Alexander Sutherland (1852-1902): Forgotten Australian Intellectual[1]

JOHN GONZÁLEZ

Rozhkov Historical Research Centre

director@rozhkovcentre.org

Alexander Sutherland (1852-1902) was a polymath who at various stages in his very short life was among other things a teacher, poet, writer, artist, mathematician, musician, journalist, politician, philosopher, historian and scientist. He wrote several books, many short stories, innumerable journal and newspaper articles, at least two novels and produced dozens of paintings and sketches. He is the author of the first volume of the celebratory work Victoria and its Metropolis and with his younger brother George wrote the first best-selling textbook on Australian history. Overseas he was lauded by some of the best scientific minds of the nineteenth century for his most important and pioneering work entitled The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct. Despite such distinctions, Sutherland has not been the subject of serious study in over a century.

This article begins to address this issue by providing a very brief biography of Sutherland, with particular reference to his interpretation of Darwinian evolution as elaborated in his magnum opus. This article shows how Sutherland influenced Russian philosophical thought at the turn of the nineteenth century and attempts to argue that Sutherland's interpretation of Darwinian evolution had more in common with its Russian variation than with the popular British interpretation advanced by Thomas Henry Huxley, Herbert Spencer and others. This article concludes that Sutherland's rehabilitation is long overdue not just because he is a forgotten important and influential intellectual but because it sheds light on philosophical thought in Australia during this period.

Keywords: Alexander Sutherland; Darwinism; Nikolai Aleksandrovich Rozhkov; historiography; morality; Herbert Spencer; Australian philosophy

Alexander Sutherland

In his *A Short History of Australia*, Sir Ernest Scott wrote:

> Historical events, like mountain ranges, can best be surveyed as a whole by an observer who is placed at a good distance from them. Out of the welter of acrimony, stratagem, ambition, generous impulses, lofty aspirations, meanness, selfishness, patriotism, and all the other motive forces amid which the work of the world gets itself done, emerge at length clear to the view certain shining personalities, certain determinations fluent in consequences which are the stuff of which history is made. Many people who made such noise while they strutted their hour become happily forgotten, and many events which were responsible for large headings in newspapers are seen to be of no particular importance.[2]

While it is true that a historian needs to assume an objective position to be able to interpret sources dispassionately and therefore properly, the concept of objectivity is a subject for philosophical enquiry. Philosophically less complex but of even more importance historically speaking is the study of forgotten personalities and events in history. For far too long history has focused on the winners, the 'leading players' that grabbed the headlines of their day and articulated the hegemonic ideology of the period in which they lived. If a better understanding of historical development is to be obtained then it is impossible to ignore the 'losers' in history. To do so means to continue oversimplifying and distorting the complex play of forces that undoubtedly comprise the historical process. Putting it differently, the study of any aspect of history is incomplete unless the constant struggle out of which emerges a dominant society with a dominant ideology is analysed as fully as possible.

During the late colonial period of Australia's history, there emerged a dominant national identity. This identity, which was fostered by most of the major political figures of the time, was inextricably linked to Australia's economic development, that is, Australia locking itself into the capitalist hegemony. While there has been quite a bit written about Australia's early economic development, there has been less interest in exploring its cultural development and negligible interest in counter-hegemonic cultural points of view. Historians, for instance, may be forgiven for believing that there was consensus at the turn of the twentieth century regarding national identity and race. Historians may also be forgiven for believing that scientific theories, especially

Darwinian evolutionary theory as interpreted by most of the influential scientists of the last quarter of the nineteenth-century, supported the racial views that politicians, academics, clergy and writers not only propagated but sadly enshrined in the opprobriously repugnant Immigration Restriction Act of 1901.

This article casts a spotlight on Alexander Sutherland, a forgotten intellectual of the late nineteenth century in Australia, who tried to show in his most important work, *The Origins And Growth Of The Moral Instinct*, that Darwinian evolutionary theory was incomplete because it did not explain how morality developed in human societies.[3] This article attempts to show that contrary to the views put forward by most British and Australian writers who embraced the Malthusian interpretation of Darwin's evolutionary theory, Sutherland attempted to show that cooperation rather than dog-eat-dog competition would lead to ethical progress and consequently better societies. Just as Darwin had done, Sutherland tried to prove this theory scientifically.

This article also tries to show that despite Sutherland's background, his theory of human behaviour had more in common with the views of the radical Russian intelligentsia than the views espoused by conservative, religious thinkers in Australia. It is argued that leaving aside the tremendous impact Sutherland's theory had on his younger brother, who wrote one of Australia's first sociological studies entitled *The Bonds Of Society*, his study was all but ignored in Australia despite being acclaimed overseas especially in Russia.[4] This article draws the conclusion that Sutherland's rehabilitation is long overdue not just because of his merit as an intellectual but because his ideas were products of a complex array of social, political and philosophical influences that existed at the beginning of the twentieth century even though they have hitherto received very little attention.

Introduction: Defending Nelson's Claim

In 1910 a Scotsman by the name of Wallace Nelson wrote a light-hearted and amusing little book entitled *Foster Fraser's Fallacies and Other Australian Essays*.[5] As the author candidly wrote in the forward, the purpose of the book was to get sold. He wrote:

> Being a Scotsman, I am modest, and, being modest, I harbor no extravagant anticipation as to the success of this book. I do not expect that the whole of the people of Australia will read it; I will be perfectly satisfied if they merely buy it - and pay for it.[6]

Nelson selected topics he thought the general public would be interested in and gave his views on those topics. As might be expected in such a whimsical and subjective study, the author makes many claims that deliberately challenge the accepted or common view. In the chapter called 'An Australian Philosopher', Nelson makes the following claim:

> Australia has produced some interesting politicians, one or two middling poets, some splendid cricketers, and a good many most excellent horses, but, so far as I know, she can claim but one really eminent thinker. And the fun of the thing is that she does not appear to know it.[7]

In Nelson's opinion, Alexander Sutherland is, 'perhaps, the greatest of Australia's sons, born or adopted'. As he added:

> Certainly, Australia has as much reason to be proud of him as she has to be proud of Marcus Clarke, or Adam Lindsay Gordon, or Brunton Stephens, or Alfred Deakin, or George Reid—I beg pardon, Sir George Reid. As a matter of fact, Alexander Sutherland—who, though born in Glasgow, lived the greater part of his life in Victoria—has, in my opinion, done more to win glory for Australia than any other man, living or dead.[8]

At first glance, Nelson's statements about Alexander Sutherland seem to be little more than hyperbole. However, upon closer inspection, it would appear that a case can be made to support Nelson's claim that Sutherland did more to 'win glory for Australia than any other man, living or dead'.

Brief Biography

Alexander Sutherland was born in Glasgow on 26 March 1852.[9] He was the eldest of eight children born to George Sutherland (1829-1885) and Jane Sutherland, nee Smith, both of Scottish ancestry.[10] Not surprisingly, living in one of the most important ship building centres in the world, George Sutherland followed his father by working in the then flourishing shipping industry. He became a highly-skilled carver of figureheads for ships and a draughtsman. However, his skill went beyond carving. He was also a talented

wood engraver, commercial artist, drawer and painter who, in spite of being colour blind, exhibited his works between 1875-1878 at the Victorian Academy of Arts.[11]

George Sutherland, however, was not a robust individual. He suffered from poor health as a result of a congenital heart condition and most of his children sadly inherited his delicate constitution. Like the father, all the male children suffered heart failure either before or in their early fifties. In an effort to arrest George's deteriorating health and to improve the well-being of the family, the Sutherlands decided to migrate. After a failed attempt at settling in America, the Sutherlands left Scotland and set sail for the warmer climate of Australia. They arrived in Sydney in 1864.

The Sutherlands stayed in Sydney for about six years. Alexander's parents had always expected that he would graduate from university. However, in place of Glasgow University, Alexander began working towards the Arts Course at Sydney University. At the age of fourteen, Alexander was already earning a small emolument as a student teacher for the Education Department of New South Wales. In 1870, when Alexander was eighteen years of age and "showing much promise of intellectual distinction", the Sutherland family moved to Melbourne where they resided at 1 Lytton Street, Carlton.[12] The house overlooked Melbourne Cemetery and was only a few minutes' walk from Melbourne University. 'In the ensuing years', as Stuart Rosewarne put it, 'the Sutherlands were to be an important part of the development of Melbourne as the economic and, more importantly, cultural centre of Australia'.[13]

When the Sutherlands decided to settle in Melbourne in 1870 with their five sons and three daughters, Victoria was Australia's richest colony and Melbourne its largest city. The wealth generated by the Victorian gold fields had created a bustling metropolis in which the Sutherlands made their comfortable livings and fortunes. Two of George Sutherland's brothers and their families soon joined him in Melbourne. The younger of the brothers, John Sutherland, had been a soap manufacturer in Glasgow and established a soap factory in Brighton after his arrival. The other brother, Alexander Sutherland, made his fortune importing power-driven machines at a time when Melbourne was just entering the electric age.[14] The booming economy of the 1870s and 1880s afforded the Sutherlands, especially their children, many economic and therefore social privileges.[15] Indeed, the Sutherland children must have lived in very intellectually stimulating environments.

Upon arriving in Melbourne, Alexander Sutherland became a teacher at the Hawthorn Grammar School while studying in the evenings for his Arts Course. He

graduated from Melbourne University with honours in mathematics, classics and English. Throughout his undergraduate studies, he gained several exhibitions including the Shakespeare scholarship which he shared with Mr Justice Higgins in 1874. The following year, he accepted the appointment as mathematics master at the Scotch College but he resigned in 1877 to found his own Carlton College which lasted until 1892. In 1876 he graduated with a master's degree from Melbourne University. He married Elizabeth Jane, the second daughter of Robert Dundas Ballantyne[16], and had a son and three daughters.[17] In 1892 he retired from his school and purchased the picturesque home that had been built by Professor Hearn on the northern side of Arthur's seat, near Dromana, where he was going to spend the rest of his life pursuing his passion for research in science and literature. However, the economic depression of 1893 cut short his retirement plans and forced him to seek paid work as a journalist. Nonetheless, it was at about this time that he began writing his most important scientific work, *The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct*, which was published in two volumes in 1898.

In the winter of 1897, Sutherland tried to enter the Victorian Parliament as the representative of Williamstown. However, as H.G. Turner wrote in 1908, Sutherland failed to be elected because 'his politics were those of the student and the class room, illuminated by a blend of beautiful, but impracticable, ethics'.[18] A reading of Sutherland's pamphlet entitled 'To the Electors of Williamstown' confirms Turner's assessment that his enemies knew that arguments and theories were no match for good party organization and rounding up men to the polls.[19] In 1898, Sutherland accepted the position as overseas correspondent for the *South Australian Register*. After a short, miserable period in London, Sutherland went to the Hague to report on the Peace Conference but the combination of home sickness, poor weather, ill health and disillusionment with the world of journalism in Europe, convinced him to return to Australia as soon as possible. After a quick visit to France and Italy, Sutherland returned to Australia in October 1899.

For the next two years Sutherland continued his work as a journalist and lecturer. While he still received a small income from the profits made by Carlton College, he had to work hard to make ends meet. In March 1901, he had 'another slight attack of that insinuating disease, political ambition' when he unsuccessfully contested the seat for South Melbourne in the Federal Parliament.[20] A few months after his political defeat, he was appointed by Melbourne University's Council to the office of Registrar to sort out the financial mess caused by the creative accounting of F.J. Dickson and others. It was at about this time also that Sutherland agreed to assume many of the duties of the late

Professor Edward E. Morris who was tragically killed while on a holidays in Europe. Morris was Professor of English Literature and Sutherland relished the opportunity to do what he most enjoyed – teach. He did such a wonderful job that, according to Turner, Council 'would probably have conferred the vacant chair upon him, as soon as arrangements could have been made to relieve him of the Registrar's duties'. [21]

Under the burden of the double duties, his health broke down. Afflicted with his father's heart condition, which sooner rather than later was going to prove fatal, the mental stress and the physical strain of all the extremely hard work he was doing took its toll on his health. At about midnight on 9 August 1902, when the streets of Melbourne were full of enthusiastic crowds celebrating the coronation of Edward VII, Sutherland died suddenly.

A prolific writer who produced in excess of one hundred monographs, articles, published lectures and reviews in a period of approximately thirty years, Sutherland was at his desk to the last. His works dealt with a wide range of questions which concerned not only the natural sciences but the social sciences as well. He wrote about world history, geography, sociology, politics, economics, philosophy, psychology, education, contemporary affairs — anything, in fact, which seemed important to him. Before the publication of *The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct*, Sutherland had already written several books. In 1877, at a time when few general histories of Australia existed, he collaborated with his brother George to write a short *History of Australia from 1606 to 1876*, which sold more than 120,000 copies and went through more than a dozen editions. In 1894, once again with his brother George, Sutherland wrote the very popular *The History of Australia and New Zealand from 1606 to 1890*.[22] Sutherland contributed significantly towards the impressive 1888 publication *Victoria And Its Metropolis, Past And Present*. In 1898, Sutherland joined with Henry Gyles Turner to write the pioneering work entitled *The Development of Australian Literature*. Sutherland also contributed the opening chapters and the biography of Captain James Cook in the marvellous work called *The Picturesque Atlas of Australasia*, published in 1886. To this already impressive list of works can be added several textbooks for Australian school children, a volume of verse and many articles for newspapers and journals, including the *Argus*, *Australasian* and *Melbourne Review*.

Consequently, his many articles are found in various journals and collections, ranging from specialised histories to scientific works, to general-political discussions, to philosophical studies. As Graeme Davison alluded in *The Oxford Companion to*

Australian History, the Sutherlands "made diverse and distinguished contributions to Australian intellectual life ….. they exhibited something of the intellectual range and high seriousness of the Scottish enlightenment".[23]

How well known and influential was Sutherland in his day?

The depth and breadth of Sutherland's professional, educational and cultural interests are reflected in the wide diversity of organisations to which he belonged. Through his involvement in the University of Melbourne's Debating Society[24], the Eclectic Association of Melbourne[25], The Australian Artists' Association[26], the Victorian Academy of Arts[27], the Royal Society of Victoria[28], the Melbourne Shakespeare Society[29], The Royal Geographical Society of Australasia[30], the Australian Church Literary Society[31] and the Social Improvement Society of the Australian Church[32], Sutherland influenced and played a valuable part in the lives of many important individuals, including H.G. Turner, Theodore Fink, H.K. Rusden, Charles Strong, J.W. Barrett, W. Turner, G. Higinbotham and Alfred Deakin, to name but a few. Indeed, Catherine Deakin, Alfred Deakin's sister, once described Alexander Sutherland, Richard Hodgson, Henry Bournes Higgins and her brother as 'a brilliant quartette'.[33]

There is plenty of evidence to show that Sutherland was known among the Victorian intelligentsia and bourgeoisie and that his pioneering works were important and influential in philosophical circles. However, Sutherland's work received higher approval and much more attention from overseas.

A major reason for this was that Australia's scientific record was regrettably a short one. As George Sutherland, Alexander's brother, declared in 1886, the scientific field of labour was small just as it was in matters artistic. He complained in a manner reminiscent of today's situation that 'the ardent scientist finds more scope for his energies in England, America, or the Continent, than in Australia'.[34] Alexander Sutherland also made this sentiment very clear when he wrote: '[a]nd I hear it often asserted that he who has something to say, and who takes the pains to say it intelligibly, is always sure of a hearing in England'.[35] Irrespective of the claims made by the Sutherlands, Australia could boast having very few scientists with an international reputation in its first hundred years after white settlement.[36] Alexander Sutherland's *magnum opus*, *The Origin And Growth Of The Moral Instinct*, was not only widely acclaimed abroad in prominent Russian, Spanish, French, German and Italian journals but almost immediately recognised by

leading European thinkers in various fields of enquiry as a classic philosophical text. Nelson's claim that Sutherland was Australia's only 'eminent thinker' no longer appears to be a ludicrous assertion.[37]

Sutherland published his seminal work *The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct* in two volumes in 1898. In the words of his close friend and colleague Henry Gyles Turner, this work was such, 'an important event in the history of mental and biological science' that it 'evoked letters of commendation from men like Herbert Spencer, Alfred Russell Wallace, Leslie Stephen, Francis Galton, and other renowned workers'.[38] According to Serle, Sutherland's work represented 'a landmark in the history of sociology'.[39] The book was reviewed in such first-rate journals as *Nature*, the *Journal of Mental Science*, the *Philosophical Review* and the *Annals of the American Academy of Sciences*.[40] Indeed, the importance of Sutherland's work to the scientific world was noted by none other than Sir Francis Galton, the influential British scientist and eugenecist, who wrote: '[f]ew books written since Darwin's time on the evolution of the human mind, are so thorough and comprehensive and well deserving of study'.[41] The *Journal of Mental Science* declared: '[n]o student of mental science can afford to neglect the book. It is the most original and important work on mental science that has appeared for more than forty years'.[42] In Sutherland's own words: 'no previous effort has cost me anything like the same amount of labour'.[43] He spent over a decade preparing his research which, unlike his previous literary work, dealt with questions that were not exclusively Australian.

Just how important and influential Sutherland's work was can be shown by the way it entered and became part of philosophical debates in Russia at the turn of the twentieth century.

An Australian Influence on Russian Philosophical Thought

I first came across the name of Alexander Sutherland while researching the Russian historian Nikolai Aleksandrovich Rozhkov (1868-1927). As I have shown elsewhere, Rozhkov was not only the most important historian in Russia at the turn of the nineteenth century, immediately before the Soviet era, but one whose work best represented the most significant transition in Russia's historical tradition.[44] He was very impressed by Sutherland's study which was published in Russian as *Proiskhozhdenie I razvitie nravstvennogo instinkta* in 1900.[45] Rozhkov wrote that Sutherland's 'first-rate and thorough analysis of moral heredity' supported the theory, elaborated by thinkers such as

Jean-Marie Guyau, Emile Littre and others, that human morality can be traced back to animals.[46] Rozhkov was especially interested in the way Sutherland used the scientific method of the natural sciences to establish fundamental psychological principles. In Rozhkov's opinion, Sutherland's work was of primary importance in the formulation of the basic premises that he believed were necessary to explain human action and ultimately historical development.[47]

Rozhkov was not the only Russian intellectual to analyse and support Sutherland's study. In 1902, Petr Kropotkin, the Russian revolutionary anarchist, published *Mutual Aid*.[48] In it, Kropotkin acknowledged that Sutherland's work dealt at some length with the notion that 'parental and familiar feelings' are the 'sole influence at work in the development of moral feelings'.[49] Kropotkin, of course, was putting forward the idea that mutual aid rather than combat was the chief criterion of evolutionary success in the struggle for existence.

It is unique to discover an Australian influence on Russian philosophical thought at the turn of the twentieth century. Such a connection is remarkable, however, given that the individuals concerned were so extraordinarily different. Sutherland, a Scottish-born Australian, was a religious and politically conservative man while Rozhkov and Kropotkin were his antitheses. Rozhkov and Kropotkin were Russian, atheists and revolutionaries. Nevertheless, despite their tremendous differences, these men were united in their belief that science offered the key to important questions about human behaviour and therefore social development. These three intellectuals believed in the positivist idea that society can be analysed, understood and constructed through the methods of science, that is, through observation, experiment and calculation. Furthermore, these thinkers were strongly influenced by Darwinian evolutionary thought which allowed them to challenge the predominant interpretation of evolution at the time and led them to believe in social progress based on cooperation and mutual aid rather than competition and 'survival of the fittest'.

Darwin's work – Spencer & Huxley

By the time Nelson published his book in 1910, Darwin's study *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or, The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life* (1859) was already half a century old and while Darwin's theory of evolution had rocked the worlds of religion, philosophy, biology and anthropology, its most profound

effect was to be in what later came to be known as 'Social Darwinism'. In 1871, Darwin published his book *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* in which he more fully presented his ideas on evolution as applied to humans. From then on, many writers used Darwin's theory to justify particular models of social relations. Perhaps the best known of these writers were Herbert Spencer and Thomas Henry Huxley.

It was Herbert Spencer who coined the phrase 'survival of the fittest' to describe how humans had survived social change throughout history. In his opinion, society operated something like a jungle in which only the strongest and best adapted, that is, the 'fittest' survived. Huxley, Darwin's friend and his most celebrated disciple,[50] further developed the notion that evolution was 'gladiatorial' in nature by emphasising the view that the animal world is driven by an implacable, no-holds-barred struggle to the end in which 'the strongest, the swiftest, and the cunningest live to fight another day'. In the same article, Huxley argued that human society is like nature because 'the weakest and stupidest' human beings 'went to the wall, while the toughest and shrewdest, those who were best fitted to cope with their circumstances, but not the best in another way, survived'. He continued:

> Life was a continuous free fight, and beyond the limited and temporary relations of the family, the Hobbesian war of each against all was the normal state of existence.[51]

Huxley believed that although the process was a cruel one, it was the best for society because the weak individuals were perpetually eliminated by stronger, more ruthless, more aggressive individuals; weak groups were eliminated by stronger, more ruthless, more aggressive groups; weak nations were eliminated by stronger, more ruthless, more aggressive nations and so on. He believed that humans were gradually evolving toward a just and peaceful society. He also believed that any human attempts to improve social conditions throughout this evolution would be foolish and futile.

Huxley eventually came to realise that any society that evolved like nature would disintegrate into anarchy and despair because the struggle for existence in nature is so profoundly 'red-in-tooth-and-claw' that it would destroy any rudimentary form of morality. Since evolution meant constant struggle, Huxley could not look to it for moral guidance. In his theory of social ethics, Huxley came to repudiate the 'gladiatorial theory of existence' by giving humans the capacity to transcend nature. As Stephen Jay Gould

nicely put it: 'the chief purpose of society must lie in mitigation of the struggle that defines nature's pathway'.[52] In other words, morality consists in understanding the ways of nature and doing the opposite. Huxley advanced this argument in his famous essay on *Evolution and Ethics* (1893):

> The practice of that which is ethically best — what we call goodness or virtue — involves a course of conduct which, in all respects, is opposed to that which leads to success in the cosmic struggle for existence. In place of ruthless self-assertion it demands self-restraint; in place of thrusting aside, or treading down, all competitors, it requires that the individual shall not merely respect, but shall help his fellows ….. It repudiates the gladiatorial theory of existence …. Laws and moral precepts are directed to the end of curbing the cosmic process.

Ever since Darwin's metaphorical use of the term 'struggle for existence', the major bone of contention in debates about ethics and evolution has been how to create a decent and just society when nature's way so relentlessly works against any such moral behaviour. In Britain and America it became acceptable to believe the pessimistic version of 'Social Darwinism' because it provided evidence to support the Malthusian principle, which was popular at the time, that population growth would outstrip the supply of food and cause an ongoing struggle for dwindling resources.[53] As Gould pointed out: 'Darwin expressed this view in a metaphor even more central to his general vision than the concept of struggle—the metaphor of the wedge'.[54] As Darwin wrote:

> nature may be compared to a yielding surface, with ten thousand sharp wedges packed close together and driven inwards by incessant blows, sometimes one wedge being struck, and then another with greater force.[55]

That Darwin characterized his concept of the struggle for existence as 'the doctrine of Malthus applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms' is amply demonstrated by Daniel P. Todes.[56]

Sutherland continues Darwin's work

When Sutherland read Darwin's *The Descent of Man*, he was only in his early twenties but it had a profound influence on the way his inquisitive mind viewed the world. A decade later he would begin researching in earnest what he believed was an elaboration of Darwin's work and some fifteen years later he published his study even though he 'cheerfully enough' would have spent 'another four years' working on it if it would have appreciably approached 'that early ideal'.[57] In the preface to his study, Sutherland wrote:

> If the name of Charles Darwin but rarely occurs in these pages, it is not that they owe little to his influence. On the contrary, full half of the book is a detailed expansion of the fourth and fifth chapters of his *Descent of Man*.[58]

He declared that Darwin could not have examined everything he mentions because it 'would have demanded a labour which neither his own health nor the length of an ordinary life would have permitted'.[59] As Darwin left 'many a department' unelaborated, Sutherland believed his book 'might make itself useful, by laboriously filling in the master's scheme'.[60]

The truth is that Sutherland not only 'confirms and extends the masterly sketch drawn by Darwin', as Galton put it, but he produced original material to provide answers to questions that Darwin left completely unresolved. When Darwin posed the question about the origins of ethics he declared that while many writers had discussed the problem 'no one has approached it exclusively from the side of natural history'.[61] Furthermore, Darwin wrote: '[t]he investigation possesses, also, some independent interest, as an attempt to see how far the study of the lower animals throws light on one of the highest psychical faculties of man'.[62] Darwin then put forward the proposition that seemed highly probable to him and that was 'that any animal whatever, endowed with well-marked social instincts, the parental and filial affections being here included, would inevitably acquire a moral sense or conscience, as soon as its intellectual powers had become as well, or nearly as well developed, as in man'.[63] There were two major weaknesses with Darwin's account; he did not show how a moral sense was acquired and he underplayed the influence of the moral instinct because he could not escape the ideological outlook of his class which, from the point of view of someone who did not share his Malthusian, bourgeois preconceptions, could be labelled as being 'typically British'.[64]

Sutherland – Selfish and Moral Instincts

Sutherland believed his work was a necessary supplement to Darwin's scheme. Sutherland convincingly argued that we have two instincts at birth – a selfish instinct and a moral instinct. This was not an original theory since Darwin himself, on a number of occasions, mentioned how struggle between individuals was replaced by cooperation to ensure a better means of existence and to secure the best conditions for survival. Darwin even stated that the fittest are not necessarily the strongest physically, nor the cunningest, but those who learn to come together mutually to support each other irrespective of whether they are strong or weak for the welfare of the community.[65] The strength of Sutherland's research is that he attempts to show how humans inherited a moral as well as a selfish instinct from animals. He provides an abundance of evidence to show 'how from the needs of animal life as they rose and developed, there sprang, at first with inexpressible slowness, but imperceptibly quickening as it advanced, that moral instinct'.[66] Sutherland argued that 'parental care must have made its beneficent appearance as an agency essential to the emergence, the survival and subsequent ascendency of the more intelligent types, amid a world of ceaseless competition'.[67] He showed that lower orders of animals, such as fish, had huge fertility rates, rapid hatching and early maturity because parental care is minimal or non-existent. Sutherland believed these features are necessary if animals with a less intricate nerve system and therefore less intelligence have any chance of surviving. The survival of lower order animals seemed contingent on the huge number of such animals being born. In fact, Sutherland went as far as to propose the following law-like statement: 'the period of gestation is proportional to the general degree of advancement of the nervous type'.[68]

He argued that animals with a higher intelligence possessed a more complex nerve organisation which took a longer time to develop into a mature form. This longer process of maturing necessitates parental care because without this parental intervention the offspring has little chance of survival after its birth. A greater amount of parental care means that the number of offspring must decrease since care can only be provided to a small number. Sutherland, looking for a simple expression of this fact, formulates the simple generalisation that 'a steady diminution in the number of offspring as parental care increases is a prime feature of development'.[69] He traces in detail the first appearances of the parental instinct in fish, then in amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals. Humans, of course, were at the head of the highest group and the most developed of all the animals.

Sutherland's analysis showed that in the face of a 'huge deluge of destruction', any given species contrive to exist in one of two ways, either through 'a stupendous fertility' or through 'the development of qualities which procure for the individual more or less of immunity'.[70] The first path is the one chosen by 'lower animals up to the level of the fish'; the second path is the course 'of later growth which leads to progress'.[71]

Sutherland's neologisms: dologeny and aristogeny

In his analysis Sutherland makes the very interesting point that without competition, without the struggle for existence, beasts and humans alike are not forced to 'reach a high standard of brain development'.[72] He wrote: 'whatever the drawbacks of competition, it at any rate forces a race out of a conservative into a progressive life'.[73] Unlike many of his contemporaries, Sutherland acknowledged that without competition species of very different levels of development could live side by side with little difficulty. This is why marsupials, for example, who have been too secure from the struggle for existence, have survived for so long without significant change or development.[74]

Sutherland believed that Darwin had not adequately explained why lower forms of animals continued to exist in a world fraught with the merciless dangers of 'the best fitted to survive' in the struggle for existence. He claimed that this lack of explanation created what he perceived to be 'a difficulty popularly felt in regard to the acceptance of Darwin's views'.[75] Eager to make this improvement to Darwin's theory, Sutherland went on to show that many 'lower order animals' are very capable of surviving in an environment where there is plenty of savage competition. As Sutherland clearly pointed out, many animals survive because there is 'ample scope' in that process which Darwin calls 'natural selection' and Spencer denominates 'the survival of the fittest' which allows the survival of a huge variety of animals. Indeed, as Sutherland correctly emphasised, the role of chance alone 'will in the majority of cases cause the survival of this individual rather than of that'.[76] However, Sutherland did add the proviso that 'in the long run there will be a certain preponderance given to those especially gifted for escape'.[77]

To explain this rather interesting but ambiguous statement, with its Lamarckian overtone, Sutherland introduced the notions of 'dologeny' and 'aristogeny'.[78] Dologeny is 'the process of breeding from the craftiest or most tricky of the race' whereas aristogeny is 'the process of breeding always from the best, wherein it is to be understood that the best is the individual of completest nerve development'.[79] This is a very important

distinction for Sutherland because while both courses of survival can give rise to parental care, it is only aristogenic change that leads to the 'noblest types' of animals with the most sophisticated nerve structure and therefore intelligence.[80] Animals that evolve along the dologenic path of change do so only because they have a 'darker tint, a brighter set of spots, a flatter shape, a more seaweed-like exterior or some such trifle which, in spite of its slender claim to respect, is yet of essential value in securing the survival of a species'.[81] According to Sutherland, such characteristics are 'but side-tracks leading to blind ends' because when a species 'has reached the limit of the trick or accident which secures for it the certainty of perpetuation, it is kept up to that limit'.[82] Such species have generally adapted themselves perfectly to their environment and they exist in perfect equilibrium with all the surrounding pressures, including their extreme fecundity. However, the slightest deviation in any individual spells certain death and 'change is possible only when change occurs in the circumjacent pressure'. As Sutherland concluded: '[i]n such a case progress is impossible; for it is probable that long ago the race has reached the limit of the trick or dodge by which it learnt to secure its safety under existing conditions'.[83]

On the other hand, animals which evolve in accordance with the aristogenic course of development 'have an endless career, and boundless possibilities, but it is only very rarely that they have a chance of occurring'.[84] This is because 'no improvement of nerve type will be permanent or of any value which is not accompanied or preceded by the development of parental care'.[85] Sutherland provided evidence to show that large variations of nerve complexity are very common in any single species but without parental care the process of selection is frustrated. If it were not for its parental care, for example, the big-brained dog-fish, with its slow maturity, would most likely die out before fish with smaller brains. However, the shark or dog-fish which 'unconsciously retains her eggs till they are hatched, and then extrudes them as active and even rapacious creatures of fair size, gives her young ones the best chances known among fish'.[86] Sutherland made it very clear that 'no form of parental care is so efficient as that which is unconscious and organic, that which leaves the mother no choice, but works out its course independently of her volition'.[87] He stressed the fact that in the struggle for existence 'an immense premium is placed upon parental care, and that not until this has been developed can the higher nervous types become possible'.[88]

After Sutherland briefly examined the steadily ascending influence of parental care in various species of cold and warm-blooded animals, working his way through an

impressive list of amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals, he arrived "at the head" of the highest group, 'foremost in all respects' – mankind.[89] Sutherland believed he had shown that:

> in the fierce competition of the animated forms of earth, the loftier type, with its prolonged nervous growth, and consequently augmented period of helplessness, can never arise but with concomitant increases of parental care. The advance from order to order is gradual, and it culminates in mankind, whose helpless babe must have perished had not the species acquired alongside of its nerve development, and, in a sense also, by reason of it, an emotional tendency keeping pace with other lines of progress, with uterine intricacies of nutrition, with perfection of lactation and the lengthening of its period, with refinements of organism such as would render the adult a victor, but the infant only a victim if it were without an abundance of loving assistance.[90]

Sutherland managed to provide ample evidence to show how, in his opinion, human beings came to possess a moral instinct. What is of special interest about his theory is not that he managed to provide such a convincing argument but rather that he believed the moral instinct was more important in humans living in the modern era than the selfish instinct. According to Sutherland, humans could not have evolved and would not be able to continue evolving without a moral instinct.

Sutherland's belief in ethical evolution

Sutherland believed that sympathy was the basis for 'a natural form of morality'. However, he added that morality is more than just sympathy, it involved 'three higher stages' of development: the morality of duty, the morality of self-respect and the morality which springs from an ideal of the beauty of goodness. [91] In Sutherland's opinion, human beings had not yet reached these higher stages of ethical development because they had not lived in civilised societies for a long time. He argued that the strength of the instinct for self-preservation would diminish and eventually be replaced by the moral instinct as individuals formed larger social unions. [92] He wrote:

> A very sketchy retrospect of human history will serve to show that in the main it has been the story of the subservience of races too little sympathetic to form powerful unions, and the emergence to power and dominance of peoples more capable of hearty consolidation. The law of sympathy has therefore been the law of progress. The more man has developed, the greater the need and inclination he has felt for life in ever-increasing association.[93]

Sutherland concluded that the moral instinct in human beings encouraged those that are 'mutually helpful' and weakened those that are 'mutually harmful'.[94] As Sutherland succinctly put it:

> The moral instinct is, therefore, that which in social life opposes and checks the operation of the self-preserving instincts of individuals in so far as these are likely to injure the community. [95]

Sutherland's research led him to conclude that when human behaviour is impelled by a moral instinct that is at least equal to the self-preserving instinct, then ideal societies would emerge. It is in mankind's interest to promote these so-called 'cultured societies' because without them the 'highest good' or 'right conduct' is unattainable. Sutherland believed that mankind would not be able to progress beyond the stage that a few 'lower cultured' nations had reached in his lifetime if the moral instinct were not encouraged to develop. [96]

Scientific work and religion

Melbourne was entering a new phase of development and its inhabitants were searching for solutions to the profound problems created by the economic and social upheavals they confronted. Traditional thoughts and ideas had become stale and supernatural explanations for natural phenomena were being challenged by the scientific ideas of Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer on evolutionary theory. As middle-class intellectuals, the Sutherlands, as well as their circle of friends and acquaintances, were certainly discussing the scientific and philosophical topics of the day. The influence on the Sutherlands of the new science, which erupted with the publication of Darwin's *On*

the Origin of Species (1859) and flourished with the publication of the *Descent of Man* (1871), was reflected not only in some of their work but in the changes that their religious beliefs underwent.

Alexander Sutherland acknowledged the huge influence that Darwin had on his scientific thinking in his *Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct*. Similarly, William and George developed their scientific views in the light of Darwin's theory of evolution. John Sutherland's work entitled *The Bonds Of Society* is a detailed study of the theory of evolution and how it can explain certain aspects of human existence. The new science demanded that the Sutherlands reexamine the orthodox teachings of the Presbyterian Church to which they belonged. As a result, they broke their ties with the Presbyterian Church and joined with Dr. Charles Strong and others to form the Australian Church in 1885 which was founded as 'a free, progressive and unsectarian Religious Brotherhood …. untrammelled by a final dogmatic theological creed'.[97] The Sutherlands, keen observers and lovers of nature, saw their religious beliefs eroded away by scientific theories that explained natural phenomena in a rational and logical manner. Not a family given to conforming or supporting views simply because they expressed long-held and cherished beliefs about religion, man and the world, the Sutherlands embraced scientific naturalism as a new religion. Although serious discussions and debates arising from epistemological differences over the role of theology as an intellectual authority had been held at many religious gatherings all over the place, Henry Gyles Turner tried to play down the impact that intellectuals like Sutherland had when they questioned their religious faith and defected from mainstream Presbyterianism when he wrote: 'Mr. Sutherland had, of course, in common with all sons of Scotia, a delight in controversy'.[98] Turner added:

> Opposition ever stimulated him to do his best, and he revelled in argument when both sides were really in earnest. Some of you may remember how, at the time when Dr. Strong was the subject of a heresy hunt, Mr. Sutherland entered the lists with the Moderator of the Presbyterian Assembly in a discussion over the Westminster Confession of Faith, with rather disastrous results to the pretensions of that antiquated, if not obsolete, formula.[99]

The truth was that as early as 1890, Sutherland had been accused by members of the established Presbyterian church in Melbourne of being an atheist.[100] Even friends, who belonged to the same scientific organisations and societies as he did, labelled him a materialist and challenged his religious integrity.[101] At first, Sutherland strongly defended his religious beliefs asserting that 'as far from being materialistic, my views are at the other pole'.[102] He wrote: '[a]s a belief in an Omnipresent Power seems to me to be the last inevitable conclusion to several separate lines of argument, I am not an Atheist'.[103] By 1898, after the publication of his scientific study, a clear statement of his religious beliefs cannot be found. The closest Sutherland came to making a statement about his religious beliefs can be found in the final chapter of his two-volume *magnum opus* which was called 'Right and Wrong' and which concluded with the following sentence:

> Right and wrong dwell out in the everlasting heavens, even as beauty dwells in a graceful woman, as coolness dwells in the clear spring water, as glorious colour dwells in the tropic sunset, as vastness dwells in the ocean—things not so in themselves, but ever and inherently so to our natures.[104]

It is not surprising that H.G. Turner, Sutherland's closest friend for more than thirty years, was unable to produce a brief statement that clearly defined Sutherland's religious beliefs. Attempting to comprehend what Sutherland was saying about 'the relations between our human morality and the things which exist beyond the limits of our world' in the chapter called 'Right and Wrong', Turner wrote that it 'can be read by no one without a quickening sense of stimulation, and a direct uplifting of the moral nature'.[105] He concluded: '[i]ts fine diction charms, and its reverent tone enforces a conviction of the sincerity of the writer's religious feeling in the broadest conception of that too often misused phrase'.[106]

The Last Years of Sutherland's Life

Sutherland regarded *The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct* as his most important work and because it did not deal with an 'exclusively Australian' subject, he felt as though he was 'only for the first time coming in front of the public'.[107] Knowing that this was the first major philosophical study to come out of Australia, Sutherland sent his

manuscript to London. Once it became apparent that some of the world's greatest minds had decided that it was an important and invaluable contribution to science, it should have heralded the beginning of an Australian school of philosophy.[108] Instead, there was no celebration of a remarkable achievement in Australia and very few writers there were willing to admit, as many scientists had done elsewhere, that this book 'cannot fail to be suggestive' even if you disagree with its main contention.[109] As Newbold wrote: '[t]he most valuable part of the book lies in the rich mass of statistical material which Mr. Sutherland has not only collected and tabulated with infinite pains, but has also enriched by many original and suggestive observations'.[110]

In Australia, Sutherland's book was rejected and criticised mainly for religious reasons. Those who held fast to views that were more compatible with the conventional clerical teachings of the time found the unabashed materialism at the basis of Sutherland's methodology too much to synthesise. Unfortunately, he was unable to answer the immediate criticisms and reactions to his book in Australia because he spent the first year after its publication in England and Europe. Late in 1899, Sutherland returned home and continued to supplement his income by working as a journalist and by giving lectures. Although he had some three years to answer his critics, there are no published replies or papers in which Sutherland defended or expounded his thesis. This can be partly explained by Sutherland's decision not to engage in polemic or debate. He believed in science and the scientific method and he was convinced his results would speak for themselves. Besides, he always regarded his work as an installment of the whole and expected others to come along and challenge his conclusions.

Even when his work 'so terribly scandalised the orthodox', to use H.G. Turner's words, Sutherland was not prepared to take up the fight and answer his detractors.[111] The nature of his work at Melbourne University, in financial administration and English literature, prevented him from elucidating and pursuing his scientific interests. However, with his decision to enter the world of politics immediately after the completion of his book, Sutherland actively began to distance himself from his controversial philosophical beliefs. As Henry Hick, Honorary Secretary of the A. Sutherland Committee, diplomatically wrote in the political pamphlet *The Candidature of Mr. Alexander Sutherland*:

> He took a very considerable interest in the question of co-operation, but, being satisfied after some years of observation and study that it was a

> system from which not a great deal was to be expected, he lost much of his original zeal, and is now content to watch the movement as an outside critic.[112]

As a political candidate, Sutherland learnt very quickly the harsh lesson of 'chance compromise and clever equivocation'.[113] Sadly for him, he failed to win over his constituency and he missed any opportunity he may have had to popularize his scientific and philosophical point of view.

It was not long after the publication of *The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct* that Sutherland's life was tragically cut short. Shortly after midnight on 9 August 1902, while crowds in Melbourne enthusiastically celebrated the Coronation of their King, Alexander Sutherland died suddenly of heart failure. The *Argus*, for which he had written many articles, ran a very modest column under the heading 'Death Of Mr. Alex Sutherland, M.A.'.[114] After a very brief summary of Sutherland's life under the sub-heading 'Close Of A Fine Career', the article concluded with the words: "[h]is death will be regretted not only by a large circle of friends, who loved him for his personal qualities, but by the community at large, to whom he is known only by his achievements in literature'.[115] He was better known in Australia as a geographer, a colonial historian and litterateur than as a scientist or philosopher. As H.G. Turner put it in one of his obituaries of Sutherland:

> Suffice it for me now to say that, apart from his great work on the origin of the moral instinct, which elicited spontaneous letters of praise from men like Herbert Spencer, Francis Galton, Leslie Stephen, and other eminent scientists, Mr. Sutherland shone most in his contributions to the history of his adopted country, particularly in those early eras about which cling the flavour of romance and adventure.[116]

A small column in *The Australasian* informed readers that an 'unusually large number of persons' followed Sutherland's coffin to the grave at Kew Cemetery.[117] Among the mourners were 'many prominent public men' and students he had taught, especially those who attended his beloved Carlton College.[118] The service at the grave was conducted by the Reverend Dr. Charles Strong and among the pall-bearers were friends and colleagues of the University of Melbourne, including its Vice Chancellor, Sir Henry John Wrixon,

Sir James William Barrett, Dr. James Jamieson, Professor Henry Laurie, Sir Harry Brookes Allen and Professor William Adolphus Laver.

The tragedy of Sutherland is that he died at the prime of his intellectual development and despite having written Australia's first philosophical treatise to influence European thinkers and to attract international acclaim, he did not receive any accolades or recognition nationally. Yet, he deserves recognition for the outstanding nature of his contribution to philosophy in general and Australian historiography more specifically. There are few, if any, nineteenth century Australian intellectuals worthier of rehabilitation than Alexander Sutherland.

NOTES

[1] In the writing of this article the author is indebted to the anonymous reader for his/her comments and suggestions and to Professor Guy Robinson for his encouragement and effort. He would also like to thank Jane Bunney and her family (the only extant family of the Sutherlands) for their hospitality.

[2] E. Scott, *A Short History of Australia* (London, 1930), p.318.

[3] See: A. Sutherland, *The Origin And Growth Of The Moral Instinct*, Vols. 1 and 2 (New York, 1974).

[4] See: J. Sutherland, *The Bonds Of Society* (London, 1914).

[5] W. Nelson, *Foster Fraser's Fallacies And Other Australian Essays* (Sydney, 1910).

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Ibid*., pp.132-133.

[8] *Ibid*., pp.131-132.

[9] Short biographical entries on Alexander Sutherland and members of his family exist in several reference works. The best of these include: P.H. Northcott, "Sutherland, Alexander (1852-1902)", *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Vol. 6 (Melbourne, 1976), pp.222-223; *The Australian Encyclopaedia*, Vol. VIII (Sydney, 1983), pp.371-371; P. Mennell, *The Dictionary of Australasian Biography* (London, 1892); *The Oxford Companion to Australian Literature* (Oxford, 1994); S. Lee (ed.), *Dictionary of National Biography*, Second Supplement, Vol. III, (London, 1912), pp.452-453 and P. Serle, "Sutherland, Alexander", *Dictionary of Australian Biography*, (Sydney, 1949), pp.393-394. Sadly, Sutherland's personal papers, if they exist at all, cannot been found.

[10] Jane was the daughter of William Smith of Galston, Ayrshire.

[11] I would like to thank Dr Stuart Rosewarne for his encouragement and assistance, especially in the early days of this project. See his introduction to 'The Sutherland Family' in The Victorian College of the Arts Gallery Catalogue to the Exhibition 8-30 September, 1977, unpaginated.

[12] W.A. Osborne, *William Sutherland: A Biography* (Melbourne, 1920), p.12.

[13] Rosewarne, 'Sutherland Family'.

[14] *Ibid*.

[15] cf. G. Blainey, *A Centenary History Of The University Of Melbourne* (Melbourne, 1957), p.45

[16] Robert Dundas Ballantyne was the superintendent of the penal settlement at Port Arthur, Tasmania.

[17] His son Dallas was killed in World War I in France on 19 August 1916 while helping a wounded comrade. See: *European War Pamphlets*, Vol. 249, c.7 held at the State Library of Victoria, Australia.

[18] H.G. Turner, *Alexander Sutherland. An Address delivered by request to The Australian Literature Society, 14th November, 1907* (Melbourne, 1908), p.9.

[19] *Ibid*., p.10.

[20] *Ibid*., p.11.

[21] *Ibid*., p.12.

[22] J. Holroyd, *George Robertson Of Melbourne 1825-1898 Pioneer Bookseller and Publisher* (Melbourne, 1968), p.49.

[23] Graeme Davison, *The Oxford Companion to Australian History* (Melbourne, 1998), p.621.

[24] D. Garden, *Theodore Fink: A Talent for Ubiquity* (Melbourne, 1998), p.25

[25] *Ibid*., p.26

[26] Australian Artists' Association Inward Correspondence, SLV MS 7593, Box 583/1C.

[27] Two letters to the Victorian Academy of Arts, SLV MS 7593, Box 581/3.

[28] Turner, *Sutherland*, p.27.

[29] *Ibid*., p.22.

[30] *The Royal Geographical Society of Australasia* (Victoria), Volume XIX, 1901, pp. 53-62.

[31] Sutherland Family Scrapbook, SLV MS 12311.

[32] *Ibid*.

[33] J. Rickard, *A Family Romance: The Deakins at Home* (Melbourne, 1996), pp.9 and 30. See also: Garden, *Fink*, p.23; J. Rickard, *H.B. Higgins: The Rebel as Judge* (Melbourne, 1984), p.58; A. Gabay, *The Mystic Life of Alfred Deakin* (Cambridge, 1992), p.6ff.

[34] G. Sutherland, *Australia or England In The South* (London, 1886), p. 121.

[35] Sutherland, *Origin and Growth*, Vol. I, p.ix.

[36] Chief among the scientists who made Australia their home were: Frederic McCoy, Ralph Tate, Archibald Liversidge, Julian Edmund Tenison-Woods, Ferdinand Jakob Heinrich von Mueller, Moritz Richard Schomburgk, Robert Lewis John Ellery, Louis Brennan, Lawrence Hargraves and William Sutherland to name a few. The lesser known names in this short list draw our attention to the need for more historical scholarship to ensure that important individuals, who once may have represented the commanding heights in their chosen fields of endeavour, are not forgotten forever. It is only by casting a spotlight on these forgotten individuals that we can obtain a complete understanding of the general development of any society. See Sutherland, *England In The South*, pp.121-123.

[37] Turner, *Sutherland*, pp.28-29. See also: Blainey, *Centenerary History*, p.44.

[38] Turner, *Sutherland*, pp.28-29.

[39] G. Serle, *From Deserts The Prophets Come: The Creative Spirit in Australia 1788-1972* (Melbourne, 1973), p.50.

[40] See, for example, the following reviews: D. Irons, *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 8, No. 4 (July, 1899), pp.420-424; W.R. Newbold, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 13, pp.91-94; W.S.S., *The American Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Oct., 1898), pp.148-149 and F.H. Giddings, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (Mar., 1899), pp.177-179.

[41] Francis Galton, "Evolution Of The Moral Instinct" in *Nature*, Vol. 58, No. 1498, (July 14, 1898), p.241.

[42] Turner, *Sutherland*, p.28.

[43] Sutherland, *Origin and Growth*, Vol. I, p.ix.

[44] John Gonzalez, "In Pursuit of a Historical Tradition: N.A. Rozhkov's Scientific Laws of History" in *Studies in East European Thought*, Vol. 59, No. 4 (2007), pp.309-346.

[45] Alexander Sutherland, *Proiskhozhdenie I razvitie nravstvennogo instinkta* (St. Petersburg, 1900).

[46] N.A. Rozhkov, *Russkaia istoria v sravnitel'no-istoricheskom osveshchenii (osnovy sotsial'noi dinamiki)*, Vol. 1, Second Edition (Petrograd-Moscow, 1923), p.16.

[47] *Ibid.*, pp.14-20.

[48] P. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor Of Evolution* (London, 1915), p.9. Kropotkin, a Russian nobleman, lived in English exile for political reasons. He wrote *Mutual Aid* (in English) as a direct response to Huxley's essay

"The Struggle for Existence in Human Society," published in *The Nineteenth Century*, in February 1888. Kropotkin responded to Huxley with a series of articles, also printed in *The Nineteenth Century* and eventually collected together as the book *Mutual Aid.*

[49] *Ibid*.

[50] Huxley was dubbed "Darwin's bulldog" for his vociferous defenses of Darwin's theory of evolution.

[51] Huxley, 'Struggle for Existence', p.165.

[52] S.J. Gould, *Bully For Brontosaurus: Reflections in Natural History* (London, 2001), p.329.

[53] *Ibid*., p.328.

[54] *Ibid*.

[55] C. Darwin, *Origin of the Species*, Chapter 3.
http://www.literature.org/authors/darwin-charles/the-origin-of-species/

[56] D.P. Todes, *Darwin Without Malthus: The Struggle for Existence in Russian Evolutionary Thought* (Oxford, 1989), p.13.

[57] Sutherland, *The Origin and Growth*, *op.cit*., Vol. 1, p.viii.

[58] *Ibid*., p.vii.

[59] *Ibid*.

[60] *Ibid*.

[61] C. Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, Chapter IV.

[62] *Ibid.*

[63] *Ibid.*

[64] Todes, *Darwin Without Malthus*, p.13.

[65] Kropotkin made this point very clear. See: P. Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (London, 1902).

[66] Sutherland, *The Origin and Growth*, *op.cit*., Vol. I, p.1.

[67] *Ibid*., p.2.

[68] *Ibid*., p.6.

[69] *Ibid*., p.41.

[70] *Ibid*., p.24.

[71] *Ibid*.

[72] *Ibid.*

[73] *Ibid*.

[74] *Ibid*., p.80.

[75] *Ibid*., p.30.

[76] *Ibid*., p.28.

[77] *Ibid*.

[78] *Ibid*., p.29.

[79] *Ibid*.

[80] *Ibid*., p.28-30.

[81] *Ibid*., p.28.

[82] *Ibid*., p.30.

[83] *Ibid*.

[84] *Ibid*.

[85] *Ibid*.

[86] *Ibid*., p.38

[87] *Ibid*.

[88] *Ibid*., pp.40 and 99.

[89] *Ibid*., p.95.

[90] *Ibid*., p.99.

[91] *Ibid*., p.11. See chapter XIV

[92] *Ibid*., p.10.

[93] *Ibid*.

[94] *Ibid*., Vol. 2, p.304.

[95] *Ibid*.

[96] *Ibid*. Vol. 1, pp.6, 19, 153-157; Vol. 2, pp.303-307.

[97] J. Hetherington, *Pillars Of The Faith: Churchmen and their Churches in Early Victoria* (Melbourne, 1966), p.27.

[98] Turner, *Sutherland*, p.33.

[99] *Ibid*., pp.33-34.

[100] W. Turner, *Examination Of Mr. Alex. Sutherland's Views On "The Physiological Basis Of Morals"*. Being the First of the Winter Course of Lectures in Connection with Elsternwick Presbyterian Church. Delivered in the Elsternwick Hall on 30th May, 1890. (Melbourne, 1890), pp.8-9, 12-13.

[101] *Ibid*., p.8.

[102] *Ibid*.

[103] *Ibid*.

[104] Sutherland, *Origin and Growth*, Vol. II, p.323.

[105] Turner, *Alexander Sutherland*, p.29.

[106] *Ibid*.

[107] Sutherland, *The Origin and Growth*, Vol. I, p.ix.

[108] See: H. Sturt, Review of *The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct*, by Alexander Sutherland in *International Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Oct., 1898), p.90.

[109] Irons, 'Review', p.424.

[110] Newbold, 'Review', p.94.

[111] Turner, *Alexander Sutherland*, pp.11 and 27.

[112] H. Henry, *The Candidature of Mr. Alexander Sutherland* (Williamstown, 1897), pp.3-4.

[113] Turner, *Alexander Sutherland*, p.9.

[114] *Argus*, 11 August 1902.

[115] *Ibid*.

[116] *The Australasian*, 18 August 1902.

[117] *Ibid*.

[118] *Ibid.*