

ignorance has built up about it. It has been said that socialism began when Mr. Robinson permitted Mr. Friday to live and enjoy life with him. In one sense of the word it was a sort of communism. They both shared equally in the products of the island. But this communistic equality did not last long uninterrupted. Those anarchists, the savages, rudely disturbed it. The greater self-protecting might of Mr. Robinson soon showed his superiority. Where was the natural equality? The savages would soon have made soup-meat of Mr. Friday. Mr. Robinson's superior ability was of life-saving value to Mr. Friday. Mr. Friday's companionship was, in a certain sense, a life-saving necessity to Mr. Robinson. Were it not so we may be sure Mr. Robinson would have sacrificed Mr. Friday. The necessity of self-preservation knows no law (so far as others are concerned) when it comes to the question of life or death. The story of Robinson Crusoe and his "Man Friday," in this emergency, illustrates very well the true selections of the men of business ability and those who have simply ordinary working ability. Both are valuable to each other. Both should intelligently play each other's game. Both are dependent on each other for self-preservation. Only ignorance causes misunderstandings. In this respect the employer is often as ignorant—and more often more pig-headed than the employee. The criminal of criminals is the agitator who seeks to incite one class against another. But to the question of rights. All rights find their origin in the individual necessity to live.

Every law, every social institution, finds its origin in the same all-pervading force. Socialism, then, is the union of men for their individual preservation. It is not a theory. Communism is something more. Communism demands an absolute equality in reciprocal ability and mutual support in doing the same work, each then sharing equally in results. A business partnership in which each partner contributes an equal amount of capital, does an equal amount of work and shares equally in results is communistic. A trust may be communistic. It may also be socialistic. It is socialistic when each partner contributes according to his ability and shares accordingly in results. Both socialism and communism make no allowance for drones or inability. They are both based on the law of the fittest. They have no place for unfits. This is a truth modern "reformers" (save the mark) either utterly ignore or are ignorant of. Neither yields or acknowledges any right to such as cannot "keep up with the procession;" that is, play their part in the game.

Rights and Might.

Rights then find their origin in the mutual necessity to live. Rights can-

not exist under isolated individual conditions, as has been shown in the case of Mr. Robinson when alone on his island. Rights began when Mr. Friday entered on the scene. Rights were seriously in danger on the advent of the savages. They became again established on their defeat and departure. Rights and socialism have the same origin. Rights are absolutely utilitarian in nature. No right is possible without the might to make it so. If A and B are to have the same rights they must have the same might. They must be equally useful to each other. Otherwise they will be like an ill-mated pair of horses. The owner or driver, who may be a theoretic socialist, does not admit that they were born equal. He beats and holds back the one while he beats and blames the other. The same is true of man to man though the methods may be different. It is true in our own families in spite of ourselves. The parent encourages the useful child while the dolt, or weakling, or mischievous tries all his patience. We are human even though we may strive to be intelligently humane. Rights are the result of mutual assent to the usefulness of one another in self-preservation. Men enter into social arrangements and form governments for individual preservation. Not one does it to save the other fellow. No business man enters into a copartnership to benefit his partner. Each partner expects the other to fulfill the conditions of the copartnership. Men do not take inability into copartnership in order that it may live. Governments were originally formed on the same basis. They have sadly departed from the ethical standard. Each man in a copartnership shares according to the ability he contributes to strengthen it. So it should be in the state. No such statement of this principle of the origin and nature of rights was ever formulated into words as the enacting clause of the Constitution of the United States. This is why it is the most wonderful of all historic documents. It is absolutely impossible to discuss the various phases of right in a series of short papers. Here it is intended to but call a few of the salient points to the attention of the readers of THE CONSERVATIVE. Before closing we must briefly discuss a much misunderstood question to which no better name can be applied than rights by concession.

Many a reader has doubtless thought the writer a brute or savage from the emphasis that has been laid on might or ability as the basis of all rights. Many a reader who looks on the Declaration of Independence as a holy document, sanctified by the blood of the fathers, probably thinks the writer a heretic, an infidel and a traitor, forgetting that the revered author of that immortal document declared it to be the guiding principle of his life "to follow truth (his) and reason

to whatever results they led and bearding every authority which stands in their way."

The Right to Life.

Rights by concession are not rights in the true sense. That impregnable condition, or law, the survival of the fittest, allows of no right, not even to life, without the ability to maintain it. The so called inalienable rights of the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, the right to liberty, and, that treetotal absurdity, the right to pursue happiness, are concessional rights to all that have not the individual ability to pursue and maintain them unaided. To return again to that assumed right that has been threshed to dust, the right to life. We concede the right to life only to such who so live as not to be criminally dangerous to society. In our great humanity we concede it to thousands who are dangerous to or a burden on society; consumptives, syphilitics, the insane. We say the murderer has "forfeited his right to life." We are getting woefully tender-hearted in concessions to the criminally and physically dangerous. But concede all we may we cannot give life to the consumptive, health and happiness to the syphilitic, or reason to the insane. Admitted that an intelligent humanity could and can almost eradicate such evils and burdens still no sane person can admit that such have any rights to things beyond the possibility of individual attainment.

The very utmost that society can possibly do is to concede to its individual members the privilege of demonstrating their ability to show their right to live and be members of it by supporting themselves and contributing to the support of these institutions which give them freedom to use all their abilities for themselves. Here is a great point—men form combines and inaugurate governments to better serve themselves, not others. As for chasing happiness, that man was created to be happy or that there is anything else for a man to do but to live, if he can, and maintain those institutions which enable him to live, and look out for the responsibilities he has himself assumed, a greater piece of imbecility never was portrayed, even though it have Epicurus for a grandsire and Bentham as immediate progenitor.

Man never organized governments to be happy or for "the greatest happiness to the greatest number." Man organized governments under the imperative necessity to live and nothing else. Man was not created even to live. He seeks to live because it is the inevitable necessity to live. He cannot help it except by suicide. While not born for anything, except as the accident of lust in most cases, man must live by bread alone, counting as bread all that is necessary to maintain life. Man was no more born to be happy than to be miserable. Under normal conditions of mind man is