on J. S. Mill, as described in his *Autobiography.* The economics of Germany has for the last fifteen years been most powerfully affected by the theories of Lassalle, Marx, and latterly also of Rodbertus. The causes which have produced socialism have also affected economics ; but a large part of the change is due directly to the teaching of the socialists, especially of Marx, whose great work is re­cognized as of the first importance. Without commanding assent to its leading conclusions, socialism has given a new direction to most of the recent Continental research in political economy. The German “ socialism of the chair,” the influence of which is by no means confined to the country that produced it, is sufficient evidence of this.

As we have already seen, Marx and his school accept in the completest form the doctrine of evolution, which they learned first in Hegel, but finally hold as taught by Darwin ; and, in common with most socialists, from Saint-Simon downwards, they recognize three stages in the economic development of society,—slavery, serfdom, and wage-labour, —which last they believe will be displaced by an era of associated labour with a collective capital. But how, it is asked, does this theory of socialism as the next goal of society consist with the Darwinian doctrine of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest? Is not com­petition, this *bête noire* of the socialists, simply the social and economic form of the struggle for existence? Is not competition, therefore, the very condition of social progress ? Is not socialism, therefore, inconsistent with progress? The question suggested is a large and complicated one, to which we cannot here pretend to give an exhaustive or determinate answer, but can only indicate some of the main lines of discussion. (1) In all periods of human development, and especially in its higher stages, progress consists most essentially in a growing social and ethical virtue and in the cultivation of the beautiful both in sentiment and art. With such an enlarging ideal of progress, how harmonize a system of competition like the present, by which millions in every great European country are effectively deprived of the means of development, and even of bare livelihood ? The struggle for existence has always been modified by social and ethical conditions. If it is to continue, as it will in various forms, it should be carried on under higher conditions, suitable to a higher and less animal stage in the evolution of man. (2) Human progress has undoubtedly been attained through struggle, especially through the struggle for existence ; but the struggle has essentially been one of men united in society, of tribe against tribe, of city against city, of nation against nation, and race against race. Thus it is easy to exagger­ate unduly the importance of the struggle of the individual man. History has only too often seen the abnormal de­velopment of private selfishness, so overgrown as to weaken, and finally dissolve and overthrow, the society in which it acted, thereby accomplishing its own destruction. This is indeed the open secret of the ruin of most of the com­munities that have existed. In short, a happy and healthy individual development can be secured only through its due subordination to social virtue and the general welfare. Human progress has been by strong societies with a Well- developed social and public virtue. The excessive develop­ment of “individualism” within a society has been its weakness and ruin. (3) While emphasizing the extreme importance of the hereditary principle, especially as con­nected with the fundamental institution of the family, we should also recognize its tendency to abuse in perpetuating the enormous inequalities of property and condition, many of which originated in a less perfect system of society. The hereditary principle has indeed greatly contributed to the solidity and continuity of the social order ; but it also gives an exceptional advantage in the struggle for existence

to the privileged few. In this point, therefore, the present system does not best fulfil the requirements of the evolution theory as applied to society. The struggle is not one of merit. It is frequently one of merit against hereditary privilege ; not seldom it is one of privilege against privilege without regard to merit at all. (4) In considering the possibilities of human progress afforded by the present system of society in the light of the evolution theory, it is impossible to ignore the fact that the continuance of the race depends most on the less fit members of society, on the lower strata, which are thriftless, the worst fed, and worst educated. While the classes which are most in­telligent and endowed with self-control abstain from marriage or defer it, those who have the lowest organiza­tion marry early and have large families. Even to per­petuate disease and deformity is not considered wrong. It may be that prohibitory and restrictive laws, even if passed, would prove inoperative and ineffectual in restrain­ing so many hasty and ill-considered unions that only serve to multiply misery and disease; but it is surely excusable at least to inquire whether this abuse of freedom could not be curtailed by strengthening the social union and increasing the pressure of the enlightenment and moral sense of the community. (5) Above all, as the tendency of the present order is to give the victory to cheapness, it may be asked whether competition,—the economic form of the struggle for existence—is really such a sure and potent element of progress, unless most powerfully counteracted by other principles? In short, history is the resultant of many complex forces, and it is easy to push too far the formulæ of any system. It is out of the balance and harmony of many principles, of which the struggle for existence is but one, that human progress can proceed. (6) The main point is that in social evolution the widest phase of the struggle for existence is between forms of social organization. Hence the great question as regards socialism is whether it is the fittest form of social organ­ization for the time coming? Is it best adapted to carry forward and develop in wider and more adequate form the progressive life of the future ?

While many socialists have announced lax views regard­ing marriage and the family, it cannot in view of popular misunderstanding be sufficiently emphasized that the essence of socialism is an economic change. It enunciates no special doctrine on the relation of the sexes. In common with other social reformers, socialists generally advocate the equality of the sexes and the emancipation of women ; they object to the mercenary element so common in mar­riage ; and they abhor prostitution as one of the worst and vilest of existing evils, believing, moreover, that it is a necessary result of the present distinction of classes and of the unequal distribution of wealth. The views of the anarchists have already been noted. In the Marx school there is a tendency to denounce the legally binding con­tract in marriage. But such views all belong to the accidents of socialism.

So with regard to religion. Socialism has been and still is very frequently associated with irreligion and atheism. The same remark applies to Continental liberalism, and partly for a like reason : the absolute Governments of the Continent have taken the existing forms of religion into their service and have repressed re­ligious freedom. On religion as on marriage socialism has no special teaching. While the anarchists of the school of Bakunin would overturn all forms of religion and reject the idea of God, the social democrats of Ger­many in their Gotha programme of 1875 declare religion to be a private concern. As we have seen, Christian socialism is a considerable force in many European coun­tries ; and in many of the other schools, especially that of