

would seem, the first principle of liberty, which is primarily concerned with that of the individual.

Whether this moral right is really more than the utilitarians admit, whether it is really more than a physical right, and is in the nature of a revelation in man to him of his condition by the Creator, we shall, in the following pages, attempt to discuss as well as the protective and initiative phases of State-interference, and what measure it seems desirable to adopt for the improvement of the industrial condition of society.

Men have not been born equal either in talent or good fortune. Against the wanton exercise of this superiority there has always existed in the minds of men a corresponding sense of sympathy or of shame which in its way was probably intended as one of the perservatives of the species. The final stage of man's development contemplates the harmonizing of superiority with inferiority, the cessation of all warfare and the general recognition of the desirability of conforming to an ideal. Socialism also contemplates the establishment of an ideal, in the State, but one in which the natural inequality of men is relieved by the compulsory union of all together, at least for purposes relating to production and trade. The final stage of man's existence represents him to the individualist as an ideal individual; to the socialist chiefly as an ideal unit. Though, as it would appear, the socialistic state would conflict with the freedom of the individual, it is difficult to see how it runs counter, as some contend, to the theory of evolution for is not every act of man by, or according to, the laws which govern his being, even those laws which are merely "negatively regulative." It may be well here to distinguish socialism from some of the other forms of popular agitation. Anarchy is individualism run to madness. It rejects not only physical restraint but moral restraint as well. Communism is a theory of holding all property in common, and may act upon its believers in one of two ways. It may give them the idea that what is everybody's is nobody's, and breed insecurity of possession, or it may give the idea that the right of each to the common property is a separate right, and so end in a system similar to the present, after having, in the meantime, done incalculable damage. It is contended by communists "that primitive property was everywhere communal not personal." Is it not truer to say that that property which is not personal is not property at all? If the communistic system of holding does not give security of possession apart from ownership, it must lead eventually to nomadic barbarism, though in the interval it may assume a neutral phase. Socialism likewise proposes the abolition of private property, but to a less extent, viz., in the means of production and distribution. Though it would thus abolish private property in capital, socialism allows the private accumulation of the rewards of labour. Dating from the French Revolution of 1848 it has come to mean a scientific polity involving state-ownership of the means of production and distribution with a return to labour in notes redeemable in means of enjoyment. As under it the state controls employment and the means of employment, to the individual is left enjoyment and the means of enjoyment. International socialism is an international movement to bring about this corporate organization and management of the whole process of industrial production and distribution. But the trend of this paper will be to the conclusion that every plan tending to deprive men of their individuality and self-reliance tends to deprive them by at least so much of the germs of humanity, charity, and those other virtues upon which alone can be built up the highest type of man. To say by way of answer that the exigencies of the time demand prompt rather than profound attention may be an offer to sell the birthright of the race for a dissolving view.

Amongst the theories bearing upon the relation of the individual to the state, there is but very little agreement, and whilst Mr. Herbert Spencer is wrestling mightily with the problems of sociology as they relate to his system of Synthetic Philosophy and Hobbes, Lasalle, St. Simon, Fourier, Blanc, Marx, Mill, George and Goldwin Smith are receiving alternately praise and censure, it is, perhaps, permissible, at least until the case is closed, to review the social question without feelings of restraint.

Some philosophers maintain that society is a mighty and mysterious organism. Others maintain that it is merely an aggregation of individuals. Whilst others again say that it

is both in one, leaving to those still unconvinced the continuance of philosophical lucubration. Mill (Liberty, cap. XI) says: "The sole end for which mankind are warranted individually or collectively in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number is self-protection." This doctrine then would suggest to those who are not satisfied with the capitalist that they simply have nothing to do with him. And where the capitalist would trespass by seeking to prevent others from obtaining from nature their natural means of subsistence Mill would sanction his being quietly brushed aside. The natural right of man is presumed to a fair field in which to contend with nature for existence. So long as he is not hungry or exposed to death from lack of covering, this natural right does not develop, but so soon as he becomes so it is the bidding of nature to fall to. The right of accumulation of the natural means of subsistence is manifestly in any event entirely secondary to the right of the starving to the natural means of subsistence. Such is the law of Nature and also of God. Other so-called natural rights in this connection are not rights given by Nature with reference to Nature, but are moral, having reference to the agreements of individuals. Moral rights are correlated to duties. Duties towards mankind consist in the observance of the rights of others. The sanction under which these moral rights and duties are observed is the religious, transcendental or objective sanction. Where a sanction is utilitarian the rights and duties become merely utilitarian, and are not moral in the strict meaning of the word. Some contend that rights and duties are never moral in a transcendental sense. That remains for each one to determine for himself. That they can appear positively so is intellectually possible.

\* \* \*

### The Last Hours of a Murder Trial.

THE long Hyams trial was drawing to a close. Actuated by a feeling which might have been the love of scientific investigation, but which was probably morbid curiosity, I resolved to see the end. Civilized humanity has become so uniform and stereotyped that any opportunity to see nature unmasked by strong emotion has powerful attractions as a subject for interesting and instructive study. Holding this cold-blooded principle of philosophy I became a temporary reporter. The assembled crowd was being jointly and severally shoved back from the court-room door, but I was able to say "Press" with that simple confidence which defies distrusting suspicion and so was passed inside.

The room is a dingy, stuffy, little hole, seemingly too cheaply mean and baldly prosaic for anything but the commonplace. It was certainly not a fitting stage-setting for tragedy. Nor did the people make a humanly harmonizing background. They were there to hear what might be the most awful of all sentences, but they could not realize the situation. Indeed the thing was an impossibility. A woman behind me said she "hoped they would be acquitted as she couldn't bear to hear them sentenced." People were complaining of the draughts. Some one near me was munching peanuts. When women were found seats by the court officers, they smiled their thanks not otherwise than they would have done in a street car. Yet there were men very near to death within reach of their parasols. The counsel for the crown was delivering his terrible indictment, and when he would succeed in piecing out the damning woof of logic with merciless astuteness, men here and there would chuckle at what they saw only as uncommon "smartness." They would have been impressed quite as much, if not more, by the aspirate idiocies and theatrical gesticulation of a lawyer before the footlights. One could not put one's self in a position to feel with the accused. It was unreal, a garish drama. Truly the jury were affected, but the current of intense feeling running between the judges and those to be judged was almost completely insulated. This has not the ring of probability, but truth is stranger than fiction. On the faces of those not directly concerned there was no "chill dread," no "breathless suspense"—not at that time; even later there was not much.

The prisoners' box was the centre to which wandering eyes kept ever returning. Their drawn, sleepless faces were the colour of unbrowned pastry. Their eyes had that dull rigidity which comes from constant looking in one direction in horrible unwinking fascination. It is a tenet of