

power of ministering to the comfort and convenience of those human beings whom science itself exists to serve.

Surely however we are offered the argument from analogy run mad when we are asked to say that humanity ought to be willing and eager to *scrap itself* in the interests of some sort of creature higher than humanity whose coming may thus be accelerated. *Cui bono?* Let us be thoroughgoing with our analogy. It is urgently desirable, it seems, that man should pave the way for Superman even as it was a memorable achievement on the part of the ape to have paved the way for man. But was it really so from the ape's point of view? If, despite the pessimist, we think the emergence of human life upon this planet to have been on the whole a good thing we must mean good as considered from the human side. Especially in an atheistic scheme of things there is no other alternative: for it becomes impossible to speak of a Creator whose glory is displayed in the unfolding series. But if we are in earnest with Nietzsche's principle it was a privilege also for the ape to be precisely the link that he was in the chain of evolution; it was the ape's solemn duty if he had been capable of appreciating it, to make haste in evolving a higher species which might congratulate itself on the extent to which it had left behind the highest attainments of its self-sacrificing ancestors.

Nor is there any attempt to minimize the extent to which we must be willing to immolate ourselves in this great cause of Superhumanity. Everything that stands in the way of Natural Selection must be swept aside: and in Nietzsche's opinion nothing stands so much in the way as that sympathy which leads to the succouring of the weak and the diseased. I suppose