

absolutely. In the United States it counts adherents chiefly among German immigrants; the Americans have not been won over. An attempt was made to convert the people of the United States by sending out Liebknecht and one of the daughters of Karl Marx, the author of "Das Kapital," but without effect. The trade unions and knights of labour would have nothing to do with the movement.

What is the reason of the failure of socialism among the English-speaking people? It arises from the fact that the Anglo-Saxon social formation is as profoundly particularist as the German and French is profoundly collectivist. In Germany public powers have been developed to a point which has undermined private and local initiative, while in England they are restrained to a narrow stage. Germany is the home of authority, but the sturdy and combative Anglo-Saxon loves to depend on himself; he loves self-government. The German seeks the solution of social problems in State intervention, in government regulation; the Anglo-Saxon asks for the purpose nothing but individual liberty.

The socialists claim to be preaching a new evangel; they tell us that the future belongs to them. Thus, Edward Bellamy places his regenerate community in the year 2000, and two socialistic articles in the *Arena* magazine for September are called "Studies in Ultimate Society." The fact is, that their ideas are terribly old, that they have become obsolete, and that the progress of the race is carrying us constantly farther away from them.

Socialism in its essence is the system of antiquity and of the Orient of to-day. Instead of youth and vigour it bears the marks of senile infirmity. It was practised in the form of a common possession and collective cultivation of the soil by the patriarchs of the Bible. Some ancient nations, among them the Hebrews, Germans and Slavs, made a periodical redistribution of the land; while among others, *e.g.*, the Egyptians, the national domain was placed in the hands of the sover-

eign to divide equally the fruits of the labour of his people and to secure the widows and the aged against want. But the people which dominated the Old World was that one which set most store by individual property and civic freedom, *viz.*, the Romans. Nothing could be more natural. What is the State apart from the individuals who compose it? In a legal point of view it is an artificial person, a corporation aggregate; and Plato tells us that it is an organic and spiritual being with a personality, a soul of its own. But these conceptions do not disturb the fact that the character and force of the community depend upon the qualities of the individual citizens.

Not only was collectivism the system of the ancients, but it is the prevailing system at this moment in Asia, North Africa and Eastern Europe. In Russia, for example, the social unit is the *Mir*, a village community where the rude assembly of boors manages the tillage of the common land, and distributes its fruits according to the number of arms in each family. But we do not look for modern progress in the East. The countries where collectivism reigns are stagnant and low in the scale of civilization. Among them the value of personal character is not understood; the individual leans upon his social setting for support. The advance of the race has been carried forward in quite another way—by the independence, self-reliance and virile energy of which the Anglo-Saxons are the chief exemplars. It is these qualities that have enabled the people of the British Islands to go forth and conquer the world.

The difficulties of life arise from the constitution of things, from the want of perfect adjustment between human nature and the circumstances in which we are placed. We cannot wave them away, nor dodge them. In collectivist societies the attempt is made, but in vain. The consequence is that among the purest examples of this type their hope for the future lies in the annihilation of consciousness, in Nirvana; and why? Because consciousness is for