

but many nations have perished through wealth, luxury, indolence, and vice. And with a large portion of the land of Europe lying idle, with millions of acres in America unsettled and untilled, with whole islands and almost continents awaiting intelligent cultivation, and with no known limit to the power of the inventive genius of men to produce houses and raiment, no one can excuse the rivalry and robbery of the world on the plea of its necessity due to impending overpopulation.

2. The law of the struggle for existence, or the necessity of activity in procuring food, does not necessarily imply robbery and murder. In the case of carnivorous animals, we may accept the destruction of other animals as the law of their life. The young of most animals, however, begin life embosomed in love: they are supported by the labor and service of older and stronger animals; they live not by fighting, but by faith. And throughout the animal kingdom members of the same species are grouped together for purposes of protection and assistance.

3. It is not true, as Mr. Kidd asserts, that reason and capacity of acting in concert make their first appearance with man. Reason, in the sense of intelligence, the perception of relations, the adaptation of means to ends and conscience in respect of social relations, exists in creatures below man. Animals, so far as we can know them, have no conscience toward God, but they have a conscience toward one another, and this conscience recognizes and enforces social laws and secures certain moral conduct. Animals have, also, the capacity of acting in concert: ants live in families; bees live in hives; birds fly in flocks; cattle graze in herds. Mutual protection and assistance are the law of their life. Their struggle is not so much against each other, admitting their quarrels, as for each other.

4. It is not true that the interests of the individual and the interests of the social organism of which he is a part are antagonistic. It is true that apparently in some cases interests conflict, as, for example, where one man employs others his interests and theirs are antagonistic in that the less he pays them the more he will have for himself. This apparent gain of selfishness is only temporary, and issues in discord and disaster in the long run, as social history abundantly proves. The interests of men of a class and of men of a community are common rather than antagonistic. Suppose we start with a primitive society of Cain, Abel, and Seth, and let them adopt the social principle that their individual interests are antagonistic and that the law of their life is a struggle to obtain each for himself the natural products of the earth. One may drive the others away from the fruits of the earth, but all will be poor: the vanquished will be degraded and the victor will be brutalized. The issue will be barbarism and slavery. But let Cain cultivate the soil and produce more food than he can eat; let Abel tend his flock and produce more woolen raiment than