

attributed to envy, class hatred, discontent with their own lot, to a mistaken view of their own interests, and so on. But this is not true. Socialists do not demand a redistribution of property. They regard, rather, the disappearance of property rights, and do not concern themselves with the present received scheme of distribution in economics. In fact, socialists of the line contemplate, instead of a reform of ownership, the traceless disappearance of it. Property with all its inherited tradition must pass away. And so with due but not large exceptions, the effective body of the modern population has been growing more matter-of-fact in its thinking, less romantic, less idealistic in its aspirations, less bound by metaphysical considerations in its view of human relations, less mannerly, less devout. By the modern machine process one does not mean to contract the well-to-do with the indigent, but the line of demarcation between those ready for the socialist propoganda and those not so available is rather to be drawn between the classes employed in the industrial and those employed in the pecuniary occupation. It is a question not so much of property but of position; not of well-being but of work. It is a question of work because it is a question of habits of thought, and work shapes the habits of thought; and habits of thought are made by habits of life rather than by a legal relation to accumulated goods. The discipline of the machine technology is especially fitted to inculcate such iconoclastic habits of thoughts as come to a head in the socialistic bias. Among those classes whose everyday life disciplines them to do their serious thinking in terms of material cause

and effect the preconception of ownership are becoming obsolescent through disuse. It may be said, then, that the modern socialistic disaffection is loosely bound up with the machine industry. The machine industry, directly or indirectly, gives rise to socialism; or the two are the expressions of the same complex of causes. Wherever the increase and diffusion of knowledge have made the machine process possible, and the mechanical technology the tone-giving factor in men's scheme of thought, these modern socialistic iconoclasm follows by easy consequence. The machine is a leveller, a vulgarizer, whose end seems to be the extirpation of all that is respectable, noble, and dignified in human intercourse and ideals.

Lastly, for our present purpose, we may observe that the same effects are discovered when we investigate the relation of the machine process to the religious life. Men trained by the mechanical occupation to industrial, mechanical habits of thought cannot appreciate, or even apprehend, the meaning of religious appeals that proceed on grounds of metaphysical validity. The consolations of a personal relation to a supernatural master do not appeal to men whose habit of life is shaped by a familiarity with the relations of impersonal cause and effect. It does not come as a matter of course for such men to give the catechism's answer to the question, What is the chief end of man? Nor do they instinctively feel themselves to be sinners by virtue of a congenital taint or obliquity. The kindly ministrations of the church and of the minister grate on them, as being so much ado about nothing. The machine is no respecter of persons; and knows nei-