

as to whether it would not be found necessary to regulate the amount of food and drink each man should have, in order to ensure his capability to do his share of work. Experience would probably prove that still more unlimited power should be in the hands of the State, in regard to particulars, rather than less.

We must not however omit to mention some of the promises which socialists hold out to mankind, in addition to that of shortened hours of labor which we have examined above.

They tell us that but few will be losers, viz. : the large capitalists,—but the many will be gainers, that all men will be on a footing of equality, which will be a vast improvement on the present social arrangements. They have great schemes for the general education of the people. Free libraries, reading rooms, museums, gymnasiums, baths, etc., will be provided on a gigantic scale. When property is abolished no one will miss it, for there will be no desire to mass wealth, where each has all he reasonably wants.

But it should be remembered, these are but promises, and are by no means ensured. As we have seen above, there is little likelihood in the socialistic state of getting through the requisite amount of labor so quickly that a large portion of the day will be spent in recreation. We now note further, that where centralization of labor has been tried it has not been marked with great success.

"The national workshops at Paris" says Prof. Goldwin Smith, "were a complete failure, and even the Government dockyards in England, though rendered necessary by the exigencies of a national defence, are conducted less economically than private ship-yards" (False Hopes, p. 19.)

With regard to the promises of education, public libraries, etc., we may merely observe that every day improvements in these respects are being made, and there are but few towns, or even villages in which the poorest may not obtain the best literature of the time for an almost nominal price.

But is it not almost certain that under such a Government as we are considering, almost all incentive for steady reading would be removed. The working man now asks for education for his children, because he knows that rightly used it will elevate their position and be a source of wealth or power. But such would not be the case in the Socialistic State. There is but one class, and the enterprising man is no better off than he who is satisfied to do just as little work as possible.

Again, healthy public opinion would stagnate. Probably the press would be gagged, or in the hands of the State, which would certainly publish nothing likely to rouse dissatisfaction. Or, again; who would supply the literature, write the books, educational and otherwise? There is no doubt that wholesome ambition is a tremendous motive power in producing works of art in all its branches, but it would receive no stimulus in such a

state. On the whole then we must conclude that the promises of socialism are lacking of foundation, and are extremely uncertain.

A distinguishing mark of the individuality of man seems to be the natural desire for possessions which shall be entirely his, and his alone. Everyone has something which he calls his own, and which he is prepared to defend. Should an endeavour be made to take it from him. Possession is the first clear notion of the child. Give him a toy, and tell him it is his own, and he understands what this means, and will resent any attempt, even from his own father or mother, to deprive him of it.

Now it is against individual possession that socialism peculiarly aims, and thus also against the very idea of individuality. There can be no question that this would be a very severe blow to man's nature. Yet under a socialistic state, where would there be stimulus or scope for individual action. To quote once more from Prof. Goldwin Smith: "Slavery has its whips; but saving this, no general incentive to labor other than property (individual possession) has yet been devised. Communists think that they can rely on love of the community, and they point to the case of the soldier who they say does his duty voluntarily, from a sense of military honor. It is replied that so far from being voluntary, a soldier's duty is prescribed by a code of exceptional severity, enforced by penalties of the sternest kind." (False Hopes.)

The views of extreme socialists with regard to the family are also striking.

Community of wives is advocated, and this would of course ensure its destruction and so tend to reduce man to the condition of a brute, and remove another object for persevering work. The sacred origin of the marriage tie, as also its recognition by Christ is either disbelieved in or disregarded. Men consider themselves wiser than God. Yet to thoughtful men, family ties are thought to be one of the greatest restraints, and safeguards from temptations of many kinds, and all who have any knowledge of what a home is, where its sacredness is acknowledged, have no belief that anything better can be substituted for it.

It is not a little significant, that most socialists ignore religion, whilst many of them are bitterly hostile to it.

How can it be otherwise? Man, living under sole command of the state, needs not to think;—that is done for him. Mechanical action is all that is expected. It is then impossible for him to be religious, nor is religion of any use to him. He who needs no earthly father's training, no earthly mother's love, of what use to him is a Heavenly Father's guidance and love? What need of atonement when he can but sin against the state. He has neither duties to his God nor to his neighbor, his duty is solely to the state, and consists in doing unquestioningly what it bids him. This abolition of religion would be the surest sign of the loss of man's personality, and his distinction from the beasts as a free rational being.