

NEW THOUGHT LIBRARY. QUARTERLY. \$1.00 A YEAR. No. 17. May, 1899.

Entered at the Post-office at Knoxville, Tenn., as second class Matter.

THE

Law of Conduct.

AS BASED UPON A CORRECT KNOWLEDGE OF

THE NATURE OF THE MIND.

BY

ALBERT CHAVANNES.

Author of Vital Force, Magnetic Exchange and Magnitation, In Brighter Climes The Concentration of Wealth, etc.

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.

ALBERT CHAVANNES,

308 Fourth Avenue,

KNOXVILLE, TENN.

LIZZIE MELTON, A SELF-RELIANT GIRL.

A novel by ALBERT CHAVANNES. 161 pp. Price 25 cents.

Albert Chavannes sends me his new novel, "Lizzie Melton," which brings to mind that he showed it to me some years ago in the partly written stage, and that I strongly advised him to finish it. Those familiar with the exceedingly heaviness of his philosophical work will be surprised at the charmingly simple and natural style of this. The book reads like a transcript from memory, and Lizzie Melton is very real. The pencil is accurate, the brush is true, and the hills and streams of old "York State" rise before you like a picture. All this is true art.

It is not intended to be a radical novel, but it holds the beautiful moral that a woman can only be "ruined" by her own assent to the world's verdict—that with self-respect, dignity and courage, the mother of an illegitimate child can live above reproach.—*J. W. Lloyd, in Free Comrade.*

IN BRIGHTER CLIMES, OR LIFE IN SOCIOLAND.

A novel with a purpose, by Albert Chavannes. 254 pp. Price 25 cts.

The thorough manner in which the writer applies his theory of life and happiness of the characters renders their everyday life a matter of deep interest, and the communistic principle a subject of keen value for practical application. The development of the strength of true love, the transient path of mere passion, the value of sincerity and integrity in the marriage relation—all that has to do with the life of humanity is treated with singular force and feeling, with the aim of assisting toward the conscious acquisition of health, harmony and happiness in all the relations of life.

He who is dissatisfied to know that the mass of humanity is obliged to work incessantly merely for the privilege of living, also all who feel our modern problems without seeing any solution will peruse "In Brighter Climes" with great interest. Its suggestions are important, straightforward, keen-sighted. The times call; a reply is being forced from the very heart of the people.—*Caroline T. Fildesbury, in Boston Ideas.*

THE FUTURE COMMONWEALTH, or What Samuel Balcom saw in Socioland, by ALBERT CHAVANNES. Price 25 cents.

In the year 19—, Samuel Balcom visits Socioland, a settlement made by progressive persons who had founded a Commonwealth from which poverty was banished and millionaires were unknown. In a series of letters to a friend, he tells how they have succeeded in equalizing distribution and giving to all a fair chance of success, by simply placing under the care of the community those enterprises which require such large concentration of capital as to give too much power to those who control them.

THE CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH. A Study as to its Causes, Results and Remedies, by ALBERT CHAVANNES. Price 25 cents

The aim of this book is to show forcibly the evil effects of the present Concentration of Wealth, and to point to the practical remedies offered by the Limitation of Ownership in Land, and the Abolition of Taxation through the profits that could be derived from the Nationalization of Natural Monopolies. One important chapter is devoted to showing that the present tendencies can be overcome only through political action.

THE

Law of Conduct.

AS BASED UPON A CORRECT KNOWLEDGE OF
THE NATURE OF THE MIND.

BY

ALBERT CHAVANNES.

*Author of Vital Force, The Future Commonwealth,
In Brighter Climes, Studies in Sociology, etc.*

KNOXVILLE, EAST TENN.

1899.

74-5/34 copy Mr. & Mrs. A. L. Chavannes

BF
645
.N4
no.9

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

In Brighter Climes, A Novel with a Purpose,	25 cts.
Vital Force and Magnetic Exchange,	25 "
The Nature of the Mind,	25 "
The Future Commonwealth,	25 "
The Concentration of Wealth,	25 "
The Causes of Hard Times,	5 "
A New Aspect of the Economic Question,	5 "
The Law of Happiness,	10 "
The Law of Individual Control,	10 "
The Law of Exchange,	10 "
The Law of Environment,	5 "
Heredity, Cross-Breeding and Pre-natal Influence,	10 "

Address Albert Chavannes, 808 Fourth Ave. Knoxville, Tenn.

THE LAW OF CONDUCT.

CHAPTER I.

CONDUCT.

The study I now intend to make as to what constitutes a true law of conduct, will be based upon a correct knowledge of the nature of the mind, and if any of my readers are not convinced as to the proof of any of my statements. I would refer them to my former writings upon the subject. I have tried, in my work entitled "The Nature of the Mind", to make my position clear, and to explain the arguments on which it is based; but as this position is largely original with me, and some of the arguments have never been used before, I judge that much I may write on the present subject will not be clear to those who are unacquainted with the theory upon which it is based.

This study is conducted upon the theory that there is but one mind in nature which controls all possible phenomena, and the first deduction I make from this assertion is that, as mind controls conduct, if there is but one mind, there can be but one set of laws, and thus all actions must be controlled by the same laws.

This belief, that there is a union and correlation between all phenomena, is the logical result of the belief in evolution, but it has not yet sufficiently permeated the minds of investigators, to give to the results of their researches the homogeneity they ought to have.

In some sciences this is well understood. All chemists recognize that all chemical combinations obey the same laws, however diverse the results may be, and the same fact is recognized in the study of the mechanical forces, but sociologists are very far from admitting the same principle in regard to the control of the conduct of men, and very few indeed, among those interested in so-

ciological studies, are the persons who believe that all men are actuated by the same motives, and that all conduct is controlled by the same laws. And yet it is a fundamental truth, which in the study of the law of conduct must never be lost sight of, that the most degraded criminal and the innocent child, the drunkard and the philanthropist, act from kindred motives in obedience to one common law.

This belief, which as I have said is accepted only by very few persons, does not even go far enough. Not only do all human beings thus obey the same impulses, and are controlled by the same laws, but this statement applies to the conduct of all combinations, let them be inanimate things, (so called) or plants, or animals, or men. And unless we succeed in establishing a law of conduct which applies to all of them, we may feel certain that we have failed to correctly understand the law which controls the phenomena by which we are surrounded.

What I claim here is not a new principle; it is only the extension to sociology of a principle well understood when applied to other sciences. Now that we know more about what is called the law of gravitation, we claim that the stone which falls to the ground, and the balloon which rises in the air, obey the same law, and that there is no contradiction involved in these different actions, the difference being found not in the law, but in the conditions in which it becomes operative.

But very few persons realize, even among advanced sociologists, that when an apple falls to the ground, and I pick it up and throw it high in the air, the conduct of the apple in falling, and my conduct in throwing it, are due to precisely the same causes, and that we obey the same law. The growth of the apple tree, the bearing of its fruit, the fall of the apple, my picking it up and throwing it, are not different processes in kind, but are only different degrees of the same process, and the true explanation of the causes which led to my action, will also explain the growth of the tree, the fall of the apple, and in fact all phenomena.

This explanation can only be understood by those who are acquainted with the nature of the mind, for then they will know how strong are the proofs that the difference in action between the drop of water which falls from the clouds, sinks into the ground, reappears in the rivulet, ripples down the stream till it finds its way to the sea, and the conduct of the most highly developed man, is a difference in degree and not in kind.

This then is my first proposition and my starting point: There is but one law of conduct. And while I intend to study this law especially with reference to its application to the conduct of men, it must follow, from man being the most complex combination on our planet, that whatever law applies to him, must also apply to all the less complex combinations which have preceded him, and by which he is now surrounded.

In the study of sociology, as well as of psychology, we are often confronted by a lack of words to convey our exact meaning, such words as we now use having been evolved at a time when the range of our knowledge was yet very limited, and our classification of this knowledge very different from what it is now.

Thus I doubt very much if the word "Conduct" expresses the idea I wish to convey, but I am unable to find any other that would define more clearly my meaning. This word as commonly used, refers only to the conscious actions of men, and sometimes is stretched to embrace the intelligent actions of animals. With my belief that intelligence exists all through the Universe, and that it controls all actions—I might say motions—and that the difference between the intelligence of a mineral, a plant, an animal and man, is one of degree and not of kind, I must naturally extend the meaning of the word conduct, so as to take in all possible actions, and must also give a new definition for it.

Conduct then means to me the control of all actions, and so far as man is concerned, embraces not only the conscious actions, controlled by the voluntary nerves, such as walking, moving, speaking, etc., but also the actions of the subordinate organisms, which are controlled by the great sympathetic nerve, without any consciousness on our part. And I further claim that it is because we fail to recognize the important part played in our conduct by these vegetative organisms, that we often fail to improve that conduct, both socially and individually.

Conduct then deals with all actions, both conscious and unconscious, and means the control of actions, which bring us to the second portion of the question of conduct, which is to determine what does this conduct refer to? To that question my answer is, that it relates to our surroundings, and that the study of the Law of Conduct means the study of the control of our actions, with the purpose that they may, as far as possible, harmonize with our surroundings.

The study of this law devolves upon man, because his position upon the earth is one of great difficulty, differing from that of all other organisms, and requiring special knowledge to fill it successfully. What this special place is, that I claim man occupies in the process of evolution, I shall now explain.

Evolution, as I understand it, consists in the mind substance seizing upon matter—atoms—and forming them into combinations, these combinations becoming more complex as evolution progresses. While this process of combinations is carried on according to well defined laws, and is controlled by the mind, as explained in "The Nature of the Mind", its results are predetermined by potentialities inherent in the constitution of the mind substance, and these results can no more be changed than natural laws can be abrogated.

Part of these potentialities could be worked out by what we call the natural process, that is by a process involving no consci-

ousness of desires in the agents employed in the work of evolution, but when all these potentialities which could thus be worked out had come to an end, the potentialities for further combinations were very far from being exhausted, and a conscious agent—one conscious of more complex desires—able and desirous to combine natural results into artificial combinations, was needed to carry on to its limits the work of evolution.

This agent is man, a natural product of evolution, who is now engaged in making combinations which we call artificial, not but what they are made according to natural law, but as a means of distinguishing them from those by which they were preceded. With the advent of man, a new factor of progress made its appearance upon the earth, and this factor was the development of sensations into consciousness, increasing the complexity and intensity of the desires of men, and compelling the development of man so that his desires might be satisfied.

The advent of man—a highly conscious organism—was necessary to the working out of the law of progress, which I defined in "The Nature of the Mind" in these terms: *Increasing capacity of feeling, and increasing capacity of knowing, make an endless chain of progress, which will come to an end only when every potentiality will have been worked out.*

It is because I claim that such an organism, capable of feeling more complex sensations, is needed to carry out the work of evolution, that I believe it to be the function of man upon earth. I see that since the advent of man, numberless artificial combinations have been evolved, becoming more and more complex as man increases in consciousness and intelligence. I can see also that the potentiality of these artificial combinations is very far from being exhausted; and looking at these facts conjointly with the further fact, that according to my theory, evolution in the past has consisted in the formation of natural combinations of increasing complexity, I claim that the theory that man is nothing more than an agent for the evolution of artificial combinations is the most plausible, and accords better with known facts than any other with which I am acquainted.

This theory does not apply only, as one might suppose, to material artificial combinations, such as clothing, houses, railroads, etc., but it applies just as well to social combinations, such as the family, city, county, state or nation, said social combinations being evolved under precisely the same laws, and by processes exactly the same.

It is evident that this question of the true place of mankind in nature, has an important bearing upon Conduct. What I have said at the beginning of this chapter, that there can be but one law of conduct for the whole Universe, can only apply to man if it can be shown that his position here in no way differs, except through

a higher development, from that of all the other combinations by which he has been preceded.

That is not possible if the old belief is true, that the earth and all it contains has been created for man. In that case, there would be a fundamental difference between man and all other created things, and an entirely different law of conduct from that which applies to plants and animals would have to be promulgated for his benefit. This is the Christian belief, which entails upon man the possibility of sin, which does not exist for plants or animals, because man alone was endowed with sufficient knowledge to be responsible to the creator for his actions. Such a belief cannot be entertained by those who accept the theory of evolution, and I see no other explanation possible for them, except that which I have stated here, that the special position of man on earth is not due to a special creation, but to a higher state of development, fitting him to do a special work, but in no way withdrawing him from the control of the forces which guide and direct the actions of the less developed organisms.

CHAPTER II.

THE PROBLEM.

There is a fundamental difference in the problem of Conduct, as it presents itself to the man who believes in fiat creation, or to the man who believes in evolution.

To the believer in fiat creation, the problem resolves itself in finding out the will of the creator, and obeying his commands to the best of his ability. Obedience, and not intelligence, is for him the foundation upon which the law of conduct is based.

To the believer in evolution the problem is much more complicated. Man is no longer the product of an outside power, which promulgates arbitrary rules to control his life, but a highly complex and sensitive organism, possessing within itself the necessary knowledge to control his own actions, and the study of the law of conduct is part of the process by which he acquires a greater amount of knowledge which enables him to overcome the ever-increasing difficulties due to more complex surrounding conditions.

The change in the problem, thus caused by a change in belief, is that it no longer consists in studying the will of God, and finding a correct interpretation thereof, but in studying the march of progress up to the present time, so that by using the inductive method, we may learn from past experience the form of conduct which will enable us best to fill the position in which we find ourselves placed.

If by the power of imagination, we look back far enough to bring before our mind's eye the epochs which have preceded the evolution of our solar system, we find that our knowledge of the conditions which then existed, is practically null. But by observing present phenomena, astronomers have concluded that the hypothesis that at one time our system was in a gaseous state, is sufficiently plausible to be accepted, and I take it as my starting point. Not because it is fundamental to my theory, but because we must start somewhere, and that is as good a point as any other.

Starting then from the nebular theory—and to bring the starting point nearer the present time would not weaken the argument—we find that at one time our whole solar system was in a gaseous state, manifesting no attributes that we could recognize except motion and heat. To-day, the same nebulous substance has transformed itself, at least as far as the earth is concerned, into a solid mass, upon the surface of which we find organisms possessing life, sensations, consciousness, knowledge, intelligence, force and motion.

This transformation has not taken place through external agencies, but through an inherent process which must be self-existent and self-operative; and the sum total of the successive changes which have thus taken place, must be scientifically considered as the conduct of the aggregate of mind and matter with which we find ourselves connected, and the study of conduct to be complete, would involve the study of all these changes, in so far as we could obtain knowledge of the manner in which they were effected.

This is too vast a subject for me to undertake, and I refer to it only because it is of the utmost importance to our investigations, that we should keep this truth in sight if we would arrive at a correct conclusion. Just as in the "Nature of the Mind", I have shown that the recognition of the possession of mind by the cell, leads logically to a belief in the Universal Mind, so the recognition that there is a law of conduct which applies to the relation of the cells to the subordinate organisms, will lead to the logical conclusion that the same law applies to the relation of the individuals to the social organism, that is, that it applies to social conduct, which is the form of conduct of which individuals are now the most ignorant.

One word of explanation here may be of use. The study of social conduct is the one which must at this time attract our greatest attention, not because it is intrinsically of greater importance than what I shall call individual conduct, but because we already possess all possible knowledge as to individual conduct—meaning by that term the relation of the cells to the subordinate organisms, and of the subordinate organisms to the individual.

Individual conduct has been evolved in ages long gone by, and has been so tested and experimented upon as to leave no room for improvement, while social conduct is yet in the experimental

stage, and in process of evolution, and now is the time for us to gain and make use of knowledge upon the subject.

The numerous failures in individual conduct, which are constantly brought to our notice, do not come, as is too often supposed, from defects in the subordinate organisms, but usually from the strain placed upon the individual by a faulty social organization. All the subordinate organisms—as the eye, the lungs, the heart, etc.—are as perfect of their kind, and as well adapted to the work they have to perform, as is compatible with the attributes of mind and matter, and their aggregation in an individual organism is the best which the mind could devise, but we are yet deficient in the knowledge which would enable us to adjust our social relations, so that they may harmonize with our individual powers, and it is on that account that at this stage of evolution, it is the study of social conduct which is of chief importance.

I have said that all the changes which have taken place from the nebulous state to our present condition, have been due to inherent forces, that is to inside forces existing at all times in the solar system, and compelling to action. Our first inquiry then, is whether these actions have an aim, or are they without purpose?

All sociologists now recognize that all sentient beings have a very clearly defined aim for their actions. That aim is the increase of pleasant sensations, or its equivalent, the decrease of unpleasant sensations; and in man that aim has been dignified by the name of the pursuit of happiness. As most sociologists do not recognize inanimate objects as sentient organisms, they had to find another law to control their conduct, and they say that they move in the direction of the least resistance. Thus we find them denying at the start the fundamental truth I have stated, that there can be but one law of conduct for all possible combinations. I suppose that many of them would be willing to acknowledge that for men the pursuit of happiness always leads in the direction of the least resistance, but they would laugh at the idea that for inanimate things, the line of the least resistance leads in the direction of pleasant sensations.

And here I must again refer the reader to my work on "The Nature of the Mind", for I cannot go over the arguments to show that mind is omni-present, and always controls the actions of inanimate things, as well as of those organisms which we call sentient beings, and I simply assert here that the seeking for pleasant sensations, and the moving in the direction of the least resistance are one and the same thing, and that either or both are the aim of all possible conduct, and that the highest development of that seeking for pleasant sensations—which we call the pursuit of happiness—is the only possible aim of social conduct, and that all social actions refer to it. I claim more than that. All social actions must be judged by it. It is the court of last resort which passes judgment upon all the actions of men.

As we proceed with our inquiries, we will find this statement of the utmost importance, because as the evolutionist has no longer a standard of conduct imposed upon him by an outside power, it must be replaced by an inward one, which can be applied to all actions, and can adapt itself to all conditions. The pursuit of pleasant sensations is just such a standard. It exists in the cell, which alone knows its own sensations, and strives for pleasant ones; it exists in the subordinate organisms, and guides all their actions; it becomes more insistent, more complex, more difficult of attainment in the individual. Its highest development, however, is reached in the social organisms, and it is because of the difficulty of harmonizing the desires of the individuals that compose society that we are confronted by the social problem.

The problem which is thus placed before us, is how to establish such relations between individuals, as will result in a steady increase in the number and persistence of pleasant sensations. To accomplish this, we must first acquaint ourselves with the process by which these pleasant sensations have been promoted through conduct affecting the relations of the subordinate organisms, being well assured that if we acquire correct knowledge of the laws which control individual conduct, we can use the knowledge to control social conduct as well.

The problem of social conduct is a very difficult one, because it cannot be solved without taking in consideration the increase of pleasant sensations of the cells, of the subordinate organisms, and of the individuals. For let it be well understood at the start, that there can be no increase of social happiness based upon a decrease in the sum total of individual happiness, nor any increase of individual happiness based upon a decrease in the sum total of pleasant sensations in the cells. But while this makes it more difficult, yet the problem is possible of solution, for the same process which has brought us to the present state of civilization, is the process which has brought us to the present state of civilization.

"Be happy, and you will be good", and the sooner the change is made, both individually and socially, the sooner shall we arrive at an harmonious state of society.

I must repeat here a statement I have already made in several of my books, to wit: That sensations defy definition. They are the fundamental fact of existence. We exist to ourselves only because we feel, and we know that we exist only because sensations develop into consciousness. If there were no sensations, or if sensations were all alike, there would be no law of conduct, for it would not matter to us how we conducted ourselves, as any kind of conduct would have the same result to us, so far as pain or pleasure were concerned.

But if sensations cannot be defined, we all know without being told, that there are pleasant and unpleasant sensations. We know it, we recognize it, and we instinctively desire pleasant sensations and dread unpleasant ones, and this power to feel, which exists all through the Universe—in a state of greater or lesser development, as the combinations are more or less complex—is the only foundation upon which a law of conduct can be built. This power to feel is one of the attributes of this mind substance which permeates the whole Universe, and is the faculty which enables it to guide the organism in the direction where there is a possibility of increasing pleasant sensations.

In accepting pleasant sensations as a guide to right conduct, we must bear in mind that while we can and must be the judges of what causes us pleasant sensations, we can have no personal knowledge of what causes pleasant or unpleasant sensations to others. The food that will be one man's meat, may be another man's poison. The book one reader will greatly enjoy may seem insufferably dull to another. Pleasant sensations are an individual

must be exercised with great judgment. And yet I may state here, that the exercise of this right of resistance is necessary to progress.

The explanation of this seeming contradiction is found by studying the cause of pleasant sensations. They are due to *harmonious actions*, that is to actions which are in harmony with the potentiality of the development of the Universe.

Pleasant sensations are due primarily to action. It is easy to prove that there can be no sensations without action. Action, motion, life, is the law of existence, the one manifestation of mind substance which is found in all phenomena. Scientists have found it in the most compact substances, and claim that atoms are kept in a state of perpetual motion. Without going into such deep investigations, we all know that it is true, so far as we are personally concerned. Thinking, breathing, digesting, are going on incessantly, and we know by our feelings that whenever we experience pleasant sensations, it is in conjunction with actions. Music pleases us because it vibrates some special nerve calculated to be set in motion by sound; we enjoy eating because it gives occupation to our digestive powers; seeing is the work of the eye; exercise the work of our limbs. In fact it is not possible to think of sensations except in connection with some form of action.

But all actions are not equally pleasant. Some of them are indeed accompanied by very unpleasant sensations, and investigation shows that it is because they are not in harmony with the line of conduct which must be followed to work out the potentialities which exist in the Universe; at least I have never been able to find any other reasons why some actions should be pleasant and others unpleasant. It is easy enough to say that a decayed tooth, or an ingrowing nail, or an inflamed eye, hurt because they are abnormal conditions, but it is very plain to me that if any of these things were necessary to the full development of man, and in harmony with the potentialities of the development of the Universe, they would cause pleasant instead of unpleasant sensations. If all the teeth were decayed, and they could give better service than sound teeth, we would see nothing wrong in them. We call them defective because they do not answer the purpose for which teeth were evolved.

It is on that account that the pursuit of pleasant sensations is the key to the right standard of conduct. It leads us obligatorily to those actions which are in the line of progress, and as progress is controlled by one mind, and obeys the same laws, it naturally follows that it must lead us to harmonious action; not only harmonious individual action, but to harmonious social action. The old maxim: "Be good, and you will be happy", can never give us a reliable standard of conduct, because there is no reliable standard of goodness, all such standards being based upon the knowledge of men, and sure to be faulty; while the new maxim: "Be

happy, and you will be good", is certain to lead us right, because each and every one of us has implanted within himself, through his ability to feel, an unerring standard, and by obeying it, he must arrive at that line of conduct which, if I am correct in stating that pleasant sensations lead to harmony, must lead him to that form of conduct which will place him in harmony with his surroundings.

And now I will try to explain briefly why it is due to the fact that *harmonious* actions alone can produce pleasant sensations, that it is so difficult to evolve a right line of conduct, and that there is need of resistance to collective control. If this were not a world of constant change or progress, it would not be the case; but there is no such thing as reaching a permanent equilibrium so long as all possible combinations have not been evolved, because this constant evolution, as I have remarked, is only made possible by increased capacity of feeling and knowing.

This process, as far as we know, has been going on from the earliest and most simple combinations, but it has now reached that stage where the contest is waged between the individual and society, and the first thing we must recognize is that harmony does not exist, and in fact that it cannot exist so long as all social potentialities have not been worked out, for as soon as harmony shall be reached, progress will cease.

Progress is due to an increased capacity for feeling and knowing, not in society as a whole, but in the individuals of which it is composed. It is well understood now by sociologists, that social institutions always harmonize as near as possible with the average power of feeling, and the average knowledge of the individuals who compose society, but as there is always a certain number of persons who progress faster than others, it follows that when any of them progress beyond their fellow citizens, it must break the harmony between them and existing social institutions, and as soon as this harmony is broken, it must result in unpleasant sensations, as it precludes for them the possibility of harmonious social actions. But here comes into play the law of progress, which induces these individuals to restore harmony so as to escape unpleasant sensations.

Theoretically there are two ways to restore harmonious action. One is for these progressive persons to retrograde to their former condition, but practically that is not possible. Progress is a growth, and you might as well force back the limbs into the tree, as to destroy the increased capacity to feel and to know. The other alternative is for them to develop the social organism, until it is once more in harmony with the state of development these progressive persons have reached.

This is the line of conduct adopted, and to it is due the progress of social development. We can trace it in all past reforms, we see it at work now, and the great advantage of recognizing this fact

is that it enables us to understand the social conflict, and so control our conduct that we may help progress the most, at the cost of the least amount of loss in harmonious relations. The advantage of the increase of intelligence is to diminish the expenditure of efforts, and to increase the amount of results. That is true of all lines of progress. It is true in economics and in mechanics, and will prove just as true in social progress. For lack of knowledge, men have wasted till now an immense amount of effort in reform work; let us see to it from this on that our efforts are so directed as to give the best possible results.

CHAPTER IV.

INDIVIDUAL CONDUCT.

I have stated in a preceding chapter that I divide conduct into individual and social conduct, and I wish now to define as nearly as possible the difference I make between them.

It must be remembered that in the first chapter, I have stated that I extend the meaning of the word conduct, to many actions which are not so usually considered, and it is to these actions that I give the name of individual conduct. There can be no doubt that in a strictly scientific sense, all actions have an influence upon the social organism, yet some of them have so much influence upon the individual, and so little upon society, that a clear distinction can be made between them. Considering as I do, the breathing of the lungs as part of conduct, the question might be asked whether it is individual or social conduct? It is evident to any person acquainted with sociological laws, that a nation whose individuals possess good strong lungs, well adapted to perform the work expected from them, will, all other things being equal, be more successful and accomplish more than another nation whose individuals are not so well endowed, and to that extent breathing can be called social conduct; yet if out of the millions who compose the nation, all should be possessors of strong lungs except one, the result to the nation could not be appreciated, while it would probably be fatal to the happiness of the one individual. On that account I hold that breathing must be considered as individual conduct.

By applying this line of reasoning, we can easily decide what we shall call individual conduct, yet as the distinction is an arbitrary one, we must recognize a class of actions as being both individual and social. For instance it would seem that education is individual action, which concerns most the separate individualities, and yet experience has shown that with the development of

progress, education has such an influence upon social success, that society has found it necessary to take it under its control, and to that extent it has become a part of social conduct. What is true of education is true of many other forms of conduct, but I shall not at present treat of those actions which partake of both classifications, but confine myself to those actions which are so clearly individual, that society has never taken them under its control.

The first thing of importance to notice is, that all sensations start from the cell. On account of the little study we have given to these questions, we are apt to believe that sensations are the attribute of the individual, or at least of the subordinate organisms, but it is an error which must be corrected. We make somewhat the same mistake as to the social organism, but here we have no trouble to recognize it when it is pointed out to us. We say, for instance, that the audience at the theatre was well pleased, but we easily understand that it is not the audience as a whole which was pleased, but the individuals of which the audience was composed, and that what we meant was that the largest portion of the individuals had enjoyed the play, for it may have been quite possible that some of them did not enjoy it at all. This we easily understand, because it is evident to our senses that an audience is composed of separate individuals, each qualified to feel different sensations, yet there are but few persons sufficiently acquainted with biology to recognize that each and every individual in that audience who enjoyed the play, did so because the cells of which these individuals are composed were enjoying pleasant sensations, and that they could not have enjoyed themselves had it been otherwise. Yet this is a fundamental fact in conduct, and of the greatest importance if we accept the pursuit of pleasant sensations as its correct standard.

I have, in the last chapter of "The Nature of the Mind", in speaking of the Universal Mind, shown the great difference that exists between the autocratic and the democratic conception of the Universe, and the same idea is involved when we study the question as to who or what is to be made to feel pleasant sensations. According to the autocratic idea of government, if the rulers or those high in authority were pleased, it did not matter much whether the people were satisfied or not; but the new democratic idea, which is slowly taking possession of humanity, is that the government must please the people, and has no rights superior to those of the citizens for whose benefit it has been organized. What is true in politics is also true in religion. The aim of conduct, according to the old idea of religion was to please God, without giving any consideration to the desires of the worshippers, but the new idea of the Universal Mind is that it permeates all things, and that there is no way to do its will except by seeking to increase the number of pleasant sensations.

As there are probably many persons who believe that such a change in belief, both as to government and as to religion, must be revolutionary in its nature, I would say here that it is a mistake, and that really it will be very slow to affect conduct. The cause is plain and easily understood. Our beliefs do not change the nature of things. The most ardent believer in the duty of man to obey the will of God, has within himself an innumerable quantity of cells, which know nothing of his religious beliefs, and care less, and which rebel and protest against all such conduct as causes them unpleasant sensations, precisely as the most abject nation will protest against too despotic a use of power at the hands of its rulers.

Let me point out here a very interesting parallel between the conduct of the cells and that of the individuals. The lesser the degree of development attained by the cells, the less sensitive they are—which means that they are not easily affected by pleasant or unpleasant sensations—and the greater their submission to arbitrary control exerted by their own ignorant brains. And these same undeveloped cells constitute individuals who allow themselves to be ruled by other individuals, who are just as ignorant of the knowledge which makes safe rulers, as their subjects are ignorant of the knowledge which would enable them to make good citizens. The control of the citizens by their rulers, let them be kings, representatives, or simply appointed agents, is exactly of the same nature as the control of the cells of the subordinate organisms by the stronger and better informed cells of the brain. Lack of development in both cases is the source of submission to control, which for them, does not increase pleasant sensations.

The chief advantage of the recognition of the democratic idea both in individual conduct and in government, is that it opens the way for greater improvement. Undeveloped individuals, ignorant of the laws which govern their conduct, will submit for a long time to control which prevents them from attaining the goal of their desires, and their progress is retarded by foolish superstitions, while more developed individuals will not accept such unproven assertions, and only submit to such control as will help them to attain the desired ends, and thus enable them to progress much more efficiently.

This change in belief, by changing the standard of conduct, will enable the individuals to give up many lines of conduct which have until now, only prevented them from attaining a state of more harmonious relations, and will replace it by actions much more in accord with human desires. But this transition cannot be a quick one, for it depends upon the development of the individuals, which is always according to the slow process of evolution. There is no doubt that the ultimate result will be great changes in human institutions and in the organization of society, but it will not be greater or more sudden than the change from the use

of horses to that of steam for purposes of heavy transportation.

While the fundamental fact in individual conduct is that the cell alone is capable of feeling, and that individual sensation is only the aggregate of cell sensations, we must at the same time recognize that the single cell is in itself incapable of increasing its power of sensation. The single cell is the most helpless of organizations, and all its power comes from combination. This is a further proof of the unity of all progress, for now we have three factors of progress closely united together. Evolution is due to the formation of more and more complex combinations; these combinations are controlled by pleasant sensations; pleasant sensations can only be increased by increasing the complexity of combinations.

Combination is only possible through organization, and both united are the law of progress, and submission to this law is the price we have to pay for the increase of pleasant sensations. The individual is the result of the combination of the cells duly organized, which greatly increase the range of cell-sensations, and society is the result of combinations of individuals duly organized, also increasing the range of cell-sensations.

While it is true that sensation starts in the cells, and that the aim of conduct must be to increase their pleasant sensations, it is just as true that this result cannot be obtained without obedience to control, first of the Universal Mind, next of society, and lastly of the individual organism. All intelligent citizens recognize that obedience to law is as much a condition of a republic as of an autocratic government, and in fact, implicit obedience is more naturally expected from the free citizen, because the laws of his government are more in harmony with his desires than those of an autocratic government, and in the same way the believer in an Universal Mind will not feel nearly so inclined to rebel against its control as the believer in a personal God.

Let us then remember in this study of the law of conduct, that an increase of pleasant sensations is only possible through combination and organization, and that if we want more happiness, we must look for it by seeking to improve present combinations in the direction of more harmonious relations. And as this result has been practically achieved in individual conduct, I will study its organization in the individual, so that we may apply such knowledge as we may gain to the organization of the social organism, well assured that it will result in an increase of pleasant sensations.

CHAPTER V.

CREATION VERSUS EVOLUTION.

I would not have my readers believe that I am inimical to the form of conduct which has been built upon a belief in creation. There is nothing of the iconoclast about me, and I recognize fully that all persons accept those beliefs which are most in harmony with their knowledge, and the faculties of which they are possessed. But as there are many persons who have outgrown the belief in creation, I wish to show them how fundamental is the difference between it and the belief in evolution, and how great a change it must make in the basis upon which we must build our new law of conduct.

We are in a time of transition. Twenty-five years ago very few persons had accepted the theory of evolution, and I doubt if any one had an idea that this new theory would affect in any way the conduct of individuals. To-day, not only a large number of persons have accepted fully this new theory, but a far greater number yet are in a state of doubt, many of them, through some process of mental gymnastics, accepting both a belief in creation and in evolution. They claim to see in evolution a mode of creation, or as they express it, evolution is the way in which God works. That is the incoherency of transition, a state of mind that must be expected whenever any important change takes place in our knowledge, but which can be passed through much quicker if we help each other to investigate the relations of our beliefs to our everyday actions. It is then, not in a spirit of hostility to the belief in creation that I shall contrast it with the belief in evolution, but to show my readers how incompatible they are to each other, and to impress upon them the necessity of making a choice between the two.

According to the history of creation, God created man in his own image, and when created, breathed the spirit of life into him. It matters little to me whether it is held that Adam was the first man, or that Eve was formed out of one of his ribs. The principle of creation is what I am discussing, and I do not see that it will change it if we modify the legend of the creation of the first man, so as to make it agree with the better knowledge we now possess of the antiquity of the human race.

Creation means that the creator had a plan, and that this plan involved the bringing into the world a being complete in all its parts, and that when this earthly shell had been completed, the active, living spirit would be placed within it. This implies several things. First that the relations between the different parts of said individuals were relations of design and not of use. The designer had a plan, but did not test his plan till all parts were created, and the spirit of life breathed into them. I may point out here

that no man of intelligence can believe that such a thing has taken place, but I am not at present showing the impossibility of believing in such miraculous action, but I am dealing with the principle involved, and the relation which must necessarily exist between the creator and the individual created.

It implies also that the relations between the different individuals are of the same nature. Society according to creation, can not be a growth, or the result of evolution any more than the individuals. Just as the relations of the different parts of individuals must have been decided before hand, so must it be with the relations between the different individuals who compose society.

It is evident then that the conduct of such individuals, and of such a society, can in no way be controlled by a desire for pleasant sensations. One single idea must control them, the desire to do the will of the creator, and so far as the social organism is concerned, all the efforts of the individuals must be directed to putting themselves in those relations which were formulated before hand for them. Out of this belief in creation must logically follow a belief in social institutions ordained of God, such as government by kings, religious ordinances and marriage sacraments. And as an inducement to obedience, just as logically followed the maxim I have already quoted: "Be good and you will be happy". Happiness was not, and could not be the reward of work well done for the benefit of self, but the reward of doing the will of the creator.

If my readers will reflect an instant they will readily see that it is the only logical position that a believer in creation can take, and I have always claimed that the Christian belief, as taught in the Bible, is logical throughout. The dogma of creation necessitates a belief in the devil to explain the fall of man, and the fall of man explains the unwillingness of the created to do the will of the creator. This disobedience of man to the will of God—represented as antagonistic to man's innate desire for pleasant sensations—necessitates places of future rewards and punishments, which in turn called for the sacrifice of Christ, when man had sufficiently developed to refuse to longer believe in the justice of his own damnation on account of the fall of Adam. Those who still accept this explanation are much more logical, as they really believe in creation, than the present expounders of the higher criticisms, and the advocates of what is called a higher religion. These new interpretations, which accept what they choose and explain away what is distasteful to them, are undoubtedly much more pleasant to the educated mind, but they are exceedingly illogical, and being the result of a transitory state, their hold on mankind will be very short lived.

Evolution teaches a very different lesson, and leads to an entirely different conclusion. Man is no longer constructed in a lump, with all its parts complete; a physical organism disconnected from

its spirit, both at war with each other when finally united, the spirit willing to do the will of the creator, while the physical organism craves pleasant sensations, and seeks its own satisfaction. Man is on the contrary the result of a slow growth, and his several parts have been carefully tested as the process of evolution was going on; this process being carried on by the mind which is the active factor in evolution. And the social institutions have been, and are being evolved by the same process, and are nothing more nor less than the result of the organization of the individuals into society, and subject to changes, not according to the will of the creator, but according to the desires and knowledge of the individuals who are organizing society.

As the present stage of social evolution can be only a continuation of a former process, and must be carried on by the same methods and in answer to the same forces, I will try here to briefly describe what I believe to have been the process of evolution, as contrasted to what is claimed to have been the process of creation.

The smallest living combination of which we can take cognizance is the cell, and physiologists tell us that all men start in a single cell, and I personally claim that thus also started the combination which was eventually to evolve into man. And here I would say that the only difference I see between the present evolution of every human being, and that of the race, is a difference of knowledge and of time. The individual now profits from the knowledge acquired by his past ancestors, and accomplishes his evolution from the single cell to the fully developed man in some twenty years, while the race, having to test its knowledge at every step, has been a great many thousand years—how many we do not know—in evolving from the original cell to the present state. We find the parallel of this phenomenon in the evolution of governments. It has taken England probably one thousand years to reach her present stage of political government, but her colonies—progeny—New Zealand for instance, has reached as high, and possibly a more advanced stage, in less than fifty years, by profiting from the knowledge gained by the experience of its progenitors.

We can then represent to ourselves, by the power of imagination, the first human cell starting on its journey of development. That cell, unlike created man, was possessed of mind, that is of life, knowledge, desires, and then started to work out all its potentialities. One of its attributes was that of growth, that is of taking to itself and making its own, some of the material by which it was surrounded, and that attribute was brought into play by a desire for pleasant sensations. We are told by those who have made a study of the subject, that when the cell has grown large enough, it breaks in two, and the two separate cells remain united, making the first combination. Again let me remark here that the fact that they remain united shows that union causes

more pleasant sensations than separation, but that it also follows that, as there are the feelings of two cells instead of one to be consulted, it also means that there is less independence of action. It is important that we should notice these things as we go, for it is the first application of a principle which controls, not only the evolution of man, but of society. For it will be found that when the cell will have evolved into the man, and the men will have organized themselves into society, the same principles will be found to be effective, and will then assume an importance they do not seem to have in the first stage of evolution.

The first combination of two cells does not stop there, but it continues to grow, and cell after cell is added, until it can no longer grow by this simple process of breaking off of cells, so a process of differentiation of functions takes place. This process goes on till the result is the physical combination we call man, an aggregate of subordinate organisms, each entrusted with a special function, and all contributing their share toward the welfare of the complete organism. It is not, however, my intention to explain here what these special functions are, but to show the relation which exists between this process of evolution and the law of conduct I am investigating.

As we all know, there is a great tendency to conflict, not only between man and man, but between the different subordinate organisms of which man is composed, and it is in explaining the causes of these differences, and in teaching the way to greater harmony, that is found the chief difference between the teachings of the belief in creation, and those of a belief in evolution. According to the Bible, the conflict comes from the disobedience of man to the laws of God, and the way to harmony lays through a surrender of our desires, and a greater obedience to the commands which have been revealed to us by those who have been specially appointed to promulgate the will of the creator. But according to the evolution theory, the conflict comes from the difference in needs and desires of the cells, resulting in a like difference in men, and from our ignorance of the best methods by which these differences can be harmonized, so that we may all enjoy the greatest number of pleasant sensations; and the way to better conduct lays through more knowledge and a greater determination to use all the forces of nature for our benefit.

Thus the relation between the process of evolution and the law of conduct, is that a knowledge of this process enables us to listen to our desires, and instead of spending our energies in a useless fight against our inherited nature, we are taught that it is a duty which we owe both to ourselves and to society, to develop our powers and put them into use to the full extent of our ability.

Evolution liberates us from a thousand outside restrictions, said to have been imposed upon us by the creator, for his own glory and pleasure, but it does not free us from the need of organiza-

tion and self-control, imposed upon us by the conditions of existence, and the desire within us for an increase of pleasant sensations. In fact, the more we study the question of conduct in the light of evolution, the more do we find that we pass from the control of an outside force, to that of a force within us, which compels us to train ourselves, that we may develop all our potentialities, so as to enjoy all the happiness within our reach under the present conditions.

CHAPTER VI.

ORGANIZATION.

The object of organization is to establish a correct relation between the different parts of a combination, in view of providing the best possible means for accomplishing the purpose for which that combination has been evolved. Organization is then the basis of correct conduct, for conduct is the relation of actions to results. This means then that correct action depends largely upon correct organization.

Organization being thus a factor of great importance in conduct, I will devote this chapter to its study. I will study now only the organization of the individual, with the purpose of using such knowledge as we may thus gain, to increasing our knowledge of the organization of society.

To the Christian, organization is the result of the will of the creator, to the materialist it is the result of law and chance, but to me it is the result of the intelligence possessed by the mind, which is the efficient factor in evolution.

The living mind in the cell, which is the starting point for the individual, possesses all the latent knowledge needed for its development; it possesses sensations and desires, and the power of appropriation. It possesses more than that; it has a potentiality, which means that the line of its development is already fixed, and will be worked out as it exercises its faculties. The man-cell cannot develop into a plant or an animal, for it would not know how, and if it did, it would not be the line of development that would cause it the greatest number of pleasant sensations.

I have said before that the original cell increases, breaks in two, and that the two cells unite. This union is the first manifestation of the process of organization. As cell is added to cell, and finally differentiation of subordinate organisms takes place, organization keeps pace with it, till the many different structures which compose man are thus evolved.

All these subordinate organisms have been evolved capable of fulfilling different functions, but all have the same purpose in

view, which is an increase of pleasant sensations to the aggregate organism; and the disposing of these several organisms in the best relation to each other, is the process we call organization.

Organization then means first the evolution of the subordinate organisms, not for their own benefit, but for the good of the aggregate organism. The lungs, for instance, are not a parasite, placed within man to be fed from his blood and carried about by his limbs, for their own satisfaction, but they have been evolved for a special purpose, to wit: to furnish the whole organism with such nourishment as can be extracted from the air. And to simply evolve the lungs is not all of organization; they had to be evolved in their proper position, and so connected with all other subordinate organisms, that all might work harmoniously together, and furnish the maximum of results with the minimum of efforts, and also that they might receive the proper nourishment, and proper protection from outside dangers. The taking in consideration of all these factors, and the construction of an aggregate organism where the best conditions can be attained, is then what we call organization, and it is clear to any one that it requires the highest development of intelligence to effect a successful organization.

In this process of evolution and organization, many different results had to be secured. Not only were all the subordinate organisms to be so constructed as to make them efficient agents for the work which was to be required from them, but they were to be so connected that their control should be placed in the power of the aggregate organism, for whose benefit they had been evolved. To leave them free to act or not act as they chose, would have been to introduce an independent power within the organism, which might refuse to act in time of need or danger. This efficient control is effected by the nervous system, and is extended as well over the vegetative as the voluntary organisms; the supervision of the vegetative organisms being in charge of the great sympathetic nerve, while the control of the voluntary organisms is the work of the brain.

Organization must also provide for the nourishment of all these subordinate organisms, for the force which they use must be restored to them. For that purpose, a most complicated net work of arteries and veins has been evolved, not only carrying food wherever needed, but also taking off the waste as fast as thrown off.

But possibly the most difficult part of the problem of development, was to provide these subordinate organisms with the right incentive to action. For while it is possible for the believer in creation, to conceive of the creator issuing his commands upon these organisms to act in unison with each other, such a belief is not possible for those who accept the theory of evolution, and of development through inward forces. Subordinate organisms must then be impelled to act by the same motive which actuates the aggregate organism, to wit: the desire for pleasant sensations.

Subordinate organisms then must be so organized, that not only will they do the work required from them, but they will find pleasure in doing it. This result has been fully attained. In a healthy individual there is not one of the subordinate organisms but what takes pleasure in action. The aggregate organism, it is true, is not strongly conscious of this pleasure, yet we recognize it, first, because the exercise of any of our faculties is the source of pleasant sensations, and usually the recognition that we enjoy pleasant sensations comes from the aggregate of feelings caused by numerous unconscious pleasant sensations; and in the second place there is a state of being which is experienced by every healthy person, when we feel that life is enjoyable for its own sake, when we are glad that we are living, said state being caused by the simple healthy working of the vegetative organisms.

This is what I call the positive proof that subordinate organisms enjoy pleasant sensations, but there is a negative proof which is too strong to be discarded. It is the ability of subordinate organisms to suffer unpleasant sensations. This we all have experienced, and been made aware of. In my estimation, the reason we are intensely conscious of the pain, and only dimly conscious of the pleasure of the subordinate, and especially of the vegetative organisms, is that when they are in a healthy state they require no special attention, the feeling of general satisfaction I have before mentioned being a sufficient reward, but when in an unhealthy state, it is imperative that the aggregate organism should be notified of the fact, so that the defective conduct may be changed, and the proper relation re-established.

I think it will be conceded by any person who is acquainted with the structure of man, that he is an example of the highest possible form of organization, and with my definition of individual conduct, I feel that I am justified in saying that it is not greater knowledge of individual conduct which we chiefly need, but a knowledge of social conduct, which would prevent us from asking from our subordinate organisms, actions for which they have not been evolved. Take a healthy child, to whom his parents have given proper parentage, and healthy pre-natal conditions, place him where he will not suffer from the defects of civilization, give him plenty of pure air to breathe, of healthy food to eat, of such exercise as is natural to him, free him from the influences of his fellow-beings, and I do not see how his structure or formation could be improved, or what could prevent his individual conduct from being perfectly correct.

But man is a social being, and was not evolved to live alone, or spend his days in idle enjoyments. He has a task to accomplish, the civilization of the world, which presents to him many new social problems which call for greater powers of organization. For lack of them, he strains his subordinate organisms, and asks from them tasks for which they are not fitted. Thus he spends

of horses to that of steam for purposes of heavy transportation.

While the fundamental fact in individual conduct is that the cell alone is capable of feeling, and that individual sensation is only the aggregate of cell sensations, we must at the same time recognize that the single cell is in itself incapable of increasing its power of sensation. The single cell is the most helpless of organizations, and all its power comes from combination. This is a further proof of the unity of all progress, for now we have three factors of progress closely united together. Evolution is due to the formation of more and more complex combinations; these combinations are controlled by pleasant sensations; pleasant sensations can only be increased by increasing the complexity of combinations.

Combination is only possible through organization, and both united are the law of progress, and submission to this law is the price we have to pay for the increase of pleasant sensations. The individual is the result of the combination of the cells duly organized, which greatly increase the range of cell-sensations, and society is the result of combinations of individuals duly organized, also increasing the range of cell-sensations.

While it is true that sensation starts in the cells, and that the aim of conduct must be to increase their pleasant sensations, it is just as true that this result cannot be obtained without obedience to control, first of the Universal Mind, next of society, and lastly of the individual organism. All intelligent citizens recognize that obedience to law is as much a condition of a republic as of an autocratic government, and in fact, implicit obedience is more naturally expected from the free citizen, because the laws of his government are more in harmony with his desires than those of an autocratic government, and in the same way the believer in an Universal Mind will not feel nearly so inclined to rebel against its control as the believer in a personal God.

Let us then remember in this study of the law of conduct, that an increase of pleasant sensations is only possible through combination and organization, and that if we want more happiness, we must look for it by seeking to improve present combinations in the direction of more harmonious relations. And as this result has been practically achieved in individual conduct, I will study its organization in the individual, so that we may apply such knowledge as we may gain to the organization of the social organism, well assured that it will result in an increase of pleasant sensations.

CHAPTER V.

CREATION VERSUS EVOLUTION.

I would not have my readers believe that I am inimical to the form of conduct which has been built upon a belief in creation. There is nothing of the iconoclast about me, and I recognize fully that all persons accept those beliefs which are most in harmony with their knowledge, and the faculties of which they are possessed. But as there are many persons who have outgrown the belief in creation, I wish to show them how fundamental is the difference between it and the belief in evolution, and how great a change it must make in the basis upon which we must build our new law of conduct.

We are in a time of transition. Twenty-five years ago very few persons had accepted the theory of evolution, and I doubt if any one had an idea that this new theory would affect in any way the conduct of individuals. To-day, not only a large number of persons have accepted fully this new theory, but a far greater number yet are in a state of doubt, many of them, through some process of mental gymnastics, accepting both a belief in creation and in evolution. They claim to see in evolution a mode of creation, or as they express it, evolution is the way in which God works. That is the incoherency of transition, a state of mind that must be expected whenever any important change takes place in our knowledge, but which can be passed through much quicker if we help each other to investigate the relations of our beliefs to our everyday actions. It is then, not in a spirit of hostility to the belief in creation that I shall contrast it with the belief in evolution, but to show my readers how incompatible they are to each other, and to impress upon them the necessity of making a choice between the two.

According to the history of creation, God created man in his own image, and when created, breathed the spirit of life into him. It matters little to me whether it is held that Adam was the first man, or that Eve was formed out of one of his ribs. The principle of creation is what I am discussing, and I do not see that it will change it if we modify the legend of the creation of the first man, so as to make it agree with the better knowledge we now possess of the antiquity of the human race.

Creation means that the creator had a plan, and that this plan involved the bringing into the world a being complete in all its parts, and that when this earthly shell had been completed, the active, living spirit would be placed within it. This implies several things. First that the relations between the different parts of said individuals were relations of design and not of use. The designer had a plan, but did not test his plan till all parts were created, and the spirit of life breathed into them. I may point out here

that no man of intelligence can believe that such a thing has taken place, but I am not at present showing the impossibility of believing in such miraculous action, but I am dealing with the principle involved, and the relation which must necessarily exist between the creator and the individual created.

It implies also that the relations between the different individuals are of the same nature. Society according to creation, can not be a growth, or the result of evolution any more than the individuals. Just as the relations of the different parts of individuals must have been decided before hand, so must it be with the relations between the different individuals who compose society.

It is evident then that the conduct of such individuals, and of such a society, can in no way be controlled by a desire for pleasant sensations. One single idea must control them, the desire to do the will of the creator, and so far as the social organism is concerned, all the efforts of the individuals must be directed to putting themselves in those relations which were formulated before hand for them. Out of this belief in creation must logically follow a belief in social institutions ordained of God, such as government by kings, religious ordinances and marriage sacraments. And as an inducement to obedience, just as logically followed the maxim I have already quoted: "Be good and you will be happy". Happiness was not, and could not be the reward of work well done for the benefit of self, but the reward of doing the will of the creator.

If my readers will reflect an instant they will readily see that it is the only logical position that a believer in creation can take, and I have always claimed that the Christian belief, as taught in the Bible, is logical throughout. The dogma of creation necessitates a belief in the devil to explain the fall of man, and the fall of man explains the unwillingness of the created to do the will of the creator. This disobedience of man to the will of God—represented as antagonistic to man's innate desire for pleasant sensations—necessitates places of future rewards and punishments, which in turn called for the sacrifice of Christ, when man had sufficiently developed to refuse to longer believe in the justice of his own damnation, on account of the fall of Adam. Those who still accept this explanation are much more logical, as they really believe in creation, than the present expounders of the higher criticisms, and the advocates of what is called a higher religion. These new interpretations, which accept what they choose and explain away what is distasteful to them, are undoubtedly much more pleasant to the educated mind, but they are exceedingly illogical, and being the result of a transitory state, their hold on mankind will be very short lived.

Evolution teaches a very different lesson, and leads to an entirely different conclusion. Man is no longer constructed in a lump, with all its parts complete; a physical organism disconnected from

its spirit, both at war with each other when finally united, the spirit willing to do the will of the creator, while the physical organism craves pleasant sensations, and seeks its own satisfaction. Man is on the contrary the result of a slow growth, and his several parts have been carefully tested as the process of evolution was going on; this process being carried on by the mind which is the active factor in evolution. And the social institutions have been, and are being evolved by the same process, and are nothing more nor less than the result of the organization of the individuals into society, and subject to changes, not according to the will of the creator, but according to the desires and knowledge of the individuals who are organizing society.

As the present stage of social evolution can be only a continuation of a former process, and must be carried on by the same methods and in answer to the same forces, I will try here to briefly describe what I believe to have been the process of evolution, as contrasted to what is claimed to have been the process of creation.

The smallest living combination of which we can take cognizance is the cell, and physiologists tell us that all men start in a single cell, and I personally claim that thus also started the combination which was eventually to evolve into man. And here I would say that the only difference I see between the present evolution of every human being, and that of the race, is a difference of knowledge and of time. The individual now profits from the knowledge acquired by his past ancestors, and accomplishes his evolution from the single cell to the fully developed man in some twenty years, while the race, having to test its knowledge at every step, has been a great many thousand years—how many we do not know—in evolving from the original cell to the present state. We find the parallel of this phenomenon in the evolution of governments. It has taken England probably one thousand years to reach her present stage of political government, but her colonies—progeny—New Zealand for instance, has reached as high, and possibly a more advanced stage, in less than fifty years, by profiting from the knowledge gained by the experience of its progenitors.

We can then represent to ourselves, by the power of imagination, the first human cell starting on its journey of development. That cell, unlike created man, was possessed of mind, that is of life, knowledge, desires, and then started to work out all its potentialities. One of its attributes was that of growth, that is of taking to itself and making its own, some of the material by which it was surrounded, and that attribute was brought into play by a desire for pleasant sensations. We are told by those who have made a study of the subject, that when the cell has grown large enough, it breaks in two, and the two separate cells remain united, making the first combination. Again let me remark here that the fact that they remain united shows that union causes

more pleasant sensations than separation, but that it also follows that, as there are the feelings of two calls instead of one to be consulted, it also means that there is less independence of action. It is important that we should notice these things as we go, for it is the first application of a principle which controls, not only the evolution of man, but of society. For it will be found that when the cell will have evolved into the man, and the men will have organized themselves into society, the same principles will be found to be effective, and will then assume an importance they do not seem to have in the first stage of evolution.

The first combination of two cells does not stop there, but it continues to grow, and cell after cell is added, until it can no longer grow by this simple process of breaking off of cells, so a process of differentiation of functions takes place. This process goes on till the result is the physical combination we call man, an aggregate of subordinate organisms, each entrusted with a special function, and all contributing their share toward the welfare of the complete organism. It is not, however, my intention to explain here what these special functions are, but to show the relation which exists between this process of evolution and the law of conduct I am investigating.

As we all know, there is a great tendency to conflict, not only between man and man, but between the different subordinate organisms of which man is composed, and it is in explaining the causes of these differences, and in teaching the way to greater harmony, that is found the chief difference between the teachings of the belief in creation, and those of a belief in evolution. According to the Bible, the conflict comes from the disobedience of man to the laws of God, and the way to harmony lays through a surrender of our desires, and a greater obedience to the commands which have been revealed to us by those who have been specially appointed to promulgate the will of the creator. But according to the evolution theory, the conflict comes from the difference in needs and desires of the cells, resulting in a like difference in men, and from our ignorance of the best methods by which these differences can be harmonized, so that we may all enjoy the greatest number of pleasant sensations; and the way to better conduct lays through more knowledge and a greater determination to use all the forces of nature for our benefit.

Thus the relation between the process of evolution and the law of conduct, is that a knowledge of this process enables us to listen to our desires, and instead of spending our energies in a useless fight against our inherited nature, we are taught that it is a duty which we owe both to ourselves and to society, to develop our powers and put them into use to the full extent of our ability.

Evolution liberates us from a thousand outside restrictions, said to have been imposed upon us by the creator, for his own glory and pleasure, but it does not free us from the need of organiza-

tion and self-control, imposed upon us by the conditions of existence, and the desire within us for an increase of pleasant sensations. In fact, the more we study the question of conduct in the light of evolution, the more do we find that we pass from the control of an outside force, to that of a force within us, which compels us to train ourselves, that we may develop all our potentialities, so as to enjoy all the happiness within our reach under the present conditions.

CHAPTER VI.

ORGANIZATION.

The object of organization is to establish a correct relation between the different parts of a combination, in view of providing the best possible means for accomplishing the purpose for which that combination has been evolved. Organization is then the basis of correct conduct, for conduct is the relation of actions to results. This means then that correct action depends largely upon correct organization.

Organization being thus a factor of great importance in conduct, I will devote this chapter to its study. I will study now only the organization of the individual, with the purpose of using such knowledge as we may thus gain, to increasing our knowledge of the organization of society.

To the Christian, organization is the result of the will of the creator, to the materialist it is the result of law and chance, but to me it is the result of the intelligence possessed by the mind, which is the efficient factor in evolution.

The living mind in the cell, which is the starting point for the individual, possesses all the latent knowledge needed for its development; it possesses sensations and desires, and the power of appropriation. It possesses more than that; it has a potentiality, which means that the line of its development is already fixed, and will be worked out as it exercises its faculties. The man-cell cannot develop into a plant or an animal, for it would not know how, and if it did, it would not be the line of development that would cause it the greatest number of pleasant sensations.

I have said before that the original cell increases, breaks in two, and that the two cells unite. This union is the first manifestation of the process of organization. As cell is added to cell, and finally differentiation of subordinate organisms takes place, organization keeps pace with it, till the many different structures which compose man are thus evolved.

All these subordinate organisms have been evolved capable of fulfilling different functions, but all have the same purpose in

view, which is an increase of pleasant sensations to the aggregate organism; and the disposing of these several organisms in the best relation to each other, is the process we call organization.

Organization then means first the evolution of the subordinate organisms, not for their own benefit, but for the good of the aggregate organism. The lungs, for instance, are not a parasite, placed within man to be fed from his blood and carried about by his limbs, for their own satisfaction, but they have been evolved for a special purpose, to wit: to furnish the whole organism with such nourishment as can be extracted from the air. And to simply evolve the lungs is not all of organization; they had to be evolved in their proper position, and so connected with all other subordinate organisms, that all might work harmoniously together, and furnish the maximum of results with the minimum of efforts, and also that they might receive the proper nourishment, and proper protection from outside dangers. The taking in consideration of all these factors, and the construction of an aggregate organism where the best conditions can be attained, is then what we call organization, and it is clear to any one that it requires the highest development of intelligence to effect a successful organization.

In this process of evolution and organization, many different results had to be secured. Not only were all the subordinate organisms to be so constructed as to make them efficient agents for the work which was to be required from them, but they were to be so connected that their control should be placed in the power of the aggregate organism, for whose benefit they had been evolved. To leave them free to act or not act as they chose, would have been to introduce an independent power within the organism, which might refuse to act in time of need or danger. This efficient control is effected by the nervous system, and is extended as well over the vegetative as the voluntary organisms; the supervision of the vegetative organisms being in charge of the great sympathetic nerve, while the control of the voluntary organisms is the work of the brain.

Organization must also provide for the nourishment of all these subordinate organisms, for the force which they use must be restored to them. For that purpose, a most complicated net work of arteries and veins has been evolved, not only carrying food wherever needed, but also taking off the waste as fast as thrown off.

But possibly the most difficult part of the problem of development, was to provide these subordinate organisms with the right incentive to action. For while it is possible for the believer in creation, to conceive of the creator issuing his commands upon these organisms to act in unison with each other, such a belief is not possible for those who accept the theory of evolution, and of development through inward forces. Subordinate organisms must then be impelled to act by the same motive which actuates the aggregate organism, to wit: the desire for pleasant sensations.

Subordinate organisms then must be so organized, that not only will they do the work required from them, but they will find pleasure in doing it. This result has been fully attained. In a healthy individual there is not one of the subordinate organisms but what takes pleasure in action. The aggregate organism, it is true, is not strongly conscious of this pleasure, yet we recognize it, first, because the exercise of any of our faculties is the source of pleasant sensations, and usually the recognition that we enjoy pleasant sensations comes from the aggregate of feelings caused by numerous unconscious pleasant sensations; and in the second place there is a state of being which is experienced by every healthy person, when we feel that life is enjoyable for its own sake, when we are glad that we are living, said state being caused by the simple healthy working of the vegetative organisms.

This is what I call the positive proof that subordinate organisms enjoy pleasant sensations, but there is a negative proof which is too strong to be discarded. It is the ability of subordinate organisms to suffer unpleasant sensations. This we all have experienced, and been made aware of. In my estimation, the reason we are intensely conscious of the pain, and only dimly conscious of the pleasure of the subordinate, and especially of the vegetative organisms, is that when they are in a healthy state they require no special attention, the feeling of general satisfaction I have before mentioned being a sufficient reward, but when in an unhealthy state, it is imperative that the aggregate organism should be notified of the fact, so that the defective conduct may be changed, and the proper relation re-established.

I think it will be conceded by any person who is acquainted with the structure of man, that he is an example of the highest possible form of organization, and with my definition of individual conduct, I feel that I am justified in saying that it is not greater knowledge of individual conduct which we chiefly need, but a knowledge of social conduct, which would prevent us from asking from our subordinate organisms, actions for which they have not been evolved. Take a healthy child, to whom his parents have given proper parentage, and healthy pre-natal conditions, place him where he will not suffer from the defects of civilization, give him plenty of pure air to breathe, of healthy food to eat, of such exercise as is natural to him, free him from the influences of his fellow-beings, and I do not see how his structure or formation could be improved, or what could prevent his individual conduct from being perfectly correct.

But man is a social being, and was not evolved to live alone, or spend his days in idle enjoyments. He has a task to accomplish, the civilization of the world, which presents to him many new social problems which call for greater powers of organization. For lack of them, he strains his subordinate organisms, and asks from them tasks for which they are not fitted. Thus he spends

his days in a crowded atmosphere, where his lungs no longer receive the supply of fresh air for which they are fitted, but must breathe the foul air vitiated by human beings, cooped up in ill-ventilated apartments. He sits up part of the night, and subjects his eyes to the glare of artificial light. He worries himself in a thousand ways, and shatters his nervous system in answer to the demands of an ignorant civilization.

All that is done for lack of proper social organization. The task of civilization has opened a new line of conduct before man, that he must discover by the slow process of experimentation, somewhat like the process which has led to the present state of knowledge of individual conduct. We have no record of the process of individual organization, but for my part I have no doubt that it was a time of trials and often of failures. I see no reason why the evolution of the eye, for instance, should not have been attended with as many trials and failures, as we now meet in the evolution of a satisfactory government. Perfect physical organization cannot take place except through dissatisfaction, for dissatisfaction is the only incentive to improvement, and therefore efforts to improve the eye can only have ceased when it gave all possible satisfaction.

And here a new question presents itself. Is it not possible that a double adjustment may, even now, be taking place? That on one hand, man may be learning to require no more from the eye than it can perform, or in other words, be learning to adjust civilization to the potentialities of the eye, while on the other hand that the potentialities of the eye have not yet been entirely reached, and that it may develop sufficiently to adjust itself to the requirements of a wise civilization?

On that question, I will offer no opinion, except that while it is probable that we have not yet reached the end of our physical potentialities, yet I feel confident that in almost every case it is civilization which is at fault, and which we must adjust to the powers of our physical organism, which means that we must improve our social organization.

In that task, we shall be greatly helped by the belief in the theory of evolution. If we read history aright, the most advanced nations have spent the last thousand years in an earnest attempt to compel physical desires to adjust themselves to the requirements of social institutions, which were said to have been established by the creator for his own glory, without any regard to the happiness of the created. A system of repression has controlled the world, and to reconcile man to it, earthly happiness has been represented as incompatible with happiness in the next world. This influence is dying out, and every day we see growing signs that from this on social effort will be directed toward adjusting social organization to the desires of individuals for an increase of pleasant sensations.

CHAPTER VII.

FEELINGS.

We have been taught so long that there was a moral danger in listening to our feelings, that we find it difficult to accept without reservation the new doctrine, that the proper satisfaction of desire is the right standard of conduct. This complete change of front is the result of the change in our beliefs. While we believed in creation, and accepted the will of the creator as the controller of our conduct, it was naturally a dangerous process for us to undertake to satisfy our desires, which were often in direct opposition to the commands we had received, and were taught to obey; but when we discard the belief in creation, and believe in progress through evolutionary forces, then it follows logically that feelings are the only possible guide to conduct, and the satisfaction of desires the true aim of our lives; and our failure to completely satisfy desires comes not from a defect in the principle, but from our ignorance of the form of conduct which will enable us to accomplish the desired end.

It seems at first, that the attempt to replace the long series of commands and precepts, which in the past have controlled our lives, by the freedom of actions supposed to be implied by the unobstructed attempt at the pursuit of happiness, must lead mankind into a dangerous road, which will end in universal chaos, where instead of reaching better conditions for happiness, any form of happiness will be an impossibility. But this fear is soon seen to be groundless, because it is found that the attainment of happiness can only be achieved by following certain lines of conduct, which instead of encouraging a tendency to chaos, on the contrary lead toward universal harmony.

I can probably best explain this fact by repeating here a part of a conversation I had some years ago with one of my friends. After stating to him my position in regard to the pursuit of happiness, he said: "You do not mean, Mr. Chavannes, that happiness must be the aim of our lives? Don't you see that happiness is no more real and tangible than the buzzing of a circular saw? To say that we must live for happiness is equal to saying that we must run the saw for the buzzing it makes, and not for the work we expect to get out of it." "That is precisely what I mean," I answered. "If you know anything about machinery, you must know that a saw cannot buzz right unless it is kept in perfect condition, the least defect in it will be detected at once by the sound it makes in doing its work. Be assured that the saw which during the day will have buzzed the longest, the truest and the loudest, will when night comes, turn out to be the saw which has done the most and best work. And in the same way, be certain that

the men or women who during their lives have experienced the largest amount of pleasant sensations, will not only have enjoyed the best of existence, but have also made the best citizens. It is a law of nature and that we do not believe it, is due to our ignorance, which prevents us from recognizing in what happiness consists, and who are the best citizens."

The righteousness of pleasant feelings being acknowledged, as well as the legitimacy of the satisfaction of desires, the next question to investigate is: What causes feelings? or it may be more correctly stated thus: How are we made to feel?

According to my belief, feelings are caused by the currents of vital force—mind substance, magnetism—passing through living combinations, the intensity of the feelings being regulated by the amount of the current. I do not know that I can explain the mechanism of sensation any better than by comparing the living organism to a musical instrument, a piano for example, and the feelings to the sounds which result from striking the keys.

First let me draw from this comparison a further argument to show that feelings are the right guide to conduct. The piano, like man, has been evolved for a special purpose. That purpose, so far as the piano is concerned, is to increase the range of the pleasant sensations of mankind, which by its help may be done in many different ways. It may be used in concerts, or it may accompany the voice, or give music for dancing, but wherever employed, it is intended to give harmonious sounds, and the more harmonious they are, the more satisfactory will be the result. This being the case, one single aim has been kept in view in the construction of the piano, to wit: its capability to render harmonious sounds, and by that alone are the merits of the instrument judged.

Compare then man to a musical instrument, only instead of rendering harmonious sounds, he is so constructed as to experience harmonious feelings, and instead of being played upon by outside forces, for the benefit of outside persons, the harmony of feelings is regulated by ourselves, and it is ourselves alone who appreciate the result. The question of how we play the tune, that is, of how we regulate the currents of vital force, so as to produce harmonious feelings, I will treat at length when I write of self-control. I will however state here that I hold that while our feelings are acted upon by outside forces, our power of regulation comes altogether from the power of inhibition.

It is because I look upon man as a living machine, which is made to feel by currents of vital force, that I have given so much thought to that subject, and that I make the claim that no correct law of conduct can be formulated, unless we are acquainted with the nature of the mind. Mind, vital force and magnetism are to me synonymous terms, and designate different manifestations of the same substance.

Feelings then, according to my belief, are due to currents of vi-

tal force passing through the subordinate organisms, and affecting in fact each and every cell, and the range of our feelings is immeasurably greater than the range of sounds of the most complicated instrument. These feelings are pleasant or unpleasant for precisely the same reason that music pleases or displeases; it is a question of harmony, and probably harmony in feelings as in music is a question of vibrations. This question however, of harmony being due to the speed of vibrations, as is claimed by many scientists, is of little practical importance here, for we cannot change the speed of vibrations at will, and can only affect surrounding conditions. We recognize the presence of harmonious sensations in ourselves just as the piano-tuner, whose task is to harmonize the tension of the strings, does his work, not through scientific knowledge, but through his inner power of sensation. Just in the same way, we all possess the innate power of recognizing the quality of our feelings, and what we need to learn is not the number of vibrations to the second, required to cause pleasant sensations, but to recognize the conditions—both within and outside of us—which cause pleasant or unpleasant sensations.

When once we understand the construction of the human machine, and the relation of harmonious currents of vital force to pleasant sensations, the principles of the law of conduct—if we admit our right to pleasant sensations—are very simple ones. Our efforts must first tend to increasing the range of our sensations, which means that we must develop all our powers to their full extent. Development, evolution, is the first condition of progress for the individual as well as for the whole Universe, and an increase in the range of pleasant sensations, is the reward provided to urge us on in this development. And in the second place, we must learn to so control these currents that they may harmonize—vibrate in unison if you please to call it so—that these feelings may cause us pleasant sensations.

If we then compare man to a musical instrument, we can also compare society to a full orchestra, where the aim of each individual is to play in harmony with the whole band; for the same law of progress which I have so often explained comes in action here; the same principles which control the actions of the individuals must also control the conduct of the social organism.

And here I want the reader to turn back to the latter part of Chapter IV, on Individual Conduct, where I make the statement that the cell alone is capable of feeling, but that the single cell by itself is incapable of increasing its power of sensations, and that this increase is only possible by combination and organization.

I want to explain this statement, and make it clear, for it is the key to progress in conduct. We all understand that one chord in a piano can only give one sound, and that an extension in the range of musical sounds is only possible by an increase in the number of the strings. But even the music that can be produced

number of the strings. But even the music that can be produced

from a piano, with its many strings, falls far short of that which can be called out of many instruments, and any intelligent person will recognize the truth of the statement that the highest musical harmony is dependent upon combination and organization. In speaking of an orchestra, we do not use these terms, but it is what we mean. The increasing harmony of society depends upon the same conditions. As man develops, the range of his feelings increases according to the same law that improvement in musical instruments increases the range of sounds, and this extension of the range of our feelings is taken advantage of to evolve more complex social combinations, these in their turn requiring a more complete organization. This increase in our ability to feel, giving rise to new desires, is felt—consciously or unconsciously—by all men, and the whole question of knowing—the march of progress depending, as I have already several times stated, upon an increased capacity of feeling and knowing—resolves itself into our finding out what are the best social combinations, and which is the best organization? the best social combinations, and which is the best organization? Now suppose again that the members of an orchestra, instead of recognizing the attainment of harmony as the test of success, that each should tune his instrument upon some key handed down to him by some past ancestors, and that in the din which must necessarily ensue, each player should also insist that he alone was right, and instead of trying to harmonize with the other performers, he should keep on his own way regardless of harmony. What would the result be? own way regardless of harmony. Suppose again that instead of being slaves to ancient rules and principles, each player should be intent first in producing the best sounds possible from his instrument, and next should turn his attention to playing as harmoniously as possible with the other members of the orchestra. Would not the recognition of harmony as the right standard produce much more satisfactory results than the previous conflict of opinions? ch more satisfactory results than The world has been governed long enough by rules and principles promulgated by persons who did not have the first idea of what is possible in the way of harmonious combinations, and it is time we followed in the footsteps of the musicians, who recognize no method as correct, except it enables them to increase the harmony of musical combinations. It enables them to increase the harmony The musicians have long discovered that there is a law of harmony in sound, and they have set resolutely to work to discover it, and make use of it to increase the beauty and harmony of their musical combinations. Let us also recognize that there is a law of harmony in feelings, and go resolutely to work to discover it and make use of it to increase the beauty and harmony of our social combinations. It to increase the beauty and harmony of our social combinations.

[illegible]

the Romans at the beginning of the Christian era. Not only is much necessary knowledge beyond our reach, but what little is discovered must be verified, then disseminated, and even when the civilized world is ready to accept it, there must be a slow adjustment of the new knowledge to the old conditions, which can be done safely only by a gradual blending of the one into the other.

How slowly new knowledge permeates humanity, is well exemplified in the belief yet entertained by most reformers, that the reforms they have at heart will soon be adopted by the civilized world. With the teachings of history open to them for more than two thousand years, having seen the democratic principles taught for nearly two centuries without making hardly any impression on the masses, who still worship and unthinkingly follow the dictates of those who have secured political power, with a fifty years' fight to introduce the principles of socialism, with the result that it is only now receiving a respectful hearing, with evolution having secured possession of the scientific mind, without in any manner having succeeded in losing the hold of dogma upon the tenets of the church, the world is yet full of men and women interested in progress, who have not yet learned its first lesson, to wit: that it is an irresistible force, but that its work is exceedingly slow.

One cause of this slow rate of progress is, that new knowledge cannot become operative until it has dislodged the old, and that the old does not exist only in the head, as most persons suppose, but that it permeates all through the individual, being an attribute of mind substance. The reverence for authority, for instance, has been transmitted from generation to generation, till it is part of human nature. Some men and women, peculiarly constituted, or in some favorable environment, may supersede it by a manly independence of character, but it usually reverts back in their children generation after generation. But the manifestation of this reverence changes, and the subserviency of the American citizen is not as offensive to the man of independent character as that of his European ancestors. Gradually new ideas, based upon new knowledge, take possession of the brain of the average man, and those ideas are transferred to the whole organism, by precisely the same process that our brain teaches our hands to write. And undue reverence to authority is being bred out just as fast as men learn to have confidence in their own judgment.

To those who accept the philosophy of conduct I am explaining in these pages, and who look upon the enjoyment of harmonious feelings as the true aim of conduct, the function of knowing is easy to understand. We increase our knowledge so that we may increase the complexity of the new combinations, this, as I have stated when writing of feelings, being the only way by which we can increase the number of pleasant sensations. As knowledge controls the process of organization, its increase is indispensable

to progress and to evolution, which consists in the increase of complexity of new combinations.

To return to my comparison of society to an orchestra, the increase of the capacity to feel more pleasant sensations, which follows the development of more complex combinations, is like the increase in the range of musical sounds, which follows the construction of new musical instruments. If the use of these instruments is not rightly controlled, the result is discord, and no orchestra would allow the introduction of new players unless they agreed to submit to the control of their organization. The question whether the addition of new instruments will be an advantage is a question of knowledge. If the orchestra possesses sufficient knowledge to assimilate them, it will be a benefit, and better music will be produced, but if it does not possess the knowledge, discord and not harmony will be the result.

So it is with society. New feelings are evolved all the time. Our ancestors, if we look back far enough, knew nothing of most of the feelings which we now enjoy. They dwelt in caves, and could not have appreciated the present comfort of our homes; hollow trees and sticks made a music suited to their uneducated ears; and reading and writing were unknown to them. They not only did not miss those things, but would not have enjoyed them had they been in their possession, for they had not evolved a sufficient capacity for feeling. And not possessing the capacity to feel, they did not need the knowledge which would have enabled them to satisfy the desire for such sensations as are produced by comfortable homes, a higher degree of music, or the information we can get out of books. Gradually, slowly, the present capacity to feel and to know has been evolved, and this process is going on now precisely as it has gone on from the dawn of civilization.

No believer in evolution will deny this statement. Will they then acknowledge that the same process which now controls the evolution of society, has in the past controlled the evolution of man? That just as at present men construct a piano to increase the range of their enjoyment, and when constructed seek for the knowledge which enables them to make a satisfactory use of it, so the undeveloped man has evolved his vocal chords, and so the throat of the opera singer has developed in obedience to the same desires which have led to the building of our theatres, and the filling of them with actors.

This is the position I occupy, and I believe I have made sufficiently clear the grounds on which I base the statement I first announced in my book on the Nature of the Mind, to wit: "That increasing capacity of feeling, and increasing capacity of knowing, makes an endless chain of progress, which will come to an end only when every potentiality will have been worked out."

CHAPTER IX.

SELF-CONTROL.

According to the law of evolution, self-control is the law of the Universe, which is no longer supposed to be directed by an outside creator, but by an Universal Mind which permeates all space. In the same line of thought, and according to the same belief, I see that recent writers recognize that all nations are self-governed, and that even czars and emperors exercise power because in them is embodied the will of the majority of the citizens. The idea that a small minority can compel the obedience of the greater part of the people, and that the will of the rulers runs in different channels than that of the ruled is losing ground, and slowly the fact is recognized that nations, like the Universe, are self-controlled.

Right here an important explanation must be given. The majority which rules is not a material, but a mental majority. Because among undeveloped nations the rulers are few and the ruled many, it seems as if it was the minority which ruled, but in fact the preponderance of mind force is with the rulers, and the majority rule based upon votes in republics, is only possible because the citizenship has progressed sufficiently in knowledge, so as to equalize the mind power of the individuals. And even in republics, the more developed classes have much more influence in legislation than the less developed classes, although the means by which they influence legislation are different from those they use in autocratic nations. As a proof of this truth we find that the only way to permanently change the conduct of nations is to educate the people—which means to increase its mind power—and that any advance which is attempted to be made based on purely physical force, is sure to end in failure.

All individuals, like nations, are self-controlled to the extent of regulating their individual conduct. The social conduct of individuals is regulated by society, but their individual conduct is altogether independent of social power. No known power that society possesses can compel a man to walk if his will is stronger than the social will. The man can be carried, or he may be dragged, but walk he will not, so long as he has control of his actions. No power possessed by the greatest despot can prevent the heart from beating, or the lungs from breathing, so long as life exists.

This law of control is absolute, and knows no exception. The cell also has its own power of self-control, and governs its own actions, and the self-control of the individuals, nations and Universe, is only the development of an attribute which first manifests itself in the cell. As these developments follow the same rules, self-control in individuals can best be studied by investigating the self-control of society, which in our present state of knowledge

is more accessible to us, and more easy to understand. In the first part of these studies, I have investigated individual conduct, as it relates to organization, feelings and knowledge, as a means of determining the proper social conduct, but now I shall investigate social control as a means of studying individual control.

Just as the cells are the units of the individuals, so the individuals are the units of society. These individuals organize themselves into groups which we call by different names such as cities and villages, etc., said organizations not being effected in answer to conscious desires, but in obedience to certain laws of affinities, which both draw them together or drive them apart. The teeming millions which inhabit our large cities, as well as the scattered dwellers of small hamlets, have not been thus located by the organized power of the whole community, but have obeyed their own promptings, or the conditions of their environment. As nations develop, certain opportunities are offered to individuals to locate here and there, and groups of different sizes are formed by a sort of automatic process, each of these groups devoting its energies to fulfilling some social function, such as distributing products, or manufacture, or mining, etc.

In the same way, by some automatic process, were subordinate organisms formed, by the grouping of cells within the individual. This grouping, as the grouping of individuals, was not the result of conscious organization, but of some law of affinity within the cells, and these groups also have their sphere of activities clearly defined. Some relate to the locomotion of the individual, others to the breathing of the air, others enable the individual to see or to hear, etc.

Two things are noticeable in this process of organization. One is that it is evidently part of the working out of mind potentialities, and the other is that each and every group increases the welfare of the aggregates. While undoubtedly both the cells and the individuals join the groups in answer to their own promptings, at the same time the final result of this grouping is to greatly add to the aggregate of pleasant feelings of the individual, and to the possibilities of the nation to supply the conditions necessary for this increase of pleasant sensations.

The analogy between individuals and nations does not end at the grouping of their units. It extends both to the commercial system of nations—and by this term I mean agriculture, manufacture and commerce—which is the counterpart of the vegetative system in the individual; and to the conscious organization of the social organism, relating to its most highly developed functions, such as are carried on by the government, which finds its counterpart in the voluntary system.

The commerce of nations is carried on by an automatic process somewhat similar to that which controlled the grouping of the individuals. The man who sows wheat in Kansas, has no conscious

desire to feed the toilers of Europe, no more than the European workman cares for the needs of the American farmer. Both of them are only intent upon the satisfaction of their own desires, and yet out of these disconnected impulses has grown a most complicated self-working system, by which the whole of a special class of the needs of mankind are supplied. The commercial system of to-day is the result of a slow adjustment of individual needs and of individual powers, and has grown to the present state of perfection, not through a process of conscious organization, but by the simpler process of individual consciousness. For it is important to notice that there is a conscious desire at work in this process, but it is not the social consciousness which comes into play.

The vegetative system of an individual corresponds to the commercial system of a nation. The separate cells are fed, and all their direct needs supplied by the agency of the vegetative system, which has been evolved, as I claim, under the same law which later on evolved the commercial system, and which is not controlled by the aggregate consciousness, but by the lesser consciousness of each cell and of the subordinate organisms.

But while certain needs of society could be supplied by this automatic process, it was found, as society developed, to be inadequate to supply other needs just as important. Thus it was found that when groups of individuals became so large as to reach the size of cities, the automatic process failed utterly to maintain the streets in a proper condition, and a conscious process of social organization had to take its place. This organization we call government, and it differs fundamentally from the automatic process in this, that the actions of the individuals no longer relate to their own desires, but to the desires of the community. Thus the man employed by the government of a city to grade and pave its streets, has no special interest in the work he is doing, for he may never be benefited by it, and in any case the benefit would bear no comparison to the labor expended. It is the city as a whole which is benefited, and it follows that it is the city which must reward the man for his labor. This means that the scope of the consciousness must be extended until it embraces the needs of the whole city. From all accounts, the social consciousness was first exercised for purposes of attack and defense, and to-day the army is the most perfect form of social organization.

I have said that nations are fed and clothed through the agency of a system where each individual strives to improve his own condition, and without the control of any conscious social organization. But a nation is defended by an organization managed under an entirely different plan. Everything is done in answer to the direction of a central power, which knows the resources at its command, and organizes its forces so as to use them with the greatest efficiency. The farmer sows his wheat for the sake of the pay he will receive, and neither knows nor cares whether it goes

to Europe or Asia, but the soldier is called away from his home, and sent here and there, not according to his wishes and judgment, but in answer to the wants and judgment of the nation, as represented by its government. And what is true of the means of defense and attack is also true of many other public functions. These functions in the early days of civilization were very few in number, but as men develop, the scope of government control increases, and no one can tell what will be its final limitations.

Conscious collective control is found in the individual also, and just as the army, the judges, the police, etc., were evolved to do the bidding of the social will, and rulers were appointed to direct them, so in the individual several subordinate organisms, such as the legs, arms, eyes, etc., were undoubtedly evolved to do the bidding of the individual will, and the different parts of the brain were also evolved to direct them. And we find that, as might be expected, the brain has no control over the vegetative system, just as the government has no control over the commercial system; but on the other hand the brain has full control over the voluntary system, just as the government has control of all collective action.

The analogy is perfect, even to the line of development of the several systems. The vegetative system developed before the voluntary system, just as the commercial system developed before the collective system; and both the voluntary system and the collective system were primarily used for purposes of attack and defense, branching out into these more complex spheres of usefulness as a result of individual development.

It is also worthy of remark that while it is true that the voluntary system cannot control the vegetative, yet it can to a certain extent regulate its functions, and we eat and sleep at regular hours, not by an automatic process of adjustment, but in obedience to regulations promulgated by the brain; and in the same way, while the commercial system must to a large extent remain subject to automatic control, yet as society develops, all departments of commerce are more and more regulated by the government.

CHAPTER X.

THE SOCIAL ORGANISM.

I have all through the preceding chapters used the words "Social Organism", to denote the organization of society, and in this chapter I want to define these words and to give the reasons for my definition. It is a subject of great importance as regards the investigation of social conduct, for according to the definition we adopt, we must believe that society has, or has not, the right to