

335

PRICE ONE PENNY.

6894

LEAFLETS FOR THE PEOPLE.

No. II.

RELIGION, SCIENCE,

AND

SOCIALISM.

"In no time since the beginning of Society was the lot of the dumb millions of toilers so entirely unbearable as it is in the days now passing over us. It is not to die, or even to die of hunger, that makes a man wretched; many men have died, all men must die. But it is to live miserable we know not why; to work sore and yet gain nothing; to be heart-worn, weary, yet isolated, unrelated, girt in with a cold universal *Let Be*; it is to die slowly all our life long, imprisoned in a deaf, dead, infinite Injustice."—*Carlyle*.

BRISBANE:

PUBLISHED BY THE QUEENSLAND SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC FEDERATION.

Queensland Social-Democratic Federation.

OBJECTS.

1. To publish and disseminate literature on social-economic subjects with a view to educate the people upon the true principles that should govern society.
2. To do such other work as may appear necessary for the advancement of Socialism.

Literary contributions on social-economic subjects will be received and published if approved of by the Committee, Q.S.D.F.

All friends of THE CAUSE are solicited to send subscriptions for the above objects to the SECRETARY, Trades Hall.

LEAFLETS FOR THE PEOPLE

Can be obtained, by all who are desirous of advancing the Socialistic Movement, from the Secretary, Q.S.D.F., Trades Hall, Brisbane, at 1s. per dozen, or 6s. 6d. per 100, post free, in postal note or stamps. If cheques are sent, exchange must be added. Special terms to agents and organisations.

LEAFLETS FOR THE PEOPLE.—No. 2.

RELIGION, SCIENCE, AND SOCIALISM.

OBJECTIONS to Socialism are invariably founded upon misconceptions of it, of almost endless varieties, yet with this one family feature, that they all agree in representing it as a creed confined, confused, and exclusive. Socialists who have cut and dried schemes for the reconstruction of society are muchly to blame for this; indeed, they share in the error, not knowing the full glory of the goal whither their feet are tending. For far from being confined, confused, and exclusive, the glory of Socialism is its catholicity, that is to say, its universality, its oneness, and its comprehensiveness. It is universal, because bounded only by humanity; one, because its basal principle is unity; comprehensive, because it receives all religions and non-religions, all nationalities and politics (affording fullest scope to the mental activities), embraces all, and excludes none. To give Socialism an organic structure, and assign its functions with microscopic detail, as did the old Utopians, is a serious error. For it has, as yet, no definite form; it is a divine idea or spirit, inspiring men to higher things, and gradually assuming shape as men respond to the inspiration. Wise Socialists will give it no more precise definition than this, that its political economy is "All for all," its religion is "Equality," and its science "Happiness." And the way to correspond with the Socialistic inspiration, and to form the future Socialistic State, is to cultivate the spirit of fraternity within ourselves; to be missionaries of the truth in all places and at all seasons; and to aim, by our votes and influence, at gradually substituting the community for the individual in the production and distribution of wealth.

With false notions of Socialism so prevalent, it is little wonder that many people oppose it, imagining its principles to conflict with some of their most cherished beliefs and theories. Accordingly, there are religious objections to it, scientific objections to it, political and social objections to it; each of these broad forms of protest, again, being divided and redivided into many varied modes of dissent. My purpose in this essay is to remove the objections by demonstrating Socialism to be in complete harmony with what is true in these different great domains of thought. Truth is essential to life, no religions or philosophies can long retain vitality without it; therefore I

am going to briefly examine some of the most important beliefs of to-day, discover the seeds of truth within them, and show how Socialism, like a congenial soil, would nourish and fructify these. The beliefs, or modes of thought, I have selected are—Christianity, in religion; Darwinism and Spencerianism in science; Malthusianism, Land Nationalism, Anarchism, and Capitalism in politics and sociology.

Unfortunately the limits of this paper are too narrow for the subject, and I shall have to content myself with treating of the three first-named beliefs at present, and postponing the consideration of the others for a future pamphlet.

Christianity.—Christian objections to Socialism are difficult to grasp, so shadowy and vague are they, looming large upon the view only because of the mental fog in which they are enveloped. I have been intently studying the Pope's famous Encyclical on Labour, to discover, if possible, what is the fundamental objection to collectivism offered by modern followers of Christ. The Encyclical is very useful for this purpose, as it has been so widely approved by Christians of every denomination. In fact, it may justly be considered a convenient epitome of Christian literature upon the subject. Now, the Pope's condemnation of Socialism can be summed up in three words, "Communism is robbery;" and this, too, is the pith and marrow of all the hard things spoken and written against Socialism in the name of religion. I will not here stop to show how Communism is misconceived and misrepresented, nor to show how, instead of destroying private property, it establishes it for the first time upon a sure foundation, but I will simply oppose to this doctrine of present-day Christianity the doctrine of Scripture and the early Church.

A person not previously warped by modern commentations and interpretations, reading the New Testament solely by the light of his own intelligence, would recognise at once that the teaching of Jesus Christ, supernatural elements apart, was not merely socialistic, but higher still—communistic. The cardinal economic principles of the Apostles were communistic; and they practised as they taught. Their followers were bound together in fraternal community, and held possessions in common:—

And all they that believed were together, and held all things in common. Their possessions and goods they sold, and divided them to all, according as everyone had need.—Acts II, 44-45.

And again: The multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul; neither did anyone say that aught of the things which he possessed was his own, but all things were common unto them. For neither was there anyone needy among them. For as many as were owners of lands or houses sold them, and brought the price of the things they sold. . . . And distribution was made to everyone according to his need.—Acts IV, 32-35.

As the Church at that time numbered at least 3,000 souls, it is evident that the common stock must have soon disappeared had it not been constantly replenished, which it could only have been by the labour of the community. So that here we have, recorded in Scripture, and under the guidance of the Apostles themselves, a perfect example of Communism in practice. Yet Christians of to-day denounce

Communism as robbery! Unfortunately, persecution from without, and doctrinal dissension within, in course of time put an end to that happy state of affairs, but for four or five hundred years Communism continued to be the social ideal of the Church.

Thus Pope Clement I says:—

The use of all things in this world is to be common to all. It is an injustice to say, "This is my property; this belongs to me; that belongs to another." Hence the origin of all contentions among men.

Thus Bishop Ambrosius (374 A.D.):—

God created all things that their enjoyment might be common to all, and that the earth might become the common possession of all. ONLY UNJUST USURPATION HAS CREATED THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.

And thus Pope Gregory the Great (600 A.D.):—

Let them know that the earth from which they spring, and of which they are formed, belongs to all men in common, and that, therefore, the fruits which the earth brings forth must belong without distinction to all.

Many more quotations of a similar character might be given, if space would permit, from the writings of the Fathers and Saints, but the few I have selected will serve to show what were the ideas and feelings on social subjects prevalent among Christian peoples in those far-off days, when the teaching of Christ and His Apostles was fresher in the hearts of men than now, and when the Church was admittedly pure and free from corruptions. Not until the Church is supposed to have fallen from grace did Socialism or Communism come to be regarded as confiscation and robbery! These quotations will also prove that there is no conflict between the principles of Christianity and Socialism, but that, on the contrary, there are Scriptural and traditional grounds for considering the latter as the political aspect of the former. Socialism, indeed, may be well defined as the conversion of the State to Christianity.

What is there in common between Christianity and the social systems of the world? Christ taught the abnegation of self, and the holiness of fraternal love. Are the sciences of political and social economy anywhere in Christendom based upon such principles? Or is their basis selfishness and greed; a basis well described in the popular phrase, "every man for himself?" Let Christians who love their Master reflect how far this universally accepted maxim is responsible for the terrible evils that surround us; how far it is responsible for the poverty, drunkenness, falsehood, prostitution, robbery, slavery, war, pestilence, famine, and industrial strife that fills God's world to-day. Let them reflect well upon this, and upon the communistic practices of the rudimentary Church, and upon the communistic teaching of the early Fathers and Saints, and perhaps they will conclude, with the Socialist, that man needs a social system which will help him conquer Self, not one which fosters it; a social system which recognises the Brotherhood of humanity, and the common dependence of each upon all; a social system which will set him free to develop the spiritual side of his nature—not one which absorbs his total energies in the struggle for mere existence; a social system, in short, essentially Christian, and essentially Socialistic.

Darwinism.—Scientific objections to Socialism come mainly from two great schools of thought, the Darwinian and the Spencerian. Darwinists, applying to Sociology their well known theory or hypothesis, assert competition among the units composing society to be absolutely demanded by the universal law of "natural selection," which being interpreted, means the "survival of the fittest." They tell us that all through the organic world there is a constant process going on of progression from lower to higher forms of life. This progress is effected by the battle for existence, by the struggling of organism against organism for the means of subsistence, unconsciously in the vegetable kingdom, more or less consciously in the animal kingdom. In this battle the weak are subdued, and the strong conquer; inferior types are eliminated, and the "fittest" survive. "It is Nature's way," say Darwinists; "it may seem cruel and unjust; that we cannot argue. It is Nature's universal law of progress, and man cannot be exempted from it. He has the power to ignore her laws (man being the only thing in the scale of existence that can be unnatural), but he cannot use this power with impunity." Now, they maintain that Socialists seek to exercise this fatal ability, inasmuch as Socialism is a departure from nature because it destroys competition and substitutes co-operation (a principle Nature never associates with progress), and because it puts an end to the battle for existence, and sets men to work harmoniously in raising subsistence for all. Therefore, being no struggle, there would be no subjugation of the weak, no triumph of the strong; no extinction of the unfitted, no "survival of the fittest," and therefore Socialism would mean, not progress, but stagnation or retrogression. That is the Darwinian objection to Socialism in a nutshell. Let us briefly examine it. First of all then, is the Darwinian theory true? Because if it is, and Socialism will not square with it, so much the worse for Socialism. It is undoubtedly true that there is a ceaseless progression towards perfectibility right through the organic world; but is it quite so clear by what means this process is carried on? Darwinists, I think, dogmatise too much about it. They postulate the "struggle for existence" hypothesis, back it up with some striking examples from nature (drawn mostly from beasts of prey), and then deliver an universal law of progress through competition. But some of the greatest scientists differ from them upon this point. Virchow, Cohn, Wigands, Quatrefages, Rolph, and many others, have produced equally striking examples from nature of progress through co-operation, of complete absence of strife, and of mutual advancement by means of mutual support and protection. I will give only one of these examples; it will be quiet sufficient for my purpose, because universal laws admit of not even single exceptions. Mr. A. Hageman, the celebrated botanist, instances a forest, on the island of Tromo, near Arendal, consisting of spruce and pine, exposed to the full fury of a violent sea, which hurls its devastating spray on the wings of the storm-wind far into the leafy deeps. He writes:—

On the very fringe of the wood, down among the fallen boulders, the *impetrum nigrum* and *juniperus vulgaris* spreads its sheltering carpet, which quite imperceptibly mixes with the spruce and pine, but not as trees at first, nor as bushes, but, on the

contrary, as perfect dwarf growths, twisting and creeping about amongst the stones, and assuming the most varied forms and shapes, with stems a foot in diameter, spreading with its sheltering bark-covered branches in snake-like forms far over the fields. From this extreme coast fringe the forest rises gradually, almost imperceptibly, one layer or belt protecting another with its curious interwoven stems, spruce and pine intertwined in each other, and forming together a solid wall, almost impenetrable. From the ocean the whole rises gradually and regularly, as if trimmed with a pair of shears, from the outermost dwarf-like bushes to the farthest tall and majestic giants. Behind this natural protecting belt one finds spruce and pine on quite equal terms, forming the most beautiful close-grown forest one can wish to see.

Thus the description. How does it fit with the Darwinian theory? The struggle for existence is palpable, but where is the remorseless battle of species against species? Have we here a spectacle of the strongest protecting and nourishing themselves at the expense of the weakly? On the contrary, there is mutual support, and an interchange of services resulting in common benefits. Species protect species; life cherishes life. The branches and limbs of the various growths twine and intertwine harmoniously to form a common shelter for the common good. No new types better fitted to resist the sea are developed. There is no Phoenix-like rising of the new from the ashes of the old, but a gradual improvement of individual forms through mutual co-operation, and mutual sacrifice. I consider this to be an exquisite example of what the "struggle for existence" really is. Observe, that it fully verifies the Darwinian theory of progress and development; but what I, as a Socialist, wish to point out, and insist upon, is that this progress and development is accomplished not through selfishness and strife, but through combination, sacrifice, and peace. So it will be under the coming Socialistic *regimé*; the individual life will attain to higher forms through the conscious co-operation of all, and the whole social organism will come at last into complete harmony with nature. And the doctrine which Darwin declared, that the principle of life is not static, but dynamic, will receive through Socialism the most glorious confirmation. And in that day, I doubt not, Darwinian scientists will recognise that Life thrives best, not in the fevered air of contention, but in the peaceful atmosphere of love.

Spencerianism.—Closely allied in many respects with Darwinism, but much more powerful and popular in its protest against Socialism, is the school of scientific thought of which Mr. Herbert Spencer is founder and chief apostle. Its popularity was assured from its inception. To borrow a phrase from commerce, "it supplied a long-felt want." The adherents of Capitalism, and social conservatives of all sorts and conditions, staggering under the brilliant logical onslaughts of Karl Marx and Lassalle, hailed with unmitigated delight the advent of these new defenders, fully furnished with the weapons of scientific controversy, and ready, not merely to defend, but also to carry the attack right into the enemy's camp. A great rally of the conservative forces was made under the banner of "individual liberty," raised aloft by Mr. Herbert Spencer, and around that banner principally the intellectual social battle is being fought to-day.

Let me freely acknowledge, before going further, that Mr. Spencer

is no partisan. Although his ideas and arguments have been eagerly seized upon and utilised by the classes against the masses, he himself, I am quite convinced, is animated solely by the highest motives of truth and justice. But, alas for human nature, these high principles have not preserved him from the biasing influences of capitalistic surroundings, and, as a matter of fact, his misconceptions and misrepresentations of Socialism are among the most glaring on record. Take, for example, his latest outpouring upon the subject, his introduction to that Property Defence League publication, "A Plea for Liberty." In this he has not shown himself at all superior to the methods of our own Patriotic Leaguers. He makes use of the same arguments and ideas that we are accustomed to hear from their platforms, and to read in their newspapers, although, of course, couched in better language and in more precise terms than they have at their command. In the most gratuitous manner he first of all assumes that Socialism means the sudden abolition of the old order, and the immediate imposition of a new, and upon this quiet assumption he then proceeds to argue very convincingly, pointing out the enormous evils bound to ensue from such a course of procedure. Surely we have heard that before, and have smiled at its imbecility perhaps, even while we refuted it; but how can such ignorance of a great contemporary movement be pardoned in a philosopher of Mr. Spencer's eminence? He then paints a very dark picture of the dangers of officialism, as exemplified upon the Continent, pointing out how, under a Socialistic régime, these dangers would be a thousand-fold aggravated; how, in course of time, officials would intermarry, and form a new aristocracy, "far more elaborate and better organised than the old." He seems to lose sight entirely of the fact that tyrannous bureaucracies are only possible today because the existing social system, based upon what Carlyle calls "the devil's maxim of 'every man for himself,'" has completely demoralised human nature. Poverty, and the evils inseparable from it—drunkenness, prostitution, crime of all kinds, and mental and moral deterioration of frightful extent—have broken the spirit of the vast masses of the people, rendering them the docile slaves of their rulers; while the fear of poverty, operating among the governing classes, and encouraging in them the very worst phases of selfishness, has produced that tyranny of officialism which is complained of. But a fundamental change in the social system would imply a fundamental change in the relations of the governed to the governing; and the elimination of poverty and the absence of incentives to individual accumulation, together with the spread of education and the fullest extension of democratic principles, would render class domination impossible. Such, at all events, is the contention of Socialists, and Mr. Spencer, and those who think with him, have never yet met the argument squarely. If our philosopher had always written in the strain of his "Introduction" (which, by the way, bears the significant title of "From Freedom to Bondage") his claim upon the attention of Socialist apologists would be easily disposed of. But not so. The line of anti-socialistic thought I have called Spencerianism has some pretensions to a scientific basis, and deserves more serious considera-

tion at our hands. To this consideration I now apply myself, regretting that limited space will not allow me to do so as fully as I would wish.

Reduced to syllogistic form the Spencerian argument would read somewhat thus:—

The Commonwealth is best secured where individual liberty is paramount.

Under Socialism the State would be paramount.

Therefore, Socialism is incompatible with the Commonwealth.

With every desire to be fair in stating the case of our opponents, I do not know of a better method of reaching at once to its pith and marrow than the syllogistic. It gives, quite clearly, the propositions which their argument is to sustain, and the conclusion at which it must logically arrive. The argument may be very elaborate, with manifold ramifications and amplifications, necessitating an equally elaborate criticism, if it is sought to destroy it branch by branch; but if the root-propositions can be laid bare at once, as in a syllogism, their unsoundness, or the unsoundness of the conclusion based upon them, may be demonstrated within the compass of a short criticism like this. Let us try.

The Commonwealth is best secured where individual liberty is paramount:

With this proposition, as it stands, I have very little fault to find; indeed, it is likely to meet with almost universal acceptance; but as soon as some definitions of its terms are attempted I fear me this happy unanimity will disappear. The "Commonwealth" admits of a plain and easily understandable translation; but what of "individual liberty?" Does this mean the abrogation of all law, and the liberty of each and every one of us to do what we please, how we please, and when we please? Some people do mean this, believing the sense of right which leavens all aggregates of humanity to be sufficient restraint upon the evilly-disposed, and to afford sufficient protection for the weak. But Mr. Spencer dissents from that view. In "Social Statics" he has shown the State to be an organism, with real functions; sometimes superseding, sometimes supplementing, the individual. Therefore he is no anarchist. What he means by "individual liberty" is "the right to do what one pleases, provided one does not infringe upon the rights of others." I do not know that he has anywhere defined "individual liberty" in precisely those words, but that they may fairly be attributed to him anyone familiar with his works will admit. Unfortunately I have only his before-mentioned "Introduction" by me as I write, but even in that I find an allusion to the "simple principle that each man should be allowed to pursue the objects of life, restrained only by the limits which the similar pursuits of their objects by other men impose." Now, that is a very important modification of the sweeping phrase, "individual liberty;" in fact, it is equivalent to a complete surrender of the individualistic citadel. For the question is immediately suggested, "What authority defines the rights of others" which must not be infringed upon, and imposes the limits upon individual liberty necessary for the protection of those rights?"

The answer, of course, is, Society. Society is the authority which defines rights and imposes restraints upon freedom. And then another, and more tremendous question arises—"What limits the power of Society in this respect?" I wish all individualists who are not anarchists to consider this well. By admitting the right of Society to limit liberty for any purpose whatsoever, they have cut the ground from beneath their feet. They have thereby abandoned the pre-eminence of the Individual, and acknowledged the superiority of the Many, and their great argument against Socialism is gone. For, to grant Society the right to dictate what individuals shall not do, is logically to admit the right of Society to define in what individual liberty consists. If Society determines (in the only way possible, by the expressed will of the Many) that private property in land is an infringement upon the "rights of others," the Spencerian definition of "individual liberty" justifies it; and in the same way, if Society determines that private ownership in capital is incompatible with the "rights of others," it is again justified. Nor can the decision of Society be either vetoed or repealed, for to what higher court of appeal can the case be carried? Individualistic philosophers, long before Spencer's time, had sought to assign scientific limits to the power of Society over the individual. In vain. The flow of human events quietly swept away their artificial barriers. It was said that the State should only act as a sort of policeman, protecting the persons and properties of its members from violence and fraud. But it was by-and-by discovered that violence and fraud operated in subtler ways than are usually attributed to them; that, in fact, they are offences of very wide and varied manifestation, and that, to afford anything like adequate protection from them, the functions and duties of the State would have to be considerably extended. Factory Acts, Mines Regulation Acts, Public Health Acts, Adulteration Acts, etc., were accordingly passed into law with this object. Then it was argued, that however wide and various might be the functions of the State in other respects, that at least it ought not to trespass upon the domain of industry as a producer or distributor of wealth, but that this work should be left entirely in the care of private enterprise. But the ever-flowing tide of progress is rapidly sweeping away this limit, too, and even at this day it is a sorry wreck. The Central Governments now have full or part control of the posts, telegraphs, canals, railways, life insurance, ship building, stock broking, banking, and money lending; while the municipal authorities manage in the interests of the community, gasworks, waterworks, tramways, markets, slaughter houses, fire-engines, lighthouses, pilotage, ferries, steam tugs, life boats, cemeteries, public baths, pounds, harbours, wharves, hospitals, dispensaries, artisans' dwellings, schools, reading rooms, museums, parks, art galleries, and libraries; all of which were once sacred to private enterprise. The assumption of these duties and functions by Society involves much curtailment of personal freedom; but in assuming them Society is only acting upon that right which I have shown Spencerian individualists to accord it in terms of their definition of "individual liberty." And I have pointed out that no

bounds can be placed to this right when once admitted, because there is no human power or agency superior to Society to impose the limit. Therein lies the difficulty for Spencerians. They say, in effect: Society alone has the right to interfere with personal liberty, and then only in protection of the liberty of others. Socialists agree with that, but proceed then to argue from the premise that it justifies every act of the State in restraint of the person, because it is evident, from the nature of the case, that Society must be sole judge of when such interference is necessary. But it does not follow from this that individual liberty is in danger of complete extinction, and that men are likely to become mere pulseless parts of a huge state machine. No! On the contrary, paradoxical though it seems, the pre-eminence of Society is the only salvation for "individualism." Society is an aggregate of individualities coalescing into one body for common benefit; and every act or expression of Society is the multitudinous acts or expressions of its individual units, separately willed, but drawn together into one great act or expression by the attraction of mutual agreement. Each unit, by a natural instinct, seeks its own good; its every action, whether isolated or co-operative, is directed more or less towards self-interest, and it is this fundamental fact of human nature which will ensure, under Socialism, the fullest individual liberty. Because, under Socialism, society will be, for the first time, pre-eminent; each of its members will, for the first time, have an equal share in the direction of its every concern; and the decisions and acts of the State will, for the first time, embody the will of the Great Majority, united for the achievement of a common purpose. An union of a great majority of individuals for the achievement of any purpose destructive of individuality, is highly improbable. That State Acts have had that tendency I do not deny; indeed, the fact is another argument for Socialism, because such State Acts have invariably represented the wishes of the Few, not of the Many. "Private enterprise" is the real enemy of individual liberty, and the intelligent student of history, acquainted with contemporary economic conditions, knows that the State Acts of all times, subversive of "individuality," were placed upon the statute books while "private enterprise" held the reins of government. Of course it was done in obedience to that natural instinct of self-interest to which I have referred. I attach little blame to "private enterprise." It is the folly of our social system that makes the instinct produce evil instead of good. Socialists do not seek to perform the impossible, and eliminate this universal instinct of nature, they only desire to prove that self-interest can be pursued as well by order and co-operation as by scramble and competition, and with much better prospect of success. Another notable fact which the study of past and present history will verify, is that in democratic countries, imperfect and corrupt though their institutions be, State Acts really representing the wishes of the Many have again and again encroached upon the domain of private enterprise in the interests of individual liberty.

I think that I have said enough to show that the Spencerian definition of individual liberty as "the right to do what one pleases

provided one does not infringe upon the rights of others, as reasoned out, entitles me to change the form of the syllogism I have been considering, and make it read thus:—

The Commonweal is best secured where the community is best served. Under Socialism the community would be paramount. Therefore, Socialism is conducive to the Commonweal.

The truth of Spencerianism is its high conception of the individuality of man: its error is in assuming Socialism as the best-ventured scheme of government, based upon the destruction of the essential element of human nature. The "Introduction" of the "Paper constitutions raise smiles on the faces of those who have observed their results; and *paper social systems* similar to those who have contemplated the available evidence." And it is impossible to establish forthwith a satisfactory social system again, "My opposition to Socialism results from the fact that it would stop the progress to a higher state, and bring us to a lower state." Those few sentences give you at once the whole of the mistake. Socialism is not a paper constitution; it is not possible to establish it forthwith; it is an evolutionary movement, whether we will or no. We may, indeed, by discovering our own place, put ourselves in harmony with it, and so accelerate its progress; but ignorance, negligence, indifference, and wilful opposition will retard it; but stop it we cannot. Nor is Socialism any more consistent with true Individualism. Sidney Olivier says "Socialism is Individualism rationalised, organised, clothed, and in its own words." That is truth in a nutshell. Socialism is simply the method of that future social state which is being gradually formed by the fusion of numberless individuals after a higher and happier mode. In the truest conception of Individualism, it is and ever will be the individuality of individuals. We cannot divest ourselves, or each other, of our individuality. It is the impress of Nature on the soul of man, an eradicable sign which a power infinitely greater than we are stamped upon him. It is the "me" of consciousness; it is the sense of isolated and distinctive being which the mind is constantly reflecting upon itself; it is that Something—that awful and incomprehensible Something—which divides our common humanity into a mass of separate and exclusive existences, and makes each one of us a mystery to the rest. Socialists recognise this; they ignore it by their teachings; they do but plead with us to conform towards the building up of a social system worthier of the name of Man and the high dignity of Man.

JULY, 31st, 1892.