LEAFLETS FOR THE PEOPLE.

No. II.

RELIGION, SCIENCE, AND

SOCIALISM.

In no country since the beginning of history were the lives of the devout millions of believers entirely unmarred by their own desire to be the elect. In no place in the world, where the idea of salvation has been instilled into men, can there be found examples of mildrected devotion. But even in this enlightened age, we are told, there are many who find comfort in the belief that the soul is an immortal being, and that it exists in a state of perfect happiness after leaving the body.
Queensland Social-Democratic Federation.

OBJECTS.
1. To publish and disseminate literature on social-economic subjects with a view to educate the people upon the true principles that should govern society.
2. To do such other work as may appear necessary for the advancement of Socialism.

Literary contributions on social-economic subjects will be received and published if approved of by the Committee, Q.S.D.F.

All friends of the Cause are solicited to send subscriptions for the above objects to the Secretary, Trades Hall, Brisbane.

LEAFLETS FOR THE PEOPLE
Can be obtained, by all who are desirous of advancing the Socialistic Movement, from the Secretary, Q.S.D.F., Trades Hall, Brisbane, at 1s. per dozen, or 6d. per 100, post free, in sealed envelopes. If objects are sent, exchange must be added. Special rates to agents and organizations.

OBSERVATIONS upon Socialism are invariably founded upon misconceptions. They all agree in representing it as a creed confined, confused, and exclusive. Socialists who have cut and dried schemes for the reconstruction of society are usually blamed for this; indeed, they share in the error, not knowing the full glory of the goal whither their feet are tending. For far from being confined, confused, and exclusive, the glory of Socialism is its catholicity, that is to say, its universality, its oneness, and its comprehensiveness. It is universal, because it is bound only by humanity; one, because its basis is unity; comprehensive, because it embraces all religions and non-religions, all nationalities and politics (affording fullest scope to the mental activity), embraces all, and excludes none. To give Socialism an organic structure, and assign its functions with microscopic detail, as did the old Turguans, is a serious error. For it has, as yet, no definite form; it is a divine idea or spirit, inspiring men to higher things, and gradually assuming shape as men respond to the inspiration. Wise Socialists will give it no more precise definition than this, that its political economy is "All for all," its religion is "Equality," and its science "Happiness." And the way to correspond with the Socialistic inspiration, and to form the future Socialist State, is to cultivate the spirit of fraternity, to aid ourselves, to be missionaries of the truth in all places and at all seasons, and to aim, by our votes and influence, at gradually substituting the community for the individual in the production and distribution of wealth.

With false notions of Socialism so prevalent, it is but little wonder that many people oppose it, imagining its principles to conflict with some of their most cherished beliefs and theories. Accordingly, there are religious objections to it, scientific objections to it, political and social objections to it; each of these broad forms of protest, again, being divided and subdivided into many small, unorganized elements. My purpose in this essay is to remove the objections by demonstrating Socialism to be in complete harmony with what is true in those different great domains of thought. Truth is essential to life, no religions or philosophies can long retain vitality without it; therefore I
am going to briefly examine some of the most important beliefs of to-day, diverse as they are, and show how Socialism, like a congenial soil, would nourish and flourish those. The beliefs or modes of thought, I have selected are—Christianity, in religion; Darwinism and Spiritualism as science; Mutualism, Land Nationalism, Anarchism, and Capitalism in politics and sociology. Unfortunately the limits of this paper are too narrow for the subject, and I shall have to content myself with treating of the three first-named beliefs at present, postponing the consideration of the others for a future pamphlet. 

Christianity—Christian objections to Socialism are difficult to grasp. As a doctrine, they are, leaving large upon the view, only because of the moral deformity in which they are developed. I have, therefore been studying the Pope's famous Encyclical on Labour, to discover if possible, what was the fundamental objection to collectivism offered by modern followers of Christ. This Encyclical is very useful for this purpose, as it has been so widely approved by Christians of every denomination. In fact, it may justly be considered a convenient epitome of Christian literature upon the subject. Now, the Pope's condemnation of Socialism can be summed up in three words, "Communism is robbery!" and this, too, is the pith and marrow of all the hard things spoken and written against Socialism in the name of religion. I will not here step to show how Communism is misconceived and misrepresented, nor to show how, instead of destroying private property, it establishes it for the first time upon a sure foundation, but I will simply oppose to this doctrine of present-day Christianity the doctrine of Scripture and the early Church. A person not previously warped by modern conceptions and interpretations, reading the New Testament solely by the light of his own intelligence, would recognise at once that the teaching of Jesus, of supernatural nature, was not merely socialist, but higher still—communistic. The cardinal economic principles of the Apostles were communistic; and they practised as they taught. Their followers were bound together in fraternal community, and held possessions in common. 

And all they that believed were together, and had all things in common. Their provisions and goods they sold, and divided them to all, according as anyone had need. Acts 4:32-35.

And again: The multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul; but all things were common unto them. For neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were owners of lands or houses sold them, and brought the price of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet, and distribution was made to all, as anyone had need. Acts 4:34-35.

As the Church at that time numbered at least 3,000 souls, it is evident that the common stock must have soon disappeared had it not been constantly replenished, which it could only have been by the labour of the community, and under the guidance of the Apostles themselves, an example of Communism in practice. Yet Christians of to-day denominate Communism as robbery! Unfortunately, persecution from without, and doctrinal disinclination within, in course of time put an end to that happy state of affairs. But for four and a half hundred years Communism continued to be the social ideal of the Church. Thus Pope Clement I says:

The use of all things in this world to be common to all. It is an injustice to say, "This is my own!" This belongs to me; that belongs to another." Here are the words of all quotations above note.

Thus Bishop Ambrose (374 A.D.):

God created all things that their possession might be common to all, and that the earth might become the common possession of all. Only unjust usurers have created the name of private property.

And thus Pope Gregory the Great (590 A.D.):

Let them know that the earth from which they spring, and of which they are fellow, belongs to all men in common, and that, therefore, the fruits which the earth brings forth must belong to the whole of all. Many more quotations of a similar character might be given, if space would permit, from the writings of the Fathers and Saints, but the fact I have selected will serve to show what were the views and feelings on social subjects prevalent among Christian peoples in those far-off days, when the teaching of Christ and His Apostles was fresher in the hearts of men than now, and when the Church was admittedly pure and free from corruptions. Not until the Church is supposed to have fallen from grace did Socialism or Communism come to be regarded as seduction and robbery. These quotations will also prove that there is no possible as between the principles of Christianity and Socialism, but that, on the contrary, there are Scriptural and traditional grounds for considering the latter as the political aspect of the former. Socialism, indeed, may be well defined as the conversion of the State to Christianity.

What is there in common between Christianity and the social system of the early Church? Christ taught the abnegation of self, and the holiness of fraternal love. Are the sciences of political and social economy anywhere in Christianism based upon such principles? Or is its basis selfishness and greed, a basis well described in the popular phrase, "every man for himself.? Let Christians who love their Master reflect how far this universally accepted maxim is responsible for the terrible evils that surround us: how far it is responsible for the poverty, drunkenness, falsehood, prostitution, robbery, slavery, war, pestilence, famine, and industrial strife that fills God's world to-day. Let them reflect well upon this, and upon the communistic practice of the ordinary Church, and upon the communistic teaching of the early Fathers and Saints, and perhaps they will conclude, with the Socialist, that man needs a social system which will enable him conquer self, not one which satisfies self; a social system which recognises the Brotherhood of humanity, and the common dependence of each upon all; a social system which will set him free to develop the spiritual side of his nature—not one which absorbs his total energies in the struggle for mere existence; a social system, in short, essentially Christian, and essentially Socialistic.
Darwinism.—Scientific objections to Socialism come mainly from two great schools of thought: the Darwinian and the Spenorcanian. Darwinists, applying to Sociology their familiar knowledge or hypothesis, assert competition among the units composing society to be absolutely necessary. The universal law of "natural selection," which being interpreted, means the "survival of the fittest," may be understood as meaning that all through the vegetable kingdom there is a constant process going on of progression from lower to higher forms of life. This progress is effected by the battle for existence, by the struggle of organisms against organisms for the means of subsistence, unconsciously in the vegetable kingdom, more or less consciously in the animal kingdom. In this battle the weak are subjugated, and the strong, the fittest, thrive. "It is Nature's way," say Darwinists; "it may seem cruel and unjust; that we cannot argue. It is Nature's universal law of progress, and cannot be escaped from it. He has the power to ignore her laws (man being the only thing in the scale of existence that can do so), but he cannot do this with impunity." Now they maintain that Socialists seek to exercise this fatal ability, man as a whole, and in consequence the forces of opposition to them that are working for the regeneration of humanity. Socialism, they say, is a departure from nature because it destroys competition and substitutes co-operation (a principle Nature never associates with progress), and because it puts an end to the battle for existence, and sets men to work harmoniously in pursuing subsistence for all. Therefore, being no struggle, there would be no subjugation of the weak, no triumph of the strong, no extinction of the unfit; no "survival of the fittest," and therefore Socialism would mean not progress, but stagnation or retrogression. That is the Darwinian objection to Socialism in a nutshell. Let us briefly examine it. First of all, is the Darwinian theory true? Because it is, and Socialism will not square with it, so much the worse for Socialism. It is undoubtedly true that there is a constant process towards perfectionability, right through the organic world, but is it quite so clear by what means this process is carried on? Darwinists, I think, dogmatise too much and stick to their pet hypothesis. They postulate the "struggle for existence" hypothesis back it up with some striking examples from nature (drawn mostly from beasts of prey), and then deliver an universal law of progress through co-operation. But some of the greatest scientists differ from them upon this point. Virchow, Cohn, Wagenaar, Quatrefages, Reichenbach, and many others, have produced equally striking examples of the perfecting influence of mutual assistance by means of mutual support and protection. The struggle for existence will give only one of these examples; it will be quite sufficient for Mr. Spence or Spencer, the celebrated optimist, instances of a forest on the island of Trench, near Ararat, consisting of spruce and pine, exposed to the full fury of a violent sea, which hurls its devastating waves against the wind that pierces the leafy depths. He writes—

On the very fringe of the wood, down among the fallen branches, the spruce and pines stand, as it were, invisible with the snow and pine, but not as trees at first, but as bushes, but, not the contrary, as perfect dwarf growths, twisting and creeping among the stumps, and assuming the most varied forms and shapes, with stems a foot in diameter, sprouting with its slumbering fathom branches in oxide-like forms far over the fields. From this extreme coast fringes the forest rises gradually, almost imperceptibly, one gigantic mountainous mass, with its various interweaving stems, spruce and pine intertwined in each other, and forming together a solid wall, almost impenetrable. From the summit the whole range gradually and regularly, as it descended with a pence of snow, from the outermost drawfs to the thickest, and majestic glades. Behind this natural protecting belt one finds spruce and pine on quite equal terms, forming the most beautiful close-grown forest one can wish to see.

Thus the description. How does it fit with the Darwinian theory? The struggle for existence is palatable, but where is the swamp to the battle of species against species? Have we here a spectacle of the strongest protecting and nourishing themselves at the expense of the weakest? On the contrary, there is mutual support, and an interchange of services resulting in common benefits. Species protect species, life hatches, and by its branches and limbs the various growths twine and intertwine harmoniously to form a common shelter for the common good. No new type better fitted to resist the sea are developed. There is anPaeplike rise of the near from the buddies of the old, but a gradual improvement of individual forms through mutual co-operation, and mutual sacrifice. I consider this to be an exquisite example of what the "struggle for existence" really is. Observe, that it fully verifies the Darwinian theory of progress and development; but what is, as a Socialist, wish to point out, and insist upon, is that this progress and development is accomplished not through selfishness and strife, but through combination, sacrifice, and peace. So it will be under the coming Socialist reign; the individual life will attain to higher forms through the conscious co-operation of all, and the whole sea of nature organisms come at last into complete harmony with nature. And the doctrine which Darwin declared, that the principle of life is not static, but dynamic, will receive through Socialism the most glorious conformation. And in that day, I doubt not, Darwinian scientists will recognize that Life thrives best in the freshest air of contention, and in the peaceful atmosphere of love.

Spenorcanism.—Closely allied in many respects with Darwinism, but much more powerful and popular in its protest against Socialism, is the school of scientific thought of which Mr. Herbert Spencer is founder and chief apostle. Its popularity was assured from its inception. To borrow a phrase from commerce, "it supplied a long felt want." The adherents of Capitalism, and social conservative of all sorts and conditions, staggering under the brilliant logical mouldings of Karl Marx and Lessing, bailed with unmitigated delight the advent of those new defenders, fully furnished with the weapons of scientific controversy, and ready, not merely to defend, but also to carry the attack right into the enemy's camp. A great rally of the conservative forces was made under the banner of "individual liberty," raised aloft by Mr. Herbert Spencer, and around that banner principally the intellectual social battle is being fought to-day.

But too freely acknowledge, before going further, that Mr. Spencer
is no partisan. Although his ideas and arguments have been eagerly sought and utilized by the classes against the masses, he himself is quite convinced, as implanted solely by the highest natures of truth and justice. For, as for human nature, these high principles have not preserved him from the blinding influences of capitalistic surroundings, and, as a matter of fact, his utterances and misrepresentations of Socialism are among the most glaring on record. Take, for example, his latest outpouring on the subject, his introduction to that Property Defense League publication, "A Plea for Liberty." In this he has not shown himself at all superior to the methods of our own Patrician League. He makes use of the same arguments and ideas that we are accustomed to have from their platforms, and to read in their newspapers, although, of course, couched in better language and in more precise terms than they have at their command. In the most gratuitous manner he first of all asserts that Socialism means the sudden abolition of the entire order of society, and immediate imposition of a new, and upon this quiet assumption he then proceeds to argue very convincingly, pointing out the enormous evils bound to ensue from such a course of procedure. Surely we have heard that before, and have smiled at its imbecility, perhaps, even while we refuted it; but how can such opinions of a great contemporary movement be paraded in a philosopher of Mr. Spencer's calibre? He then paints a very dark picture of the dangers of SOCIALISM, as exemplified upon the Continent, pointing out how, under a Socialist régime, these dangers would be thousands-fold aggravated; how, in course of time, officials would intermarry, and form a new aristocracy, far more elaborate and better organized than the old. He seems to lose sight entirely of the fact that tyrannous bureaucracies are only possible to-day because the existing social system, based upon what he calls "men's will," "the devil's maxims of 'every man for himself,'" has completely decentralized human nature; poverty, and the evils inseparable from it—drunkenness, prostitution, crime, of all kinds, and moral and intellectual deterioration of frightful extent—have broken the spirit of the rest of the people, rendering them the docile slaves of their rulers; while the fear of poverty, operating among the governing classes, and encouraging in them the very worst phases of selfishness, has produced that tyranny of officialism which is complained of. But a fundamental change in the social system would imply a fundamental change in the relations of the governed to the governing; and the elimination of poverty and the absence of incentives to individual accumulation, together with the spread of education and the fullest extension of democratic principles, would render class domination impossible. Such, at all events, is the contention of Socialists, and Mr. Spencer, and those who think with him, have never yet met the argument squarely. If our philosopher had always written in the style of his "Introduction" (which, by the way, bears the significant title of "From Freedom to Bondage") his claim upon the attention of Socialist apologists would be easily disposed of. But not so. The line of anti-socialistic thought I have called Spencerism has assumed pretensions to a scientific basis, and deserves more serious consider- 
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tion at our hands. To this consideration I now apply myself, regretting that limited space will not allow me to do so as fully as I would wish.

Reduced to syllogistic form the Spencerian argument would read somewhat thus:—

The Communalist is best secured where individual liberty is paramount. Under Socialism the State would be paramount. Therefore, Socialism is incompatible with the Communalist.

With every desire to be fair in stating the case of our opponents, I do not know of a better method of reaching at once to its pith and narrowness than the syllogistic. It gives, quite clearly, the propositions which their argument is to sustain, and the conclusion at which it logically arrives. The argument may be very elaborate, with manifold ramifications and amplifications, necessitating an equally elaborate criticism; if it is sought to destroy it by branch by branch; but if the root-propositions can be laid bare at once, as in a syllogism, their unsoundness, or the unsoundness of the conclusion based upon them, may be demonstrated within the compass of a short criticism like this. Let us try.

The Communalist is best secured where individual liberty is paramount. With this proposition, as it stands, I have very little fault to find; indeed, it is likely to meet with universal assent; but as soon as some definitions of its terms are attempted I fear not this happy unanimity will disappear. The "Communalist" admits of a plurality of definitions, each phrased with a different phraseology, but what of "individual liberty?" Does this mean the abrogation of all law, and the liberty of each and every one of us to do what we please, how we please, and where we please? Some people do mean this, believing the sense of right which leaves all aggregates of humanity to be sufficient restraint upon the evil-disposed, and to afford sufficient protection for the weak. But Mr. Spencer disavows from that view. In "Social State," he has shown the State to be an organism, with real functions; sometimes superseding, sometimes supplementing, the individual. Therefore he is no anarchist. What means "individual liberty" is that right to do what one pleases, provided one does not infringe upon the rights of others. I do not know that he has anywhere defined "individual liberty" in precisely those words, but that they may fairly be attributed to him anyone familiar with his works will admit. Unfortunately I have only his before-mentioned "Introduction" by me as I write, but even in that I find an allusion to the "simple principle that each man should be allowed to pursue the objects of life, restrained only by the limits which the similar pursuits of his objects by other men impose." Now, that is a very important modification of the sweeping phrase, "individual liberty," in fact, it is equivalent to a complete surrender of the individualistic cliche. For the question is immediately suggested, "What authority defines the 'rights of others' which must not be infringed upon, and impose the limits upon individual liberty necessary for the protection of those rights?"
The answer, of course, is, Society. Society is the authority which
defines rights and imposes restraints upon freedom. And then another,
and more transcendental question arises—"What limits the power of
Society in this respect?" I wish all intermeddlers who are not
philosophers to consider this well. By admitting the right of Society
to limit liberty for any purpose whatsoever, they have cut the ground
from beneath their feet. They have thereby abandoned the pre-
eminence of the Individual, and acknowledged the superiority of the
Many, and their great argument against Socialism is gone. For,
to grant Society the right to dictate what individuals shall not
logically is to admit the right of Society to define in what individual
liberty consists. If Society determines (in the only way possible,
by the expressed will of the Many) that private property in land is an
infringement upon the "rights of others," the "reservation in favor of
"individual liberty" justifies it; and in the same way, if Society deter-
nines that private ownership in capital is incompatible with the
"rights of others," it is again justified. Nor can the despotism of
Society be either vetoed or repealed, for to what higher court of
appeal can the case be carried? Individualistic philosophers, long
before Spencer's time, had sought to assign scientific limits to the
power of Society over the individual. In vain. The flow of human
events quietly swept away their artificial barriers. It was said that
the State should only act as a sort of policeman, protecting the
persons and properties of its members from violence and fraud.
But it was by-and-by discovered that violence and fraud operated
in subtle ways than are usually attributed to them; that, in fact,
they are the offspring of very wild and varied manifestations, and
that, to afford anything like adequate protection from them, the functions
and duties of the State would have to be considerably extended.
Factory Acts, Mines Regulation Acts, Public Health Acts, Cul
tivation Acts, etc., were accordingly passed into law with this object.
Then it was argued, that however wise and various might be the
functions of the State in other respects, that at least it ought not to
treach up upon the domain of industry as a producer or distri-
butor of wealth, but that this work should be left entirely in the care of
captive enterprises. But the overwhelming tide of progress is rapidly sweeping
away this limit, too, and even at this day it is a sorry verdict.
The Central Governments now have full or part control of the posts,
telegraphs, canals, railways, life insurance, ship building, stock broking,
banking, and many lending; while the municipal authorities mugost in
the interests of the community, gasworks, waterworks, tramways,
mills, slaughter houses, fire-engines, lighthouses, pilotage, ferries,
signal-stations, lifeboats, congregations, public baths, pounds, harbours,
warehouses, hospitals, dispensatories, artisans' dwellings, schools, churches,
houses, museums, parks, art galleries, and libraries; all of which were
once reserved to private enterprise. The assumption of these duties and
functions by Society involves much entailment of personal freedom,
but in assuming them Society is only acting upon that right which I
have shown Spencenerian individualists to accord it in terms of their
definition of "individual liberty." And I have pointed out that no
bounds can be placed to this right when once admitted, because there is
no human power or agency superior to Society to impose the limit.
Therfore lies the claim for Spencenerian. They say, in effect: Society
alone has the right to interfere with personal liberty, and then only in
protection of the liberty of others. Socialists agree with that, but
pursue them to argue from the premise that it justifies every act of
the State in restraint of the person, because it is evident, from the
nature of the case, that Society must be sole judge of when such
interference is necessary. But it does not follow from this that
individual liberty is in danger of complete extinction, and that men
are likely to become mere pules of a huge state machine.
No! On the contrary, paradoxically though it seems, the pre-eminence
of Socialism is the only real salvation of "individualism." Society is an
aggregate of individualities condensing into one body for common
benefit; and every act or expression of Society is the multifarious acts
or expressions of its individual members, sanitary, wisely, but drawn
together into one great act or expression by the attraction of mutual
agreement. Each unit, by a natural instinct, bears its own good;
itself action, whether isolated or co-operative, is directed more or
less towards self-interest, and it is this fundamental fact of human
nature which will ensure, under Socialism, the fullest individual liberty.
Because, under Socialism, society will be, for the first time, pro-
centric; each of its members will, for the first time, have an
equal share in the direction of the issues of its concern; and the decisions
and acts of the State will, for the first time, embody the will of the
Great Majority, united for the achievement of a common purpose.
An action of a great majority of individuals for the achievement of any
purpose destructive of individuality, is highly improbable. That
State Acts have had this tendency I do not deny; indeed, the fact is
common argument for Socialism, because such State Acts have
invariably represented the wishes of the few, not the Many.
"Private enterprise" is the real enemy of individual liberty, and the
intelligent student of history, acquainted with contemporary economic
conditions, knows that the State Acts of all times, whatever the
expression of "individuality," were placed upon the statute books while "private
enterprise" held the reins of government. But it was done in order to do to that natural instinct of self-interest to which I have
referred. I attach little blame to "private enterprise." It is the
folly of our social system that makes the instinct produce evil instead of
benefit. Socialists do not seek to perform the impossible, and
eliminate this universal instinct of nature, they only desire to prove
g o

provided one does not infringe upon the rights of others, reasoned out, entitles me to change the form of the syllabus being considered, and make it read thus.—

The Communist is not aimed at where the community
Under Socialism its communality would be paramount.
Therefore, Socialism is continuous in the Communist.

The truth of Spontaneousism is its high conception of the indivisibility of man; its error is in assuming Socialism vested 'with a scheme of government, based upon the desire for an essential element of human nature. The "Spontaneous"
"Paper constitutions result from the need of the forms..." and paper constitutions similar to those who have contemplated the available evidence." And impossible to establish forthwith a satisfactory social state.

"Mr opposition to Socialism results from the slow and steady progress to a higher scale, and being...

"These few sentences give you at once the main mistake. Socialism is not a paper constitution; it is an evolutionary move for whether we will or not. We may, indeed, by discovering ourselves to be in harmony with it, and so accelerate its process, ignorance, negligence, indifference, and willful opposition retard it; but stop we cannot. Nor is Socialism ever

...into true Individualism. Sidney Govier says "Social Individualism rationalised, organised, clothed, and in its

That is true in a nutshell. Socialism is simply the idea that future social state which is being gradually formed by the numberless individuals after a higher and happier mould.

In the truer conception of Individualism, it is true individuals are. We cannot divorce ourselves, or each

individually. It is the impress of Nature on the soul of the individual which makes it stronger and stamper upon him. It is the "me" of consciousness, those of isolated and distinctive being which the mind reflects upon itself; it is something—what a

believable something—which drives our common humanity of separate and exclusive existence, and makes each on

found, mystery to the rest. Socialists recognise this, ignore it by their teachings, they do but plead with us to

towards the building up of a social system worthier of and...