly development—we are adapting the old institutions to the new wants. This is the real secret of that political genius which the Anglo-Saxon peoples are now displaying. When we turn to peoples amongst whom the Latin form of Christianity prevails, we find that the situation is not exactly the same. The profound change in social character has not proceeded so far. The deepening of individual character, resulting in a certain inbred sense of integrity, which has rendered the sense of wrong intolerable, and the softening process which has made the Anglo-Saxon peoples so sensitive to the sights of misery or suffering, have not progressed to the same extent. The struggle among the peoples who have not been so deeply affected by the humanitarian movement tends to become more a selfish trial of strength in which each party is determinedly and bitterly fighting for its own material interests, and in which the issue swings, according to the relative strength of the opponents, between successful resistance on the one hand and successful revolution on the other.”

We have given this long extract to prove the fallacy in Mr. Machen's statement and also to show the enlightenment which attends the scientific study of history. Moreover, the passages quoted have a most important bearing upon the social amelioration of the people and the altruistic influences at work as a result of the

ethical evolution originated by the Founder of our religion.

After consideration of these ideas of Messrs. Wells and Machen, we are forced to conclude that the present "labour unrest" must be allowed to work itself out, with the assurance that the altruistic influences of Christianity will raise men by slow steps and sure to a higher spiritual plane, the chief feature of which will be an increase in the spirit of self-sacrifice, of the love of one's neighbour, and a desire to raise the comfort and well-being of the race to a higher standard, and thus secure for succeeding generations a gradual betterment in the conditions of existence. At present it must be accepted that the only method is combination, and as long as the workers are asked to work for insufficient reward, their only resource is to refuse to do so until their demands are granted. Before long Parliament will find it necessary by legislation to enforce a minimum wage in all industries. All who possess abundant means must accept the fact that money won't go so far, as everything will be dearer, for the reason that the existence of the workers must be made tolerable, and no one need ever regret the extra expenditure when it is realised that "*la misère*" is no longer the spectre shadowing our trade and commerce. As a matter of fact the altruism possessing our minds is urging on with all possible speed the betterment of these deplorable conditions, and the demands for reform are acquiring momentum which ere long will prove irresistible.

Considering the long period during which the workers have been compelled to toil in conditions of poverty and misery, it is no wonder that at last, realising the power they possess, they should use it somewhat ruthlessly. When men are aching under a sense of injustice and convinced beyond all doubt of the

178 Spiritual Evolution of Society

righteousness of their cause, in the interests of themselves and their children it is only to be expected that their action would be precipitate. Life is short, and to men whose aspirations are infinite, action must be taken and reform accomplished now or never. In the last great strike, of 1912, no doubt thought should have been given by the miners to the millions outside of their own industry who were already in misery and were only made to suffer in an increased degree. Had the "sweet reasonableness" of Christian ethics operated with greater potency, the interest of all workers, and especially of the very poor, would have met with every consideration, and the trade unions would have seen to it that help was given all round and that the interests of the class of workers immediately concerned were not allowed to injure those of others—equally necessary to the body politic but not so able to defend themselves. But the evolutionary process has not yet developed sufficiently to allow of the organisation of such a plan, and this imperfection in method was the very reason why the strike failed to accomplish its full intention. By degrees it became evident that the mass of the people did not support the strikers on account of the too great self-assertion of their own interests to the neglect of greater sufferers outside. When once Labour is so organised as to act on behalf of each section without injury to others, when once it is imbued with that altruism which is slowly pervading the thoughts of all men, then only will it become the supreme power in the State, and the greatest factor in the higher evolution of the race and promoter of the happiness of men.

Notwithstanding this defect in method, by their efforts and self-sacrifice in the interest of burdened members of their own class, the miners secured a triumph, not only for themselves, but for all workers.

The introduction and passing into law of the principle of a minimum wage is of overwhelming importance, and its full effect is not yet realised. It is the first real assertion by the State of its intention to secure for every worker in the land a wage sufficient to give him all necessary comforts, to put an end once and for all to "*la misère*," which has been forced upon one-third of the population, in order that a small section of the community might accumulate unnecessary wealth and property, or live in excessive luxury which only accomplishes their degeneration and decay. Therefore, it is that the name of "Asquith" shall mark an epoch in human evolution, and indicate the "fair beginning of a time"; for this one deed, if for no other, his name shall be, "as long as memory holds her seat," emblazoned on the page of history and immortalised upon the scroll of heroes. No doubt it shall be said he was forced to take this action, and to a certain extent this is true, but a weaker man would have taken what is commonly called "strong" action and precipitated a revolution. The Prime Minister preserved the tradition of the nation's past, and his own, and restored order out of chaos, and shed the divine light of hope over the spirit of the toiling millions. The late laureate cried in despair :

" Ah God, for a man with heart, head, hand,
Like some of the simple great ones gone
For ever and ever by,
One still strong man in a blatant land,
Whatever they call him, what care I,
Aristocrat, democrat, autocrat—one
Who can rule and dare not lie."

But he reckoned without the spiritual evolution of man, otherwise he would have known that God repeats Himself in many ways, and that from age to age the light of heaven is made to descend upon the race of

180 Spiritual Evolution of Society

men and point the way to peace and joy. All who can lay aside political prejudice will agree that in the person of the Chief Minister of the Crown we have such a man, and will join in this tribute in his honour, and in gratitude for his help in the amelioration of society, and aid in securing the opportunity of a higher spiritual evolution, not only for the toilers of the land but for the nation as a whole.

As a nation we ought never to forget our great men. One of the greatest books ever written, we firmly believe, was "Heroes and Hero-Worship," and we have often thought if it were read in schools it would do more to influence the young mind for good, to help it to learn the real lesson of history, and give it a true love of the best literature, and set it on the high road to a wider culture than most of the so-called "knowledge." And Thomas Carlyle was one of the greatest and best who have been sent into this world to raise the soul of man. Would that he were more studied and revered—the enemy of all hypocrisy and cant, and a true disciple of the Eternal, like one of the prophets of old, warning men of the Nemesis of sin and pointing the only way of rest for their souls. "We all love great men," he says, "love, venerate, and bow down before great men. Nay! Can we honestly bow down to anything else? And to me it is very cheering to consider that no general insincerity, triviality, and aridity of any time and its influences can destroy this noble inborn loyalty and worship that is in man. . . . One comfort is that great men, taken up in any way, are profitable company. We cannot look, however imperfectly, upon a great man without gaining something by him. He is the living light fountain which it is good and pleasant to be near—the light which enlightens, which has enlightened the darkness of the world; and this, not as a kindled lamp only,

but as a natural luminary shining by the gift of heaven, a flowing light fountain, as I say, of native original insight, of manhood, and heroic nobleness, in whose radiance all souls must feel that it is well with them." Why do we quote this? To show how necessary it is that we study the thoughts of the great ones of the past, for in them we possess the most potent factor in helping on the spiritual evolution of humanity. A general rise in intellectual development is necessary to the spiritual evolution of man. In another notable passage Carlyle makes this very clear: "Beautiful it is, and a gleam from the same eternal pole-star, visible amid the destinies of men, that all talent, all intellect, is in the first place moral; what a world were this otherwise. But it is the heart always that sees before the head can see; let us know that and know therefore that the good is deathless and victorious, that hope is sure and steadfast in all phases of this 'Place of Hope.'" It is very necessary that the full meaning of this sublime passage should be realised. Think of it—*all intellect, all talent* is in the first place *moral*, therefore the good alone is deathless and victorious. It follows as a necessary consequence that leisure for culture is necessary to the higher evolution of humanity. Matthew Arnold, another great man, for whom we cannot be sufficiently grateful, defined "Culture" as "a knowledge of the best that has been known and said in the world, and thus with the history of the human spirit." How necessary is it, then, that all men—the children of the toiling millions as well as the sons and daughters of the rich and privileged—should have leisure whereby they can acquire this knowledge of the best things which have been said by the best men, and expressed in the best way—the radiance emanating from those "living light fountains which have enlightened the darkness of the world . . . natural luminaries

182 Spiritual Evolution of Society

shining by the gift of heaven." And Ruskin can be called to witness in this regard: "The Fine Art is that in which the hand, the head, and the heart of man go together. . . . Thoroughly perfect Art is that which proceeds from the heart, which involves all the noble emotions, associates with these the head, yet as inferior to the heart; and the hand as inferior to the heart and head, and thus brings out the whole man."¹

These three passages ought never to be forgotten; first, Carlyle's: "All talent, all intellect is in the first place moral, therefore the good alone is deathless and victorious"; secondly, Ruskin's: "Thoroughly perfect Art is that which proceeds from the heart 'as the prime factor,' associates with these the head and the hand, yet as inferior to the heart"; and thirdly, Matthew Arnold's: "Culture is the knowledge of the best that has been known and said in the world, and thus with the history of the human spirit." These sayings of three of our greatest and best men do indeed give us cause for hope and rejoicing. All intellect, all pure Art is moral, and therefore the attainment of culture should be made possible to every unit of society, and when this is accomplished the spiritual evolution of the race is assured. The culture of the ages, as a matter of fact, is being brought nearer to every man, woman, and child from day to day, and is helping with increasing power the gradual advance of that spiritual evolution which the advent of Jesus brought within the compass of the human spirit.

The loyalty and worship of all men to the great ones "gone for ever and ever by" is a constant tribute to the ascendancy and the supremacy of the spiritual in the nature of man, and of the power it wields in moulding the advance of the race. "Man worships what is above

¹ From a lecture on the "Unity of Art," and incorporated in his book "The Two Paths."

him"—the ideal is ever in the recesses of his mind, as an essential element of his nature, and by constant endeavour, unconsciously it may be, he hopes to attain unto it. And if this ideal is an essential of his nature, how did it originate unless implanted by the Eternal, and does it not prove, as far as fair deduction can, the immanence of the Divine? We are now able to understand the appeal which the altruism of Jesus made to this spark of the Infinite and the Eternal which is in every man, and by this means stimulated its evolution to higher and higher flights, until the supremacy of the law of love and self-sacrifice has become the supreme fact in the advance of the race. "Self-abnegation means self-realisation" is a truth of pregnant force, and that is why man only realises true happiness when he subdues self and sacrifices his own interests to those of others. The hero in olden days was ennobled by the thought:

" How can man die better
Than facing fearful odds
For the ashes of his fathers
And the temples of his gods? "

This was a great thought and the highest of which man was capable in the days when materialism was in the ascendant. But with the advent of Jesus the ascendancy of the spirit and the higher evolution of the race became the potent factors. It will not be considered inappropriate that we should recall a few of the sayings and teachings of the Master and His disciples after Him, and reflect upon the power they exercise as from age to age they distil their "sweet reasonableness" in the minds of men: "In lowliness of mind, let each esteem other better than himself." "Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, hath forgiven you." "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so

184 Spiritual Evolution of Society

fulfil the law of Christ." "Whosoever of you will be the chiefest shall be servant of all." "Looking unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith, who, for the joy that was set before Him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of God." "Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." "These things I have spoken unto you, that in Me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer: I have overcome the world." "I lay down My life for the sheep. No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again." "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For My yoke is easy, and My burden is light." "Sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor." "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these My brethren, ye did it unto Me." "He that saith he abideth in Him, ought so to walk even as He walked." "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you. . . . Rejoice, and be exceedingly glad: for great is your

reward in heaven. But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you." . . . "He that is without sin among you, let him cast the first stone."

Men ever since His time on earth have read and repeated His sayings and teachings, and studied the sweet beauty of His life, and aspired to reach the ideal which He preached, through the practice of self-sacrifice and love of the brethren. Many died, as He did, for the faith; they died, as He did, that we might live; they pointed the way by the supremest of all sacrifices; they stimulated us by a noble example, which influences our thoughts consciously and unconsciously, and is bringing about the betterment of mankind through the operation of the law of Love. Many and great things require to be done; the path is steep and the burden heavy, but the end is assured; history proves it, and the spiritual evolution of man is at work now, not only in the interests of those who bear the burden and heat of the day at the present time, but in that of the unborn generations yet to appear. Do we not all derive joy and satisfaction in the thought that things are always getting better and conditions ameliorating for our sons and daughters, and that the prospect is improving increasingly for the future of mankind?

The lesson of history was a necessary study if the argument was to have power with men, as the aim of this volume is to demonstrate its truth as being the only possible conclusion, after giving every consideration to the observed phenomena of nature; and, in so far as we enter into the region of theory, that this is the only logical sequence of the scientific process of thought founded upon these and the lesson of history.

186 Spiritual Evolution of Society

The lesson of history demonstrated the phenomena of our Western civilisation to be the improved social condition of the people as the result of an ethical evolution, which had progressively extended its influence upon mankind ever since the dawn of the Christian era, and the permeation of men's minds with a sense of duty in the direction of securing the welfare of humanity as a whole. And the progress of this spiritual evolution has been demonstrated to be a new thing in the world's history, and can be shown to be in abeyance in the non-Christian peoples of to-day. And there is the further fact that it is only the nations who have given full play to this ethical principle who can claim to be first-class powers in the van of civilisation and world policy, and who are showing that capacity for endurance and permanence which the ancient, military, material empires of Greece and Rome were unable to secure.

And this progressive spiritual evolution is leading us slowly but surely towards the final goal as far as this world is concerned—the "Ideal State," with which we shall shortly deal. The cynic and the scoffer no doubt can be heard railing against interference with

" The good old rule, the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can."

The vast majority know that this is the rule by which we are governed now ; the rights of property are too secure to allow of any sudden change in method, but much has been done which could not have been done if such an evolution were non-existent. As we have pointed out already, we have abolished slavery, given free education, regulated the hours of labour in such occupations as mines and factories, improved conditions of work, of housing, of pay, established a system of poor law which ere long will be greatly

improved, of preventive medicine, sanitation, town planning, old age pensions, and state insurance. These latter measures, of the utmost beneficence, have been classed together as State Socialism. This term is intended by those who use them to pour contempt on this policy. Let us consider for a moment the objections raised in opposition to the Old Age Pension Act when introduced. It proceeded, of course, from the rich man, not necessarily the immensely rich : by the rich man we mean the tax-payer. We were told that the great principle of thrift would be destroyed ; we were attacking the independence of the poor and pauperising the working classes, and shattering the foundation of society by the negation of the sense of duty of children towards their aged parents, by preventing the former from manifesting their affection by maintaining the latter when too feeble to earn their own livelihood. It is fortunately unnecessary now to combat such arguments, and one only need be dealt with to show the fallacy of all. We ask : Is it possible for a married man with a family of his own, with wages insufficient for his own wants, and thus himself living below the poverty line, to maintain his aged parents ? It is, of course, an utter impossibility ; and when attempted the only result was to increase the sum of human misery. The fact remains, after scientific examination of the effect of this measure, that by the removal of the stigma of pauperism alone, and the consequent ability of aged couples to remain in their own dwellings and keep outside the dreaded workhouse, it can be stated without fear of contradiction that it has done more to increase the sum of human happiness than any other legislation of modern times. This act became law through the operation in men's minds of the altruism of Christian ethics ; it may not have been carried by the votes of members who were adherents of

188 Spiritual Evolution of Society

our churches ; many may have professed no religious belief whatever, but consciously or unconsciously the influence of the teachings of the New Testament had permeated their minds. This is a striking demonstration of the spiritual evolution at present in process, and of its method of amelioration of society, and of promotion of humanity step by step to a higher and noble standard of being.

Before leaving this subject, it is essential that we should deal with the mechanist philosophers, represented by Haeckel in Germany and Lankester in England. Matter and energy, according to them, fulfil the entire requirements of the Universe, and physics and chemistry explain the working of the whole machine, and this applies to the organic as well as the inorganic world. A volume has just appeared by Mr. Hugh S. R. Elliot, entitled "Modern Science and the Illusions of Professor Bergson," and is prefaced by Sir Ray Lankester. As this book contains a very categorical and emphatic statement of the position of this school of thought, it may not be unprofitable to examine its contents for a little. Lankester writes : "As to what, if anything, is outside or behind this mechanism of Nature, as to whence or how it came about, or whither it is going, as to what it and what our consciousness of it really are, and why it is, and why we are here, modern science has no answer. . . . One may regard the utmost possibilities of the result of human knowledge as a bracket, and place outside that bracket the factor x to represent those unknown and unknowable possibilities which the imagination of man is never wearied of suggesting. The factor is the plaything of the metaphysician. Its existence is vehemently denied by the strict materialist, and as vehemently asserted by the founders of theological creeds and so-called metaphysical systems. The

attitude of those who neither deny its existence nor assert it, and in any case hold that it must never be mistaken for, or confused with, the contents of the bracket, was called by Huxley, 'Agnosticism.' It was his own position, and one which is now very general." As far as I have been able to discover, this is only a partial truth in regard to Huxley. No doubt he was the protagonist of the Agnostic school, but the fact remains that he was ultimately forced to the conclusion of an "inscrutable power" behind the machine. I believe these were his own words; at present it is impossible for me to verify this statement; however, I am able to give one or two extracts from the article on "Huxley" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," which prove that he did arrive at this conclusion: "He insisted, however, that 'atheism is, on purely philosophic grounds, untenable.'" His theism never really advanced beyond the recognition of "the passionless impersonality of the unknown and the unknowable, *which Science shows everywhere underlying the thin veil of phenomena*" ("Life," i. 239). We have here clear proof that Huxley was compelled to give up the purely materialist standpoint: his strong logical faculty and power of reasoning, combined with wide knowledge and outlook, demanded the concept of an eternal, omnipotent Power, who must logically be the designing and regulating Power, otherwise why postulate Him at all? The denial of Him was, "on purely philosophic grounds, untenable," and even Science proved in similar fashion unwarrantable, for "everywhere" there is evidence of an inscrutable Power "underlying the thin veil of phenomena." The *thin veil* is most interesting, and is certainly damaging to the mechanists, who look to Huxley as the high priest of their dogma. Truly, out of their own mouths have they been convicted of error.

190 Spiritual Evolution of Society

We are entitled to say that to-day the men of the highest intellectual gifts demand the Deity as a necessity of thought. We know this statement will be denied, and we are well aware that there still exist scientific men who retain the agnostic position, but it must be admitted that great scientific attainment is not necessarily accompanied with high intellectual capacity or power of the imaginative faculty, and hence the satisfaction with the purely material. Moreover, the absorption in dead matter and natural law unfortunately seems to produce a cast of thought which cannot get beyond the purely mechanical, and so the higher faculties of the mind become blind and unappreciative of the other phenomena around them—of consciousness, thought, spirit, the search after the "Ideal," the beauty of art, poetry, literature, the permanence of intellect in contrast to the decay of matter. They always profess to follow Truth and cry aloud, "Magna est veritas et prævalebit," which is excellent and most desirable, but not, when only one aspect is presented to us. The true man of science not only sees the earth beneath him, but looks around and above and takes cognisance of every impression which humanity can convey, and it is from such only that we can accept with reverence ideas as to men and things, the laws of Nature, the Cosmos, and the Eternal. The mere statement that beyond finite knowledge there are "unknown and unknowable possibilities" conveys nothing to us; it is arrogant and ought never to be made. He is quite entitled to suppose the unknowable possibilities, but as a man of science he has no right to state it positively. We are entitled to ask him, why he endeavours to follow a law of righteousness, why he is unhappy when he violates it; how or when did he acquire a conscience? Are consciousness, thought, conscience, the law of righteousness, not as important as gravita-

tion, and the conservation of energy? These laws of matter are a necessity of life upon the earth and the continuity of the machine, but apart from conscious life they need not be regarded, and for all we know may be mere transient agencies; they are the seen and the temporal; what of the unseen and the eternal? Why does he not penetrate the things of the mind? Why is he miserable, we repeat, when he is cruel and unjust, or greedy and unscrupulous? Why is he happy when the cause of happiness in others? These things far transcend the laws of dead matter; considering the transitory nature of human life and the terrible misery of a large proportion of mankind, the thoughts of the best minds are far more important than the forces of matter. Such things as thought and the law of righteousness are entities which neither Professor Lankester nor anyone else has any right to put aside. How did conscience arise? Why did conscience evolve if it came only in later days? How is man impelled to self-sacrifice? Why are men and women to-day giving their lives to raise the standard of well-being among the poor and miserable? These are not bodily secretions or excretions. They are not mere brain products—the result of chemical action in the cerebral nerve cells; no doubt this is the medium of their evolution and transformation into speech, but it is absurd to postulate that conscience and self-sacrifice are the result of chemical change in the cerebrum—and nothing more. Such statements are a travesty of science and only bring it into contempt. These entities are knowable, and yet beyond sight, taste, smell, sound, or sensation. They rest upon consciousness, which implies thought, which implies intuition; and intuition implies a something apart from the body and its purely physical functions, and we are quite entitled to call it spirit or soul, if we so

192 Spiritual Evolution of Society

desire. It is such a process of deduction which causes one to believe that Bergson is scientifically right and the mechanists wrong; again we say: let the mechanists reject the spiritual side of man's nature at their peril.

Is history not science? If it is, why do not the mechanists investigate it? We suppose because it is not a concrete thing; it is not a "gross material fact." Surely the history of human thought, imagination, and culture are worth investigating; these are higher things than matter, which, after all, is only the medium of life: it fulfils no other purpose, and in the scheme of things is subservient to the spirit of man. Apart from consciousness, the whole cosmos may return to chaos for all the purpose it would serve, colossal as it is! That being so, why make such a fuss about matter, when we have such a marvellous force as the mind to investigate? No; Bergson may be false in many of his analogies and conclusions, but he is by no means submerged; he still holds the field against his opponents of the mechanist school; and we believe the majority of intellectual men will be more likely to decide in favour of "creative evolution" rather than the abstract theory of "natural selection," now at last discovered to be a broken reed, and devoid of support from the observed phenomena of nature.

One is surprised to find a man of Professor Lankester's position and reputation resuscitating the stale and well-worn platitude of "the blind man in the dark room hunting for a black hat, which isn't there," as a satire on the metaphysician. It is both puerile and futile; the author of it may have been a great lawyer, but we make bold to state that he was not a great thinker; no great thinker could ever have given expression to such pusillanimous twaddle; it may be considered smart, but in scientific matters we do not

heed such expressions ; we are only concerned with Truth, and this definition is untrue. Fortunately for humanity there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in Sir Ray Lankester's laboratory ; we may appropriately quote him against himself and say he " becomes a maker of untruth and for those who listen to him a harmful ' Confusions Meister.' "

Mr. Elliot begins his argument with Bergson in this manner : " Metaphysical systems generally, however we may admire their wonderful ingenuity and subtlety, can have no interest for science unless they are founded on gross material facts which can be examined and verified." He believes the universe began with matter in motion subject to certain laws, but as to how it began or what force generated the initial energy he does not know, and apparently does not care. He might have known, if he had chosen as a man of science to extend his purview to every possible phenomenon of nature, and not turn a blind eye to such phenomena as thought, consciousness, imagination, etc. These things are not concrete—they are not gross material facts, therefore he doesn't know them. But we know he does notwithstanding, and we take no denial. One has only to read his book to see that he is touched by the beauty and imagination of human thought and the elevated ideas it originates. He goes on to inform us that " the feeling we have of necessity to explain the Universe arises from the conformation of our brains, which think by associating disjointed ideas." What is this but mere metaphysics, of which he is never done accusing Bergson, who makes very few, if any, statements more unwarrantable ? To use Mr. Elliot's own method of argument with his opponent, we would ask : " Did he ever see an ' idea,' or witness its evolution, as the result of chemical action in the nerve cells of the brain ? " No ; therefore

194 Spiritual Evolution of Society

there is no such process, and yet he asserts that he founds his mechanistic theory on ideas of what he would call visible and tangible evidences. And how little he knows! To go on with the catechism after his own fashion: How did the Universe begin? Has it existed from all eternity? If not, how did the laws begin to operate in matter? How did motion begin? How was the energy generated? Can he conceive a Universe such as he knows it, without intelligence behind it, suddenly acquiring energy? Can he comprehend eternity of space or time? Has the Universe a limit or not? Can he conceive it illimitable? If limitable, what is beyond? He can only remain dumb. He knows nothing; even the material baffles him.

It may be permissible now to put a few questions on a subject of which he believes he possesses complete knowledge. Why does he accept the Darwinian theory? It is an idea: therefore not concrete, therefore unprovable. This, however, is Mr. Elliot's method of accounting for the diverse forms of plant and animal life upon the earth's surface. He has never seen "natural selection" produce a new species, and yet he accepts this purely abstract theory—this idea—as the explanation without any demonstration—without mechanistic proof. And this natural philosopher at the same time chooses to refuse to accept the ideas of the most cultured and elevated minds of the world, such as Carlyle's, to whom Huxley stated he owed everything in the sphere of the intellect; he refuses to accept the movements of human thought. We ask: What are the things which are seen—the temporal—compared to those which are not seen—the eternal—to the best thoughts of the best minds—to the ideals which mould mankind and alter the face of history? And yet Mr. Elliot cannot get along without ideas any more

than Bergson ; the fight between them is only a wordy warfare, and it cannot be said that the mechanists carry off the palm. And why? Because a man of science must take cognisance of all the phenomena of Nature, and Mr. Elliot cannot get away from the things he can see, and taste, and feel ; the law of the automaton is final. Why does he not extend his range of vision to those things which move humanity, to the methods by which men are trying to alter the face of history and make life better for all nations and peoples and tongues ?

We can agree that modern science is further advanced than mediæval scholasticism, but the fact remains that it is yet under the dominance of a creed just as much as any of our modern systems of theology. The present-day creed of science is the Darwinian theory, and until recently to doubt it was proof of prejudice and ignorance, for the action of Natural Selection was as demonstrable as the sun at noonday. But there always have been a few who did not find the evidence irrefutable, and refused to bow the knee ; among others, as has been shown, Paulin, who was the first to demonstrate the non-necessity of the operation of such a law. And to-day two acknowledged observers and zoologists of the first rank, Dewar and Finn, in their book " The Making of Species," adduce evidence to show the small part, if any, which natural selection plays in the organic world of Nature. It is to be hoped that the mechanistic philosophers will ponder the statements of these thinkers and observers, and it is possible that even they will come to doubt that we have got so very far from mediæval scholasticism. Doubtless there is extended vision of many phenomena and of the natural laws governing them, but we are a long way from finality, and we have cause for humility when we reflect that the creed which has held sway for over half a century

196 Spiritual Evolution of Society

is beginning to collapse and to cease to retain the allegiance of men of science themselves. We can only hope for less "cocksureness" in the future, and we have every reason to expect it, when we recollect that some of the most intellectual men of science have declared their allegiance to a belief in the eternal and the immortality of the soul. Our mechanists in this instance appear to be hit with the recoil of their own guns: they demand that Bergson shall produce "time," "consciousness," "the vital impulse," and when they have demonstration of their existence as gross material facts, they will recognise them as within the domain of science; at the same moment they assert their absolute faith in the Darwinian creed, discredited by two of the leading biologists of the day, and condemned by the best minds of our era.

So confident is Mr. Elliot in his mechanistic theory that he makes the following statement: "The nebula which preceded the solar system developed—under the ordinary laws of matter and motion—to the state in which we now see it; in such wise that a physicist, who was supplied with exact data concerning the original distribution of matter and energy in the nebula, and armed with an all-powerful mathematic, could have deduced the exact condition of the Universe in any required subsequent era." No doubt Mr. Elliot believes this, as all through the book he supports with all his energy and powers the mechanist position. Following his method of argument with Professor Bergson, we are entitled to believe that the evolution of the Universe and its method are things of which he has absolutely no consciousness, except by means of a metaphysical process such as he scorns in people who do not think as he does. Moreover, neither he nor anyone else can account for the origin of life by physical processes. "Chemical synthesis has

never succeeded in reconstructing anything but the waste products of vital activity." Man has never been able to produce synthetically the diamond crystal, although he can make something exactly similar in chemical composition ; so with Life ; he may combine carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen in any proportion he chooses, and expose the compound to radioactive or any other rays, and the result points to only one conclusion—the law of Pasteur—"omne vivum ex vivo"—no life without pre-existing life. Therefore science must account for its origin on the earth if we are still asked to accept the Darwinian hypothesis, for the reason that if life cannot be originated by artificial means, and has never been demonstrated by natural means, if Pasteur's law is true, and we know it is, then, by a purely logical process—by pure reason—we must postulate an Omnipotent Power, who created Life in the form of the unicellular protoplasmic unit, endowed with "the primitive impulse of life," and so designed as to be able to perpetuate its own form, and at the same time to undergo evolution, resulting in the production of a graduated scale of beings represented by the multitudinous forms of plant and animal life which have existed and do exist upon the earth, their structure and form varying according to the environment in which they find themselves. Bergson has done a great deal to widen our view, and he effectually demolishes the mechanistic argument, but he will never be believed until he adopts the logical outcome of his own position—the argument of design on the part of the Eternal, Omnipotent Power, and the teleological view of the Universe, which means an evolutionary plan pointing to the Final Goal.

"I smiled to think God's greatness
Flowed around our incompleteness,
Round our restlessness, His rest."

198 Spiritual Evolution of Society

This is one of the finest conceptions of the Eternal, which we owe to that sweet singer Elizabeth Barrett Browning. Never has more beautiful expression been given to this sublime thought.

Professor Schafer, in his presidential address at the British Association meeting of last year, has endeavoured to bridge the chasm between inorganic matter pure and simple and organic living matter. He revives the old belief—spontaneous generation—and presents it in a somewhat new dress, and does so in a most able and attractive manner. But it cannot be said that he has brought us any nearer to a solution of the question of the origin of life. No doubt he has surprised scientific men generally by taking up a position which can only be described as antagonistic to the axiom of Pasteur—than whom no greater chemist or man of science has yet appeared—“*omne vivum ex vivo.*” In fact, it would appear, according to the new doctrine, or rather the new statement of an old doctrine, that multitudinous transmutations have in all probability been going on—fortuitous combinations of chemical atoms—with the resultant protoplasm full of vital impulse. Without any demonstration of such a process the scientific mind is bound to put these suggestions aside—however striking and elaborate the analogies presented for our consideration—as mere efforts of the imagination. After all, it is only Haeckel *redivivus*. No doubt the Monistic theory is a wonderful conception and deserving every consideration, but scientific men cannot accept theories which do not rest on solid fact. It may be asked: “Do you then positively deny that the chemist in his laboratory may not some day combine oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, sodium chloride, calcium salts, magnesium, potassium, and iron in water, so as to get resultant living protoplasm?” The only answer

possible is that it would be unwise to deny anything concerning a matter of which men are profoundly ignorant, but even at the risk of being proved wrong, one is justified from a study of observed phenomena in stating that it is most unlikely that any such result will ever be obtained.

When we reflect that the experiments of Pasteur, resulting in his famous axiom—"omne vivum ex vivo"—were those upon which Lord Lister founded the present system of surgery, resulting in such untold benefits—in the saving of pain, sorrow, and death—to the human race, we are not likely to change our attitude to this established law, proved to the hilt in our experience from day to day. The earth at one time may be said to have been an aseptic mass just as water is after sterilisation by boiling, and there being no source of contamination we are entitled to believe in the light of Pasteur's experiments that no "primordial slime," potential of life, by means of a purely chemical and physical change, ever appeared. The primordial slime was the result of bacterial infection. This is the teaching of science—of observed phenomena as we know them, and beyond that we are not entitled to make assumptions which entail a departure from these.

In discussing Dr. Charlton Bastian's experiments so long discredited by the Royal Society, Professor Schafer remarks: "Nor should we expect the spontaneous generation of living substance of any kind to occur in a fluid, the organic constituents of which have been so altered by heat that they can retain no sort of chemical resemblance to the organic constituents of living matter. If the formation of life—of living substance—is possible at the present day—for my own part, I see no reason to doubt it—a boiled infusion of organic matter—and still less of inorganic matter—is the last place in which to look for it." With all due

200 Spiritual Evolution of Society

respect, we hold that this is burking the whole question. It only means that experimental demonstration of the origin of life *de novo*—of spontaneous generation—is impossible. But why cannot we boil a watery solution or compound, containing all the elements and salts previously mentioned, without so altering them that it becomes impossible to generate living organisms from them, if such is one of the processes of nature? Moreover, all these elements in watery solution, which, we are told, in the process of evolution brought life upon the earth, had been subjected to far greater heat than that of boiling water, and yet they combined fortuitously under certain influences, radium, sunlight, or other unknown medium, or by a purely chemical and physical transmutation, and formed vital protoplasm, originating the lowest order of the biological scale of beings—the Protista, or Protozoa. If the only answer to this argument is that the process was so slow, and that long periods of time were required, then of course it is impossible for the chemist ever to demonstrate the method. So that we are exactly where we were; and observed phenomena compel us to our original conclusion of a special creative “intervention in the first production of life.”

He goes on to suggest that the evolution of life may have occurred more than once, but points out that in this case the geological record would reveal more than one geological series, and he continues: “Indeed, had the idea of the possibility of a multiple evolution of living substance been first in the field, I doubt if the prevalent belief regarding a single fortuitous production of life upon the globe would have become established among biologists—so much are we liable to be influenced by the impressions we receive in scientific childhood.” It is conceived as quite possible that the evolution of non-living into living substance may be

happening still. Quite so, and if so, why not universally? Why may not every fresh formation of "slime"—that is, the fortuitous combination of the elements which are capable of transmutation into living protoplasm with all the marvellous properties of biological evolution potential therein—result in what we can only call a special new creative act? And is it necessary it should always take the same form or evolve on the same plan? What limits the substance and the forms? How is it we have a uniform biological scale or tree of life? As has been well said by the Rev. R. J. Campbell: "Scientists were dealing with phenomena, but what was at the back of phenomena?" It is very striking and not inappropriate to recall the fact which has been already dwelt upon that Huxley, the protagonist of agnosticism, acknowledged this. He refers to the "passionless impersonality of the unknown and the unknowable, which science shows everywhere underlying the thin veil of phenomena." Mr. Campbell continues: "Science might tell us in the future that there was no such thing as dead matter—that, as a matter of fact, there was nothing but life. But it could not tell them anything more about life." Admitting for the moment that Professor Schafer's suggestions are true, we are no nearer the explanation of the plan of things, of the evolution of matter, of energy, of life, of the plan of a graduated scale of living beings on this earth, which, according to that grand old man of science, Alfred Russel Wallace, is the only sphere in the Universe where the conditions are such that man could maintain an existence. After mature consideration of these arguments, as logical beings dealing with observed phenomena, we are compelled to return to the old belief of Design on the part of the Eternal.

Instinct is defined by Mr. Elliot as "appropriate reaction to certain stimuli by means of the nervous

202 Spiritual Evolution of Society

system." This is no more true than many of Bergson's statements which meet with such strong disapproval on the part of the mechanists. Some naturalists would deny that the animal of widest range and necessarily of longest existence—the primary unicellular protoplasmic organism the *Amœba*—had any nervous system at all; and yet it has perpetuated its species through all the æons of the past by continual division of its own organism. No doubt there must be a stimulus, and of necessity the action is appropriate as the only means of perpetuating the species, but there is no demonstration of such a stimulus. Like the Darwinian theory, it is inferred; such a process of thought is not allowed to the metaphysician; he must not infer anything: he is tied down to gross material fact. This being so, what right has the mechanist to assume an abstract metaphysical postulate of this kind? He is hoist with his own petard. Again we ask, Has the *Amœba* a nervous system? If not, how does it react? Here is instinct which he cannot define, and of which Professor Bergson certainly knows more than the mechanist, and his theory of vital impulse as the chief agent of creative evolution appeals directly to man's reason, and particularly to his logical faculty.

Descartes is quoted to the effect that "animals were mere machines or automata actuated solely by physical and chemical forces, and devoid of any subjective correlate." "It can never be formally proved that he was wrong" is Mr. Elliot's comment. One would only like to ask for an explanation of the case of the dog which dies on its master's grave, refusing food and shelter. Is this explainable by purely physical and chemical forces, by "the automaton theory"? Is this the act of an automaton? The mechanists know it is not. Therefore we deny that it cannot be proved that Descartes was wrong.

In describing the "Automaton Theory," he states that "man may be defined as a machine for converting chemical energy into motion. . . . all actions of men are explicable as purely material and mechanical sequences, without invoking the assistance of mind or consciousness, or anything but matter and energy, working under their ordinary laws. Consciousness appears as an inert accompaniment of material cerebral changes. This is the theory to which Huxley gave the name of epiphenomenalism." With Huxley's definition we have no quarrel: consciousness is something super-added—something above phenomena, and shows that the great scientist's mind comprehended thoughts as not only an inert accompaniment of material cerebral changes. His lucidity of thought and power of logical insight taught him that the plays of Shakespeare and the writings of Carlyle were beyond this material origin. It will take thought far beyond and infinitely greater than the Automaton Theory to explain the power of the imagination.

We are informed that "the whole of science is built upon materialism, as the whole of chemistry is built on the atomic theory, and the foundation is secure." In reply we have only to say that pure materialism is the negation of science. Stated categorically, materialism is simply a refusal to recognise such an entity as Thought—the faculty of the Imagination; not the process of ideation which the mechanist believes represents solely chemical change in the nerve cells of the brain. It is a refusal to recognise such things as history and the ideas moulding it to-day, such as the evolution of liberty, altruism, social amelioration, and the causes of the rise and fall of empires. These are not gross material facts, and must be put aside as of no importance, because they necessitate a belief in the spirit or soul of man, quite apart from the physical

204 Spiritual Evolution of Society

organism it inhabits. The present demands of the mass of the people for a decent existence in every sense, and the altruistic feelings of many of the "haves" prompting them to surrender part of their property and privilege in order to ameliorate the lot of the "have-nots," do assign an active rôle to spirit, whatever the mechanist may say. If he refuses to recognise such historical facts, and the method of their origin and evolution, then he is not a man of science—he has proved himself a prejudiced partisan; like the Calvinist in heaven, who is not willing to believe that there are any but Calvinists there, he would require special accommodation in the form of an enclosed area, where his own sect and no other can come within the range of his vision.

Bergson's philosophy is most suggestive, and his style full of beautiful phrasing. Let us listen for a brief space to some of the things he says in regard to Time, which he believes to be concrete—real. "My mental state as it advances on the road of time, is continually swelling with the duration which it accumulates; it goes on increasing—rolling upon itself, as a snow-ball in the snow." "No staff, more resistant or substantial." "We think with only a small part of our past, but it is with our entire past, including the original bent of our soul, that we desire, will, and act." "Thus our own personality shoots, grows, and ripens without ceasing. Each of its moments is something new added to what was before. We may go further: it is not only something new, but something unforeseeable." "For a conscious being to exist is to change, to change is to mature, to mature is to go on creating one'sself endlessly." Apart from two points of difference, Bergson carries us with him. It seems unnecessary to postulate Time as a stuff, resistant and substantial; it serves a purpose, however, in directing attention to

a new aspect of regarding this entity—Time, for Time is an entity, just as much as energy, but it is not matter. The other point of difference is in regard to the thought that a conscious being goes on creating one's self endlessly; if he had said evolving endlessly, he would have been in full accord with his previous statement that we think with our entire past. If that is so, then our present is part of our past and is evolved from it, not created afresh. Bergson ought to have limited creative evolution to the first creative act of life, endowed with the original psychical impetus, which, in a manner not yet demonstrated, was able to evolve all the multitudinous forms now existing, their form being the direct result of their environment. And to complete his process of thought he must find refuge in the Eternal, Omnipotent Power, the all-wise, righteous, Designer of the Universe.

His ideas in regard to time ought to assist the ethical evolution of man, when he comes to realise the truth that we think not only with the present, but with our entire past. Every evil deed leaves its stain, and thus the Nemesis of all departure from the law of righteousness; every act of self-denial makes the altruism of Jesus easier to follow, and thus are we evolving towards the Ideal State.

In regard to memory he says: "We cannot see how memory could settle within matter; but we do clearly understand how—according to the profound saying of a contemporary philosopher (Ravaisson)—materiality begets oblivion." With this we are compelled to agreement, but Bergson goes beyond scientific observation when he refuses to admit that mind or memory has a physical counterpart, and this no doubt arises from want of opportunity of observing this relationship, so evident in brain disease or accident. Without medical training and experience it is most difficult for any man

206 Spiritual Evolution of Society

however gifted to deal with such matters, and no other profession gives such opportunity for the observation of the phenomena of nature scientifically considered.

Mr. Elliot devotes a chapter of this work to what he calls "The Origin of Fallacies," and a consideration of some of his statements may be of benefit. One of these is to the following effect: "Whether a man believes a true theory or a false one appears to be a matter of heredity as much as anything else. He derives from his ancestors his mental tendencies just as much as the shape of his nose. If he lives in an enlightened period, his tendencies will of course crystallise in a more reasonable form than if he had lived in a period of ignorance." And quoting Lankester: "Man, on the contrary, is born with singularly few instincts or capabilities of acting; but instead of this, he has enormous capabilities of being educated." Surely, for a logician this fallacy is astounding; he mixes up heredity and environment; talks about a child being born with a belief, while at the same moment he admits it can only have been communicated by its parents when possessed of sufficient intelligence to appreciate it, and is therefore solely the result of environment. Talk of the origin of fallacies; they are due to the limitation of the human intellect resulting in confusion of thought, as in this instance when we are told that mental tendencies and the shape of the nose are both hereditary, and in the same breath demonstrates the cause of the former to be environmental only, and Lankester is actually dragged in to prove it. The dogmatism characteristic of this and other statements in this chapter calls to mind the famous pronouncement of the late famous Master of Balliol, put into his mouth by a witty undergraduate:

"I am Principal of my college: my name is Jowett;
Nothing is knowable, if I don't know it."

It is difficult to conceive how men of such eminence in their own sphere as Lankester and Elliot can limit their range of vision to the narrow orbit of purely mechanical laws as they affect matter and energy. These constitute a very minute portion of "science," and it is a pure travesty to expect intellectual men to accept such a definition. In fact, as long as the mechanists choose to talk of evolution, they are admitting something, at any rate biologically, beyond their grasp, and therefore logically are bound to reckon at the same time with the thoughts which move men individually and in the mass, which alter the face of history, and throw one back upon the argument of Design on the part of an Omnipotent Eternal Power, of Whom is energy, matter, life, evolution, thought, spirit, truth, righteousness, and love.

Consciousness is not unknown to science. It is altering the trend of history to-day. The altruism of Christian ethics is entirely a matter of consciousness, and upon it the whole betterment of society depends, and history proves that without it there can be no permanence, for all civilisations based on the purely material have declined and fallen ; they must of necessity decay. Thus we see consciousness to be a far greater power, scientifically considered, than astronomy, geology, physics, chemistry, or mathematics. These work by law, and the laws which regulate matter are necessary to the existence of man upon the earth, but the happiness of men, their advance to a higher order of thought and outlook, and the consummation of the spiritual evolution of the race, depends upon consciousness alone.

We have said nothing as to the evolution of the idea of God among men, and there is not space, nor is it necessary that we should deal with this fully here. We know the idea of a Supreme Power has possessed the minds

208 Spiritual Evolution of Society

of men more or less from the dawn of history. All the races, even the most ignorant, have a belief in the supernatural. The earliest recorded conception was anthropomorphic: "God walked in the garden in the cool of the day." As man progressed in intelligence God became the Moral Governor of the Universe. He became "the Eternal not ourselves, who maketh for righteousness." With the advent of Jesus He became the "Father of Men, the God of Love." Wordsworth has given beautiful expression to the idea of the Immanence of the Divine:

" I have felt
A Presence, that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean, and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man
A motion and a spirit that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things."

It is only by means of the Immanence of the Divine that such a conception as this is possible.

I hope we may be pardoned if in bringing this chapter to a conclusion we give the lines of Matthew Arnold to his father, written in Rugby Chapel, as a great and striking example of the sweet influence of Christian teaching upon one noble soul, whose conception of life was duty, conjoined with "sweet reasonableness" and love of his fellow-men:

" If in the paths of the world
Stones might have wounded thy feet;
Toil, dejection, have tried
Thy spirit—of that we saw
Nothing—to us thou wert still
Cheerful and helpful and firm,

But thou wouldst not alone
Be saved, my father, alone
Conquer and come to thy goal,
Leaving the rest in the wild.
Therefore to thee it is given
Many to save with thyself ;
And, at the end of the day,
Oh, faithful shepherd, to come,
Bringing thy sheep in thy hand."

Chapter IX

The Ideal State

“ I will not cease from mental strife,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till I have built Jerusalem
In England's green and pleasant land.”

William Blake.

THE subject of history has never been taught scientifically hitherto. The child is made to acquire the names of kings and queens and the dates of their accession and demise ; and thus finds it to be a weariness to the flesh when the study might have been made of absorbing interest. It is only in recent times that attention has been drawn to its consideration from the evolutionary standpoint, largely due to the genius of Benjamin Kidd, who has shed the light by which we are enabled to observe the slow progress upwards from the “ dark abysm of time ” to the advanced stage of science and civilisation at the present day. History, in fact, has become a science, and all the observed phenomena in the evolution of humanity are considered in relation to one another. As Mr. Kidd has so ably remarked : “ Human history can no longer be regarded as a bewildering exception to the reign of universal law—a kind of solitary and mysterious island in the Cosmos, given over to strife and forces without clue or meaning. Despite the complexity of the problems encountered in history, we seem to have everywhere

presented to us systematic development, underlying apparent confusion. In all the phases and incidents of our social annals we are apparently regarding only the intimately related phenomena of a single vast orderly process of evolution."

We have observed the rise and fall of the ancient civilisations previous to the dawn of the Christian era. The feature to be noted is that all these were founded on a purely military basis; the whole organisation of the State was devoted to the maintenance of the present; there was no progressive social amelioration, which alone can give permanence, because it is "broad-based upon the people's will"; there was no looking into the future with the intention of making things better for the race to come. With the advent of Christianity and the permeation of the minds of men with its ethical altruism, the whole trend of things became profoundly altered, the State was influenced by new considerations, "the thoughts of men were widened with the process of the suns," and most fortunately so, otherwise civilisation could only succeed civilisation, each in its turn to suffer inevitable ruin and decay. But under our Western forms of government what do we behold? We see the State devoting its energies and legislation to the one end and aim of improving the condition of the people within its boundaries, and framing its measures so as more and more to grant not only political equality, but equality of opportunity to every individual. If this were not so there could be no stability: herein, alone, is permanence. The French Revolution proves this to a demonstration. That violent and terrible outburst was produced by the conditions which preceded it, and its arrival was as certain as the operation of natural law. No doubt it was "too rash, too unadvised, too sudden," but it was necessary, and it was a warning, and to all time it will

remain a sign-post on the steep road of human endeavour towards the higher evolution and the search for permanence in our Western civilisation. Fortunately most of our European States are giving heed to this warning, and are doing what they can to ameliorate the condition of their people. Britain can claim, without doubt, to be the most advanced. We think it may be asserted that the British subject has greater social advantages than that of any other nation. He has a widely extended franchise, and is awaiting now its extension to the only logical conclusion—adult suffrage, which will mean as nearly as possible under present-day conditions equal political opportunity; under free trade the trade and commerce of the country is increasing marvellously, so that there is work for the masses in abundance and unemployment is at a minimum; at the same time commodities are cheap and money goes further than in any other country. Free education is another great boon, and there are many more which are too well known to require mention, such as old age pensions.

But while this is so, we cannot shut our eyes to *la misère*. It seems to be an increasing accompaniment of present-day commerce and industry. Fortunately for the toiling millions, "Labour" has begun to organise, and has not been slow to threaten serious consequences unless the appalling conditions are removed, and that very soon. We think we may say, without fear of contradiction, that the time has come when all men who have given the subject patient consideration, have reached the conclusion that all who "have" must be prepared to do with less. Laws must be passed to give the masses a better environment, sanitary dwellings in pleasant surroundings and pure air, the possibility of a higher culture, which can only be acquired by means of a certain amount of leisure, and it is essential that

every responsible head of a household shall have secured to him, as long as he is willing to work, sufficient to meet all necessities and comforts, and in ill-health this must not be allowed to lapse. The much-abused Insurance Bill will help towards this ideal, but without doubt it requires amendment in the interests of the workman ; no head of a household, rejoicing in the lordly sum of one pound per week, ought to be asked to pay the weekly tax ; it is absurd to expect it. Shorter hours must be conceded in many trades ; work without the possibility of leisure is a potent cause of discontent, and this, with the possibility of, and inducement to acquire, a higher culture, must be granted. It is evident that higher wages, improved conditions, and shorter hours must involve a higher price for all commodities ; in this way the people of " great possessions " are taxed for the benefit of those who " have not." This many object to, but find themselves compelled to it by means of law and Government ; and fortunately there are not a few who rejoice and are willing it should be so under the influence of Christian altruism. The former would like to oppose this tendency absolutely, and use specious and varied arguments to uphold the policy of stagnation. The most oft-repeated has acquired almost the authority of an axiom, and it is that a nation must never break with the tradition of the past. If the Government were to act consistently on this principle it could only result in absolute stagnation. The crux of the position now is, that if we do not break with the tradition of the past, in granting a minimum wage to the heads of all households who are willing to work, so as to secure all necessary comforts for every member of the family, the masses, who are in poverty and *la misère*, and their comrades, living under better conditions, but yet in sympathy with their poorer brethren, will break with

this tradition, and, as in France a little over a century ago, we shall be called upon to suffer the horrors of revolution. This is by no means an extravagant view. We have pointed out already that Mr. Asquith by his wise action and sane methods saved the country and the Crown from a revolution by placing upon the Statute Book the Act securing a minimum wage to miners, for the reason that the masses accept this as an acknowledgment by the State of the principle of this concession to all, whether employed by the State or privately.

In order to soothe the minds of all who dread this break with the tradition of the past, we may point out that the granting of this principle is only a further stage in the evolutionary process at work in our midst, and is as certain to come as that to-morrow's sun shall rise. All students of the past who were imbued with the altruism of Christianity knew that ere long it could not fail of accomplishment, and were able to predict its coming from the study of observed phenomena. The lesson of history conveys a wholesome lesson to all classes of the body politic at the present time—to the "haves," to act as far as possible, under present conditions, in the spirit of the teachings of Jesus, to be willing to sacrifice some of their possessions in order to improve the lot of those who have none, but who are entitled just as much as they are to all necessary housing, clothing, food, pure air and water, perfect sanitation, and a natural environment, with leisure sufficient to give opportunity for the acquisition of the culture of the ages, as far as in them lies, of the best thoughts of the best men, and chief among these the Founder of our religion; and to the "have nots," to be content with the gradual social amelioration now in progress, knowing full well that too precipitate methods, a too sudden breaking of the tradition of the

past, too complete a wreckage of "the scheme of things entire," as at present constituted, mean for them only disaster and the putting back "the long result of time" for many a day. Let both sections of the community take warning from that object lesson—the French Revolution—the one to adopt fully and earnestly the spirit of Christian altruism—"Love thy neighbour as thyself"; the other in the selfsame spirit to proceed by peaceful methods, without resort to violence or bloodshed, to the necessary attainment of their demands. Both sections must accept the lesson of history, that in human society a process of evolution is proceeding which has resulted and must continue to result in the progressive betterment of human society, which alone can give permanence and has been made possible through the operation of Christian ethics consciously or unconsciously upon the minds of men to whatever grade or class they may happen to belong.

At this stage it may be useful to consider some of the theories of modern times, which have held sway from generation to generation in regard to the amelioration of society. Hobbes and Locke enunciated the principles of the Utilitarian school, which were further elaborated by Hume, Bentham, and John Stuart Mill, proclaiming the ideal of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number." Mill held that "utility would enjoin that laws and social arrangements should place the happiness or (as speaking practically it may be called) the interests of every individual as nearly as possible in harmony with the interest of the whole." Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his "Data of Ethics," goes further and sees a conciliation taking place between the interest of each citizen and the interests of citizens at large, tending ever towards a state in which the two become merged in one, and in which the feelings answering to them respectively fall into complete

accord," and he contemplates a time "in which the individual will have reached such a stage of development that it will afford him the highest pleasure to act in a manner conducive to the interests of the social organism even when such conduct may appear antagonistic to his own interests, and so, like parental sacrifice, lead the individual to obtain the highest satisfaction in voluntarily sacrificing himself in the interests of the social organism."

The theories associated with these names mark stages in the evolution of thought in regard to social amelioration, and they emphasise the influence of the altruistic teachings of Jesus upon the minds of men. No doubt this influence in its earlier manifestations has been quite unconscious, but we behold it, there, silently exerting its power, and altering gradually the whole aspect of human society. And the names of Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Bentham, J. S. Mill, and Herbert Spencer ought not to be forgotten, and should be inscribed in letters of gold among the scroll of great ones who have made the history of modern times. "The greatest happiness of the greatest number" was a concept of a high order, and the further advance to "a stage of development in which it will afford the individual the highest pleasure to act in a manner conducive to the interests of the social organism, even when such conduct may appear antagonistic to his own interests," was a still greater. For the first time we have an economic philosopher accepting the doctrine of the necessity of self-sacrifice as a supreme factor in the evolution of human society. It remained to Benjamin Kidd to make two discoveries—one, that this gradual effort to ameliorate the conditions of society, upon which alone the permanence of our civilisation depends, was the direct result of the influence in men's minds of the altruism of Christianity;

and the other, that this was operating not only to improve present-day conditions, but to secure "the greatest happiness of the greatest number of the generations yet unborn." Mr. Kidd points out that Sir Henry Maine, in "Ancient Law and Popular Government," was influenced by the conviction that "the modern philosophy of society had not as yet given us the explanation of the difference between the recently developed and rapidly progressive societies of our Western world, and that almost stationary social state which he perceived to have been normal to the race throughout the greater part of its past. The cause of this difference Maine held to be one of the great secrets which enquiry has yet to penetrate." At last the secret has been fathomed, and to Kidd the credit of its discovery must be accorded. It is entirely due to the altruism of the teachings of Jesus. A new agency has been introduced, and the whole face of history has been thereby changed. This new force has made society more and more stable as time advanced. The members of the State feel the effects of better conditions and of the consideration constantly exerted to ensure their welfare; the civilisation of which they form a part becomes an object of interest and affection, and its permanence is thus assured. In other words, society becomes more efficient, and in this way the culture of the ages tends more and more to become an environment of the people. It is through the operation of such a process that we are able to explain the great and rapid mechanical evolution which has taken place within the last half century in our modern civilisation. Increased social comfort and efficiency has enabled the men of scientific instinct in the mechanical world to acquire a knowledge of all the methods and principles at work in previous epochs and among all peoples, and more particularly the most recent developments in

mechanics and science. We are all apt to flatter ourselves that the extraordinary evolution of the intellect is the explanation of such marvels as the steam-engine, the motor-car, the power-loom, the telegraph, the telephone, wireless telegraphy, the aeroplane, the hydro-plane, the modern warship, the perfection of surgical art and science, but these are one and all only an evolution, the most recent phase of development possible up to the present time, but we are as much indebted to the pioneers as we are to the actual patentee of the final instrument. The rush of these wonderful contrivances now has become possible through increased social efficiency which the amelioration of the conditions of life has permitted. These have been made possible only through the growth of the altruistic spirit, resulting not only in the display of greater love towards our neighbour, but in the desire to remove all conditions inimical to the health, the necessities and comforts of the poor and miserable. We have only to consider for one moment the care which the State now exercises in the interest of the aged and the child, and we know this is only a beginning. We have already dwelt on the benefit of the old age pension, not only to the aged poor, but all the other members of the State, who are happier in the knowledge that they who have borne the burden and heat of the day have sufficient to keep the wolf from the door as long as life endures, and that to a very limited extent they are repaying a debt long overdue, and are relieved of a weight of subconscious remorse which no longer presses. We know from this scientific study of observed phenomena that it was inevitable such a measure should have been enacted, and many others, such as the Children's Bill, and all Acts limiting hours in shops, factories, and mines, and we are able to prophesy without fear or doubt that measures of greater and

greater efficiency in ameliorating the ordinary existence of the working classes will before long be accomplished. This Mr. Kidd has been the first to demonstrate from the scientific study of history, and it is well that we should acknowledge our indebtedness for this profound discovery, immeasurable in the range of its influence.

In the discussion of this question he endeavours to prove that human evolution is not primarily intellectual. In other words, he means that man in his evolution from the Stone Age—the age of the cave-dwellers—upwards has developed physically and intellectually to his utmost limits. It must be evident, however, that this only applies to the individual who has had a fair opportunity, who has been brought up in a good environment, who, as a child, has had every necessary want supplied as far as pure air, good food, suitable clothing, absolute cleanliness, and kindly interest could secure, and at a further stage every suitable form of athletic exercise necessary to physical development, and at the same time the culture of the ages presented in an attractive form. Hitherto these have been only possible to the comparatively few ; but we know that very soon, under the further evolutionary process, these will become the environment of every child born. It may be well to point out that this is not only a matter of simple justice, it is an absolute essential of the welfare of the State. The child does not ask to be born ; it finds itself in the world without any say in the matter whatever ; it has therefore every right to demand the best possible environment in order to ensure perfect growth and efficiency of man and womanhood. This the State is at last endeavouring to secure. Every child must have pure air, suitable clothing, good food, absolute cleanliness, tender care, and afterwards the culture of the ages. Patriotism from the purely selfish standpoint demands this also in

order to secure the best possible physical development of the men who are to man our ships and defend our shores. There is in addition the altruistic impulse to procure the highest standard of physique of the races yet unborn.

Taking this for granted, we can go on to consider two aphorisms which Mr. Kidd presents. "It would appear," he says, "that the process at work in society is evolving religious character as a first product, and intellectual capacity only so far as it can be associated with this quality." With the first part no doubt most will agree, and a fortunate thing it is for the world that it is so, otherwise no other result is possible than the ascendancy of the Nietzscheian philosophy, with the revival of the rule of the "superman," which can only mean slavery, the gospel of "Be hard"—a world without kindness or sympathy or love, government by the whip—the law of "the weaker go to the wall, and we shall help them to"—the cessation of all tenderness or self-sacrifice in the hearts of men, which these two greatest prophets of modern times and two of the greatest of all time, Carlyle and Ruskin, have shown to be the most potent influence for good in the world. Either Nietzsche or Karl Marx must rule; in the latter case we shall be governed by the Social Democrat, which would very soon prove as chaotic as the other, for the reason that social stability can only be attained by means of an all-pervading content which is only procurable by willing self-sacrifice on the part of each individual in the interest of the State as a whole. This attitude of mind, which results in self-sacrificing action not only for one's neighbour and society generally, but also for the generations to come, can only be attained directly or indirectly through religious influence, and the lesson of history is that the teachings of the Founder of our religion alone are those which have so influenced

mankind as to secure permanence in our Western civilisation. Without doubt, therefore, we can accept as a scientific aphorism founded upon observed phenomena that the process at work in society is evolving religious character as a first product. The latter part may be accepted, but with a certain amount of modification. We have already come to the conclusion that the further evolution of the human intellect is not to be expected, and that the only evolutionary process possible to humanity at this stage is a spiritual one. But with an improved condition socially we are certainly entitled to hope that for every man there will be greater leisure in which to develop his intellectual faculties to the highest degree possible for him. Each man will be so affected by the higher ethical plane to which he has attained, that he will feel it to be his duty, not only in his own interest, but in that of his fellow-men, to do his fair share in the particular sphere of action allotted to him and for which he is best fitted, and to devote his leisure to the attainment of the best possible intellectual and physical standard, so that he may keep thoroughly efficient, and thus resist those degenerative tendencies with which we are threatened if we do not live our lives under the dominating law of the struggle for existence. Mr. Kidd is quite entitled to urge that I have only proved his point, and I am quite willing on condition that he agrees as to the process by which the ethical affects the intellectual development. The general intellectual standard would undoubtedly improve, but this is quite a different thing from the statement that the intellect is capable of greater evolution than has been evidenced in the time of the great Greek civilisation—of Æschylus, Plato, Socrates, Sophocles, or of the Elizabethan period, when the master mind not only of his age, but of all time—the immortal Shakespeare, of whom his rival, Ben Jonson, testified :

“ I loved the man, and do honour his memory this side idolatry as much as any ”—poured forth the treasures of his mighty genius.¹

We are quite justified, then, in accepting this first aphorism in its entirety, but we fear there will be grave misgivings as to the second, and these will affect not the conclusion but the method. He says : “ The most distinctive feature of human evolution as a whole is, that through the operation of the law of Natural Selection, the race must continue to grow ever more and more religious.” Now, do not think it is possible to arrive at any other conclusion from a study of observed phenomena than that “ the most distinctive feature of human evolution as a whole is, that the race must continue to grow ever more and more religious.” We do not require to argue this further ; it has been proved and firmly established, notwithstanding all that can be said as to original sin, the brute in man, the wickedness of all kinds

¹ Mr. Elliot, in “ Illusions from Professor Bergson,” makes an interesting remark in regard to this subject. He says : “ The Greek civilisation was merely a preface to the intellectual progress of mankind. Without that clearance of the way, science never could have developed ; so heavy were the obstacles to be removed, so gigantic the task, that the greatest race of antiquity exhausted their powers in the effort, and expired before its accomplishment.” This statement is the result of an entire misconception. A great race does not exhaust its powers by great intellectual effort : our great men do not do so. Shakespeare, Carlyle, Scott, Burns never exhaust their powers ; they become progressively feeble with advancing age after crossing the meridian of life in the ordinary course of nature. Men may die prematurely from disease, and that is exactly what happened to the Greek and other great civilisations of the past. They died from disease of the body politic—the State was assuredly “ a goodly apple, rotten at the core.” The intellectual effort would have evolved the race to the highest possible if it had been directed towards the social betterment of *οι πολλοι*, and have established it as a permanent force, and led the nations of the earth to-day in all advance of intellect, art, drama, and ethics but for the reason that it appeared too soon to benefit by those teachings which are bringing to our civilisation that permanence which in no other way is possible of attainment.

everywhere evident in our great cities, the increase of the so-called criminal classes, and the prevalence of drunkenness and vice in all sections of society. These are only imperfections of passing phases of evolution, which we believe will be slowly eliminated, and with ever greater rapidity as the spiritual development proceeds. It is with deep regret that one observes the domination of Mr. Kidd's mind by that creed of science rapidly declining to its fall under the searchlight of the higher criticism. Even the most scientific of our zoologists have been forced by the most extended study of observed phenomena to conclude that Natural Selection has never possessed and does not now wield the power assigned to it by Darwin. It is therefore impossible not to express surprise that Kidd should make use of this law, which was the keystone of the Nietzscheian arch, of the gospel of "Be hard," of "The weaker go to the wall, and we shall help them to," to support his own argument on behalf of spiritual evolution, made possible to man through the operation in his mind of the high ethical standard and self-sacrifice of the teachings of the meek and lowly Jesus, Who gave His own life to save mankind, in order that they might learn the "pathway to Reality" by means of sacrifice of the self—the assimilation of the truth that self-abnegation is the only method of self-realisation, and that the "ideal is the real." From both points of view, therefore, we are entitled to consider that Kidd in this instance has allowed his otherwise strong logical faculty to be obscured by his devotion to the now discredited Darwinian philosophy, and which in this instance he has dragged in to explain a condition of things to which in its essence it was absolutely opposed. Therefore it will be considered justifiable to alter this second aphorism, and in such a way as to allow of it still being acceptable to

the author of "Social Evolution": "The most distinctive feature of human evolution as a whole is, that through the operation upon men's minds of the self-denying ordinances and teachings of Jesus, the race must continue to grow ever more and more religious."

If these two aphorisms are true—and as far as the human intellect is capable of judging we are entitled to believe so—then there is hope for the world, and its amelioration can be prophesied as a certainty. It is therefore the duty of all social reformers to look forward and consider on what lines the "Ideal State" is to be moulded and what are the processes by means of which it is to be evolved, attention being directed mainly and persistently to the method by which every individual shall be enabled to live that life which shall result in the greatest happiness of all the members of the State, and at the same time allow of the highest physical, intellectual, and spiritual development to him personally. This we know can only be attained under a system of religion which insists as a prime necessity upon a spirit of voluntary self-sacrifice in which it will be the highest pleasure of each to sacrifice himself for the good of the State as a whole, and of the generations of men, which are to people the earth after his own interest in the affairs of the world are over, and which can in no material way affect his own personality. It has been shown that this has been the power promoting the betterment of the social organism in our Western civilisation up to the present time. It has been slow; it has taken a thousand years to accomplish the present stage of development, but it is always so—"the mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small." The lesson of history is that social evolution gains momentum with the process of the suns, and we know that recently it has come like a flood, and notwithstanding

its many imperfections, which after all are only those of human nature and are being gradually eliminated, will grow with ever greater power and knowledge, and approach nearer to perfection, so that we have every reason to believe that it will not be long before the world becomes cognisant of the approach of the "Ideal State," which even at this time is looked upon, by people of property and great possessions, as impossible. It is thus that the study of history reveals the impress of the Eternal upon human affairs. It proves man to be in the grip of a law which makes for righteousness and self-sacrifice. Humanity finds itself moved on, impelled to action, contrary to the selfish interests of the individual members, and resulting in increasing welfare of the body of the people. Tennyson asks in one of his poems—

" We are puppets, Man in his pride, and Beauty fair in her
flower ;
Do we move ourselves, or are moved by an unseen hand at
a game
That pushes us off from the board, and others ever succeed ? "

The lesson of history supplies the answer. The poet is quite right—we are puppets, and do not move ourselves ; we are moved by an unseen hand—" the Eternal, the not-ourselves," the designation by means of which Matthew Arnold put into words the as yet unconscious thought of the time, " who maketh for righteousness " and, through the teaching and example of Jesus, for love and self-sacrifice. The lesson of history in this manner becomes the revelation of the Eternal, Who moves man as He lists for His own purposes, which are full of love to mankind, and are evolving him spiritually and raising him " ever upward and onward " to nobler deeds of self-sacrifice. The Eternal is not only a hope, or even a faith ; the Eternal is now a fact, better and better known from

day to day by means of the operation of His laws. We have a complete vindication of "science" here, which has proved itself the friend of the theologian notwithstanding the scepticism often meted out to it. No doubt the shortsightedness of man, owing to the limitation of his intellect, has obscured the issue; there have been faults on both sides in the conflict between science and theology. The apostles of both should have understood that the study of observed phenomena, embracing "all objects of all thought, all thinking things," could only result in a knowledge of "the spirit that impels and rolls through all things." We have now reached this point—a knowledge of the Eternal is no longer problematic; it has become the established creed of science; and for mankind it is fraught with the greatest issues, making certain the dawn of better days when righteousness shall prevail, war shall cease, permanence be given to society, and peace and joy to all men by means of the reign of love and self-sacrifice as the dominating principle of existence. We can now say with positive assurance—

"God's in His Heaven; all's right with the world."

It is right that a meed of praise should be accorded to all who in the past have fought the fight of the progressive party in the State. One must express the hope that it will be understood that this is not a political treatise; it is what it purports to be, a scientific study of observed phenomena. It is therefore right that it should be acknowledged that the non-progressives must not be condemned as useless or as a mere hindrance to the betterment of man's social condition. In so far as this party has prevented a too sudden break with the tradition of the past, it has been of benefit; such a break means chaos, out of which order can only be slowly restored and the

work of social amelioration accomplished. On the other hand, progress must not be too long hindered or delayed, as the inevitable result is social discontent, which, if not pacified, must result in revolution. We are not likely to have such violent manifestations of popular wrath in England, because the non-progressive party has always allowed the advance of reform whenever it became evident that the people were determined it should come, and thus social discontent has never become sufficiently strong to result in precipitate and revengeful acts. But while this is true, it must be acknowledged that the names of all who have trod the hard, toilsome path and fought the weary uphill fight on behalf of the poor, down-trodden, overworked, underpaid toiling millions of men and women are not sufficiently borne in our memories. These names ought to be the outstanding on the banner of history.

The action of such men is all the more noble in that there is little or no acknowledgment of their services ; it is only possible under the stimulus of a great ideal ; the attainment of the end is for them sufficient reward, and it is good it is so, for how otherwise could they face the lifelong obloquy meted out to them by their own class ? It would be possible to give many instances in which a scion of the aristocracy, from pure conviction, has adopted the toilsome path and fought the good fight, from pure conviction, only to find that his own caste have reviled and slandered his reputation for no obvious reason beyond his desire to alter the present-day condition of things and thereby increase the happiness of men. And hitherto this has invariably been the case when a man acts in response to the appeal of the altruistic ideal, and opposes the purely materialistic self-interest of those who have " great possessions."

The workers of the nation are too apt to forget the efforts of such men. In all our schools their names ought to be taught as the true makers of history. The noble example of such lives would produce a desire to emulate their endeavours, and fresh impetus from day to day would be given towards the realisation of the "Ideal State." At present one notices that the Syndicalists, the ultra-violent Socialists, attack the Labour Members in the House of Commons because they are not able to secure a complete revolution of industrial methods here and now. These extremists never seem to realise that change must be gradual; that the Government cannot break with the tradition of the past too suddenly, otherwise they run the risk of "wrecking the scheme of things entire," and thereby lose all opportunity to "re-mould it nearer to the heart's desire." As a matter of fact, those Members of Parliament whom the extremists contemptuously name the "Lib-Labs," do far more for the general body of the workers by the pursuance of the methods within their reach, which are slowly ameliorating the social organism. And one is warranted in coming to the conclusion that the Labour party is actuated much more by the spirit of altruism than the Syndicalists. The latter, like the Social Democrat, are actuated largely by the spirit of materialism. "The idea of the Syndicalist was that the railways should belong to the railway men, and the mines to the miners. The idea of the Socialist, on the other hand, was that the mines, railways, and other industries should belong to the people. *The Syndicalist was merely working for the transference of property from one private owner to another.*" Such was the opinion of a member of the British Socialist party, expressed at the Conference at Manchester in May, 1912. And the President of the Conference of Delegates

of the Independent Labour party at Merthyr voiced the same sentiment. He said: "Syndicalism has made no real appeal to the British workers, and offered them no means to escape from exactions of landlordism and capitalism." It is good that the representatives of the workers see through the folly of attempting to bring about social betterment by the mere transference of property. Materialism brought about the downfall of all our past civilisations, and as surely it will effect that of present-day industrialism. As Mr. W. C. Anderson said at Merthyr: "Social justice was the only remedy for labour unrest, and social justice was not compatible with private ownership of land and industrial capital. What was needed was an industrial system that would have a conscience behind it, that would not count dividends at the expense of human wreckage and degradation. The monopolies that had been set up in land, railways, canals, mines, and many other industries were ripe for the introduction of collectivist principles. Their cause would stand to gain in every direction if they could secure a national minimum for all, a minimum of health and housing, of leisure, education, and wages. As years went by their assurance of victory was deepened not only by labour unrest against capitalist tyranny, *but by the growth of the public conscience*, by the spread of Socialism, by a widespread desire to rescue nations from chaos, muddle, and disaster, and to rebuild society on the foundation of organisation, co-operation, and mutual aid." Now it is not only interesting, but gratifying to find this acknowledgment of a growth of public conscience, and a desire to rescue nations from chaos, and to rebuild society on a basis of mutual aid. What is this but the perception of Christian altruism, of the spirit of love and self-sacrifice increasingly influencing men to think

less of self and more of others—the final completion of this spirit being the thought of self-sacrifice and pleasure therein when directed towards the help and the welfare of others. This is the Ideal, which the Eternal has ordained for men. “The growth of the public conscience?” How do we explain the appearance of such a phenomenon, for it is so just as much as the law of gravitation? We can only reiterate the lesson of history, that it is due to the operation in men’s minds of the altruism, the sweet reasonableness, the love and self-sacrifice inculcated by the Founder of our religion, distilling its influence in the hearts of men, and establishing a public conscience which becomes more potent from day to day in ameliorating the evils and abuses of commerce and industry in so far as the conditions of the workers are concerned. But what we want now is public acknowledgment, from the Labour party and all organisations desiring to secure social betterment, of this influence, and expression of gratitude to the Teacher of this ethical principle, who has made such things possible. The world is every day becoming “more and more religious,” but it is time the Labourists recognised the necessity of proclaiming their submission to the Eternal, to the law of righteousness, in the spirit of Him who inculcated love to all men, rich and poor alike. There must be no desire of revenge; indignation there may be at the many injustices of the past, but no gratification of the passion of hate; the social betterment will be much more rapid if it is pursued in the spirit of love to all men irrespective of class. The display of such a spirit will hasten the movement more than any other method.

And this acknowledgment of the power of religion is all the more necessary now that the enemies of social evolution have pursued an active propaganda.

They send broadcast pamphlets to prove that Socialism means revolution. They quote Karl Marx to the effect that "violence must be the lever of our social reform." This is quite sufficient to prove to any student of history that Karl Marx will not be followed. Violence and revolution mean chaos—a complete rupture of the tradition of the past, which in Great Britain will never be necessary and therefore will never be accomplished. The Government is broad-based upon the people's will, and thus neither of these methods will ever become necessary or be permitted. The sure and safe social evolution of society will go on without any sudden break with the past; one reform will evolve from another until the ideal state is realised.

We cannot wonder at threats of "stirring up discontent, of force, of actual conflict" on the part of men who know what *la misère* means among the toiling masses of the great industrial centres. We can sympathise with them, but we do not believe these will go any further, owing to the ethical influence at work among all classes. The threats against the monarchy are not often heard, and are due to the same cause. Every part of the governmental machine is threatened; even the Liberal party, which has given to them most of the benefits they now enjoy, and is still devising fresh measures for their betterment, is to be smashed. These are the ravings of individual enthusiasts, who have themselves endured *la misère* and are determined that it shall cease, but who have not yet learned the lesson of history.

Mr. Hyndman and Mr. Blatchford are only instances of the limitation of the human intellect. They have evidently joined Marx and Dumont in their intention to destroy "l'hypothèse Dieu!" Can we forbear again to cry, "Man, proud man, most ignorant of what he's most assured!" Another instance this of the material-

ism of the world seizing the minds of men and leading them to destruction as it did the ancient civilisations. Let the enemies of social change rejoice as long as their opponents refuse to recognise the law of the Eternal, and self-sacrifice as taught by Jesus, because history tells us that only under the influence of such beliefs can man hope to progress individually and socially. Mr. Hyndman and Mr. Blatchford will ere long be recognised to be a danger to their party, notwithstanding any ability they may possess. Why do not the members of the Labour party in the House of Commons proclaim there and everywhere their belief in the influence and power of our religion, and chiefly—the altruism of Christian ethics? It would be a good thing if this were more generally understood. As a matter of fact, it is this spirit of altruism which gives this party the great power and influence it possesses in moulding legislation at the present time.

Of all men of modern times who have penetrated far into the mystery of the Unseen and the Eternal, W. T. Stead stands pre-eminent. He never hesitated to sacrifice himself for the salvation of society, and great is the regret with which we part with his serene brave soul. We are glad to know that he died as he lived, like a hero, and passed to the Eternal with the same confidence that he faced the world of his own day. And why? Because Love and self-sacrifice imbued all his actions and thoughts as proceeding from the Eternal, from whom alone they came. It may not be inappropriate at this stage to consider his message “to all English-speaking folk,” written over twenty years ago, when he issued the first number of the “Review of Reviews.” His desire, as he said, was to “mirror the best thought of our time, done distinctly as a religious principle. The revelation of the Divine Will did not cease when St. John wrote the last page of

the Apocalypse, or when Malachi finished his prophecy." . . . "God is not dumb that He should speak no more," and we have to seek for the gradual unfolding of His message to His creatures in the highest and ripest thoughts of our time. Reason may be a faulty instrument, but it is the machine through which the Divine thought enters the mind of man. Hence the man who can interpret the best thought of his day in such a manner as to render it accessible to the general intelligence of his age is the true prophet of his time. Like the greatest prophet of our time—Thomas Carlyle—he recognised that the intellectual is essentially the moral, and that the best thought of any time is of necessity the Divine thought in so far as it has entered the mind of the individual man, acknowledged to have given forth the best thought of the epoch in which he lives. "We believe in God, in England, and in Humanity." The English-speaking race is one of the chief of God's agents for executing coming improvements in the lot of mankind. He is no Jingo, although to him we owe the "two-keels-to-one standard" of naval supremacy; he believes in England on account of her desire to alleviate human misery, and in the advantage of her guiding hand in all the affairs of the world, and more particularly in dealing with subject races, and acknowledging this as the result of her more advanced spiritual evolution.

He quotes Carlyle to the effect that "the wise are few," and gives an extract from this greatest of modern prophets, which it will not be inappropriate to reproduce now. Stead calls it Carlyle's last political will and testament to the English people. "There is still, we hope, the unclassed aristocracy by nature, not inconsiderable in numbers, and supreme in faculty, in wisdom, in human talent, nobleness and courage, who derive their patent of nobility direct from Almighty

God. If indeed these fail us—then, indeed, it is all ended. National death lies ahead of our once heroic England. Will there, in short, prove to be a recognisable small nucleus of Invisible Aristoi, fighting for the good cause in their various wisest ways, and never ceasing or slackening till they die?" And Stead applies this: "The time has come when men and women must work for the salvation of the State with as much zeal and self-sacrifice as they now work for the salvation of the individual. . . . But to save the country from the grasp of demons innumerable, to prevent this Empire or this Republic becoming an incarnate demon of lawless ambition *and cruel love of gold*, how many men and women are willing to spend even one hour, a month, or a year. . . . The idea that the State needs saving, that the democracy needs educating, and that the problems of government and of reform need careful and laborious study, is foreign to the ideas of our people. The religious side of politics has not yet entered the minds of men. What is wanted is a revival of civic faith, *a quickening of spiritual life in the political atmosphere*, the inspiring of men and women with the conception of what may be done towards the salvation of the world if they will but bring to bear upon public affairs the same spirit of self-sacrificing labour that so many thousands manifest in the ordinary drudgery of parochial and evangelical work. It may well seem an impossible dream. Can these dry bones live? *Those who ask that question little know the infinite possibilities latent in the heart of man.*" Here we have the germ of Kidd's theory as to the process at work in our Western civilisation, but Stead had not fully fathomed the lesson of history and the certainty of a further evolution for humanity under the stimulus of the altruistic teachings of Jesus. There is no doubt it was latent in his mind, and it gives much

additional force to our previous argument that such a man as Stead, with his marvellous knowledge of the world of men and things, should take such a spiritual view. It must be remembered, enthusiast as he was, that he was no dreamer : he dealt with affairs as he found them, and by methods which were practicable. And it is very striking and cheering to consider that the man to whom we owe the two-keels-to-one standard of naval supremacy should be the man who cries for " the quickening of spiritual life in the political atmosphere." And this it is that makes us eager to know his method : " What we have now to do is to energise and elevate the politics of our time by the enthusiasm and the system of religious bodies. Those who say that it is impossible to raise up *men and women ready to sacrifice all that they possess and, if need be, to lay down their lives* in any great cause that appeals to their higher nature, should spare a little time to watch the recruiting of the Salvation Army for the Indian Mission field. These missionaries have to face certain disease, cruel privations, and probably an early death. *But they shrink not.*" How can it be done in the political atmosphere? " By the foolishness of preaching," he answers, " we must look for the revival of civic faith which will save the English-speaking race—an active service of men and women, who will enlist in self-sacrificing labour for the young, the poor, and the afflicted. In this lies our hope for doing effective work for the regeneration and salvation of mankind." He goes on to say that this involves a religious idea, and many may consider that when religion is introduced harmonious co-operation becomes impossible, but he declines to believe that this will always be so, for, as he quotes from a writer in the " Universal Review " : " A new catholicity has dawned upon the world. All religions are now recognised as essentially

divine. They represent the different angles at which Man looks at God. All have something to teach us—how to make the common man more like God. The true religion is that which makes most men most like Christ. *And what is this ideal which Christ translated into a realised life?* For practical purposes this: *To take trouble to do good to others. A simple formula, but the rudimentary and essential truth of the whole Christian religion.* To take trouble is to sacrifice time. All time is a portion of life. To lay down one's life for the brethren—which is sometimes literally the duty of the citizen who is called to die for his fellows—is the constant and daily duty demanded by all the thousand and one practical sacrifices which duty and affection call upon us to make for men." Here we have the secret of Jesus—to take trouble to do good to others. And this is operating increasingly in the thoughts of men, and resulting in active alleviation of the burden of misery, weighing down and pressing heavily upon poor long-suffering humanity.

We have a striking illustration of the dawn of truth simultaneously upon separate minds. In science this is well known and recognised. Discoveries in medicine and mechanics seem to arrive coincidentally. The evolution of thought, gradually accumulating through the long and weary process of past ages, suddenly emerges with intense illuminating force and seizes the mind of man, and as often as not, quite independently two or more at one and the same period. There may be diversities in the form of expression, but the same truth or method of its application is the central idea of the theory or process. In this case Stead gave expression to the thought that religion was the potential influence by which men were brought to deeds of self-sacrifice, not only for their faith, but for the State. Kidd was able to prove simultaneously and inde-

pendently that Christian ethics had moulded, in fact profoundly altered, the face of history, and was the agency by which our civilisation had established itself on a permanent basis. Stead's belief was the outcome of a stern, strong faith, conjoined with a fervid imagination ; Kidd's was the outcome of the scientific study of the observed phenomena of history. Truly God fulfils Himself in many ways. We have here two absolutely diverse personalities, and yet at the same moment of time practically each was able to proclaim without fear of contradiction the spiritual evolution of humanity under the influence of Christianity as the one ameliorating agency operating in society and giving stability and endurance in our civilisation which had not been possible in the past.

The gradual social amelioration throughout Europe, and more particularly in Britain, has been demonstrated over and over again, and it would only waste time to repeat in detail what is already known of the removal of serfdom, the press-gang, the passing of the first Reform Bill, the abolition of the Corn Laws, the gradual extension of the franchise, shorter hours and improved conditions of labour, especially as regards women and children ; the minimum wage, the old age pension, free education, and the assertion of the principle of equality of political opportunity.

Of all the programmes pushed forward at the present time, one would enter once more a protest against women's suffrage, for the reason that it is a mere cry, is totally unnecessary and unscientific, and can only end in disaster ; its influence upon the sex can only be evil, and in the process of time its abrogation in the interests of society and the continuance of the race would become inevitable ; in all probability such a measure would be rescinded by the women themselves. Men have done and are doing much more for women than they themselves

can. They have not the faculty of legislating just as they have not that of soldiering, sailing, engineering, policing, and a thousand and other one things. The cry about voting and payment of rates being corollaries is an absurdity; they are not; many men pay rates who are unable to exercise the franchise through being abroad at election times, or suffering from illness at home. Men pay rates in return for policing and defending of person and property. Moreover, at this stage a property vote can never be given to women: it can only be a universal franchise, and the Labour party are demanding this now, for the very excellent reason in their own interest that it will double the Socialist vote, and in all probability double their parliamentary power. But no measure ought to be advocated for such a motive only; no measure ought ever to be supported, however great the material advantage to any party, which is not sincerely believed in as of benefit to the State as a whole. Women's suffrage is so potential of danger that no party should light-heartedly advocate it. Woman's influence in society is greater than that of man. By her maternal faculty, and the ethical teaching with which she environs the mind and thought of the child, she does far more to raise the standard of human conduct and promote the spiritual evolution moulding our legislation than all the powers of universal franchise could confer upon her. Her sphere is in a higher, holier plane, but the rough-and-tumble of the political arena is not for her. The love of man for woman and woman for man is a sacred thing, and ought to be kept apart from the contaminating influence of an effort foreign to her nature and degenerating to her faculties, which ought to be fostered so as to be exercised to the full extent in the discharge of her maternal duties.

It is a remarkable fact that many women of undoubted intellectuality are opposed to this measure. It is nevertheless commonly stated by the suffragist school that all the strong-minded women are on their side. This is a bold statement, but not therefore true. It is argued with pride that nearly all women doctors are in its favour ; but women doctors are not necessarily either strong-minded or of great intellectual calibre, as is proved by the fact that professionally they have not attained to the high position at one time prophesied. Mrs. Humphry Ward, for instance, one of the most intellectual women of this generation, is the head of an organisation whose aim is to prevent the passage of any such measure. In the case of such a woman the explanation is easy ; she has studied observed phenomena ; she knows the capabilities of the two sexes, and she is aware of the evil effect such a measure would have in regard to woman from the point of view of sex, and that of the State as a whole. She recognises that there is a sphere for woman in public life, in the administration of Acts already passed concerning women and children, primary education, and to a certain extent higher education, the care of the sick, the insane and the feeble-minded ; conditions bearing on infantile mortality and epidemic disease ; the care of women in childbirth, and the urgent moral questions that arise in our large towns, and in connection with local administration. As she says : " In all these matters we want more good and qualified women to help their own sex, to help children, to help the nation." She urges that women are not only wanted in local government administration, but the education of women voters and the wives of voters must be fostered so as to enable them to take a deeper and more active interest than they do now in the affairs of their own town and district. The Local Government Committee will specially

endeavour to reach women voters and show them what is now in their power quite apart from any extension of the franchise. The Committee will support qualified women candidates of anti-suffrage opinions who, speaking generally, are accepted by the recognised municipal or local associations ; and, if necessary, will contribute to the election expenses of such candidates. Whether for the county and borough councils, the rural and urban district councils, or the boards of guardians, the Committee is ready to give help as far as it can.

As Mrs. Ward points out in a letter to "The Times," the prejudice against women candidates for these local bodies is unfortunately great, owing largely to the violent agitation of the extreme suffragists, and therefore the Committee ask for anti-suffrage candidates, carefully selected by an anti-suffrage committee, in order to overcome this prejudice. She addresses an appeal to "public-spirited women who are anxious to serve their locality and their country, while believing with us that the suffrage agitation is in reality an unpatriotic agitation, the success of which would weaken and hamper the English State, to come forward and co-operate with us. . . . We appeal to all those who sympathise with this positive side of the anti-suffrage movement, who believe, *not in an identity*, but in an honourable division of public functions between the men and women of this nation to support our committee, to contribute to our funds, and help our work." This is the expression of opinion of one of the ablest and most cultured women in Britain at the present day, but who is not puffed up with vain conceit, and is thereby able to take a sane view of the relations of the sexes and their particular endowments, especially in regard to the legislative faculty. So fully does she recognise this that she has no doubt as to the danger

to the English nation from the foisting of the parliamentary suffrage upon those not only incapable of, but totally unfitted for its exercise. No doubt there is present to her mind the danger to the maternal faculty, which is a prime necessity of the State. The attitude of such a woman ought to arrest the attention of all thinking men and women. We say "thinking" advisedly, because the supporters of this unbalanced, ill-thought-out scheme for woman's emancipation (so-called) are not those as a rule for whose judgment we feel inclined to entertain much respect. We can only trust that all women who have come within the spell of Mrs. Humphry Ward's literary work will give heed to her earnest and most disinterested warning upon this very serious matter.

As we have pointed out, Mrs. Ward has not hesitated to designate this suffrage agitation as unpatriotic, and so much so that its success would weaken and hamper the English State. But she has gone further in that she has drawn attention to the "dark and dangerous" side of this movement, and Miss Godden, in a letter to the "Times," emphasises this very serious aspect of the question. An examination of the sixpenny books and pamphlets to be purchased at "suffrage shops" in the districts of Kensington, Paddington, and Charing Cross Road proves the present suffrage movement to be deeply involved in an unnatural and unseemly agitation quite distinct from purely political views. And the statements in these publications are not only unseemly, they are absurd, untrue, and unscientific. As Miss Godden points out: "Suffrage physiology teaches that 'woman's organism is more complex, and her totality of function larger than those of any other thing inhabiting our earth. Therefore her position in the scale of life is the most exalted, the most sovereign one.' 'Science has abundantly proved that the male

element was primarily an excrescence, a superfluity, a waste product of Nature.' In sociology and ethics we hear that 'man-made social order has its foundations laid in ruined souls and bodies; that monogamous marriage is monotonous; that morals are based as much upon convention as principle; that sex war is a necessary and desirable stage to sex peace.' "

We are assured that a woman wrote the *Odyssey*; that Priscilla is accredited with the composition of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*; that Adam was made of dust, and to dust shall return, but that Eve was not; that "we have even now a new revelation, and the name of its Messiah is Woman," and "the cause for which men have been torturing Mrs. Pankhurst is the same cause for which Jesus Christ died." Miss Godden concludes: "A mental condition which has been educated into accepting these statements is precisely that condition which confounds hammers with argument and suicide with martyrdom. . . . It is a condition bred and fostered by the suffrage literature freely on sale at suffrage shops, and the suffrage teaching sedulously diffused from platforms, in drawing-rooms, at street corners. . . . It makes an immediate and public dissociation from the promoters and disseminators of these doctrines incumbent on every man and woman who has at heart the honour and sanity of English womanhood."

It is significant of much that in the weekly edition of the "Times" newspaper containing the above, there is an article on the increase of lunacy, as evidenced by the Sixty-sixth Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy to the Lord Chancellor, which has been issued as a Blue book. We find it there stated by Dr. Motts: "In the offspring of insane parents, daughters are much more numerous than sons, viz. in the proportion of 292 to 208. These figures show that the female sex

in a stock is more liable to become insane. . . . Much more striking is the sex difference with regard to the predominance of the factor of mental stress. Sudden stress was thus recorded in thirty-five males as compared with sixty-five females, a fact in harmony with the greater susceptibility to emotional disturbance. Prolonged stress, of which the recorded instances were more than thrice as numerous, likewise appears to be a more frequent precursor of insanity in females than in males, but not to such a marked degree—namely, forty-five males to fifty-five females.”

It must be evident that already in the hysteria of their so-called literature, history, and science, we have distinct suggestions of insanity in the movement and ample warnings of the dangers of its continuity, and more especially of its success, which could only result in a progressively insane development, not limited to women, and which would of necessity affect the race as a whole, and in time bring about disaster. Fortunately we know that this awful culmination is not possible, in that Nature invariably reasserts herself, and must inevitably interfere to save the race from extinction. As already observed, in a short time we would find the women demanding, in their own interest and that of their sons and daughters, a return to the old condition of things, in which men resumed, as their own peculiar function, the making and enforcing of the laws by which society is regulated, and the great maternal function of women in the best possible environment would continue to act in the interests of society and the well-being of the race.

Sir Almroth Wright has already abundantly proved the evils of political life upon the feminine mind ; indeed he has proved from observed phenomena that the ferocity and instability of the methods pursued in the present agitation are the outcome of morbid tendencies

arising out of social conditions which require remedy, and which the franchise could not alter. Our creed ought therefore to remain unchangeable.¹

This controversy alone proves the necessity of a ministry of medicine in the Government to instruct and guide the nation in matters such as these, for which special study and training is required in order to be capable of sound judgment and necessary courage to resist the cry of the hysteric and the psychopath. The prime fact remains that the women of the nation do not want the vote. The scolding of the morbid, discontented, vain woman has attracted too much attention. All the more reason why it must be resisted if the process of social amelioration is not to be interrupted and the spiritual evolution of humanity delayed.

There is a deep-seated reason for the change in public opinion, which at first seemed to be carried away by the false arguments and system of terrorism which the more violent advocates of this revolutionary movement adopted. But just in as far as these methods departed from the "sweet reasonableness," which we supposed characterised the actions of all good women, they were doomed to failure—they violated the most sacred obligations of womanhood—and not only that, they were in direct antagonism to the altruism of our religion, which has always appealed to woman through the innate self-sacrifice of her maternity. For women to violate in this manner the code of Christian ethics was a proof of the morbid psychology of the whole agitation. It was not long before it was hoist with its

¹ "Man for the field and woman for the hearth ;
 Man for the sword and for the needle she ;
 Man with the head and woman with the heart ;
 Man to command and woman to obey :
 All else confusion. . . .
 The bearing and the training of a child
 Is woman's wisdom." TENNYSON'S "Princess."

petard ; “ the whirligig of time brought in its revenges,” and the clever women at the head of the movement found the men turn and rend them for this gross violation of their maternal instinct and the modesty of nature ; and the real mothers of the nation were not long in showing their disapproval ! Truly, “ these violent delights have violent ends and in their triumph die ! ”

Another cause of the collapse of this ill-thought-out, ill-digested programme was the fact that within its borders were two hostile camps. The movement began with the demand for the suffrage to women of property ; before long the Labour members were not slow to discover that Britain would never tolerate such a violation of all democratic principle, and it appeared to them a good political move to lend their support as thereby securing the suffrage to all women on the same basis as men and in all probability double their own parliamentary party. From the present-day political standpoint, the latter were quite right to advocate a measure which would be likely to augment largely their parliamentary power. But this is at best a poor motive, and until parties and Governments realise the advantage in the long run which accrues to those who act solely in conformity with Christian ethics, they will find that such methods will fail and recoil on their own heads.

We want, moreover, more reverence for scientific opinion ; no body of men in Parliament or outside of it have any right to advocate such a breach with the tradition of the past, who have not referred the matter to the leaders of psychological science, who have had experience through the devotion of their entire lifetime to its study, and have observed the mentality of both sexes over a long period of years. Inexperience and power are a sorry combination, and the sooner all men,

however clever in the ordinary sense, learn that they are quite incapable of deciding scientific matters not only requiring training and observation over long periods of time, but much accumulated thought and reflection, the better it will be for the people as a whole ; otherwise our parliamentary machine will be relegated to the limbo of effete institutions. We have dwelt on this matter now, because in the Ideal State some system must be devised so that the accumulated experience and ripened judgment of men of special training and power may not be lost to the State. Before long we shall have a State Medical Service, answerable to a Ministry of Medicine as one of the chief offices of the State. Only then will preventive medicine have full play and the general standard of health be raised to a much higher level. Slums will very soon be condemned and extirpated, and the life of the child in our industrial centres made much happier, with a resultant improvement in the physique of our man and womanhood. As Mr. Gladstone foretold, it cannot be long before the medical man becomes the prime factor in the maintenance of the welfare of the State. In the full realisation of the Ideal State, when men work not for gain, but solely with the view of " taking pains to help others " in the knowledge that they are benefiting the race at present existing and the generations yet to come, every individual will be able to secure the ripened judgment of experience wherever required, whether in his own interest or in that of public affairs.

One word may be said here in regard to the question of marriage and the present-day demand for a loosening of its bonds in the direction of making divorce or separation easier. It would certainly seem from the point of view of common sense that where an unhappy union tended to wear out the life, or destroy the usefulness of either partner, that it would be better that

greater opportunity should be allowed for its dissolution. No doubt society will gradually devise a better way than exists at the present time, when every incentive impels towards the formation of an irregular alliance, which, once admitted, opens the way to a ready means of securing the desired separation. Every safeguard must be taken against divorce becoming too easy of accomplishment. The altruism of Christianity, as it continues to influence humanity progressively, will undoubtedly create a caste of thought and mutual consideration which, as time goes on, will make partners in the marriage contract more tolerant towards each other and cause them to vie in seeking each the other's good physically, intellectually, and ethically. In the present transition period, however, the law requires some amendment, which must be made to apply equally over the United Kingdom.

The extension of the suffrage to women could only result in chaos as far as the marriage bond is concerned, for two reasons. In the first place, the diversity of opinion, which would arise in a large number of cases in regard to public affairs, could only result in anger, animosity, and hatred. One may have a private friend with whom one differs politically, but this is somewhat uncommon, and certainly implies a spirit of mutual forbearance not at all usual; political agreement to-day is almost a necessity of private friendship in the vast majority of instances. In any case, one is not forced to live in constant companionship with this private friend, but this is a *sine qua non* of the marriage contract. Secondly, the exciting and disturbing effect of the political arena upon the emotional nervous temperament of the woman would either upset her mental balance or disturb her physically and psychically in such a manner as to unfit her totally for the function of maternity, so necessary to the race, to the

joy of home life, and to the well-being and happiness of woman herself.

It may not be inappropriate at this stage to devote a little time to the study of our legal system. No doubt on the whole at the present time justice is secured, although the system is by no means perfect. Our judges endeavour honestly to administer the law, but yet miscarriages do occur, and it is not always possible for our Lord Justices to free their minds from prejudice they may have acquired through an environment of wealth and luxury. And therefore we have no hesitation in saying that in the Ideal State where wealth shall have no sway, and the judge no salary beyond the reward of dispensing justice wisely and well, and thereby increasing the sum of human happiness, we look forward to a time when all men shall be so imbued with the spirit of love and self-sacrifice that judgment seats will be as vacant as our prisons.

This being admitted, we are now free to consider the methods of legal administration. We have no hesitation in saying that it is devised not in the interests of the body of the people, but entirely in order to fill the pockets of the members of the Bar. The Bar, and not the Bench, controls the great legal instrument. Being a Scotsman, I know more of the Scots procedure than the English, and therefore I shall presume that an action has been raised against me in the Scots courts. I am a poor man; my total capital is two thousand pounds. A rich man raises an action against me for fifteen hundred. Now it may seem an absurd thing to say, but it is absolutely true, the best thing that can possibly happen as far as I am concerned is that I should lose my case, pay the fifteen hundred pounds, and a further sum to the lawyers, which no doubt makes a large inroad on what remains, and start the world afresh with the pittance remaining. And why is this so? Because in all proba-

bility what will happen 'will be, that if I win my case before the Lord Ordinary of the Court of Session, my rich opponent will pursue the case before the Outer Division of the Court. Suppose I win again: he appeals to the Inner Division. I win again. He appeals to the House of Lords, where for various reasons Scots decisions seem to be more often overturned than confirmed. As the result of this appeal, I lose my case; at last, finding the decision against me, I am told there is no appeal for me. I, the poor man, am ruined, and my rich opponent is happy, by means of his greater riches, in having smashed me, notwithstanding the fact that I have won in three courts to his one. It must be evident that there is neither sense nor justice in such methods. There is only gain to the members of the Bar, at the expense of every innate principle of right and common sense. The feeling is increasing that money is the only essential to winning a case in the long run, and is almost certain to win if the opponent is a poor man.

From the point of view of common sense, and keeping in mind the hypothetical case just given, let us consider what the law is—it is a series of Acts of Parliament in conformity with which men and bodies of men must act, as subjects of the realm. The Lord Justices or Senators of the College of Justice are appointed on account of their wide knowledge of these Acts. That being so, we hold that one judgment should suffice and no appeal be allowed. The appeal is always made in the hope of a different view being taken by another judge as to the meaning or purport of the Act involved. Our senators are not slow to uphold the diverse views of members of the medical profession in matters of expert opinion to ridicule. They always appear to me to be quite oblivious of the fact that if it were not for such diverse views in the vast majority of cases in regard to the

interpretation of Acts of Parliament, there would not be half the number of judges required of those who now adorn our seats of judgment. They forget also that medicine can never be an exact science, on account of the differences existing between all members of the species, so much so that no doctor can be sure of the effect of any one drug until he has administered it in each particular individual. In the case we have mentioned three verdicts in his favour were no good to the poor man ; had he lost in the first instance before the Lord Ordinary he could not have appealed, because he had no money to enable him to do so with safety. This is where wealth is given an undue weight in matters of so-called justice. Before long we hope that the legal instrument will become part of the Civil Service, and thus the poor will be efficiently protected from the onslaught of the rich, and the rich will find that justice is above their gilded sway.

To pursue the argument, the judge is paid a large salary, so that the legal expenses are apart from this altogether. The main item in all legal expenses is the payment of the barrister's fees, whose charges vary from five to a hundred guineas per day, according to experience and reputation. Here again is another cause of injustice ; the rich man buys up, in legal phraseology, "retains" the ablest advocate on any given question by huge payments, with the idea largely of preventing his opponent getting the benefit of such help and advice. We begin now to understand why the Law allows cases to be appealed again and again. It is solely in the interests of the Bar, who require large incomes on account of their social position, and for the reason that later on, when Lord Justiceships and titles come to them, they may be able to take their place with that of the landed aristocracy. We have seen that this power of appeal is bad from the people's standpoint, and there-

fore we believe, ere long, we shall find a reform of our legal system demanded by the Liberal party, notwithstanding the overwhelming preponderance of legal members in Parliament. The law must be systematised and decisions by our senators made final, whether in favour of rich or poor ; and the legal instrument must become part of our civil service. Indiscriminate legal action will not be allowed ; it will not be possible ; all will be regulated as other departments of State are at the present time, with one certain result—a gradual and increasing diminution of actions at law, and consequently of legal officials, and thereby no small saving to the coffers of the State.

We have now reached a point in this discussion in which it becomes necessary to consider the lines upon which further development must proceed. We have found that much has been done in the way of social evolution under the influence of Christian ethics, and we have indicated certain reforms requiring immediate attention, such as a State medical service with a ministry of medicine, the drastic alteration of our legal system, which must become part of the ordinary Civil Service, a universal minimum wage, the nationalisation of land, mines, and railways, and reform of the poor law on the lines of the Minority Report. On further examination we are forced to the conclusion that all the evils of our system in methods of government are financial ; it is as true to-day as when first uttered, that “ the love of money is the root of all evil.” It will therefore be found that on investigation of such things as poverty, unhappiness, or injustice, in every instance “ greed ” or “ Mammon ” is the fount and origin of the misery. *La misère* depends solely upon the desire for huge dividends, and we have already referred to Huxley’s dictum that if this were to remain a characteristic of our advancing commerce and civilisation

he would hail the advent of some friendly comet to sweep it all away into nothingness. Huxley was a great man, and as honest as the day, but he was no Socialist, no idealist, as we understand the word, yet even he, through the evidence of observed phenomena, was forced to come to this conclusion. That being so, *la misère* being of such awful horror as to call forth this cry from one not professing a belief in the dogma of the Christian religion, although doubtless influenced by its altruism, it behoves all who profess to follow the teachings of the New Testament—and what is religion if it is not conduct—to endeavour to bring about by every possible means the annihilation of the system which produces such widespread misery and vice and crime among the masses of the people. Matthew Arnold asks in one of his books—What is religion? And the answer is supplied—“Religion is conduct, and conduct is three-fourths of life.” If then we profess the teachings of Jesus as the guide of our life, and go to church Sunday after Sunday to hear again these wondrous messages of love and self-sacrifice, and yet in daily conduct traverse every one of these, what are we? “Woe unto ye, hypocrites and Pharisees. Ye honour Me with your lips, but your hearts are far from Me.” If then we are imbued with the altruism of Christian ethics, one of the first reforms which Parliament ought to be asked to effect is the prevention by law of the payment by any company to its shareholders of high percentages procurable only by sweated processes for the reason given above, that *la misère* was the result of the striving on the part of our managing directors to pay big dividends. If this were enacted, and a wage sufficient for all wants secured to every householder, and a limitation of the hours of labour so that no such thing as overwork would be possible, then the sweating system would automatically cease. It

ought to have been ended long ago, but the powers of Mammon were too powerful ; but at last the trumpet has sounded, and the walls of Jericho are about to fall. Poor suffering humanity has had long to wait for this simple act of justice, but at last the clouds are breaking, and the sun of Christian love and self-sacrifice shall shine forth in its full effulgence to enlighten and warm the world with its cheering rays.

In a recent number of the "English Review" Mr. H. W. Hobart, "still struggling at fifty-eight years of age for a bare subsistence in the industrial army, having started as a breadwinner at nine," gives some "Revelations of Industrial Life." This article ought to be circulated widely ; it is so obviously true, and would do much to bring home to the well-to-do the folly of attempting to continue society as at present constituted. We can quite well remember the days when the clergy were in the habit of rebuking the working classes for discontent, and enforcing the duty of thanking God for their manifold blessings. Now our ministers of religion are deserving of honour and gratitude in so far as they endeavour to carry out the teachings of their Master, but in regard to this matter they act in entire opposition to His message in many instances. One has only to read this article in order to appreciate the fact that it is quite impossible for the members of the great industrial army to pay much, if any, regard to Christian ethics as long as they are compelled to suffer at the hands of professing followers of Jesus for no other reason than that the latter are determined before they die to accumulate hundreds of thousands of pounds, become great landowners, and advance their position in aristocratic society. And the methods by which professing Christians attain to wealth are often such as to proclaim the ideal of our religion as hypocritical cant of the first order, or even worse, as of fraudulent

intent to deceive, a cloak to entrap the unwary. It ought to be insisted on that if the profession of religion is not accompanied by complete evidence of conduct as far as possible consonant with the altruism of Christianity it should meet with no attention or regard. If religion is not conduct, it is only a mask, a hollow mockery. And for anyone professing the religion of Jesus to attempt to amass gold by means which can only bring about the degradation of his fellow-men physically, intellectually, and morally, is a self-evident contradiction of such belief. One wonders that the apparent contradiction has not become so manifest that the hypocrisy of the whole situation, not to mention the shame of it, would have forced other methods in order to satisfy the prickings of conscience. But no! the lust of gold appeals with such force to the natural man that it is only by Divine agency that a revolution is being slowly wrought in human society by the power of religion and gradual diffusion of the altruistic spirit. The greatest wonder of the world is now in operation, and is only dawning upon the blind intelligence of mankind; and that is the very gradual overcoming and final conquest of the strongest passion of the natural man—the love of money—by the still small voice of conscience—the God in man—guided by “the sweet reasonableness,” the love, and self-sacrifice of the gospel of Jesus. Surely this is the greatest of all miracles! “I have overcome the world!” He told His brethren while here on earth, and only now, two thousand years thereafter, do we begin to realise the truth of these words. By dying on the cross, and showing forth the only way—the path of self-sacrifice—the Pathway to Reality—in other words, by dying that we might live, He became indeed the Saviour of the world. And it is the only way if we are ever to know happiness, for who can be

happy as long as he or she realises that their own comfort and luxury depend on the unhappiness of their fellow-men—their brothers and sisters?

This brings us to a consideration of a common delusion of the middle and upper classes—the fetish of “family.” The sooner it is demolished the better for humanity. The sooner it is realised as an axiom, the better for everyone, and chiefly by those afflicted with the delusion that “there is no such things as ‘family.’” This soul-destroying doctrine has led to more foolish pride and selfishness on the one hand, and snobbery and deceit on the other, than any of our absurd prejudices. The sad thing socially is that no sooner do people rise from the industrial army into the moneyed classes than they at once begin to lie about their ancestors in the most barefaced manner, and of necessity this entails the shunning of their poorer acquaintances and the neglect even of near relatives. “Family” has come to mean “money”; “*nouveaux riches*” may be whispered by the aristocrat about some parvenu and his relatives who have pushed their way into the higher ranks by the power of their millions, but it does not last long. The man of so-called “ancient lineage” is soon bowing the knee to the trader or speculator whose wealth surpasses his own. Is it not strange that men take so long to appreciate the truth of observed phenomena, that luxury operates so adversely on humanity that in a few generations it must result in decadence? and hence our aristocrats constantly require renewal from the masses, who can generate a stock capable of virile power and endeavour and maintenance of the standard of physical well-being. So that, scientifically considered, it is the lower orders who should be classed as “good family,” seeing it is upon them we depend for the force and vigour of the race. It is not their fault that they cannot

secure the accumulated culture of the ages as a constant environment. Were it so, we would soon see universally that atmosphere of "gentle breeding," which a constant environment of culture has made possible to people of wealth, and leisure, and refinement, and which has thrown a charm and a glamour over many of the privileged members of our aristocracy. One cannot help recalling Tennyson's lines :

"Howe'er it be,
It seems to me
'Tis only noble to be good ;
Kind hearts are more than coronets,
And simple faith than Norman blood."

This beautiful and pregnant truth has been quoted repeatedly as a pious opinion, but never believed or acted upon. To deal with it from the scientific standpoint, Norman blood is no doubt the possession of many who are poor and needy, but in their case it is unrecognised ; it is devoid of merit and unworthy of acknowledgment. Further, the inbreeding required to preserve the pure strain of Norman blood results in degeneracy : this is not only the rule in man, but in all species of the vertebrates. New blood is constantly required to keep the breed strong and healthy.

In regard to this matter we have an amusing illustration of the illogicality of human nature. The people who believe most in their ancestry as a rule belong to the orthodox religion, and profess an entire faith in our common descent from Adam and Eve. That being so, it follows that every member of the "genus homo sapiens" can claim equal lineage and long descent with any other. In fact, every one of the toiling millions can claim to belong to as "old family" as that of the most aristocratic peer. Moreover, any particular strain of Norman or Celtic or any other is very soon swamped by the potent influence of marriage. The result is the

average type, with special characteristics which depend solely upon environmental influences, and the lesson from this study of observed phenomena is to improve the environment all round, and we shall soon have universally gentler manners and what is called good breeding and that air of refinement which a knowledge of literature and art tends to convey. There is not much doubt that this fetish is tottering to its fall: the majority of the people do not regard it, and think of it only as one of those stupid superstitions which held sway among men until the enlightenment of Christian ethics dissipated the mist which obscured their vision, and demonstrated the native equality of man, when robbed of those artificial distinctions which are as useless as they are false.

The process of racial development going on in America at the present day is most interesting, and bears upon this point. Emigrants from Europe are being poured into that continent as into a huge mortar, and as a consequence we have a mixture there of all the nations represented in our Western civilisation. And what is the result? A race possessed of intense virility and energy, with a capacity for work which is unrivalled. This proves the benefit from the union of different strains in the white races at any rate, and shows that we are more likely to get a strong, virile, energetic race from this intermixture than we can get on the average from any one of the individual strains. Further, what do ethnologists tell us? That a type is being developed from this intermixture which from generation to generation is becoming more and more like the original inhabitants of the country—the Red Indian. If true, what can this mean? It can mean nothing else than that the environment of this huge continent, with its illimitable plains, mountains, rivers, and forests, is evolving a type similar to that of the

aborigines, who occupied the country long before this intermixture of races, who represent the flower of our Western civilisation, set foot upon its soil. This intermixture has brought with it the culture of the ages and the altruistic spirit, and the result is the continued betterment of society and a nation in the very acme of civilisation and refinement. But yet the type of feature and form is approximating more and more to that of the aboriginal inhabitant, demonstrating once again the power of environmental influences. And yet we continue to uphold the superstition of family and heredity!

After this digression we must return to Mr. Hobart's article, and we will begin with its conclusion: "All through life the trials and troubles of the industrial community are incessant; there is no rest; no relaxation: scarcely a pause, but like the ever-rolling sea, just a brief calm, to be followed by a fierce storm of the bitterest severity." This is a strong indictment, and one which must be remedied if we are to maintain any consistency whatsoever in our profession of the Christian religion. As in days of old, it can be said of us to-day: "Ye honour Me with your lips, but your hearts are far from Me." Mr. Hobart points out that the child of the working-man is handicapped from birth. It has neither proper food, suitable clothing, cleanliness, tender care, nor pure air—all absolutely necessary. Indeed everything seems to be done to hamper the growth and development of the child by a bad environment. Mr. Harold Begbie, in his graphic descriptions of London slum life, has made us well aware of the terrible environment as far as morals are concerned. We seem positively to do everything to encourage the growth of disease, vice, and crime, and thereafter in sanctimonious fashion talk superiorly of the sad and deplorable growth of criminality amongst the lower

orders ! When shall we learn wisdom ? Can anyone honestly argue that we are bound to maintain laws which enable a few individuals to draw exorbitant rents from land and housing if we thereby create misery, insanitation, poverty, drunkenness, vice, and crime in increasing degree among the masses of our citizens ? Most certainly not. Property has been conserved too long to the detriment of humanity ; and we believe to-day that no law can endure which acts prejudicially to the physical and moral welfare of the individual man. In the first place, it is a gross violation of the law of righteousness ; in the second place, the laws at present established have been made by man and can be repealed or amended whenever in his wisdom he thinks fit. That being so, we demand alteration in land and property laws, which violate the health and happiness of the people, and are in direct opposition to the altruistic principles at present operating in human society. Such reforms will be stigmatised as confiscation and robbery. This we can pass unheeded ; the robbery has been all from the poor man hitherto, and that must cease ; the rich man has more than he requires, and will not suffer through curtailment of unnecessary wealth or luxury, which are only a stumbling-block in the path of his own ethical development. Moreover, in many ways such reforms would benefit the plutocrat. His class are ever crying over the decadence of the race and the decline in stamina of our soldiers and sailors, who, after all, are the only real defence against the confiscation of their property. Once our soldiers and sailors are defeated by a foreign foe the rich man will soon discover that his property is either confiscated or that it yields a very small return comparatively. That being so, if his eyes were not blinded by pure selfishness and greed, he would see by the light of reason that it was his business,

if not his duty, to secure the best possible environment for the children of the workers, so as to rear strong virile men to man the ships and defend the shores. As he cannot see it, and will not, he must be compelled, and ere long, let us thank God, in his interest and in all our interests, physically, intellectually, and spiritually, the reforms which are necessary to this great end shall be accomplished.

Mr. Hobart gives many instances of the trials to which the workers are subjected. "Who is there amongst the advanced democratic writers of to-day who fully appreciates the extent of suffering and even agony inflicted in many working-class homes by the late arrival at its destination of a workman's train? Hot, tired, exhausted, and fatigued, they arrive at their workshop one minute after the gate is closed, there to wait and worry for a quarter of an hour, an hour, or a quarter of a day. And what does this mean? The loss of a few paltry pence? Ah! no. It means perchance a long spell of unemployment, for some employers are so precise and attach so much importance to punctuality, that they will discharge a man immediately for being late in the morning. It may mean another week of shoeless feet for one of the children, or the lack of some necessary comfort for a delicate wife . . . or a further accumulation of arrears of rent, and this in its turn may mean the hastening of the day of the broker's man's visit, and of eviction from the place called 'home.' Those who talk glibly of the thousands of pounds lost in wages through a lock-out, or strike, do not know that thousands of pounds of wages are lost every year by the workers through late trains, tramcar delays, cheap alarm clocks that will not 'alarm,' sleepless nights through toothache, baby's restlessness, wife's illness, and scores of other causes, and none of them

due to any fault of the workers themselves, and with no balancing satisfaction of a righteous endeavour to improve bad conditions, such as is looked for in a strike. The struggles of industrial life are fraught with tragedy."

Truly, as Burns has said, "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn." Is it not disgraceful that to-day one man is able to inflict such injury on his neighbours and is enabled to do this by the power of the wealth created by the industry of the workman. It ought never to be forgotten that without the efforts of working-men there would be no possibility of the accumulation of great wealth by any one individual, and that to use this wealth so acquired to damage those who helped him to obtain it is an act of the meanest description. The only defence ever attempted is, "It's business." If so, it is bad business, and the methods pursued in our trade and commerce call loudly for remedy. At present the only cure for evils such as have been described by Mr. Hobart is representation of the workers, with powers, in the board of management of every business concern which requires to employ many hands.

The worker is of greater advantage to the State in many instances than the employer, and it is very wrong that the State should not protect the toiler who, after all, must labour if he is to live. And yet, people revile trade unions. How otherwise could the artisan have security of work, or livelihood, or home, food, or family? What we want is the extension of the principle of trade unionism to all trades, and every kind of worker, male or female, if the cup of human misery is in any degree to be lessened. Methods of compulsion are of necessity required at this time to restrain the evils due to the tyranny of capital and monopoly; but we fortunately can look forward with confidence to a further stage when all men shall be

possessed of the altruistic spirit to such a degree that they will vie with each other in their endeavours to secure the universal happiness of the race and of the generations to follow hereafter. It is evident that this is a necessary consequence of the spiritual evolution we have demonstrated to be in process in human society.

Mr. Hobart proceeds to expatiate on the difficulties experienced by the working-man in his endeavour to keep home and family up to the minimum of existence on a pound a week or less. He points out that philanthropists have divided and subdivided the workers into sections according to the different degrees of poverty, and this is his comment thereupon: "But they are merely cold, lifeless figures. They do not convey to the reader the slightest indication of the mental torture endured by loving parents, when they see their children gradually but surely becoming weak and emaciated for want of wholesome food and home comforts. . . . We hear of neurasthenia and business breakdown among the business men of to-day, as being due to the rush and scramble of commercialism and the anxieties of city life. But not a word is said about the nerve strain and tension of the industrial population, to keep pace with the speeding-up methods in vogue everywhere. . . . Look at this position. With a minimum wage of thirty shillings weekly—considered too high by our comfortable legislators—and any number of hours per week from fifty upwards, a man is expected to turn out healthy and responsible citizens of a future generation. His weekly outlay is: rent, 7s.; travelling expenses, 2s.; clubs and insurances, 3s. (for a man must be thrifty and careful, no matter what his income, or he will be dubbed a 'waster'); his church or mission, 6d.; . . . occasional gratuities to charitable institutions, averaging

6d. ; pocket money for children, 2d. ; pin money for the wife, od. ; for breakfast and dinner away from home, 3s. ; total, 16s. 2d. This leaves 13s. 10d. for food for the whole family for a week, his own tea and supper for the week, and all his meals on Sunday ; also boots, clothes, fuel, and light and for replenishing the home (for every business man allows for depreciation). What a travesty of life ! And close on his heels, dogging his footsteps at every turn, follows the nemesis of sickness, short time, wet weather, increase of family, and accidents." As regards the woman he says most truthfully : " I venture to say there is no comparison between the alleged anxieties of middle-class women, and the mental tortures perpetually endured by the wife of the average working-man. Their anxieties begin with their life and end with their life."

It was very necessary to dwell at length upon this subject for the reason that the belief is prevalent in the middle and upper classes that the workers have no call upon their purse, having no position to maintain ; that their wants are few and that therefore livelihood presents no difficulties to them. The investigations of Booth and Rowntree led to the discovery that nearly one-third of the people was below the poverty line, that is to say, were members of families whose bread-winners were earning one pound per week or less ; and the appeal of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman to the nation to take steps to remove this social sore of the body politic, marked an epoch in social evolution. Since then the minimum wage has been granted in one trade and the principle is now established in the minds of all thinking men imbued with the altruistic spirit, so that very soon we have every reason to believe that to the bread-winner of every household, man or woman, a living minimum wage will be

secured. Think of the gain in human happiness, the peace of mind and physical well-being to the toiling millions, and they "who toil not, neither do they spin," will realise the joy of those who have helped to lift the weight of sorrow and anguish from the heavy burden of poor suffering humanity.

Legislation is fortunately proceeding on these lines ; it is providing better housing, garden cities, destruction of slum property, and is about to reform the land laws so as to make it easy for people to have ample room and gardens and fresh air. These measures must be secured if the development of the child is to have a fair start. Upon this we are practically all agreed nowadays. The child is the future citizen and from both the material and the ethical standpoint it is the duty of the State in its own interests as well as in that of future generations to see to it that every possible means are taken to give him the healthiest environment possible ; and if capital or property interfere with this in any degree, they must yield to the paramount interests of the future of the race. The child finds itself in the world ; it has not asked to be born ; it is not responsible for its parents, and if they neglect it, the State must interfere and see to it that in the interests of this entity, who has his rights as a member of the human species, and as a unit in society, and in the interest of the State itself, the child shall have every necessary comfort and care in order to secure in the early days its highest possible physical development, and later on the opportunity of a still higher evolution by the environment of every opportunity of culture and refinement.

We think we hear the cry which has always arisen when reforms have been mooted : " What of the independence of the people ! Nothing but pauperisation ! What made the men of the past ? The struggle for

existence, to be sure." The independence of the people has been ever a false cry, used as an excuse for doing nothing and spending nothing to alleviate poverty and distress—a mere selfish refusal to give to the brothers and sisters of the race the same healthy and comfortable environment which we consider necessary to ourselves. As regards the struggle for existence and the making of men, I can assert without fear of contradiction that poverty and starvation never made men or contributed to their higher physical development. Poverty has slain millions of healthy infants who would have been a valuable asset to the State, and who had every right to demand healthy conditions of food, clothing, and pure air. This is all so evident surely that we do not need to pursue this aspect of the method of social evolution. It is in process now and must continue to advance.

It must now be evident that if once we have this treatment of the child physically, intellectually, and ethically thoroughly established, in a generation at most we shall have to deal with a class of workers who are contented and happy, who realise that they are cared for by the State, and who will do all in their power to help the process of social amelioration in all classes of society. The altruistic feelings will operate with vastly greater power and intensity, and the spirit of love and self-sacrifice will everywhere prevail, so that we shall have reached a much greater advance in the betterment of the conditions of life among the people, with the prospect of attainment hitherto undreamt of.

The spiritual evolution of the people has not been confined to any one class. It has been evident in its operation in society as a whole, but I think we are entitled to consider that in the generation just concluded it has been more evidenced among the lower

orders than in those above them. The growth and work of the Salvation Army is the most outstanding feature of modern times, both ethically and socially. In this organisation we find men and women giving their lives to save others from "sin and misery." Harold Begbie's "Broken Earthenware" has brought home to all of us the self-abnegation of those whose lives have been changed by the altruism of Jesus, and through the power of His teaching have overcome the world. In this they find their joy and exceeding reward. In this work of self-sacrifice they realise themselves. In sacrificing the flesh they realise the soul, and know the peace and joy of the Divine Immanence; they come to the full recognition of the truth that "the ideal is the real," which brings the only lasting satisfaction to their spirit; they come to the knowledge of the truth that "the things which are unseen are eternal." It means, as Eugels has admirably stated, "the ascent of man from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom." When freed from the "cloak of self," men are enabled to grasp the unseen, to breathe the air of heaven, and become one with eternity. Carlyle, in one of his finest passages, has said: "In the grimmest rocky wildernesses of existence there are blessed well-springs; there is an everlasting guiding star"; and the Salvation Army has been the means of bringing the grandeur and the joy of this thought to many weary souls.

It has been given to few men, as it was to the late leader of the "Army," to see the triumph of his schemes for the betterment of mankind thoroughly established. One of the finest tributes ever paid to a man at the end of the day, took the form of an article in "The Times," in which the work of W. Booth and Livingstone was compared. There it was said: "The words of Sir Bartle Frere, describing Livingstone, are not less applicable

to Booth. 'The work of his life will surely be held up in ages to come, as one of singular nobleness of design, and of unflinching energy and self-sacrifice in execution.' This is a combination which compels the admiration of all save the dull and the base. The men who have it are rare, and we may be thankful for them. They may not succeed, and, indeed, it is difficult to say of either of these missionaries how far he succeeded in his aim. Nor does it greatly matter. *The great thing is that they had the aim and pursued it with unflagging energy and unflinching self-sacrifice.* They are an example and a light; they raise the whole standard of conduct in their generation in a way which men with different gifts cannot compass. *As for visible success, no one ever failed, according to the common ideas of success, so utterly as the Master they both served.*" "The Times" is here consciously or unconsciously helping the ethical evolution of man. In this conclusion it idealises self-sacrifice and shows forth its belief in the ideal regardless of worldly success or substantial gain or possession; indeed, indirectly, it may be said to pour contempt on "the common ideas of success." It must be evident surely that here is visible proof, if such were needed, of the triumph of the teachings of the Master, Whom, to-day, consciously or unconsciously, we all serve or try to serve, and thus help on towards the glorious consummation of the ideal state, when, indeed, "Good shall be the final goal of ill." The ascent of man through the ages has been long and steep, but at last we are within reach of his final evolution by means of the permeation of his thoughts by the ideal of love and self-sacrifice. It may be long in coming, but the indications are strong that the Will of the Eternal approaches completion and the realisation of the ideal is nearing accomplishment.

It is impossible to refrain from inscribing here Mr.

Owen Seaman's poem,¹ full as it is, as was that already given on the late Dr. Barnardo, of the noblest Christian ideal, and perfection of expression :

In Memoriam.

WILLIAM BOOTH,

Founder and Commander-in-Chief of the Salvation Army.

Born 1829.

Died August 20th, 1912.

As theirs, the warrior knights of Christian fame,
 Who, for the faith, led on the battle line,
 Who stormed the breach and swept through flood and flame
 Under the Cross for sign,

Such was his life's crusade ; and as their death
 Inspired in men a purpose pure of taint—
 In some great cause to give their latest breath—
 So died this soldier saint.

Nay, his the nobler warfare, since his hands
 Set free the thralls of misery and her brood—
 Hunger and haunting shame and sin that brands—
 And gave them hope renewed.

Bruised souls and bodies broken by despair—
 He healed their heartache, and their wounds he dressed,
 And drew them, so redeemed, his task to share,
 Sworn to the same high quest.

Armed with the Spirit's wisdom for his sword,
 His feet with tidings of salvation shod,
 He knew no foes, save only such as warred
 Against the peace of God.

Scorned or acclaimed, he kept his harness bright,
 Still, through the darkest hour, untaught to yield,
 And, at the last, his face towards the light,
 Fell on the victor's field.

No laurelled blazon rests above his bier,
 Yet a great people bows its stricken head
 Where he who fought without reproach or fear,
 Soldier of Christ, lies dead.

¹ By kind permission of Mr. Seaman and the Proprietors of "Punch."

There are many sublime thoughts in this poem. He healed the broken-hearted, "and drew them, so redeemed, his task to share," and around his tomb "a great people bows its stricken head where he who fought without reproach or fear, soldier of Christ, lies dead." But these are not only great thoughts, but facts, and we are entitled to point to them as evidence that the Great Miracle is in process of accomplishment, and that "the despised and rejected of men, the Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," has triumphed and "overcome the world."

We have referred to trade unions. No doubt there must be an extension of these organisations so as to include every worker in the land, so that poverty, as a result of insufficient wages, will be demolished, and have passed to the limbo of forgotten things. The most recent development of trade unionism is known as Syndicalism, and the subject has already been dealt with generally. It was pointed out that in so far as the workers desire to become the possessors of the different trades to the exclusion of the capitalist and the people as a whole, they are on wrong lines; and that if a new condition of things, to be secured by the abolition of the present capitalistic system, is to be permanent, it must be founded on altruistic and not on materialistic principles. An exchange of possession may be necessary as a step in the evolutionary process at work in society, but it cannot be permanent. The only permanence possible is that which shall be established on a basis of collectivism. In other words, all landed property and all industry and commerce must become an integral portion of the State, all being controlled and worked for the benefit of every individual according to his necessary requirements. This entails the abrogation of individual wealth, of greed, of the desire to accumulate possessions, which

can only be accomplished when the natural man shall have come to realise that true happiness is only possible when he has discarded the cloak of self, and adopted the teachings of Jesus as his rule of conduct. Man all along has been "Time's fool." The immortal Shakespeare had fathomed this truth, as he had all truth, for what is there in the nature of man and things to which he has not penetrated? "Love's not Time's fool," he says; which means that love is not of time, but of eternity. In the consummation of the spiritual evolution which is at the present time slowly operating in society, and will ultimately obtain the mastery, we shall be able to say to the race of men in the beautiful words and illuminating thought of a recent poet:

"Wert thou Time's fool? I am Love; I set thee free;
I am the door into Eternity."

Is it not one of the greatest miracles of history that the salvation of the world is about to be accomplished by the application of the teachings of One who, two thousand years ago, was the "despised and rejected of men; a Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," Who died a felon's death? Men of all Christian countries have professed all through the ages since that time their belief in His teachings, but only now is it coming to be realised that they must not only be professed, but acted upon. "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's good." "Having food and raiment, let us be therewith content." "But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition." "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things

of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are : that no flesh should glory in His presence." We know these are true ; we believe they are the very truth of God ; and yet how slow we have been to act upon them. But secretly they have been leavening the whole lump, and now all the powers of wealth, of property, of pomp, and empire are beginning to realise that the temporal must yield to the eternal, that the vain passing show is naught, and can only be considered worthy of attention when it acts in conformity with the universal and the infinite, and the sufferings of men can only disappear when all submit wholly and unreservedly to the guidance of Him who overcame the world by the supremest act of self-sacrifice.

To return to the consideration of "Syndicalism," we hope we may be permitted to quote from a recent article¹ by Odon Por and F. M. Atkinson, in order to show that the workers are quite alive to the fact that it is not possible to expect any substantial social regeneration with the human material of the present order unchanged, and "accordingly they endeavour to combine the creation of the new society with the creation of the new man." Does not this prove the falsity of the statements contained in the pamphlets issued by the anti-Socialists, who state that the denial of God, of Christianity, of all religion, is the cardinal doctrine of the Socialist propaganda? There need be no fear on this score, as the social regeneration which has been accomplished, and is now ameliorating the lot of humanity, is entirely the result of the diffusion of Christian ethics in men's minds, and by this means alone have such things become possible. "They firmly believe that such a future depends entirely upon their

¹ "English Review."

personal qualities and efforts, and upon their moral value, and so they consciously seek out ways of increasing the technical capacities of the industrial worker, knowing that through this he will desire a profound change in the organisation of the industries in particular, and in society in general." G. Beaubois, a clerk in the French Post Office, writes in regard to this aspect of the question: "Syndicalists must take care of the technical, moral, and social perfection of the young workers; they must guide and advise them, and awaken in them the spirit of observation, the qualities of initiative and energy. They must efface the painful and repugnant features that accompany labour under the present organisation of production. The problem of progress lies in saving work from monotony, and routine from fatality and servitude. In other words, the problem of progress lies in freeing work, and ennobling it. To initiate every worker into the progress of industry and the marvels of human activity, to show them the usefulness of their efforts and the grandeur of their work—that is, to give them a passion, a soul, a conscience. The labour organisations should become paternal homes for the young workers, protecting them from all temptations and leading them into life. A revolution does not improvise itself, and it is necessary that in the industrial groups new ideas, new collective sentiments should be born, and should develop and prepare the social change."

It ought to be understood that this is one of the most recent pronouncements by one of the most advanced advocates of industrial reform on collectivist lines, and yet, instead of doctrines of atheism, anarchism, and "*l'hypothèse Dieu*," we have the inculcation of the technical, moral, and social perfection of the young workers, of guidance and advice so as to awaken the spirit of observation and qualities of initiative and

energy, of freeing work and ennobling it, showing forth the usefulness of effort and the grandeur of work, thus giving them a passion, a soul, a conscience. Does not this show clearly the subtle influence of the altruistic ethical evolution moulding men and history and guiding them towards a higher and higher spiritual plane? The labour organisations are to protect the young workers from temptation and lead them into life. Surely a movement of this kind with such noble ideals ought to be encouraged by every possible means, and advised wherever it may appear to deviate from the path of true altruism. It ought to be observed, however, that never before in the history of trade or business has it been considered that the care of the youth morally came within its province. Seldom has the rich employer taken steps to guard the unwary and the inexperienced setting forth on life's precarious journey, with its many pitfalls, particularly in its first stages. It must be evident to all—he who runs may read—that the social betterment of the working classes must of necessity mean a moral betterment, for both the social and the moral are phases of the spiritual evolution which is the fount and origin of the whole propaganda.

The reader will be interested to learn how the workmen have proceeded in one or two instances where Syndicalism has taken concrete form. The Industrial Union of the Bottle Blowers of Italy had been in existence for ten years; it was a Socialist organisation endeavouring to realise its aims by political action. In Italy the bottle-making industry now lies between the factories of the Industrial Union and the Bottle Trust. A strike occurred against one glass manufacturer who refused the demands of the Bottle Blowers' Union, to which all workers in the bottle industry, whatever their trade, belong. After a year of struggle, the members of the Union raised funds, some even

selling their beds, and built factories, in which employment was given to their brethren on strike. Soon a new furnace was required, and the workers, without help from mechanics or masons, built the second one in about a fourth of the time usually required, and gave work to other members of the Union out on strike or unemployed. The manufacturer was beaten and was finally absorbed by the Trust, which granted all the demands of the Union for its members.

The Trust endeavoured to crush the Union, but the latter was able to build new factories, so that the Trust found its business curtailed and profits reduced. The Trust then tried underselling and inducing the banks to refuse credit. This failed, for the superiority of their manufactured article won the day. Each factory was able to produce a bottle of such quality that although it was necessary to sell at higher prices than the Trust, the Union could dispose of its whole output in advance. At the present time there are 3500 members in the Union, of whom the Trust employs 1000 and the co-operative factories 2500. Every member is a shareholder, even those working for the Trust.

Por and Atkinson point out the two factors which have secured their success. "The first is their technical efficiency, their professional consciousness brought out in their effort to create collectively something new and positive. The second factor is their *moral solidarity*, evolved by their Socialist training. . . . In their struggle they forgot their immediate interests and worked with all their energy for the liberation of their whole class from capitalism. They were dominated by a social vision, by a greater sense of human fraternity. A wonderful discipline prevails, which guarantees a continuous process of production, and fires each worker to work at his best. In all the factories there is not a single overseer. The moral solidarity created by the

struggle awaked the conscience of workers in all directions. For example, glass blowers the world over are heavy drinkers, but these men gave up drinking. Their life being filled with an ideal, a social purpose, and a continuous concentration on various problems, they find pleasure in it, and have no need to drink for solace." They renounced their legitimate dividends, accepting the same wages as their comrades working for capitalist concerns, and turned over all the net profits of their co-operation to mutual aid funds. *They have no intention of becoming capitalists.* They want to free themselves from capitalism and to set an example to other workers. With the profits of their enterprise they help the Socialist and Labour movements, they provide schools for their own children and for the children of other workers, and were actually the first to adopt the now famous Montessori system of kindergarten education. They built workmen's houses, providing better homes, better nucleuses for the new social life. Their factories are model factories in the industry; they are the best equipped in the world with labour-saving machinery, labour-protecting devices, hygienic arrangements, and they are prepared to introduce any new technical or financial method in their industry. Experts from all countries come to them to learn and profit by their experience. . . . In short, they have improved the conditions of their own life and work, making both healthier and less irksome, accomplishing their higher duty to themselves, since a revolutionary working-class must elevate its material level in order to make itself fit for fulfilling its social mission. "This movement, then, represents the new fact of Syndicalism in operation. An industrial union of workers has found within itself all the necessary elements for resistance against organised capital and all the necessary factors of progressing towards the

positive and thorough conquest of the means of production. . . . The force which these workers have substituted, for individual and associated capitalist initiative and efficiency of their organised class, foreshadows to syndicalists the future, for they declare that just this professional consciousness and moral training is the force which will lead to the future social order, and on which it will depend, and as it is at the present, so will it be in the future, a source of increasing economic progress and continuously growing moral development."

We have given this long extract from the article in order to show that the modern cry of "the country going to the dogs"; "revolution rampant"; "the wreck of the constitution," is the result of ignorance and prejudice. Social betterment, as we have reiterated again and again, must mean moral improvement. Raise a man's mental outlook, and he at once becomes possessed by an ideal, which causes him to shed the gross and the degrading, and concentrate his energies on the attainment of higher effort. As instanced above, the drunkards cease to drink. Moreover, the love of their fellows is proved in this instance to be the direct outcome of better conditions. Having known the evils of capitalism, these men have no desire to accumulate wealth, and therefore they devote their superfluous means to help the movement which has done so much for them, to provide schools, workmen's houses, and better homes.

A similar movement has been applied to the land in Italy, where 200,000 acres have passed into the hands of the farm labourers, and to the satisfaction of the landlords. They have improved the land, regulated employment, and eliminated the heartless sacrifice of the unemployed, of the old and the less fit workers. The Italian Government has recognised the importance of

this new departure by introducing a Bill with the purpose of leasing the Italian State lands, amounting to several million acres, to these co-operative societies, and at the same time to establish a co-operative bank, so as to give credit to the land labourers on favourable terms, and encourage their collective organisations. May we not join in the cry of "Wake up, England!" Surely it is time we were seeing to it that we were not left behind in the path of reform.

It will be observed that this movement is a great advance; it means the control of the industry by the workers collectively, for their own advantage and that of the trade concerned. What is wanting at present is a further collectivism of all trades acting together, for the benefit of every member of the State. This will necessarily follow, and when the abolition of the gold standard is an accomplished fact and the attainment of individual wealth becomes impossible, each will seek the other's good and find his chief happiness therein. As a stage in the process of social evolution, which deserves every encouragement, it must be guided so as not to take up a too independent or isolated position; each trade or industry must recognise that it is part of the body politic, and as it seeks its own social betterment, it is its duty to take every possible means to secure better conditions for every other member of the State. Already we may see a movement in this direction—the syndicalists desire to make the movement international and universal and bring about an international affiliation and co-operation. The syndicalist believes that his ideal society will only be attained by the organised will of the working-classes. It will be attained much quicker and more thoroughly, however, when they come to understand that what they have done has been possible only by means of the spirit of love and self-abnegation, generated in men's minds by

the ethics of the Christian faith, and that all is controlled by the Eternal, who maketh for righteousness.

It may appear that this law of spiritual evolution is too often repeated and insisted on. We do not admit this, and do not think it can. If it is not realised and acted upon, the social evolution and higher spiritual development of mankind can only be delayed, and the struggles to improve his lot rendered fruitless and vain. The sooner man universally comes to a knowledge of the operation of this law of spiritual evolution, under the guiding hand of the Eternal, the more rapid of necessity will be the advance of the social amelioration of humanity, and the voluntary self-sacrifice of each individual for the benefit of all.

We must now, for a brief space, consider the "theory of value" of Mill and Marx, which means that every article must be valued according to the amount of labour expended upon it. This definition can hardly be said to be exact, as many articles are of value according to the rarity of the original substance, or the difficulty of securing it, before any actual labour has been expended in the way of producing the finished product. And the awful condition of those engaged in the sweated industries proves that the amount of labour is a small factor, and that unless the interests of those engaged in these are safeguarded—in other words, until they form a trade union to defend their own interest—the workers cannot expect to receive a return in proportion to the labour expended. Mill and Marx contend that the share of the value of a given total of products, which is taken by the employer as his profits, is due to the fact that labour produces more than is necessary for its own support. Mr. Mallock, on the other hand, contends that the labour of average men, when directed by a man whose mind is above the average, produces indefinitely more than it would

produce were it operating solely under the direction of the minds of the labourers themselves. This can no longer stand as a stable proposition, considering the businesses managed and controlled by the workers alone in Italy, as just explained in the glass-blowing, agricultural, and railway industries under the Syndicalist regime at present in vogue there. A great deal might be written in regard to this "theory of value," but in relation to the evolution of the ideal state it would be "weary, flat, stale, and unprofitable." No doubt in the earlier stages of such an evolution a system of barter such as has been tried in London among a band of social enthusiasts even under present-day conditions would be founded upon a certain value, attaching to each product supplied or service rendered by the different members of the community. To take a concrete example, the doctor for, say, a week's work will receive according to his labour so many barter tickets, which will be exchanged for so much bread, meat, clothing, and housing such as he requires. The purveyor of all the necessaries of life simply returns these tickets to the doctor, lawyer, clergyman, or schoolmaster for their services, and each exchanges them as he requires. Thus the cycle works among all members, who are also workers, in the community. As already urged, all are labourers in the ideal state; we cannot talk of classes, for in the New Utopia there can be no such luxuries, except in so far as men are of outstanding merit intellectually and morally. It is not possible to secure and it is not desirable to attain a dead level of uniformity; one cannot eliminate the power and domination of the intellect. But as the ideal state will only become possible when man has become purged from much of his dust and dross, it is quite fair to argue that men of great intellectual calibre will use their talents for the benefit of their brethren, and take their

chief delight therein, well content with the gratitude and appreciation of their fellow-men, and deriving serene satisfaction and elevation of soul from the thought that by taking trouble they have been able to do good to others.

As man grows in spiritual attainment, which we believe we have proved is a necessary result of the present evolutionary process at work in our Western civilisation, it seems right to believe that all idea of value will be discarded. Each man will have food, housing, and clothing secured to him without payment of any kind, simply in return for good work well done. As we have indicated, the gold standard must be abolished ultimately if the race is to evolve to a higher spiritual nature. A higher evolution is quite impossible as long as man has the opportunity of giving way to greed, to the accumulation of unnecessary wealth and property. Each unit will find his niche in the great temple of the State, and be willing to do there the work for which he is best fitted, in the interests of his fellow-men, and realising in supremest degree his own happiness. Each works for all, and all for each, and are thereby content. The spirit of love and self-sacrifice inculcated by the Saviour of men shall have overcome the world under the guidance of the law of righteousness which proceedeth from the Eternal.

There are difficulties not a few, and of no mean order, which must be faced—"the way is long, and the path is steep"—but the overcoming of these is demanded by the spiritual evolutionary process, as necessary to its fulfilment, and in order to allow of the realisation of the ideal state, where selfishness will be unknown and altruism the one rule of life. Just to mention one difficulty: let us imagine that a great intellect is found to inhabit a member of the State engaged in a menial occupation. Is he to be removed from his work and

allowed to develop his higher faculties, and who is to adjudicate in this important matter? Such difficulties as these will in the course of time settle themselves; they will doubtless be dealt with by bodies of men of ability and sound judgment specially selected. In many cases it would be wise to relieve the exceptional man of his ordinary duties altogether, so as to devote his entire energies to the intellectual, artistic, or spiritual betterment of society, and so contribute in a greater degree to the further happiness of the race.

Bellamy deserves our gratitude for his delightful book "Looking Backward," and we shall always honour him as one of the pioneers of the ideal state. All endeavouring to help on the higher trend of things must acknowledge their indebtedness to him for the thinking out of many details which but for his insight might have appeared insuperable. One of the great difficulties has always been the performance of menial and disagreeable duties, and the conduct of trades of specially severe effort or noxious conditions. Bellamy points out that there is only one way in which this difficulty can be solved, and that is by all young men and young women for a certain number of years (three is the limit suggested) giving their time and effort to the performance of such duties. Only a limited portion of each day would be required for this with such an army of workers. It does not need to be pointed out that this would be most carefully supervised, and that young women would be spared the very disagreeable duties, or those to which they objected or were unfitted, and that they would never be asked to undertake severe labour or that in which the conditions were unsuitable. Such duties would not be undertaken until maturity had been attained; and as only a limited portion of each day would be required for this with such an army of workers, everyone would

have ample time for physical and intellectual effort, such as would fit them to be efficient in their future work on behalf of the State. The future work suitable to every individual would be decided by special committees and sub-committees, such as have been indicated, who would carefully study the inclination, the faculties, and previous record of every individual. No doubt it would be arranged that if in process of time it were discovered that a change of occupation was desirable, the decision would be reconsidered, and, if thought advisable, altered.

In Bellamy's system all artistic pleasures—the drama, painting, sculpture, and music—can be enjoyed by everyone without limitation, as at present to those of large means. The artists, loving Art for Art's sake, and recognising that "Life is short, but infinite; Art is long, but inexhaustible,"¹ give their powers and talents to the higher evolution of the race, and find therein the truest happiness and reward. They receive from the State all needful requirements and necessities of existence, with equal advantages similar to those possessed by everyone, in the privilege of enjoyment of all forms of art and culture they may desire, with all literature within their reach, and the pursuit of the study of any subject which interests them in the State Universities. Similarly, the experts in all subjects of philosophy, science, and learning, as professors in the Universities of every large town, imbued as they all are with the altruistic spirit, delight to pour forth the treasure of their minds, the results of long years of study and reflection in order to raise their fellow-men to a higher standard of being.

We think we hear someone say: "This is very well for literary people, professors, and artists, but it won't do for business men. Who is going to take the trouble to

¹ Frederic Harrison, "Among My Books," in "English Review."

import, for instance, such a substance as cotton, supervise factories, and send the finished product over the length and breadth of the land to help to clothe the multitude if there is to be no reward for this labour and thought? ” It would certainly be very difficult to get anyone to do such work at the present time for a mere livelihood, even with all the advantages of art, literature, and learning, which, as we have already indicated, are open to all. It is surely, however, not a difficult thing to believe that in a more advanced stage of spiritual evolution a man of energy would find the greatest satisfaction in the knowledge that in his own particular sphere, and according to his ability, he was serving mankind to the utmost extent of his capacity. There is no reason why the idea of acquiring wealth or property should ever occur to his mind, as it is never possible for him to forget the many and great advantages which the State confers in every possible way, and not least in showing him the pathway to reality—of true self-realisation.

It may be asked: “Can no one, then, obtain any special work of art to adorn his own household? ” We have no doubt, and cannot conceive that the desire for artistic beauty would not be encouraged in every way, but it must not be allowed ever to interfere with the general advantage, and therefore all great works must find a home in special galleries where they can be studied and admired by the general body of the people. The collections of great paintings on the part of rich men in their own residences is not to be encouraged or admired; the pleasure derived from their contemplation is of so thoroughly selfish a character that it can confer no elevation of soul: it is a stream of pure water polluted at its source. There are some men of large outlook and possessed by true altruism who have been able to enjoy the delight of self-sacrifice and given

their art treasures for the enjoyment of the nation as a whole. If this is possible for one, is it not for all? And in a further stage of evolution it will be the only thinkable way of fostering and developing Art.

As we continue it becomes more and more evident that such a state is only possible by the subordination to the utmost of all selfish interests. Before this can be secured, the State must take steps to prevent the accumulation of wealth, and this can only be done by the abolition of the gold standard. This is necessary not only in the interests of the lower strata of society, but in that of the clever, the greedy, and unscrupulous, who take their chief pleasure in the hoarding of gain and the acquiring of property; for nothing is more deteriorating to man's higher nature and productive of the greatest evil to his own physical condition and mental capacity than the gross satisfaction of luxurious and sensual tastes which the power of money enables him to gratify. We are therefore entitled to conclude that such a system is the only one which can do anything to alleviate the present "*la misère*." As long as gold is the vehicle of exchange, the burdens of industrialism must continue to weigh upon the shoulders of the poor to a greater or less extent. And such a system is quite as workable as the present, and brings with it what the other does not—the peace which passeth all understanding—to all who have seen beyond the mere material aspect to the light which enlightens the darkness of the world.

No doubt it will be maintained that even with the abolition of the gold standard and the negation of private property the greedy individual will always be able to appropriate more of the goods common to the State than is his proper and fair share, and in this way will acquire possessions even although the amount be limited. In regard to this objection one cannot

doubt that the State through its officials would be able to guard its own commodities in the interests of all. Moreover, this act would be a gross violation of that ethical system which alone has made the existence of the State possible, so that attempts of this nature are almost inconceivable, and in any case must be very rare. The dread and certainty of discovery would be a deterrent of no mean force. In fact, a case of this kind in such a community would be dealt with from the point of view of mental aberration, and would entail special treatment.

Luxury has been stated to be bad for the individual who succumbs to its attractions. It deteriorates the body of man, and degeneration of soul invariably accompanies that of body induced by such causes. This was one of the main arguments against the accumulation of wealth from the point of view of the welfare of the individual. Its effect on the family was also considered, in that the sons of men who had accumulated wealth were tempted by the seductions of alcohol and vice. But the subject deserves consideration from another aspect. It is commonly believed that it does not matter how money is spent ; that the great point is the spending of it, as thereby it is circulated and society as a whole eventually gets the benefit. It must be evident, however, that money spent on the racecourse in the form of gambling losses or in alcoholic debauch not only injures the individual so indulging, but injures others, in so far as it is being used for a purpose damaging to society in fostering gambling and helping a trade which, in most instances, is deleterious to the members of the State. Moreover, the money so misspent might have been devoted to the purchase of commodities the manufacture of which deserves encouragement, to foster the general trade and prosperity of the country, and in this way pass on to the workers

who make the necessaries of life the means of subsistence. Or it might have been devoted to the acquisition of works of Art, which is ever deserving of encouragement, and is the means by which the happiness of the people can be increased and their culture promoted.

All luxurious use of wealth is injurious to the State in so far as it interferes with industry, as it must be evident that all money so misspent might have been used to develop or foster trade and so increase the food supply or augment the purchasing power of the labouring classes. If a farmer, for instance, spends his income on alcohol, or racing, or buying unnecessary horses, which ought to have been devoted to manuring and working his land and thereby securing larger crops, he is not only injuring himself by misspending it and in diminishing his own income from the land, but he is reducing the food supplies which it ought to be his aim to augment to the fullest possible extent.

We thus see how it is the duty of every man under present conditions to consider his wealth as a trust to be devoted to his own highest good and that of the greatest benefit to the society in which he lives, as by misspending he is interfering with the purchasing power and even the food of the workers of the land, who in the first place produce wealth by labouring the soil, which is the primary source of all wealth.

Some unthinking people among reformers at the present time—we think it is a cry of the more advanced of the Syndicalist party in England—are demanding the control of the industries by the workmen, who would work them for their own private gain without regard to parliamentary control. Parliament is too slow for them, and they mean to anticipate governmental action and act independently of its controlling power. Such a state of matters is unthinkable ; it means chaos, and can only end in disaster to themselves. It is quite

impossible to imagine the working of a great industrial concern depending upon the governmental machine of a great nation for its own security and protection, and for the regulation of the food supply and safety of the homes and physical well-being of the workers, unless its own actions and proceedings are controlled in similar fashion by the central Parliament. There must always be a central, controlling, guiding body maintaining the scheme of government and securing the method which the common sense and ethical development of the people have decided shall be the rule of life and conduct. No doubt in such a State it is inconceivable that compulsion would be necessary, as all men shall have come to realise the beauty and delight of the altruistic life; but in order, particularly in the earlier phases of evolution, to guard against chaos or tumults, or failure in individual cases to conform to the ideals of the State, a central body must always be maintained.

A barter system may require to come into force during the transition period until the evolution shall have attained to completion, but such a system would be difficult to control, and jealousies would tend to arise as to the amount of goods to be given for so much work done. The progress of the altruistic temperament would solve this difficulty very soon.

In a country such as our own, with steamships and colonies which can provide all our needs, it would be comparatively easy to secure our food supply and raw material without purchase or expenditure of money, but these could not be secured in a country without colonies and supplies of their own. In such a case no doubt the State would require gold to pay for these, and would require to raise money by taxation of the people in order to go on. In such circumstances the abolition of the gold standard could not be accomplished until territory was conceded to this particular

State by some other which had more than was necessary for its own requirements, and desired to enable it to secure the benefits of its own system without such effete methods as taxation and the raising of money. An act such as this could only be prompted by the inspiration of the ideal, and no doubt it would. The desire of the ideal state would be to extend its blessings over the whole earth, and would never rest until this had been accomplished. Only then shall we attain to the ideal man in the ideal world. In thinking over this matter it has often appeared to me that the enthusiasm of the missionary is intended not only to secure the happiness of those converted to the Christian faith in a future world, but consciously or unconsciously it is the means by which the social betterment of mankind will be attained, with the ultimate realisation of the ideal state; we see, in faith, the approach of the poet's dream—"the Parliament of man, the federation of the world." If this is ever to be attained, it is the duty of every man professing Christianity to do all that in him lies to bring about the glorious consummation of the ascendancy of the altruism of the teachings of Jesus among all nations and peoples and tongues. We have been told in the colonies that Christianity demoralises the negro and makes him less fit to be a servant to the white man. After much study and reflection we have no hesitation in classifying this as a prejudiced statement. In many instances the methods of the missionary may be wrong. For instance, in the present stage of their civilisation it is a mistake to tell the negro that he is the white man's equal in the sight of God, for this statement conveys an entirely different meaning to his mind from that which the missionary intends. He should be told very little dogma, and that of the simplest, for he cannot comprehend it. The doctrine of the Trinity—the Three in One, and the One in Three—is not for him

at his present stage of non-ethical existence: the Fatherhood of the Eternal, the law of righteousness, and the teachings of Jesus, with their idealisation of love and self-sacrifice, are all he requires, and by continued reiteration and absorption can only result in a gradual uplifting of the race. First and foremost, it ought to be emphasised that religion is conduct, and that profession of faith without a righteous life is an absolute contradiction. This necessitates on the part of the white man the same rule of life, otherwise the black can only conclude it is a mere garment of hypocrisy, and refuse to be guided by it as a consequence. In South Africa the Kaffir is a very intelligent man: he is forming syndicates and taking large farms, requiring, in one instance at least, a capital of five thousand pounds; he is learning all the trades and is fast becoming a skilled mechanic.¹ As many have said to me: What does this mean, seeing there are 9,000,000 Kaffirs to 1,000,000 white men in the South African colonies? It means that, as the white man is not there in sufficient numbers to carry on the skilled trades and work the soil, one day the Kaffir will oust the white man. This is very likely to prove true. How necessary it is then, that instead of sneering at missionaries and running counter to them in every way, and refusing to help the cause of the religion we profess, we should do everything in our power to help the only cause which will regenerate the lives of these future masters of the country, and gradually uplift them to a higher plane, so that they may act in no vindictive spirit, but in that of the altruism of Jesus, thinking only of the welfare of their fellow-men.

To progress on these lines we shall require to alter our ideas of patriotism which have held sway over men's

¹ There are already two Kaffirs practising as barristers in the High Court of Pretoria.

minds for a long period of time : no doubt it fulfilled a great purpose in the past, but to-day its tendency is to smother the interests of humanity. The boundary of a country is an artificial thing, and we are too apt to extol the merits of the people on one side, and decry those on the other side. How much better that we should all act for the betterment of the men and women of all countries, and not with the selfish view of benefiting only those of our own. This no doubt will be the last phase of the ideal state, and then the whole earth shall behold the rule of the law of Righteousness and Love, and individual possession, like many another fetish of the past, like many another evidence of the foolishness of men, shall have passed to the limbo of forgotten things. All a dream ! you say. Alas ! it may be, but we think not, and have given many strong and powerful reasons for this faith and hope. The world can never certainly be so miserable under a reign of self-denial as it has been under that of its opposite. The rich have accumulated only pain, even for themselves ; money has not brought good in its train as they had hoped and believed ; all this wretchedness—this dead-sea fruit—will be eliminated ; all will have enough, and the cry of the poor and the needy will be heard no more.

We must now consider a very ancient evil, for which the cure can only come effectively through the elimination of the lust for gold and the power of money, and that is the white slave traffic. That is how we know it in the country of the white man, but in some of our Protectorates the name of the black slave traffic might be more appropriate. In the latter, however, prostitution does not exist ; it is rather a system of concubinage, and is certainly not attended by anything like the misery, suffering, disease, and early death which accompany this canker of the body politic in the countries in

the van of civilisation. Miss Jane Addams has brought out a remarkable book on this subject, and she calls it "A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil." She shows forth the awfulness of this traffic; the deceit used to trap young girls into it, who, ignorant in many instances of the most elementary matters of sex, become an easy prey; the insignificant salary which young women receive in many establishments forcing them to seek other means to augment their income so as to have any security of lodging or any ordinary comfort in life; and the impetus given to the traffic by alcohol. As General Bingham, formerly Police Commissioner of New York, says: "There is not sufficient depravity in human nature to keep alive this very large business. The immorality of women and the brutishness of men have to be persuaded, coaxed, and stimulated in order to keep the social evil in its present state of business prosperity." This would show that, without the evil stimulus of alcohol, chastity and self-control possess men and women much more than is at present understood. The desire for purity is of the essence of the soul, and when this is nourished by the love and self-sacrifice of Christian ethics it becomes a potent force in the direction of abatement of this ever-present evil.

The Vice Commission appointed by the Mayor and City Council of Chicago reports that "prostitution in the city is a commercial business, controlled largely by men, and producing a profit of more than three millions sterling a year." The number of women engaged in it is approximately five thousand. As A. J. Allen says in a recent number of the "Church Quarterly Review": "The annual revenue of three millions a year profit made by men from the moral and physical damnation of five thousand women is probably one of the very blackest spots on the escutcheon of any city,

almost enough to justify the laconic description given by a visitor to the Great Lake City : ' Chicago is hell.' ” This description would, sad it is to tell, apply to many great cities of the world—with certain modifications. Now this terrible state of matters is the result of one cause only—the lust for gold. Men find in it an easy livelihood, or even affluence; and when stranded through the committal of some offence which bars the way to future employment they take up this awful traffic as a ready means of subsistence, and associate with it the gambling den and the drinking saloon. But men are not alone to be condemned : it is only recently that men have taken up this foul business : women were at one time the sole, as they are now partially the procurers of our white slaves,¹ whom Lecky calls “ the most mournful and awful figure in history, who remains while creeds and civilisations rise and fall, the eternal sacrifice of humanity, blasted for the sins of the people.”

Miss Addams argues that this evil will only be remedied by the extension of the franchise to women. This is unfair and unjust. In England it was W. T. Stead who took up the cause and sacrificed himself, suffering no end of obloquy and slander, but who by his action secured the passing of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill. It is doubtful if women would be joining in the cry now but for the valiant efforts of Stead, that noble man who moulded his life upon that of his Master, and did more for the reign of righteousness and self-denial than any other of his generation. An Act of greater power has recently become law, and will do much to control and ultimately smash the traffic. The altruism of Christianity moulding the thoughts and lives of men will cure this malady of the body politic—not the extension of the suffrage to women. This

¹ Just recently an aunt got five years' penal servitude for trying to “ procure ” her own niece in London,

the wives and mothers of the nation know very well, and that men are much more able to secure all such reforms than they are themselves.

Medical men have for long tried to establish the State regulation of vice, which would have cured and prevented disease which has wrought such havoc to innocent women and children, and would eventually have reduced prostitution to the lowest possible limit. Reform of this nature has been prevented by agitation on the part of people unable to appreciate facts, with the result of continual increase of the very evil they wish to remove.

Acts of Parliament are very useful things, but they will never accomplish the final destruction of vice of this nature. Its ultimate destruction will only come with a universal spirit of self-sacrifice as the law of life, and the removal of the great temptation to acquire gain by the abolition of the gold standard, and consequently the power of acquiring riches by means of the foulest and most degrading traffic known to our civilisation. In the meantime it must be dealt with drastically and without fear; and, coincidentally, gambling dens must be summarily swept away and the liquor traffic rigidly controlled by Government, and drunkenness in every case punished by detention, the period of imprisonment to be increased according to the number of offences.

But we must go further. Presuming that population increases to the utmost limit of the food supply, and that the gold standard and private property has been abolished; in such circumstances the young men and women will wish to marry. If they all do so, how is the growth of the population beyond the means of subsistence to be prevented? As has been proved, the population at present is controlled by the labour market; a man does not marry until he has acquired sufficient to enable

him in his degree to marry ; when the barrier of the want of the means of subsistence is removed, what is there to prevent him satisfying his desires in this respect ? Undoubtedly we have a very difficult problem before us here, but it is not insoluble to the believer in the spiritual evolution of society. The State would undoubtedly do everything in its power to regulate marriage. In our own time the age of incidence of marriage, particularly among the professional and more highly educated classes, has been gradually extending, and in all probability this would be extended and fixed by statute in order to enable men and women in the most active period of their lives to do work for the State, always provided the limit of age was not so advanced as to affect the physical welfare of the child. A certain number from motives of pure altruism would desire to remain unmarried ; others would be prevented altogether from marrying by the State, and would readily acquiesce, as all are trained to do in every measure devised for the advantage of the people and the generations who are to succeed. The further question we have to answer is : Would those compelled to remain unmarried be able to exert sufficient self-control to prevent the creation of some such traffic as that with which we have to deal to-day ? In answer we can only point out that in such an advanced state of spiritual evolution, and with no temptation to private gain, such developments common to our earlier civilisation will not only be impossible, but unthinkable. We are well aware that we are dealing with one of the most powerful primeval instincts, and one which is absolutely essential to the perpetuation of the species, and know the difficulty of asserting that impulse to vice would cease to exist, but we can only contend that it would be effectually prevented in the highest state of evolution attainable to man by self-control and the

ever-present desire to save others from suffering of any kind.

The abolition of the gold standard and the consequent impossibility of gratifying the desire of gain would ere long result in the complete annihilation of greed or the vice of acquisitiveness. Through disuse, one of the morbid developments of a primeval instinct would cease to exist. And with its extinction there would largely disappear the "impulse unto crime"; theft and burglary would die from want of incentive, and our prisons and penal settlements would rapidly empty. With the State regulation of the sale of alcohol, and at a further stage its total prohibition, the present incentives would cease to operate altogether. Any criminal developments which might appear would be of the nature of insane impulses, requiring treatment in our mental hospitals. A gradual diminution of the inmates of these institutions would be a certain result of a perfect environment, not only from the purely material and physical condition of things, but the spirit of love everywhere pervading would create an atmosphere of joy and peace which would bring rest to the souls of the weary and distraught. Two of the chief causes of lunacy are alcohol and syphilis; as we have indicated, both are preventable by strong legislative enactment, and when once this has been accomplished we will be entitled to look for a reduction of at least fifty per cent in the number of our insane. Of the remainder—occurring in people of neurotic temperament who have suffered from disease such as influenza, which has a marked depressant effect on the nervous system—we can look forward to the elimination of all such. The admirable environment which we have secured for all, and the consideration extended to everyone suffering from nerve strain or exhaustion, the removal of anxiety as to ways and means, and

of necessity to keep on working when weighed down by illness, would in time effectually cure all such tendencies. Moreover, the bright outlook which the spiritual evolution brings with it would be a potent force in the prevention of all tendency to depression, and would dispel the gloom of melancholy which at the present day settles down on many a weary soul. We make, therefore, bold to state that in the further evolution of mankind we can look forward without fear to the ultimate elimination of these blots upon our civilisation—the criminal and the insane.

The soul of man is essentially good and not evil. This is not in accord with the orthodox belief in original sin, but we are entitled to consider that as only a priestly doctrine inculcated as a necessary preliminary to the soul's salvation. When Carlyle said that might was right, he meant that Right is always the strong thing, the thing that conquers, because it is in harmony with the Eternal—with the Ultimate Reality or Absolute Mind. The heart of the Eternal is good ; His law is righteous, and it is only when man gets into harmony with it that he is strong—that it is well with him. Hegel meant the same thing when he gave expression to the thought—"The real is the ideal." When you get to the real man—the essential nature of man—you find it will only be content with the Good—with the ideal. It is a remarkable fact, however, that in most men it is the surface-nature—the unreal part of him, the accidental, we may call it—that speaks loudest. As man is at present, it would seem that Evil is most congenial to his nature. Lord Haldane writes in the "Pathway to Reality" : "Man has a double nature, out of which arises for him, on the one hand the consciousness of separation from God or evil ; on the other, potential union with God or religion. Though finite spirit, man is none the less spirit ; consequently he is

essentially free and therefore responsible." We have here a concrete statement of man's essential nature which must be borne in mind throughout the whole of this argument. How, then, do we explain man's preference for evil? How is it that dirt and ugliness seem most congenial to many people? It is without doubt due to the fact that their circumstances—an evil environment—have habituated them to the bad. They have never known the better, and therefore they assimilate the inferior. They are unwillingly deprived of the better environment, and as long as they adhere to the evil their nature is divided against itself. The unwillingness may not have risen into clear consciousness, but it is seen in the unhappiness that comes from the division in their life. If we looked merely to man's nature as it appears on the surface, it would be quite as true to say that it is essentially bad. A contradiction of this kind is found in every creature undergoing evolution. If you take it at any particular stage there is always much in its actual condition that is alien to its real nature and ultimate end.

It is not necessary to demonstrate here that "crime" is almost invariably the result of a bad environment. That is why the criminal classes are to be found largely in the slums of our big cities; and with the amelioration of social conditions and better surroundings we know that crime will suffer gradual diminution. But thus far we must realise we have only made a beginning. Man has still to fight the cravings of the flesh, and most of all "greed"—the vice of acquisitiveness—the morbid development of the primeval instinct of self-preservation. It is a necessity of existence that he must seek food and housing, but when he makes it his aim to acquire more than he needs, and seeks after "many possessions," then the natural instinct becomes a vice, and the essential nature—the spirit—"though finite

... none the less spirit"—is obscured and submerged. But the spirit of man—his inner and true nature—is essentially free, and man himself is therefore responsible. It therefore rests with himself to rise above the merely surface nature—the “cloak of self,” “the carnal mesh,” “the muddy vesture of decay,” as it has been so aptly termed by some of the great and good of the past—and give full play to the essential good in him—the soul or spirit—by means of which he acquires potential union with God. Man is miserable when he does evil because it is foreign to his real nature. We will do well to recall here some of the utterances of the greatest of modern prophets. In “Sartor Resartus”¹ we read: “Well did the wisest of our time write! It is only with Renunciation that Life, properly speaking, can be said to begin.” . . . “Art thou nothing other than a Vulture then, that fliest through the Universe, seeking after somewhat to *eat*; and shrieking dolefully because carrion enough is not given thee? Close thy *Byron*; open thy *Goethe*.” . . . “*Es leuchtet mir ein*: I see a glimpse of it; there is in man a higher than love of Happiness: he can do without happiness, and instead thereof find Blessedness. Was it not to preach forth this same Higher that sages and martyrs, the Poet and the Priest, in all times, have spoken and suffered; bearing testimony through life and through death of the God-like that is in Man, and how in the God-like only has he strength and freedom? Which God-inspired doctrine art thou also honoured to be taught; O, Heavens! and broken with manifold merciful afflictions, even till thou become contrite, and learn it! O thank thy destiny for these; thankfully bear what yet remain: thou hadst need of them; the self in thee needed to be annihilated. By benignant fever-paroxysms is Life rooting out the deep-seated chronic

¹ The everlasting Yea, Chapter IX, “Sartor Resartus.”

Disease and triumphs over Death. On the roaring billows of Time, thou art not engulfed, but borne aloft into the azure of Eternity. Love not pleasure; love God. This is the everlasting Yea, wherein all contradiction is solved; wherein whoso walks and works it is well with him."

Again, we must put to ourselves another question. If men find blessedness in the Good, why do they so universally choose the Evil? As was said before, environment accounts for much. "We needs must love the highest when we see it," and it is therefore our duty to bring the highest within the reach of all by means of a perfect physical, intellectual, and ethical environment. Further, we know that the mists of passion obscure the mental and spiritual vision. These will come more and more under control when men universally attain to realisation of the true self by means of the renunciation of the baser elements; and this must follow the permeation of men's minds with the altruism of Jesus' thoughts and teaching.

We must further ask: Is it the case that men are miserable in doing evil if their evil is successful? We know that the best minds of the past and the present say they are. With success and a good digestion a man may have little misery over his wrong-doing for a long time, but ultimately his real nature, his true self, will speak, not in the next world, but here. But even if it did not, the argument remains as strong as ever, for the men who are most fully men—who, by common consent, have reached nearest the ideal of manhood, who have seen the beauty and feel the peace of the good—would look and do look upon the fate of such a man as the most miserable of all. He is so false to his higher nature that he has almost ceased to recognise the fact. Whenever a man gets into the region of the true in thought, the beautiful in Art or Nature, and

the noble in deed, even although they demand sacrifices of him, he knows and he says: "It is good for me to be here." They are so congenial to his nature that he never can again be satisfied with the inferior. So much is this the case that those who are best acquainted with the Good declare with one voice that it is better to have it with suffering than to have the whole world without it—that is the meaning of "gaining one's own soul."

To pursue the argument, we are entitled to say that society supports the belief in the essential good of man's nature in the punishment inflicted on those who do evil. But it is fortunate that in European countries we are beginning to pay heed to the idea of reform in punishment. We are coming to see that punishment that does not reform is sheer brutality. The very fact that society punishes evil shows that men have got the conviction from experience—and from experience because the Divine is immanent within them—that *evil* is anti-social—that man's nature is such that it hurts him—that *it* is the enemy. If it were not, they would not punish evil at all. It has been said that society punishes not from any interest in the Good, but from interest in self—in pure selfish protection of its individual interests. It must be admitted that this does affect the question, but it could not be otherwise in our state of society, which is so largely controlled by present-day material interests. It must be remembered, however, that this just proves that man's nature is such that it is his interest to crush the Evil and cultivate the Good. In the "Ideal State" the aim of punishment must be more and more to reform the evildoer and get rid of the Evil; and much more attention must be given to prevention than to punishment. Dickens—one of the greatest of benefactors of the poor and the afflicted—pointed out long ago that the first time the Government

.....

thinks it is its duty to take account of the wretched is when they have committed a crime. He asks if the judges and others had no duty to them before that? Since his time we have endeavoured to do something. We try to educate them and give them a better chance; but in the present state of society it is a very slow process of betterment. Multitudes are still brought up in an atmosphere of evil and trained to crime, in semi-starvation and foul dwellings; and it is only when they commit, what we consider, some flagrant act of evil, that we take an active interest in them, and once we commit them to prison we are satisfied in the thought that there our duty ends. As a matter of fact, it is there our duty begins. If we consider their circumstances there is room for infinite compassion, which can only be satisfied when every means have been taken to remove some of the causes. The bad environment must first be seen to, and we are glad to think is being seen to. The possibility of work for every man and a living wage in return is another necessary reform. It will then be possible to deal effectively with the "Weary Willies" and the "Won't works." The further progress of the spiritual evolution of man must necessarily ultimately remove all crime, not only by raising the whole standard of being but by removing any motive which could act as an impulse towards evil. These same influences must ere long teach us that in punishment there is little satisfaction either to society or to the offender. Its only justification can be that the period of detention is used as a means to re-awaken the higher nature of the prisoner—to show him the direction in which true happiness lies, and take every possible means to prove to him that society is not his enemy but his friend; that his fellow-men love him and only desire to do him good and get good from him. And to do this he must have a sound environment from

every point of view, and every endeavour made to raise him intellectually and morally.

In actual practice it ought to be stated whenever it becomes apparent that the criminal acts are the outcome of mental disease—acute or chronic—such cases can only be benefited in our hospitals for the insane; and where it is evident the disease is incurable, it is clear that a return of the individual to society becomes impossible. All such cases in our ideal state must of necessity become less and less, and be finally extinguished under a perfect environment physically, intellectually, and spiritually.

Socialism has been defined as the nationalisation of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange. If a definition is required for the principle upon which the "ideal state" is to be conducted and maintained, we believe this is as exact and comprehensive as any which can be formulated. We do not for a moment imagine that such a means of conducting the affairs of our nation could be adopted and put into action immediately; it must be a gradual process, and legislation must lead up to its accomplishment by easy stages; there must not be too sudden rupture with the tradition of the past; otherwise we return to chaos, and bring "confusion worse confounded" and delay the wheel of progress, maybe, for centuries. It will require as a necessary accompaniment, without which it is impossible, the continuously higher ethical evolution of man's nature. Notwithstanding the many sad facts, the awful extent of misery and vice prevalent in our present stage of civilisation, we are confident that such an evolution is now in process, and is leading on towards the glorious consummation of the "ideal state." In the heart of every member of the community we must do everything to stimulate the spirit of self-sacrifice and of willingness to suffer on behalf of all with whom we

are brought into contact, not only in our own interest and theirs, but with the aim of helping the still higher evolution of the State in the interests of the generations who are to come after us. Everything depends on the spiritual evolution of man, and the certainty of this as the plan of the Eternal, and we believe this to be the only conclusion possible from the study of observed phenomena in the past history of mankind.

Even at the present day we have many conditions existing which were declared utter impossibilities. For instance: in the profession of medicine, any member who conceals a remedy or a means of benefiting mankind for his own private gain is looked upon as an outcast, and is treated as such. He is at once ejected from his college or university. Everyone imbued with the true spirit of his profession derives more than sufficient compensation from the fact that he has been able to reduce the sum of human misery, and that the work he has done has met with the approbation of his brethren. Indeed, the members of the profession who make the great discoveries which benefit humanity are not those who become wealthy; the most scientific members of the faculty give away willingly the fruits of their discoveries without any reward of a monetary nature. At present, moreover, they are the only profession who give their time and skill in our hospitals, dispensaries, and even privately, without reward in many instances. It is true that this work may lead to profit, owing to the distinction which appointment to a hospital confers; on the other hand this does not necessarily follow, and the fact remains that no other profession works as they do for humanity without return. It may be well to take this opportunity of pointing out that the provocation to revolt against the clauses of the Insurance Bill compelling work for fees which were insufficient must have been considerable. No doubt the poorest mem-

bers of the profession would have benefited, but the vast majority would have suffered from a marked reduction of income—a most unjust procedure towards the only men in the State who for long years have given a large proportion of their services without reward and with the sole aim of easing the pain and lifting the burden of sorrow from the back of poor suffering men and women. So that even at the present day we find, in one profession at any rate, the effects of the teachings of the altruism of Christianity and a system at work which does not depend upon gold, and where the gospel of self-sacrifice is actually at work moulding the actions and lives of men. We have here a demonstration of such a system as has been forecast at work, and therefore we are encouraged to go forward without fear to the final accomplishment and universal application of this principle of life and conduct to all men within the State.

All the powers of wealth and property are, as a matter of course, opposed to such an evolution. The amassing of wealth, the power which it confers, the privileges it secures, and the luxuries always within call, are potent influences which will not yield to anything but overwhelming odds. It is of no avail to demonstrate to the rich man the risks to which he is exposed in the way of temptation to excess, and consequent degeneracy and the shortening of his days. It is of no avail to repeat the warning of Scripture: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven." It is of no avail to point out the dangers of an environment of luxury in the case of his sons, and the possibility of headlong destruction in their youthful prime. He is quite uninfluenced by the argument that the amassing of riches is a soul-destroying process and takes all the real charm out of life, robbing it in most

instances of the intellectual and the ideal. The fact remains that even for the rich it were much better that they had never known more than enough. It is they who never weary of telling us that riches do not bring happiness; and we know that as often as not they bring misery. True, you say; but have you not been telling us *ad nauseam* that it is poverty—the want of riches—which is the cause of all the misery among the poor? Yes, we reply; and all that is asked is that to every head of a household shall be secured means to give all the necessary comforts of life and sufficient leisure to devote to artistic or intellectual development in exchange for a certain amount of work to be regulated and controlled by the State for the best advantage of all its members. Ultimately, as already stated, it is hoped to reach the ideal of “each for all and all for each,” when the gold standard shall be non-existent and private wealth and property a thing of the past.

It is now necessary to endeavour to sum up as succinctly as possible the various ideals to be sought after in the higher evolution of the race. The aim in the first place is that of a perfect environment—or as near to its attainment as possible—for every unit therein: every child to breathe the purest air, to have the clothing most suitable to the climate in which he is reared, and good food and water. Later, to be helped in every way to acquire the culture of the ages, and encouraged always in the development of his physical and intellectual faculties, and necessarily coincidentally his ethical faculty; his personal inclination as well as capacity to be considered in deciding upon the labour or profession best suited to his individuality.

All necessary requirements and comforts to be secured for everyone; these to be fixed by committees or sub-committees of the State.

The amount of work allocated to each to be so

guarded that it never goes beyond the strength of the individual concerned ; and for everyone there must be sufficient leisure to allow of physical and intellectual culture.

All art, music, and drama to be within the reach of all ; all lectures and university teaching to be free to all during times of leisure.

All men working with their hands to retire at fifty-five or sixty years, according to their physical necessities ; all brain workers, such as professors and lecturers, to retire at the same age, but still available in giving counsel in regard to all matters where their ripe experience is likely to be of benefit.

The gold standard must ultimately be abolished of necessity. There is no payment of money wages, and consequently no accumulation of wealth, resulting in such absurd distinctions as those which divide our classes into rich and poor. There are neither rich nor poor ; all have enough and all are happy. The vice of acquisitiveness has been overcome as a result of the ripe experience of the past and the altruism of Christian ethics. The aim of everyone is "to take trouble to do good to others," finding thereby their own chiefest good and soul's satisfaction. Men individually and collectively seek to devise means to improve the conditions under which succeeding generations will be called upon to live.

" Eugenics " are an automatic result of the improved environment which from day to day finds betterment. In the meantime such an Act as that recently before the House of Commons for the care of the feeble-minded is necessary.

The State must assume complete control of the liquor traffic. It is universally admitted to be the cause of much widespread misery, not only to those who over-indulge, but, in even a greater degree, to many innocent

people who otherwise would lead happy and profitable lives. In all probability the State would find total prohibition a necessary procedure at this imperfect stage of man's ethical evolution.

The white slave traffic to be stringently and relentlessly supervised until prostitution is abolished.

All women, for a certain number, say three years, to take their share of such work as domestic service; as daughters of households this would be nothing more than their simple duty; the nursing of children comes under the same category. All men similarly to take their share of what are called the more menial occupations, such as work on drains and other trades necessary to the accomplishment of a perfect sanitation. It is well for men and women to have practical knowledge of every department of work and method, and particularly everything pertaining to the wise conduct of a household. This could not but be beneficial to the individual and to society.

The system of punishment for criminal offences to be revised and altered. The soul of man is essentially "good"; it has become attracted to its opposite through the force of a bad environment upon the husk of the soul—the "carnal mesh"—the "muddy vesture of decay." Therefore we must effectually change the environment, and especially in prison, where the defaulter should only be detained until, with safety to himself and others, he can be restored to the society of his fellows. At present we do all we can to make him the enemy of society, and confirm this by our attitude when he returns to it. We must endeavour to remove the evils of his previous bad environment, to shed the spirit of love into his soul, and reawaken the true self—the Divine element, immanent and ever awaiting the light from the Eternal to arouse its dormant energies. Therefore, in future, until all crime

has disappeared by means of a perfect environment physically, intellectually, and spiritually, we must endeavour to conquer the misguided, or rather ill-treated, member of society who has transgressed the laws of righteousness, by the spirit of love. We must prove to him that society desires nothing more than to re-absorb him, to take him to her large heart, and do everything to make his lot happy, and receive his help in return. He ought to be taught useful work, given ample leisure for physical exercise in the open air, supplied with good literature, and advised from the ethical side by men specially trained and chosen for such work. The present method of choosing chaplains—without special qualification, indiscriminately from a body of men who have signed the “nine-and-thirty articles”—can only be said to be deplorable. On leaving, the prisoner must be met and receive every care from people specially appointed; and work secured and his footsteps guided until society has re-established faith in him.

All castes and orders will undergo a process of gradual elimination. In process of time it will possess men's minds that no other honour is necessary than the esteem and gratitude of their neighbours, conjoined with the consciousness of self-abnegation and of good work well done—the best possible attainment for the individual under the law of the Eternal and in accord with the teachings of Jesus.

We are entitled to look for the gradual disappearance of the Army and Navy. These remain as evidences of a still semi-barbarous phase of existence. At present, no doubt, they are necessities of our continuance as nations and great powers. With a higher plane of ethical evolution, however, they will become unthinkable and intolerable; all disputes of every kind will be settled by means of arbitration. The beginning of this

“method of reason” is already in operation at the Hague, and will increase in power and influence as we secure the gradual attainment of the poet’s dream—“the Parliament of Man—the Federation of the World.”

Until we reach the stage of the abolition of the gold standard we must secure as rapidly as possible a universal minimum wage for the heads of all households, men and women alike, so that no one in the land shall be without every necessary comfort, ample leisure, and the means of culture, in return for work done in any capacity for the benefit of the State.

Every household must have sufficient room for each unit, so that an abundant supply of fresh air and the means of privacy and decency are brought within the reach of everyone. The housing must be on thoroughly sanitary lines, with ample supplies of hot and cold water, of light and heating.

Garden cities must be planned for all congregations of people so that there can be no congestion of air, or space, or other conditions tending towards insanitation or disease.

Preventive medicine must eventually become the chief thought of the governmental machine, with a Ministry of Medicine, in all probability held by the Prime Minister as the chief officer of State. A State Medical Service will be a vital necessity, and will, before long, extinguish the absurd methods of private practice. At the present moment the poor are not, except in hospitals, efficiently and scientifically attended. Under the present system it is impossible. This will be totally altered under a State Medical Service. The medical man will benefit materially. At present he is either underwrought and underpaid, or he is overwrought and—it maybe—overpaid. Very often he is both underpaid and overwrought. It is unfortunately

true that there are at least 4000 medical practitioners in our big industrial centres who never know what it is to have a holiday from the cradle to the grave of their professional life ; who are compelled to work at excessive pressure all their waking hours, with many inroads on what ought to be their sleep, for a bare pittance of £200 to £250 a year. Mr. Lloyd George has at any rate done good to this section of the profession, in that he has brought what is comparative affluence within their reach. Their income will be doubled, and perhaps trebled ; they will be able to work less and enjoy a little leisure ; and the annual holiday will begin to illumine their imagination and bring balm to their souls and health to their bodies. But under a perfected State Medical Service no doctor will be overwrought : he will not work into decrepitude and senility ; at fifty-five or sixty a pension will enable him to rest from his labours and devote such energies as remain to advise the State for the welfare of the body politic.

A body of specially selected scientific advisers to be formed, and consulted by the Ministry, when required, and to be final in its decisions, so as to avoid the possibility of too sudden change, potential of great danger to the continuity of the State.

It is most unlikely that Britain will ever be called upon to face Revolution. Her constitution is broad-based upon the people's will. There has been in the past, there is in the present, and there will continue in the future a gradation of concessions to the demands and needs of the people by the Government. Indeed, we may now say it is truly government of the people, by the people, for the people. It is not at all likely that our Government will ever declare war from no other motive than political exigency, such as has been done by other European powers in the past and may

be used by others in the future. The internal discontent of Germany is a menace to the peace of Europe in that the Kaiser may find it necessary to provoke hostilities in order to arouse the patriotic fervour of his subjects, and thus evade revolution temporarily, withdrawing attention from their own misgovernment. For it is to misgovern when the interests of the people of a great nation are sacrificed to military aggrandisement and power.

The influence of Christian altruism, under the law of righteousness of the Eternal, is evidenced with greater potency in our own country than in any other, and will insist from day to day upon the progressive betterment of society, which alone can and does give permanence to our civilisation. In the words of Benjamin Kidd, already quoted, "Society is evolving religious character as a first product, and intellectual capacity only so far as it can be associated with this quality," and the most distinctive feature of human evolution as a whole is that through the operation upon men's minds of the self-denying ordinances and teachings of Jesus the race must continue to grow ever more and more religious.

A scroll of heroes to be displayed in all our schools, so that the youth may know the men who in the past have done most to advance the State in all lines of noble thought and enterprise. The teaching of all history ought to cluster round such names.

The legal system must eventually be merged in the Civil Service. All cases presented will receive consideration in an outer Court as to whether they are undeserving of trial on account of such faults as triviality or mere litigiousness. The latter would require careful repression, as it would tend towards the abuse of the legal instrument. One judgment to be final in all cases ; barristers to be civil servants, paid by Govern-

ment as the judges are ; to receive no private fees, and promoted according to their knowledge, ability, and experience.¹

The State must do everything to foster the permeation of the mind of the child with the ethics of the teachings of Jesus. Under our present system the main idea inculcated in the educative system is "Get on, or get out," with the perpetuation of self-seeking and its attendant evils evident everywhere, and not least in "business," where the ruin of one's neighbour is quite "fair game" as long as we ourselves profit thereby—most inconsistent and deplorable in a country boasting of its Christian religion and government.

It is not intended that any Church shall be established, but it will be the duty of the Ministers of State to act under the guidance of the lesson of history and see that the child is thoroughly instructed in this particular by means of the schoolmaster, so that he may come to realise the influence of these teachings in the evolution of the social betterment of mankind and the amelioration of his lot, giving assurance of peace and joy to his own existence, and permanence to civilisation, and the removal of all risk of sudden rupture with the tradition of the past as a result of social discontent in the form of Revolution, which interferes for long periods with the process of human advance.

The general physique must be maintained by every opportunity of exercises, whether gymnastic or in the form of open-air sport—these to be wisely directed and scientifically guided so as to get the best results for the individual and to secure that they are not overdone, as do many of the "idle rich" at the present day. They make it their work, which is as bad as neglecting it altogether.

¹ This applies only to immediate reform.

Every opportunity for intellectual advance to be accorded to all by means of a constant environment of the best thoughts of the best minds of the past and the present in the form of access to literature and lectures on every kind of literary and scientific lore. By this means the general intelligence and culture is raised and the individual is enabled to make more of his abilities and capacities, and in this way serve the State better. The knowledge of the best thoughts of the best minds tends ever to elevate the soul of man and help onwards his spiritual evolution; for to quote again the greatest prophet of the nineteenth century—Thomas Carlyle, whom may we all bear ever in most reverent memory: “All intellect, all talent is in the first place moral—what a world were this otherwise; therefore the Good alone is deathless and victorious.” So that an atmosphere of culture serves a double purpose—and the highest of all purposes—in helping on the ethical evolution in process among men. Like all other evolutionary processes, this is necessarily of slow growth. Hence the need by every possible means to augment all agencies which have helped or can help towards the Final Goal.

That eminent man, Lord Morley, in an address delivered at Blackburn recently, quoted the Archbishop of York to the effect that an educated man was a man who knew the difference between knowing and not knowing. It is not easy to discover this by any means, and that is why we must all endeavour not only to study observed phenomena, but we must learn how to study and weigh the conclusions which we draw. Lord Morley went on to extend his definition of the educated man, quoting another prelate to the effect that he was a man with a clear view of some purpose running through life, with which he identified himself and tried to co-operate. An educated man, among

other qualities, knows what is evidence and when an assertion is proved and disproved ; and he added, and this is very important and gives support to the whole contention and argument maintained throughout this treatise : “ The educated man should have an ardent care for the well-being of his own species, and his own countrymen to begin with.” Therefore it is that we are bound to conclude that it is the duty of every man, and particularly every educated man, regardless of self, to seek after the attainment of a perfect environment not only for his fellow-men but in the interests of the unborn generations of men and women who are to succeed.

“ See ! In the sands of the world
Marches the host of mankind,
A feeble, wavering line.
Where are they tending ? A God
Marshalled them, gave them their goal.

.
“ Ye fill up the gaps in our files,
Strengthen the wavering line.
Stablish, continue our march,
On, to the bound of the waste,
On, to the City of God ! ”

Chapter X

The Final Goal

AS we approach the end of our thesis we must endeavour to sum up the whole argument and prove a logical sequence onwards to our conclusion. As long as the theory of Darwin held the field, it was evident that anything in the nature of a higher or spiritual evolution of the race was impossible. His theory rested on the assumption that man, like the units of every other species, was in a state of constant struggle with the other members for the means of subsistence. This struggle was necessary to his own existence and to that of the genus, otherwise the units would cease to continue "fit," and would therefore be exterminated by other genera. This he called the "Law of Natural Selection." As Darwin based his case on the carnivora, we have taken up the argument from observed phenomena of this species of vertebrates, and have given proof of the law of the cannibal habit in the male which is the means of repression of all excess of reproduction. The method by which this was controlled was acknowledged by Darwin to remain "most obscure." There is therefore no necessity of a struggle for food, and therefore the Law of Natural Selection goes by default and is proved to be a false doctrine. As Darwin had homologated the doctrine of Malthus, which he said applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdom, it was necessary to demonstrate the unsoundness of this theory, and without

difficulty we were able to show that growth or decrease of population in man is controlled entirely by the labour market. An increased death-rate will temporarily affect the birth-rate and cause it to rise ; emigration from a country has a similar effect. But there is no tendency whatever for the growth of population to out-run the means of subsistence, which was the dread doctrine preached by Malthus and caused him to proclaim that only by means of war, pestilence, famine, vice, and misery could the numbers of the species be kept within due bounds. This we absolutely confuted ; and it is fortunate for the race that this awful doctrine has been destroyed, otherwise the only possible fate of man was one of despair and devoid of hope or cheer.

The destruction of these false doctrines was necessary if man were to retain any prospect of a brighter future. One other dread doctrine remained, and that was the "dead hand" of heredity. It was proved that by means of continuity of the germ plasm man inherited the characteristics peculiar to his own genus, with occasional physical features—such as shape of nose, colour of eye or hair—which might resemble those of one parent or grandparent. But the fact remained that the essential man, his mental and moral qualities, even his physical powers, depended largely upon his environment. "Sports" of genius or remarkable intellectual gifts do occur from time to time, but are not the result of heredity, and the descendants of such extraordinary individuals return at once to the average under the potent influence of marriage. It was demonstrated that poor physique, undeveloped mentality, and a low morality could all be eliminated, and the higher faculties physically, intellectually, and spiritually stimulated and developed by a good, sound and suitable environment. Therefore it is the duty of the State in every regard to grant to each individual, and especially

to the child from its earliest years, the best possible environment. This can only be realised by slow gradations; but there ought to be no cessation of effort until the full complement of the "ideal state" has been obtained.

It was proved that the lesson of history supports our contention. The fact of social betterment at present existing and in process is an entirely new phenomenon on the stage of the world's progress and has only become apparent within recent times in this our Western civilisation. Such social amelioration was unknown in any of the great empires of the past, even although high physical and intellectual evolution had been attained. The only difference existing was shown to be an all-pervading altruism, first demonstrated by Benjamin Kidd in his work "Social Evolution"; and this again was proved to have its origin and subsequent growth in the teachings of love and self-sacrifice under the law of Righteousness of the Eternal, proclaimed in the New Testament by the Founder of our religion. Man was shown to have completed his physical and mental evolution. This means that higher attainment in these directions was not possible for him, but this does not preclude a very considerable rise in the general standard of such among the body of the people. But for everyone the process of spiritual evolution is not yet by any means on a high plane. It began with the diffusion in men's minds of Christian altruism. It has been operating for a thousand years in our own civilisation and it has yet a very long way to go; but such a process acquires momentum as it proceeds, and ere long will be a much greater fact in the world's history and in man's long climb upwards on the ladder of being. As this spiritual evolution proceeds, the approach of the "ideal state" comes nearer, and its completion within reach of attainment. In the chapter on this subject,

details were given as far as possible of all the objects to be sought after, and the most important of these was shown to be the abolition of the gold standard, for the reason that until the vice of acquisitiveness and greed has been overcome, the tyranny and persecution of the toiling millions must continue and crime of many kinds be fostered and encouraged. This must inevitably take a long time, and indeed seems wellnigh impossible at present, but the mills of God grind slowly, and the progress of man's spiritual evolution will make all things possible which are proved to be necessary to the higher progress of humanity. This explains why the idealists at the present time, regardless of obloquy and slander, pursue the path of beneficent legislation with infinite pains. Humanity in its heart knows this to be a true outcome of the study of observed phenomena, and men and women will before long demonstrate their belief, and as they progress will show their willingness to act always in the spirit of "sweet reasonableness," and find their chief happiness in taking trouble to do good to others. At present what is the world of commerce but a wretched scramble in the effort to "down" one's neighbour with the aim of increasing one's own possessions? "Great possessions" were shown not to be by any means a blessing, but a curse in the vast majority of cases both to those who acquire them and to those who succeed.

It was shown that the essential nature of man was good—is only and can only be content with the good. We have already quoted from Lord Haldane's book, "The Pathway to Reality," "Man has a double nature out of which arises for him, on the one hand, the consciousness of separation from God or evil; on the other, potential union with God or religion. Though finite spirit, man is none the less spirit, consequently he is essentially free and therefore responsible." If

man is free and responsible, his plain duty is to seek truth and pursue it, so that he may learn the way of righteousness and never flag. Carlyle has told us: "Love not pleasure; love God. This is the everlasting Yea, wherein whoso walks and works, it is well with him." And why so? For this reason, that the finite spirit in man comes from the Eternal, who maketh for Righteousness. It is the Divine Spirit immanent in man, and this explains why the self-sacrifice and love inculcated in the teachings of Jesus are bringing about the salvation of the world. They have so appealed to the true self—the soul—the immanent spirit of the Divine in man—that the "cloak of self" is discarded. Man has ceased to be "Time's fool," and become one with Eternity. This is the explanation of Kidd's axiom that "The most distinctive feature of human evolution as a whole is that the race must continue to grow ever more and more religious; religious character is being evolved as a first product, and intellectual capacity only in so far as it can be associated with this quality." We endeavoured to show that the concept of the Eternal, the Great First Cause, the All-righteous, All-wise, Omnipotent Designer and Controller of the Universe was a necessity of Thought to which we were compelled by logical process from the study of observed phenomena. Indeed, any other concept, any negation of the idea of the Eternal is unthinkable. The purely material concept is impossible to human reason, and has been abandoned by the world of science to-day. We say this notwithstanding Sir Ray Lankester and the Mechanist school, whose theories are as impossible of belief and as wanting in continuity of method or demonstration of law as any fairy-tale of Jules Verne. In the last century no man was considered deserving of scientific reputation who did not uphold the purely materialistic stand-

point and the agnostic position. That was the age of "cocksureness," but nevertheless it was intellectually doomed, and the ethical evolution at work in society gave it the finishing stroke.

With the advance of spiritual evolution has come the idea of the Divine Immanence. This means that the Eternal has given to every individual a portion of the Divine Spirit—the soul of man—the real self—the true self, imprisoned in the "muddy vesture of decay." The greatest intellect of this world—he who "was not for an age, but for all time"—recognised the God in man, too much concealed or altogether hidden by the covering of the flesh; and he perceived that when freed from the muddy vesture the music of the immortal soul would then manifest itself. In the beautiful words of Scripture, "the Spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

It has been said that man is the only animal who goes through life conscious of his death sentence, and this is very true if there is no Hereafter. To approach death without fear we must have absorbed the teachings of the Master, and realised the only pathway to happiness and peace by means of a life spent unreservedly in the service of others. This is the true self-realisation. The spirit or soul of man, free and responsible, by realising itself has come into harmony with the Divine, has become one with God. We know not what is beyond, but we are entitled to say with the poet: "On earth the broken arc; in heaven the perfect round." In God we find the "Ultimate Reality."¹ With us "the Ideal has become the Real," and the spirit returns unto God who gave it. This, without doubt, is the Final Goal.

¹ Haldane's "Pathway to Reality."

Index

Addams, Miss Jane, 291-2
Agnosticism, 189
Allan, A. J., 291
America, 257
Anderson, W. C., 229
Angell, Norman, 144-5
Anthropoids, 25
Aristotle, 145
Arnold, Matthew, 18, 127, 181,
225
Art, 282-306
Asquith, H. H., Prime Minister,
179-80, 214
Astor, Col., 165
Atkinson, F. M., 271-7
"Atlantic Monthly," 161
Australia, 42
Automaton Theory, 203

Balfour, A. J., 43, 119, 123
Balkan States, 146
Bannerman, Sir Henry Camp-
bell-, 263
Barnardo, Dr., 107
Bartlett, 38
Bastian, Dr. Charlton, 199
Beauboiss, 272
Beethoven, 123
Begbie, Harold, 258
Belgium, 96
Bellamy, 281
Bentham, 215
Bergson, 12, 67, 188, 192, 196,
202, 204
Bingham, General, 291
Bismarck, 143
Blake, William, 210
Blatchford, 231
Booth, William, 263
Booth, General, 266-8

Bottle-blowers of Italy, 273-7
Browning, Mrs. Barrett, 198
Bruce, King Robert, the, 25
Burns, Robert, 111, 123
Byron, Lord, 111

Cæsar, 14
Campbell, Rev. R. J., 201
Carlyle, Thomas, 111, 123, 151,
180, 220-2, 233, 266, 296, 298,
313, 319
Carruth, W. Herbert, 148
Catherine of Sienna, 123
Cecil, Lord Hugh, 136-40
Charlemagne, 14
Child, The, 264
Christianity, 16, 133, 144, 147,
154-60, 174, 214
Church, The, 135-42
"Church Missionary Review,"
161
Churchill, Winston, 161
Corn Laws, 153
Consciousness, 207
Conservatism, 137-9
Crime, 104-8, 297-9, 307

Daly, 139
D'Arcy, Bishop, 161
Darwin, 11-14, 16, 20-30, 31-42,
43-68, 151, 315
Descartes, 202
Devine, Dr., 124
Dewar and Finn, 29, 45, 48, 49-
55, 57-61, 108, 111
Dickens, 300
Dieu, l'hypothèse, 155-7, 160, 231,
272
Dumont, Arsène, 155-7
Drama, 306

- Eimer, 20
 Elderton, Miss, 126
 Elizabethan Age, 111, 134, 221
 Elliot, Hugh S. R., 188, 193-6
 Emigration, 84
 England, 88
 Environment, 100-26
 Eugenics, 43, 99, 106, 306
- Fabre, Henri, 62-8
 Faimali, 37
 "Fallacies, Origin of," 206
 Fleischmann, Professor Von, 20
 France, 98, 141-5
 Francis d' Assisi, 123
 Frere, Sir Bartle, 266
- Gairdner, Sir William, 105
 Galton, 23, 56, 111
 Garden Cities, 309
 George, Lloyd, 310
 Germany, 142-4
 Gladstone, W. E., 14, 246
 Godwin, 71
 Gold standard, 277, 284-7, 295, 306
 Gooden, Miss, 241
 Greek Civilisation, 128, 134, 221
- Haeckel, 188, 198
 Haldane, Lord, 147, 296, 318, 320
 Hall, Dr. Winslow, 146
 Hamlet, 126
 Harrison, Frederic, 282
 Hartman, Prof. Von, 20
 Hegel, 296
 Heidelberg man, 27
 Henslow, Rev. Prof., 20
 Heredity, 100-26
 Hobart, H. W., 253, 258-63
 Hobbes, 215-16
 Hogg, 123
 Hoocke, 20
 Horsley, Canon, 165
 Hume, 215-16
 Huxley, 14, 25-6, 47, 189, 203
 Hyndman, 231
- Immanence, Divine, 163, 266, 307, 320
 Imprisonment, 300-2, 307
 India, 71
 Indian, Red, 257
 Insanity, 103
 Instinct, 62, 201-2
 Insurance Bill, 143, 213, 303, 310
 International Relations, 287-8
 Ireland, 71
- Java man, 27
 Jesus, Teachings of, 183-5, 270-1
 Jonson, Ben, 221
 Jowett, Dr., 206
- Kaffir, The, 289
 Kant, Immanuel, 123
 Keats, 111, 123
 Keith, Professor Arthur, 25, 27
 Kidd, Benjamin, 15, 128, 130, 155, 173, 210, 217-23, 237, 317
 König, Dr., 104
 Kropotkin, Prince, 124
- Labour, 134, 158-9, 167, 177, 212, 228, 245
 Lamarck, 19
 Lankester, Sir Ray, 188, 193, 319
 Legal system, 248, 311
 Lincoln, Abraham, 123
 Lister, Lord, 13, 199
 Livingstone, 266
 Lloyd, Miss, 104, 107
 Lloyd, Prof. Morgan, 56
 Locke, 215-16
 London, Bishop of, 112
 Lunacy, 242
 Luther, 123
 Luxury, 285
- Macaulay, Lord, 75
 Macdonell, Sir John, 112
 Machen, Arthur, 165, 170-7
 Macpherson, Hector, 125
 Maine, Sir Henry, 127
 Mallock, 278
 Malthus, 11, 67-100, 151-3, 315
 Marshall, Prof., 175
 Marx, Karl, 155-7, 220, 231, 278

- Medicine, Ministry of, 246, 309
 Melrose, Abbey of, 164
 Memory, 205
 Meredith, Mrs., 104, 107
 Michelangelo, 123
 Mill, J. S., 215-16, 278
 Minimum wage, 179
 Missionary, The, 288
 Mivart, Dr. St. George, 29
 Mongols, 26
 Morley, Lord, 313
 Motts, Dr., 242
 Mozart, 123
 Music, 306
- Napoleon, 14, 123
 Natural Selection, 14, 19, 43-68,
 151-2, 222, 315
 Navy, The, 167
 Negritos, 26
 Negro, 26, 288
 Netherlands, 94
 Newtown, Sir Isaac, 124
 Nietzsche, 154, 160-220
 Nightingale, Florence, 123
 Norway, 89
- Old age pensions, 187
 Owen, Sir Richard, 29
- Palace of Peace, 153
 Parliament, 286
 Pasteur, 12, 197, 199
 Paulin, George, 8, 11, 20, 34-42,
 47-48, 54, 61-70, 96, 195
 Pearson, Prof. Karl, 126
 Peerage, 111
 Phidias, 14
 Pitt, 76
 Plato, 14, 220
 Pleistocene, 28
 Por, Odon, 271-7
 Portugal, 140
 Poverty, 265
 Protista, 200
 Prussia, 92
- Reformation, 130, 142, 193
 Reinicke, 20
 Renaissance, 173
 Revolution, 143, 214, 312
 Revolution, French, 211, 215
 Robertson, J. M., 144-5
 Roman Empire, 128-9, 145
 Romanes, 55
 Roosevelt, 112
 Rosebery, Lord, 13
 Rowntree, 263
 Ruskin, 182, 220
 Russia, 86
- Salvation Army, 129-31
 Schäfer, Prof., 67, 198-201
 Schofield, Dr., 104, 113
 Scotland, 88
 Scott, Sir Walter, 222
 Seaman, Owen, 107, 268
 Sergi, Prof., 28
 Seth, 39
 Shakespeare, 111, 123, 126, 129,
 163, 221-2, 270
 Shaw, J. D., "Tasmanian News,"
 Editor of, 105
 Shelley, 123
 Slavery, 129-31
 Smith, Capt., 165
 Smith, Prof., 122
 Socialism, 169, 210-314
 Socrates, 14, 220
 Sophocles, 14, 220
 Spain, 140
 Spencer, Herbert, 104, 124, 215-
 15
 State Medical Service, 309
 State religion, 136-42, 312
 Stead, W. T., 165, 232-6, 292
 Straus, Isidore, 165
 Syndicalism, 228, 271-8, 286
 Sweden, 89
- Tasmania, 105
 Tennyson, 18, 111, 150, 225, 244,
 256
 Testament, New, 126
 Time, 264
 "Times, The," 267
 Turkey, 144-6

- Ultimate Reality, 320
 United States of America, 142
 Universities, 282
 Urwick, Prof., 149
 Utilitarian school, 215
 Utopia, New, 279

 Verne, Jules, 319
 Vries, De, 20

 Wagenen, Von, 122
 Wagner, 123
 Wallace, Dr. Alf. Russel, 50, 201
 Ward, Mrs. Humphry, 239-41
 War, 144

 Weismann, 123
 Wellington, 14
 Wells, H. J., 167-70
 Wellstein, Von, 20
 Western civilisation, 186
 "Westminster Review," 47
 "Westminster Gazette," 137-8
 Wolf, Gustav, 20
 Won't-works, 301
 Wordsworth, 111, 208
 Working-classes, 258-65
 Wright (American author), 25
 Wright, Sir Almroth, 118, 243

 York, Archbishop of, 313

THE END

Mr. Fifield's New List

A New Revised and Enlarged Edition, entirely re-set, of

Alps and Sanctuaries of Piedmont and the Canton Ticino

By Samuel Butler

Author of "Erewhon," "The Way of All Flesh," etc.

With 85 Illustrations by the Author, H. F. Jones and
Charles Gogin.

Large crown 8vo. Cloth gilt. 5s. net, postage 4d.

An entirely new and popular edition of Samuel Butler's delightful travel book, originally published in 1881, will be welcomed by all Butlerians. The cumbrous and heavy form and the high price prevented the first edition from having a speedy sale, but to the wise who ignored these things the volume was a source of infinite pleasure and amusement. Nowhere is Butler's humour and humanity so well displayed as in these descriptions of North Italy and the Italian Alps. Mr. R. A. Streatfeild, in preparing the new edition, has incorporated Butler's last alterations and additions, including an entirely new chapter and an inimitable descriptive index found in MS. The illustrations exhibit Butler's skill as a black and white artist. The blocks are interesting examples of early photo engraving. The type of the volume has been entirely re-set, a light paper of good quality employed, and the price is five shillings instead of a guinea.

The Times, in its Essay on Butler, 1908, says:—"Alps and Sanctuaries' and 'Ex Voto' are concerned with the mountain shrines of Piedmont and the Ticino, a country to which Butler returned to again and again and knew intimately. They are far more than a description of exquisite places and little-known monuments of a fine local art. They brim over with the author's swift mocking laughter, as well as with his innumerable fads and fancies. Anyone who wishes to make Butler's acquaintance should begin with the first of these two books. In no other did he write with a freer, fuller, more felicitous self-abandonment."

London : A. C. Fifield, 13 Clifford's Inn, E.C.

Mr. Fifield's New List

The Presence of the Kindly Patriarch. By Raymond Taunton. *Boards, 2s. net, postage 3d.*

"Its plain, lively, and naturalistic narrative takes one to an English village, and there persuasively brings in a queer, supernatural sort of wandering Jew with a blessing instead of a curse. The tale is interesting, serious, and pleasing."—*Scotsman*. "Written with . . . insight and humour."—*Athenæum*.

The Plays of Brioux. By P. V. Thomas, M.A., Assistant in French at University College, London. 112 pp. *Cr. 8vo, wrappers, 2s. net, postage 1d.*

Brioux has been called almost everything from "an apostle" to "the French Shaw." This study without attempting to give him a name, and without intruding too much criticism, aims above all at giving a straightforward chronological summary of the man's work by means of analysis of the plays from *Bernard Palissy* to *Suzette*, and quotations from the original texts, with a brief account of his career. [Just Published.]

The Little Wicket Gate: An Experience Ex Nihilo. By Algernon Petworth. 256 pp., *cloth gilt, gilt top, 6s.*

The Little Wicket Gate leads to a finely imagined idealistic Utopia, —or perhaps it is a picture of life after death. The problem of love is present, but free from the factors of wealth and rank commonly involved in romance. The story will attract and interest many as greatly as it will repel others. The writer is known; the author is not. [Just Published.]

The Further Evolution of Man.

A Study from Observed Phenomena. By W. Hall Calvert, M.D. *Cr. 8vo, 328 pp., cloth gilt, 5s. net, postage 4d.*

In its ten chapters this book treats of "The Cannibal Habit in the Male" and the "Law of Population" as modifying to a large extent the struggle for existence, and so removing the horror of an inevitable and perpetual conflict, and it then discusses the "Lesson of History," "The Spiritual Evolution of Society," "The Ideal State," and "The Final Goal." [Just Published.]

London: A. C. Fifield, 13 Clifford's Inn, E.C.

Mr. Fifield's New List

Henrik Ibsen : Poet, Mystic, and Moralist.

By Henry Rose, Author of "Maeterlinck's Symbolism."
Cr. 8vo, 156 pages, Cloth gilt, 2s. 6d. net, postage 3d.

"A helpful introduction to the study of the plays."—*Times*. "An interesting study of the spiritual development of Ibsen."—*Athenæum*. "Students of Ibsen will be grateful to Mr. Rose for his thoughtful and suggestive criticism."—*Standard*. "Mr. Rose does his work extremely well."—*Observer*. "A very useful and timely volume. It is a clear and coherent effort to show the continuity of Ibsen's development by a skilful analysis of the problem presented in every play."—*Literary World*.

On the Truth of Decorative Art.

A dialogue between an Oriental and an Occidental. By Lionel de Fonseca. *New popular issue. Cloth gilt, 2s. 6d. net, postage 3d.*

"A most notable and remarkable book. . . . Let the reader be advised to get it, he will find rich and stimulating food for thought."—*Academy*. "A spirited and piquant criticism of our artistic concepts which deserves and ought to be read."—*Nation*. "A protest against the modern tendency of the people of Ceylon, under Western influences, to abandon their traditions in art and in life."—*Athenæum*.

The Ego and his Own. By Max Stirner.

Popular edition. 520 pages, Cloth, 2s. 6d. net, postage 4d.

"It must always rank as the most uncompromising attempt to vindicate the all-engrossing egoism that is the intellectual basis of anarchism properly so-called. . . . This strange masterpiece holds an abiding fascination."—*Morning Post*. "One of the profoundest of human documents."—*Freewoman*. "It is a book even more relevant to modern thought than to its own age."—*Athenæum*.

Richard Jefferies : His Life and his Ideals.

By H. S. Salt. *New edition. Boards, 1s. net, postage 2d.*

"For a true appreciation of Jefferies' work, nothing could be better." *New Age*.

New Verse

- The Call of the Mountains. J. E. Pickering. 1s. net.
The Peacemaker : A Play. Dr. Winslow Hall. 1s. net.
The Flood of Youth. H. S. Spencer. 1s. net.
Gloom and Gleam. Teresa Hooley. 1s. net.
Life's Lottery. B. L. Ffolliott. 1s. 6d. net.

London : A. C. Fifield, 13 Clifford's Inn, E.C.

Mr. Fifield's New List

The Note-Books of Samuel Butler

Author of "Erewhon," "The Way of All Flesh," etc.

Arranged and Edited by Henry Festing Jones

Large Crown 8vo, 452 pages, 6s. net, postage 4d.

Second impression.

The volume includes a photogravure portrait of Butler taken by Alfred Cathie in 1898; a preface by the editor; a biographical statement of the chief events and dates of Butler's life; Butler's poems and sonnets, and an Index.

The Times says:—"No one knows Samuel Butler who has not read this book through; and perhaps it will come to be the most read and valued of all his works." (From a three-column review.)

WALTER DE LA MARE, in *Edinburgh Review*, says:—"They defy summary or analysis, crammed as they are with speculation and wisdom, irony, satire, pranks, quips and stories. Any page will set the wits to work, to amuse, arrest, provoke."

The Nation says:—"The book is packed with good things from cover to cover, and it makes up what amounts to a fresh and striking work from Butler's pen."

English Review says:—"A priceless book of wit and wisdom. . . . Even the most liberal quotation could hardly convey any adequate sense of its gay wisdom and pregnant wit."

A sympathetic and informed study of Woman, Marriage,
and the Family.

The Nature of Woman

By J. Lionel Tayler, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.

Crown 8vo, cloth gilt, 186 pages, 3s. 6d. net, postage 3d.

The English Review says:—"The qualities that have won Dr. Lionel Tayler success as a lecturer on biology combine to make his book a profound and valuable study, to which it is impossible to do justice in a short notice. It is notable for its calm sanity, its sound logic, and the manner in which every statement is supported by proof. . . . The whole book is one that no student of modern life should miss."

The Irish Independent says:—"Reasoned, forcible, and convincing. . . . It deals with every phase of the woman question of the day."

London: A. C. Fifield, 13 Clifford's Inn, E.C.

