

Granted: but it has come to stay. The growth of civilization from its savage beginnings has been the growth of social integration, and the anarchical individualism of Nietzsche or of anyone else can do nothing to arrest or to divert it.

I cannot put the case more strongly than by remarking that to bring back the days of pre-Christian inhumanity is as hopeless an enterprise as Nietzsche's other project of reversing the democratic movement. In so far as his devotees presume to draw any invidious distinctions among the phases of their master's thought his defence of the aristocratic principle seems to be singled out for special adoration. Aristocracy was never made so ridiculous or its claims so effectually burlesqued as in the essay entitled "What is noble." The most violent democrat could ask for nothing more propitious to his schemes than that his opponents should drink deep of inspiration like this. That which we might conceive as being spoken in the ear in closets—in the council chamber of some oriental despot with a turn for speculation — Nietzsche has proclaimed upon the house-tops. The great man should rule, not as Plato taught, because it is good for the small man that the great should rule over him, but simply and nakedly because he is a superior being and superior beings are to be pampered. A host of menials will enable the despot to rise to a "higher"—that is to a more luxurious, and a more aggrandized life.

Again I ask what has been the movement of history? If pretensions of this sort may be truly said to have become more hopeless with the lapse of every decade of the last century of European progress what is the moral? As the Pyramids rose higher and higher by the labour of a nation of slaves,