

LABOR AND THE COMMUNITY.

BY H. R. VANDERBYLL.

THE views expressed in the following paragraphs partly originated and partly assumed definite form in a life of labor that lasted for a number of years. I flatter myself with the hope that experience and observation lend to them the neutral tint of non-prejudice. My judgments own a foundation which differs from that on which the average worker builds his views. The cause of this difference must be found in the fact that nature did not endow me from the start with those qualities, physical and otherwise, that make a good laborer. If there be question of a rise and a fall in my career, then I fell into the world of labor and subsequently emerged from it. And it is for that reason that I consider myself to be in a better position to rightly discern the place which labor occupies in the community, and to pass fair judgment on the nature of its relations with capital and with the balance of society, than the average worker, himself, is.

In order to see things and their relations clearly, impartiality is a first requisite. It is unnecessary to remark that impartiality is a rare phenomenon. We not only view facts and conditions with the assistance of our own particular more or less developed intellect, but we judge them from a standpoint of self-interest. In the first instance there is question either of ignorance or of understanding, in the second instance, of prejudice. I think prejudice a more vicious disturber of peace, a more malignant enemy of the human race, than ignorance. Prejudice finds its source in selfishness whereas ignorance is the natural expression of a brain as yet undeveloped. However, a certain amount of self-interest would appear to be necessary to the health of the community. It seems to be a useful tool of evolution wherewith she coaxes man to struggle towards better and nobler things. It is not surprising, therefore, that prejudice taints most controversies relating to mat-

ters of popular interest. There are many different individuals and groups of individuals whose judgments reflect their respective desires. This fact makes it almost impossible for a particular class of society to fairly judge another, or to view impartially the condition of society as a whole. A workingman's opinions about such matters do not altogether originate in the cells of his gray matter. They are mixed with a dash of self-interest. The same may be remarked about corporation heads, preachers, lawyers, publishers; in short, about the representative of any class or group of people that are active in society in a particular manner.

In order to be able to clearly discern facts and their relations, in order to be in a position to justly praise or condemn conditions, so far as society is concerned, one must be something more than a group—or class-representative. One must be a member of the community, of the nation, of the human race. I am not so sure but one may be required to be a member of the infinite universe, the fruit of whose eternal labors we sometimes so heartily and blindly condemn. At least, one must be broadminded, able to place oneself in the position of one's fellow being, able to survey the world from his particular standpoint, able to realize that the individual is a member of society and humanity rather than of a class or of a group. A most difficult thing to do, unquestionably! I believe, however, that as man evolves, he realizes more and more that self-interest is but a means to an end, and that life's struggle at bottom is a question of intellectual, moral and spiritual development. Broadmindedness grows with that realization, and the provincialism of the class-representative accordingly becomes less intense.

Having labored for a number of years, I find myself in a position similar to the one of an American who has lived among a foreign people, who has participated in their struggles and their joys, who has studied their nature, their customs, their morals and ideals, without having destroyed that which characterizes him as an American. In other words, the fact of my having been a laborer did not destroy my original personality. It probably added something to it, or it annihilated some of its undesirable features. My original self, however, continued to exist, to experience and to evolve. It is clear, then, that the ideas set forth in this article do not emanate purely from the laborer's standpoint, but rather from that standpoint which is as broad or as narrow as my personality.

Prejudice is therefore out of the question, although, of course, a certain degree of ignorance may be reflected in those ideas.

I am well aware that I am contradicting a certain theory which holds that "circumstances make the man." My long and intimate association with the worker has, according to that theory, moulded my inner being in such a manner that my former self has been transmuted into the self of the average laborer. Or, at least, it has hampered or completely stopped its development. Abilities, inclinations and capacities which I once possessed have been reduced, stifled or destroyed by conditions among which drudgery and poverty are not the least conspicuous. But I must deny that circumstances have thus influenced my being. I admit that the external world of condition and circumstance has moulded my being, but I object to the manner in which this is supposed to have been accomplished. In a moulding process, two factors have to be considered; that which moulds, and that which is being moulded. If we agree that the external world is the moulder, then the thing which is subjected to a continuous moulding process is our inner being. It stands to reason that the nature of the resultant product at any time depends on two things: on the conditions of the external world, and on the nature of our being. The most skilled potter cannot create a fine vessel from low grade material. Nor can the clumsiest of potters destroy the originally high grade matter which he is manipulating. I am of the opinion that our popular theories of evolution largely ignore the nature of the thing upon which the conditioned external world acts, and that, as a consequence, the fact that evolution operates from external as well as from internal forces, is not sufficiently considered. If evolution be a fatalistic process (wise or otherwise), then we should not seek its directing forces merely in nature and the universe, but also in the individual. Is not this also a condition which results in fatalistic direction (wise or otherwise), viz., that the individual is born with a certain quality of gray matter and with certain qualities of being?

In these days, rich with theory and ism, fad and cult, we are inclined to recognize but a single wing-tip of the white bird of truth. We cling to a detached truth with blind fanaticism, use it as a cornerstone for a new structure of philosophical religion or religious philosophy, and are nicely on the road towards narrow-mindedness and mental stagnation. Thus there are some who say that circum-

stances and conditions mould the individual, and there are others who claim that the individual moulds himself. Both classes of people are right, and both are wrong. They are both wrong because they fail to recognize the truth of which their opponents are aware. The bad feature of their failure is, that their theories are not only philosophically but also morally unsound. Believers in the theory of circumstance and condition have the tendency to transmute a firm, healthy spine into the backbone of a jellyfish. Their opponents, holding their fellowman absolutely responsible for what he is and in time becomes, are in danger of parting forever with Christian principles and ethics.

II.

I have made the preceding remarks, personal and impersonal, for the purpose of introducing something which in my opinion constitutes one of the two most important elements of social development. I am referring to individuality. Individuality is the key to the explanation of society's present condition. Let us leave individuality out of our discussions of social problems, and we shall be considering the features of an empty shell. We shall be philosophizing on the destruction of that shell or on the problem of its re-creation. All which is very interesting, but unfortunately a waste of time and mental energy. The empty shell is visible society; its good and bad conditions, the weak and strong links that unite its parts, the contrast between the condition of one member and that of another. We unconsciously picture to ourselves this empty shell when referring to society. We ignore its contents, of which this shell is but a reflection, a necessary expression. What is society at bottom if not a group of individuals, similar but not alike, whose relations are determined by the nature of their various beings? We are scratching on the surface of things, so long as we consider visible society only. Underneath, within and back of it, is its creator—invisible society. And if asked to partly define invisible society, I should say that it is a group of brains and souls of many degrees of development. This definition implies, of course, the presence of many degrees of intelligence and morality, of a variety of ambitions and ideals, of a considerable number of religions and pet theories, of a vast quantity of likes and dislikes, of innumerable natural abilities and capacities. Of the billion and a half birds of different plumage that constitute humanity, those that

outwardly resemble one another flock together. Differences of minor importance are overlooked. On the whole, they are birds of a feather. And why do they flock together? Because, primarily, there is an inner resemblance. This inner resemblance is a matter of evolutionary development. Then, again, we find groups within groups. Consciously, their members seek association only with those who express themselves in life in a manner almost identical with their own manner of expression. Unknowingly, they acknowledge finer distinctions of evolutionary development. And, although conditions of harmony do not always prevail within the sub-group, and certainly not within the group, foreign birds of a feather will find a united front of attack and defense. There is a certain natural opposition between human beings whose fundamental natures and whose intellects differ greatly in development.

After this bird's eye view of society, visible and invisible, the question may well be asked, where is the superman who can change the constitution of society and remedy its ills? This question occurs, mainly, of course, because there are so many would-be saviors of society who by the stroke of a pen, or by the throwing of a bomb, or by eliminating capital, or by other methods, would produce an ideal state of affairs. But this ideal condition would be a surface condition, only. What about invisible society, the thing which society really is? What about those many and different brains and souls that, knowingly or unknowingly, faithfully reflect themselves in their own creation of social conditions? The problem, I think, is not one of improving the expressions of an organized humanity, but rather of improving that humanity itself. If we can improve the individual being, we need not be concerned about its expressions in life and society. They take care of themselves. They reflect at any time what man is, mentally, morally and spiritually. They slowly move towards the ideal as he develops.

Our question, therefore, if put a little more pointedly, reads: Where must we look for the superman who is able to develop the individual? My own answer is, nowhere.

III.

Most of the proposed schemes for the improvement of the conditions of society are built on a shaky foundation. Their foundation is sought in the expressions of society rather than in its constitution. We consider the conditions of labor, or those of

capital, but we seldom consider the inner condition of the laborer or of the capitalist. If the face of society is wrinkled, haggard and diseased, a dash of powder and rouge may temporarily improve appearances. But the unhealthy condition remains, and only a fool is deceived by an artificial appearance of health. It is not in society's diseased countenance but rather in its constitution that we should find the cause of its disease. By society's constitution we should mean something ultimate. When we say that laborers, doctors, bakers, capitalists, preachers and kings constitute society, we are speaking of expressions, not of fundamentals. Barring exceptional cases, leadership expresses roughly what a man is; so does labor, so does art. The surface of society is lit up by a glimmer which is the resultant light of the many glows cast by the individual beings separately. At bottom, society is that which is capable of producing leadership *plus* that which is capable of producing art, etc. At bottom, society is an organization of brains and souls of many degrees of development.

An important question is, How well or how badly does a scale of human development fit into society? Each member of the community, I take it, is active in the interest of the whole of which he is a member. No matter how thoroughly absorbed he may be in his personal interests, his activities are nevertheless instrumental in determining the condition of the whole. It is a simple fact, which is not sufficiently realized, that absolutely independent individualities and activities are impossibilities in community life. Being a member of the community, the individual not only contributes his share towards its preservation, but is also compelled to respond to certain demands that emanate from the whole. The nature of those demands is determined by the nature of the whole, and the nature of the whole is, of course, the blended product of the many and various natures of the members. The family, for example, is a small community, and it determines certain boundaries within which the member may move. The whole of which the husband is a constituent member places certain restrictions upon him, and demands certain things of him. The interest of the family is his own, and he cannot, logically, object to the restrictions and demands in question. Similar relations between the member and the whole exist in larger communities. The voice of the individual is never heard singly, nor is his individuality considered separately. There is a voice of the community in which the voice of the member can be but partly heard, and his particular nature is merely one of the

many component parts of the nature of the whole. Society's healthy or unhealthy appearance, therefore, is determined by the several natures of its constituent members. If that appearance is the indicator of that which we call civilization, then the degree of civilization which exists at any time is the reflection of the average degree of mental, moral and spiritual development of its members.

I cannot, at this point, refrain from referring to a bit of cosmic philosophy. The most interesting and best operated community is the infinite community of the universe. Each member of the universe contributes his share towards preserving the eternal balance of the whole. All members, so far as their existence and their activity are concerned, are interdependent and interrelated. There is a universal law to which each member of the whole obeys. Were it possible for a single member to escape that law, and to become an absolutely independent individual, the eternal balance of the whole should become disturbed, and the universe should crumble into an unimaginable nothing.

A comparison between our human community and the infinite community of the universe cannot, of course, be a fair one. The universe as a whole is perfect, its members are perfectly interrelated, and the nature of their various activities cannot, therefore, be questioned. We cannot consider the limits within which their individualities are moving anything but just. Our own community, however, is imperfect. Human effort, conscious or unconscious, is constantly urging it towards the ideal. I believe, however, that if we consider society as it is, and not as we think that it should be, viz., perfect, we shall find justice in place of injustice, wisdom instead of circumstance, purpose rather than whim. But this justice, purpose and wisdom are expressions of an impersonal whole, not of the individual. I have particularly in mind the fact that one member of society labors for a wage while another makes a profit.

Were it possible for members of the community to be absolutely independent individuals, society might consist solely of capitalists. But to think of absolute individual independence in community life is to think of a contradiction. We have in our American Declaration of Independence a glorious clause which states a relative truth. All men are born free and equal. To a limited extent, I think. Were there fifteen hundred million islands, absolutely alike, on each of which were placed a single individual, and were these individuals absolutely alike, then truly it could be said that all men are born free and equal. In view of the reality, however, we

are born free when we consider ourselves in relation to slavery, which we repudiate in any form whatsoever. Barring this freedom which is the repudiation of slavery, there is no such thing as freedom in community life. And in view of the existences of innumerable degrees of mental and moral development, equality is out of the question.

There is no more repulsive argument than this one of freedom and equality when it is used by the ignorant and discontented individual for the purpose of being convincing. If there be freedom and equality, why should he be the employee of his employer? Why should he obey laws formulated and passed by others? A just state of affairs would see him his own employer, his own law-giver. Experiments in the direction of such a just state of affairs are proving to be colossal failures in Russia, Italy and elsewhere. Hysterics produced by the recent war have distorted a dim conception of democracy into fantastic nonsense. An industrial democracy is no more a democracy than a capitalistic one. And the former is a little worse than the latter on account of the elimination of a certain kind of leader who, as it happens, is seldom produced by the working class, so-called. Man is a creature born to take orders. who unconsciously demands the direction and the leadership of his superior in ability and intelligence. The most unpretentious section gang is at sea without its boss.

Discontent is not altogether objectionable. But there are two sorts of discontent. The first is the result of a constant realization that the struggle with life is a hard one. Added to this is the desire that the struggle may be eliminated through the medium of outside agencies. The second kind of discontent is sometimes called divine discontent. It is the voice of nature urging the individual to seek conditions and surroundings that more closely express the nature of his being. Unfortunately, this last sort of discontent is rare in comparison with the first. It is human to dislike struggle, and to wish to acquire possessions in the easiest manner possible. We find this human trait among rich and poor, among the powerful and the weak, alike. At heart we are capitalists, though sometimes circumstances prevent us from demonstrating the fact.

The truth that society is, fundamentally, not a homogeneous but a heterogeneous whole, is the one to which we are blind. We are in the habit of classing men under a single heading—human beings. We endow them with the same inherent capacities and abilities. We imagine that all men suffer, enjoy, experience and

evolve in the same manner. At the same time we concede that there are no two people alike. We meet with different likes and dislikes, with a variety of vices and virtues. The trouble is that we conceive people to be alike fundamentally, and that we do not associate the differences that appear on the surface with the differences that concern their inner beings. The result is that we expect a single religion to suffice for an entire humanity. We think all people capable of living up to a single code of morals. We consider all men to be potentially able and intellectual. We go so far in contradicting the result of our observations as to declare that man's personal choice decides whether he shall travel towards intellectual and moral brilliancy or towards ignorance and perdition. Such rot it is which causes un-Christian souls to hold the intellectually, and sometimes morally, unpretentious toiler responsible for what he is and for the manner in which he is active in society.

Our observations of man concern reflections. His actions and activities in this society of ours not merely betray but actually reveal his ME. They are the odor of his individual self, and belong to it as perfume belongs to the rose. We are compelled to accept them as the necessary and natural expressions of that which he is. That which he is prompts him to act in a certain manner, endows him with certain capacities and abilities, causes him to become laborer or president, criminal or saint. What, at bottom, is an individual? He is a product of evolution—a fine, bad, or mediocre product, according to our viewpoint. It stands to reason, then, that the degree of evolutionary development which he represents, and which was determined before birth, clears him of the responsibility for the nature of his being *and* its necessary expressions. That a man is not responsible for the quality of his soul and for that of his gray matter seems to many of us to be an indigestible truth, simple as it is. "Why does he not do this or that?" we ask. Or, "Why does he not educate himself?" What foolish questions, and what foolish answers we find for them. Why does not the fish fly? Why does not the rose grow below the surface of the soil? What a man does expresses what he is. Because he is what he is, he does what he does.

IV.

When we accept man's individuality as the true foundation of society, we are compelled to rid ourselves of the erroneous idea

that our fellowman forces us into our particular station in life. If there is any compulsion, if there are any demands, they originate in society as a whole, of which we are a constituent member. There is no question of one class of men driving another to labor. Society, at its present stage of development, demands labor. Certain of its members are peculiarly fit to supply it.

It is this response to an impersonal demand which lifts labor above the level of inferiority on which we are apt to replace it. We too often make the mistake of mentally separating the individual and his activities from society as a whole. We see only the individual, and compare his being, his activities and his abilities with our own. As a result, we conceive of inferiority and superiority, of servant and master, of enslaved labor and ruling capital. It is the wrong conception. If there were no such thing as the community, we could think of the capitalist's playing a little game of his own with the laborer. Capital would be a criminal institution, and labor an unheard of injustice. And this is exactly what capital and labor think of each other: that they are playing a little game of their own. In reality, however, they are active in the interest of the community of which they are constituent members. For it is as impossible for the member of the community to travel an absolutely independent path as it is for a planet to move at will about the solar system.

The community as a whole is the great coercer and dictator. The natures of its various demands are determined by the average evolutionary development which it represents. Its demands are distributed among the members in accordance with the nature of their being. And it is the member, himself, who being peculiarly fit to represent a source of supply, responds in a natural manner to the demands placed upon him by the community. Labor being necessary to the preservation and to the welfare of the modern community, there are members who, being peculiarly fit to supply this demand, are usefully active as laborers. Only a fool, and sometimes a prejudiced laborer, will deny the necessity or underestimate the value of capital. Only a fool, and sometimes a prejudiced capitalist, will deny the necessity or underestimate the value of labor. But it matters little how superior or inferior, necessary or unnecessary, one member considers the activities of another member. Considered from the standpoint of the community as a whole, there is no question of superiority or inferiority. Each member contributes his share towards making society what it is. The

nature of his contribution is determined by the nature of his being.

Those who wish to uproot society in a single night, and reconstruct it in a single day, let them think well. Eliminate the street-sweeper; does not the community lose something of its near-perfection? Does not the same thing result when the manufacturer and employer is eliminated? Clamoring for equality is demanding the impossible. The various needs of the whole must be supplied, and they are being supplied by unequal members.

Fraternity, equality, liberty! Yes, indeed—until a leader arises, whose very presence takes away a little from fraternity, a little from equality, and a little from liberty. On the whole, man is dangerously in love with liberty and equality. He does not always fully comprehend that the only possible liberty is that liberty in a democracy which eliminates slavery, and that equality is not fundamental, but concerns useful activity in the interest of the whole. Absolute liberty, something inconceivable, would silence the voice of the community. Where there is a community, there is also a task for each member, which must be performed for the sake of the whole. Community-life thus prevents the individual from following a path of absolute liberty, and keeps him circling around the center of social interest like a planet around its sun. Incidentally, this curbing of the individual's movements coincides with the wise purposes of evolution. It is hardly necessary to observe that the principal tool of evolution is obstacle thrown in the path of the self-propelling individual. Is it not primitively a painful rubbing of shoulders with nature, and subsequently with a more or less organized humanity, that made it necessary for the individual to struggle and conquer in order to lift himself to a higher level of development?

As to equality, fortunately for society it does not exist. Considered from the personal viewpoint, there is everywhere superiority and inferiority, leadership and following. Only with regard to useful activity, useful when considered in relation to the condition of the whole, can we speak of equality. Each member is as important and valuable to the entire community as any other member, whether he be active as laborer or as manufacturer. But, comparing one member with another, inequality is apparent. It is fundamental, touching the being and the intellect of the individuals compared, expressing itself in difference of abilities and gifts, of stations in life, of conditions and surroundings, and even of modes of evolving. Destroy this inequality, what becomes of society?

Must all its members perform similar tasks? Must leaders be eliminated, and the blind lead the blind? Must all useful activity have a single reward, and the demand for skill, ability, integrity of character, and leadership find no supply? It is unnecessary to try to picture a condition of absolute equality. The picture would be an impossible one.

When I stated that man is often dangerously in love with liberty and equality, I had in mind the fact that his conceptions of liberty and equality are utopian. Whenever he tries their practical application, he shakes the very foundations of society. There follow blood and thunder, lawlessness and disorganization. A leader generally arises, and with him iron rule. After a while, when the heat of passion has cooled and the thunder of revolution has subsided, there is an unuttered realization that the healthy community is founded on something of which the violent reformer of society had not thought. The trouble with the violent or radical reformer in most cases, is that in his intellectual analysis of society he ignores society as a whole and considers his individual problems only. On the whole, he is intensely aware of his own struggle with life. And so, he conceives of an ideal state of affairs—ideal as regards his individual well-being—leaving the natural demands of the balance of the community out of his considerations. He commits the blunder which the average man is inclined to commit in the mental process of society building. He employs a single kind of building material, say bricks, laboring under the delusion that he can very well dispense with steel, plaster, cement, lumber; in short, with those materials which are necessary to complete the solid structure. If given the opportunity to construct his society, it will turn out a tottering group of individuals of a single kind who vainly and madly hunt for something, they know not what, that will solidly cement them together. The rest of the original community is dumb, inactive, and bereft of the opportunity to be useful in behalf of the whole. Then follows the guillotine or the machine gun.

V.

The philosophy of community-life reaches to far greater depths than we at first imagine. Were it only a matter of injustice, perhaps the various clashing groups of members could arrive at an amiable and satisfactory understanding. I have had the opportunity to consider the laborer's position in society from two stand-

points. There is the personal, the laborer's standpoint, and there is the impersonal, the philosophic standpoint. It is hardly possible for the laborer, who is not also thinker and philosopher, to be unaware of injustice of some sort which accompanies his position in society. Painful experience has caused me to ask a few questions which are not so easily answered by a human being who is also humane. Here follow a few of these questions: Why should the wage earner be compelled to expose himself to constant danger, to shorten his life in the evil fumes of mine and plant? Why should he be compelled to violate the laws of nature, to work and eat in the hollow of the night, to sleep when the sun is bright in the sky? Why, loving his wife and children, should he not be in a position to give them the best that life can offer—comfort and education? I repeat that such questions are not so easily answered. In many, many instances, however, I have found the answers in the individuals themselves—in their supreme physical constitution, in their natural aversion to intellectual development, in their particular conception of ideal living. And I have come to the conclusion that nature has made it possible for each class of members of the community to successfully bear the burden of the particular task which they perform in behalf of the whole.

There is another viewpoint—the philosophic one. As I have stated before, the philosophy of community-life penetrates far below its surface and touches the very being of the individual—one of the reasons, perhaps, why a satisfactory understanding between opposing groups is forever out of the question. Satisfaction and evolution do not travel together very well. And if I be not mistaken, it is evolution which is at bottom of society. Or, is it merely an aimless scramble for money and for the things which money will buy? But we see civilization advance and the health of society improve, year by year, century by century. That advancement and improvement are indicative of a growing average human development. The growth of average human development is the leveling sum-total of all individual development. If our present civilization is superior to that of a century ago, we must not, as we are often inclined to do, seek the cause in the creative efforts of a few individuals or of a single class of individuals. Civilization, at any time, reflects the average development of the individual brain and soul. Its progress mirrors that of a nation, or of the human race—as the case may be—not that of a few favored individuals. Labor of five centuries ago is not the sort of labor that we know to-day. Is such the case

because those who are "in power" and who represent a cause of external conditions, have become more tolerant, generous and Christian in their attitude towards their fellow being? Such is partly the case, undoubtedly. But internal as well as external changes affect the conditions of labor from time to time. With the development of his individual being, the laborer's useful activities in society become more dignified and the conditions of living continue to harmonize with his developing mind and soul.

For illustration's sake, I am perhaps permitted to digress. Consider from a purely philosophic and therefore impartial viewpoint, competition between Japanese, Chinese, and Hindu labor on the one hand, and American labor on the other, as a crime against the nation. Facts are facts, and that the average American represents a higher degree of human development than the average member of the Yellow race cannot be denied. What is it which really happens to our American society when hundreds of thousands of Orientals are allowed to become usefully active constituent members? The average level of society is lowered, as the viscosity of a heavy oil is lowered by adding a lighter oil. The demands and needs of the community as a whole lose something of their more or less lofty nature. For the demands of the new element which has been added to the original, reflect different degrees of intellectual and moral development. There is labor and labor. There is Hindu labor, and there is American labor—for the very simple reason that there are Hindus and Americans. The needs and demands of the former are few and humble, those of the latter more dignified and more in keeping with their evolutionary development. Only in case the American laborer should have evolved beyond the point of labor and should be required by the community to be usefully active in a different manner, could we logically conceive of American labor performed by Orientals.

I have made this digression for the purpose of pointing out that the conditions of labor are caused by external as well as by internal influences. The latter emanate from the laborer himself. When we add the external and the internal influences, we obtain a sum-total of influences that emanates from the community as a whole. We must not make the mistake of conceiving the laborer to be apart from the whole of society. The labor-group, although it is not the whole of society, is *of* society. The laborer, by being what he is, individually, helps to make society what it is, and to a certain extent imposes its conditions upon himself. Should he therefore

be desirous of changing those conditions, he could not very well escape the necessity of changing himself—or, rather, his self.

And thus we return to the simple fact that society changes with the individual. Its condition improves as the individual being of the member improves. This change and improvement are universal. They touch every group and level of society. The laborer evolves as well as any other member. The evolution of his being is one of the determining factors in the re-moulding process of labor's conditions. It should be realized that conditions and institutions exist because they are tolerated. They are tolerated because they reflect a certain average human development. When average human development appreciably soars to higher levels, ancient institutions begin to totter on their foundations, and social conditions to clamor for improvement. It is not a particular religion which is forced upon man; it is man, being what he is, intellectually and morally, who accepts it. It is not a Kaiser who forces his individuality upon a German people; he is the response to a demand which emanates from a certain average intellectual and moral development. In the most common bypaths of life we meet with this law of intellectual and moral supply and demand which allows things, conditions and institutions to flourish temporarily. A homely illustration is perhaps that of the popular newspaper. Ask a Brisbane whether or not a successful newspaper should print the news and the articles which people desire to read. Study the popular newspaper or magazine and you will obtain some conception of the average intellectual and moral development of the reading public.

VI.

How does evolution operate among human beings? Does it operate as an external force that influences and moulds the individual being? Is it an internal force operating within the confines of the individual being, and do its hidden activities express themselves outwardly and visibly? Is, for instance, the balance of society also the fatal power that directs a single group of its members? Or do the members themselves mould their individual present, with its conditions, and do they themselves lay the cornerstone for their particular future?