MODERN SOCIALISM
IN ITS HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

BY
DR. M. TUGAN-BARANOWSKY

TRANSLATED FROM RUSSIAN BY
M. I. REDMOUNT

Современный социализм в его историческом развитии
1906

LONDON:
SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO., LIM.,
25 HIGH STREET BLOOMSBURY
1910

М. И. Туган-Барановский

СОВРЕМЕННЫЙ СОЦИАЛИЗМ

В СВОЕМ ИСТОРИЧЕСКОМ РАЗВИТИИ

Размышляя о марксизме № 114

URSS

HX
59
T81m

PREFACE

THE Socialistic literature notwithstanding its vastness opens to view a gap, the almost total absence of a systematic, scientifically objective and critical investigation of what constitutes the doctrine of modern Socialism. Schaeffle's famous book *Quintessence of Socialism* exhibits to a certain extent such a tendency but lacks every historical illustration and bears more or less a dogmatical stamp. This work, as well as Menger's *New State Doctrine* are besides mere expositions of a part of the general doctrine of Socialism as they interpret only its positive side. Bourguin's *Contemporary Socialist Systems*, one of the latest researches in this province, is to my mind far from fulfilling the void I have pointed out, being in a considerable measure but an unconvincing attempt to confute Socialism as a positive doctrine.

Many good writings on Socialism have of late been published. It will suffice to mention Sombart's well-known book *Socialism and the Socialist Movement during the Nineteenth Century* which also belongs to that class of writings, the

tendency of which, in most cases, is not so much to characterise the doctrines of Socialism as to expound the Socialist movement.

The book now put before the reader has another aim: a succinct critical exposition of the essential tenets of modern Socialism as a definite social doctrine. And taking into consideration that Marxism, as I strongly believe, does not embrace all the scientific elements of Socialism, my investigation necessarily assumed an historical character in so far as I was obliged to retrospect and introduce earlier, partly forgotten doctrines of the so called *Utopian* category, which I consider deserving of the most serious attention and which in some respects are even more scientific than Marxism. I shall be glad, indeed, if my book will again draw attention to the either wholly neglected or but little read works of the many great originators of modern socialist ideals, who, failing to accomplish what they had striven for during their lifetime, have left a deep and indelible mark of their thoughts upon the epoch we live in.

M. Tugan-Baranowsky.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE . . . . . v.

INTRODUCTION

THE ESSENCE AND THE AIM OF SOCIALISM

PART I

CRITICISM OF THE CAPITALISTIC SYSTEM

CHAPTER I.—Exploitation of the Working Classes by the Non-Working . . . 35

" II.—Concentration of Production and Income and the Pauperization of the Labour Class . . . 64

" III.—The Vices of Civilization and General Estimation of the Capitalistic Economic System 83

PART II

SOCIALISTIC ORGANIZATION OF SOCIETY

" IV.—Centralized Socialism and Communion 109

I. Centralized Socialism . . 111

II. Centralized Communism . . 137

" V.—Corporate and Federal Socialism and Communism 146

I. Corporate Socialism . . . 146

II. Federal Socialism and Communism 151

" VI.—Anarchism 169

PAGE

PART III

REALIZATION OF SOCIALISM

CHAPTER VII.—Means for Realising the Social Order Socialistic Tactics . . . 185

„ VIII.—Transition from Capitalism to Socialism. Practical Programme of Socialism 212

MODERN SOCIALISM

INTRODUCTION

THE ESSENCE AND THE AIMS OF SOCIALISM

The curtain of the twentieth century was drawn up under the sign of Socialism. The proletarian red flag, hailed by some with enthusiasm, viewed by others as a menacing symbol with horror, is by none regarded with indifference. Creations of the brain of solitary thinkers turned into a social movement the mightiest history knows of; the immense Socialistic literature is increasing every day; thousands of organs of the press in the old and new worlds endeavour to elaborate, develop and spread Socialistic ideas. Millions of people actively participate in this movement, and it is indeed not to be wondered at that the problem contained in this agitation forms the central topic of public thought.

However, Socialism as a doctrine is as yet very far from the ideal of an accomplished scientific system. The very conception of Socialism is unsettled and vague. What is Socialism? Laveleye in his work on modern Socialism says that he did not light upon an exact definition of this conception. Proudhon's answer when a similar question was put to him was, that, in his opinion, whoever aims at the improvement of social conditions "is a Socialist." If

this be so, who can be a non-Socialist? Every one, concluded Laveleye, is a Socialist from somebody's point of view—" le socialiste de quelqu'un."

The predominating tendency of modern Socialism—Marxism—prides itself on its having changed Utopian Socialism into a scientific doctrine, but unfortunately one of the peculiar features of Marxism is its unscientific indifference with regard to the definition of the terms and notions it makes use of. Generally speaking, we can say that Marxism identifies Socialism with socialization of the means of production, with the transition of the means of production from private property, which they are at the present time, to the community as a whole, for a regular organization of social production. As to objects of consumption, they are supposed to retain their private character.

But this conception of the essential point of Socialism can also be considered as unsatisfactory. It takes a wrong view of the matter, first and foremost, by showing the means and not the goal of Socialism. It is true that, according to the predominant Socialist views, the new order can be reached only by socializing the means of production. But does this imply the attainment of the actual scope of Socialism under all circumstances and conditions? By no means. The passage of the means of production from the hands of the capitalists and landlords to those of the whole community can be effected in two ways, either by purchase or by confiscation. To bring about this passage, Rodbertus proposes the expropriation of the present owners of land and capital by the community pledged to pay to them to the full the annuities they formerly received from their property. In this case the landlord and capitalists would, for ever and ever, become creditors of the community with the right to the claim of

a tribute of the same amount as before. The part of the workers' produce would, as before, be appropriated by the wealthy class, and the result would be the division of the population into poor and rich; the exploitation of one individual by the other would thus remain in full force and virtue, and society would retain the class character in spite of the socialized means of production and the disappearance of private property. Such a community can nowise be regarded as socialistic, since Socialism counts socialization of production solely as subservient to a purpose of a higher order—the suppression of human exploitation. The socialization of production in the shape proposed by Rodbertus would be but the perpetual preservation and strengthening of the dominant position of the wealthy classes, producing nothing and consuming the fruits of the labour of others. Such a state would be just as far from the ideal of Socialism as is the present order founded on private enterprise and private possession of the means of production.

Thus, socialization of production by itself does not yet constitute Socialism. Let us imagine that the growth of joint stock companies and their subsequent combining into syndicates and trusts will lead to the absolute extinction of single capitalistic enterprises by assimilating all capitalistic production in one immense national organization, the shareholders of which are not only wealthy owners but workpeople, as is the case with the cotton mills in Oldham, where the majority of the workmen own shares in the concern, and as also seen in the greatest capitalistic organisation in the world—the renowned American Steel Corporation, which uses every imaginable expedient to induce the workmen to become shareholders, and thus to pinion them to the enterprise. All these centralizations and socializations of production,

effected on the capitalistic base, remain capitalistic, and are far from reflecting the principle of socialistic production.

According to the well-known Belgian Socialist, Emil Vandervelde, the ultimate aim of Socialism consists in the corporate ownership of the means of production and exchange in the social organisation of labour, in the distribution of that part of the surplus value among the working men which remains after the deduction of a portion of it necessary to satisfy the wants of the community in general. Nor can this definition be considered as satisfactory because of its confounding the aim with the means of Socialism. The final goal of Socialism consists, as we have seen, neither in the socialization of the means of production, nor in the social organization of labour. It is true that the annulling of income without work is one of the ends Socialism strives to attain to; but Socialism goes further. At the present time the pecuniary reward of a manager of a factory exceeds that of a journeyman tens of times, although the work of the latter is not only not less, but generally even exceeds that of the former. Socialism will undoubtedly reject such differences of remuneration, as it does not only demand distribution of produce as such among its producers, but the distribution in keeping with certain ethical principles which Vandervelde did not take into consideration in his formula.

Menger gives a more precise explanation of the final aim of Socialism. "The essentialness of a socialistic state," he says, "consists, expressed in a general form, in the individual interests of the majority of the population, being the chief end of the state," a definition, which although undoubtedly accurate, still throws very little light on the intrinsic qualities of Socialism, in so far as the most marked characteristics of the socialistic order, compared with all other social systems, completely disappear. The

philosophy of the eighteenth century sincerely believed that free competition more than anything else secured the welfare of the mass of the people, which view necessarily led them to advocate for the capitalistic and not the socialistic organization of economic life.

To finish this cursory and anything but complete survey of different definitions of Socialism, I will quote a passage of Werner Sombart, elucidating the conception he has formed of what constitutes the essence of Socialism. "All theoretical attempts," he says, "to show the proletariate the aim they are to strive at, to instigate them to action, to organise the struggle and to find the means by which this aim could be reached, put together, constitutes what we call modern Socialism." We agree with this explanation but cannot suppress the question as to what the essential aim of the proletariate consists of? Now, this is just the question which requires to be solved, and in relation to which Sombart prefers not to express his opinion.

The reason of the unsatisfactory state in which, till now, we have found the definitions of the conceptions of Socialism—of this potent movement, with its obscure theoretical starting points, lies sufficiently deep. In the "great Utopists" of the beginning of last century, Owen, St. Simon and Fourier, we must recognise the generators of the positive doctrine of modern Socialism. A great part of the intellectual labour that was required to create a new social ideal has been performed by them. But their Socialism bore a sectarian character. The Owenites rejected the tenets of St. Simonism, and the followers of St. Simonism repudiated those of Owenism. The adherents of Fourierism declined to profess the principles of either of them, and there was nothing in them bearing any similitude as to their being conscious of the common aims and strivings that unite them all.

Trivial differences respecting the lines of their thoughts completely veiled from them the contiguousness of their postulates. The very term "Socialism," compassing all socialistic trends, appeared considerably later. According to Weill, author of an excellent monography on St. Simonism, this word was first used in France, in a St. Simonist journal of 1832, in a somewhat different sense from that to which it is now applied.

At the Congress held in 1836 in Manchester, Owen's followers assumed the name of Socialists for their party. During the forties, owing chiefly to the widely propagated although shallow work of Louis Reybaud, the term "Socialism," in the modern sense came into use.

The primitive Socialism was entirely the produce of abstract speculation, like any other philosophical system or scientific theory. Reprobating the existing social order and proposing to replace it by a new one, the great Socialists of the commencement of last century, reposed their trust in the power of persuasion. They appealed to human reason, and acted like an architect who proposes to pull down a building which turned out a failure, and to construct instead a new one on a new plan. This method of procedure includes the power and the weakness of the original Socialism. The power lay in the fact that the method contained certain true and rational conceptions. If the existing human community cannot be said to be the outcome of human art, it obviously becomes such in a growing degree, keeping pace with the progress of mankind. The originators of Socialism were, therefore, perfectly right in strongly believing that, after having shown the advantages of the new social structure—the issue of their imagination, after having spread these convictions among the masses of populations, they must sooner or later stir them to rearrange their life on new lines.

The belief in the possibility of social organizations, by means of logical arguments, has moreover been attended by the advantage of animating the first Socialists to theoretically improve their teachings. How immutable must have been the belief in the irrefragability of the inferences drawn by reason from the abstract premises when a Fourier could go to the pains of explaining, on tens and hundreds of pages, from point to point, the innumerable benefits of the organization of labour in his Phalanstery. He did not fear the triviality and pettiness of his computations, on account of which he was obliged to descend into provinces which modern science majestically declines to take notice of. The kitchen, laundry, poultry-yard, store-room, and in general, all usually unnoticed household appurtenances, appeared to him to afford just as important fields of investigation as those in which economic forces of world-wide interest collided. Fourier intended to convince people that their life in the palace of the future, the Phalanstery, will be better than in the buildings of modern type, and as the life of common man consists of summed up trifles, not one of them was being passed by Fourier as too worthless. It is very easy to turn into ridicule such calculations, as, indeed, they have been derided many times; but the result of the mental strain to devise a completely new social organization, and to evince its superiority over the existing conditions, has nevertheless been of intense significance.

The social ideal, under the banner of which the working classes are actually fighting, was called into being by no one else but by these phantastical individuals, whose fancies challenged the rude reality of the surrounding world. Socialism as a positive doctrine, representing a definite social system of the future, has been pointed at by them as the high aim to which mankind is now tending.

On the other hand, the method of devising, inventing and

peacefully propagating new social orders has been the source of incurable weakness for the primeval Socialism. The average man is, at all events, not so reasoning a being as is often assumed. The spiritual world is wrapped up in a rather dense tissue of interests, customs, traditions, preconceived views, and prejudices, which will stand against the strongest logical arguments. Whatever may be brought forward in order to convince people of the charms of the future social order, the majority will turn but a deaf ear to all discussions if their immediate material interest will not induce them to boldly step forward and break with the existing system. In the imagination of the early Socialists the future world is separated from the present by an unfathomable abyss, and the people at large took little interest in their sermons, notwithstanding their persuasiveness and their internal force.

In order to acquire an influence on the masses of a people, Socialism must bear in mind their daily requirements, a problem which Marxism solved. Owing to Marxian ingenious tactics, the Socialistic movement has become a labour question, and the struggle for the Socialistic ideal has assumed the character of a contention for the improvement of the position of the working class. To these dispositions only is to be ascribed the fact that Socialism has become what it now is: the greatest political power of the present.

However, the more the centre of gravity of the Socialistic movement is being transferred into the sphere of practical politics—the immediate needs of the labouring classes—the more its ultimate aim recedes to the background. The interest taken in the future Socialistic order made way for the interest in immediately realisable reforms of the existing conditions. Questions of labour legislation, methods of improvement of the present position of working classes,

and so on, became the focus of the attentions of the Socialistic actors, whilst the proper ideal continues to serve but as a symbol, without any concrete contents.

Marxism has not added anything to this ideal as it was created by the early Socialists; it is, however, clear that it is just this ideal that makes the modern labour movement Socialistic. In other words, Socialism as a doctrine is, above all, a doctrine of a new social ideal.

Thus the tactics of Marxism, crowned by so brilliant a success in practical life, have in theory resulted in weakening the interest in the final issue of Socialism. Nothing can, therefore, be more erroneous than the opinion generally entertained, that the theory of Socialism is entirely to be found in the writings of Marx and his school. The ingenious works of the author of the "Capital," the significance of which I am not at all inclined to disparage, do not contain the theory of Socialism but that of Capitalism, of the development of Capitalism conducive to Socialism. As to Socialism, in relation to the future organization of society, Marx has well nigh not alluded to it. He received from his predecessors the Socialistic ideal ready made, without, as we have already remarked, adding anything of his own. Nor does it appear from his writings what part of this ideal he endorsed and what he repudiated, although, judging by fragmentary hints and allusions, one can guess that regarding the future structure Marx did not remain behind the idealism of his predecessors.

This explains the strange fact we referred to—that at the same time as the working classes of the whole world are gathering around the flag of Socialism, the conception of Socialism continues to be obscure and confused. The Socialistic ideal cannot be understood but in connection with the speculative view of the world, which has

brought it into existence. The ingenious author of the "Utopia," Thomas More, can be regarded as the harbinger of this ideal in a finished and systematic shape. But his ideas were too far in advance of his time and out of touch with real life. Modern Socialism has sprung from a later epoch—the epoch of the great French Revolution, which in many relations formed the landmark at which the newest history has commenced. At this epoch arose and grew in strength a new view of the world, the cornerstone of which was the idea of the human personality as the greatest aim in itself. The best founder and interpreter of this system is, in my opinion, he who stood aside from social life, but whose bright and powerful genius penetrated deeper into the human mind than any one else. I mean the greatest philosopher of the modern time—Kant.

In his writings on Morals and Rights, he has established the theory of viewing the world which has found a practical expression in the revolutionary demand of "liberty, equality, and fraternity." The second of this triad, "equality," is of vital importance to Socialism as its ideal root, its basal principle, which, however, it is utterly difficult to substantiate. The desirability of freedom and fraternity does not want to be demonstrated, the absence of freedom being felt by every one as a sufferance, and the presence of fraternity as a positive good. As to equality, it is quite another thing. Now, in what sense is equality an advantage and inequality an evil? Inequality is deeply rooted in the nature of things. Men are born unequal, are unequal in their physical constitutions, in their mental faculties, moral inclinations, tastes, wants, etc., etc. No social system whatever can annihilate this variety, and why should it? Does general equality guarantee general happiness? All these considerations are so natural and convincing that they have been hitherto invariably appealed

to on the part of the adversaries of Socialism. Kant's theory only, by its rigorous logical inferences, has laid a foundation of the claim of equality, as solid as granite. The activity of man pursues different aims, and everything that represents an aim has with us a certain value. The value of our purposes is a relative one if we determinate it arbitrarily, according to our own judgment and personal views, which have no binding power over others. But is there not in nature something that should have an absolute obligatory value for all? Yes, there is. "Everything in Nature," Kant says, "over which we exert our power, can serve us as a means, only man, and with him every creature endowed with reason, constitutes his aim in himself. Man and generally every reasonable creature, as an aim in himself and not as a means for the will of others, shall always be regarded in all his doings relating to himself or to other reasonable creatures as an "aim." Of course Kant does not assert that this fundamental moral principle is always being carried out, but it is the universally binding ideal tenet, lying at the very bottom of this view of the world, which, after having thrown down many holy things, found out and determined one object of supreme sanctity—human personality—and bowed to man as such, independently of the difference in rank and character, whether respected or despised. In every man, let him be ever so low, there is something which has an absolute value, a value that tops everything—it is his human nature. Whatever the individual may be, he has an innate, inalienable right to demand that our relations to him be not as to a means, but as to supreme aim. Kant accordingly arrives at the idea of the "Reign of Aims," in which reasonable beings, aiming at reasonable objects, regard one another not as means but as ends. An ideal human society must represent such a "Reign of Aims."

The ancients, in their view of the world, did not see in slavery anything inadmissible. The greatest philosophers of antiquity, as for instance Plato, denied the right of the barbarians to demand, on the part of the Hellenes, a kind, humane treatment. The new conception of the world, recognising the absolute and unlimited value of the human personality, cannot, from its point of view, make such differences, and therefore proclaims the absolute equality of all reasonable beings.

From this postulate Kant deduces his doctrine of the innate rights of man. "There is only one innate right of man. Freedom, independence from the coercion, from the arbitrariness of others, in so far as this is compatible, according to general laws, with the freedom of others, is the only original right inherent in every man upon the strength of his being man. The innate equality, *i.e.*, the right of everyone not to take upon himself greater obligations in relation to another man than the latter charges himself with in relation to the former, and then the right to be his own master, which rights are involved in the principle of innate freedom and cannot be disjoined from it, as subdivision of a higher conception of right."

Now, it is in this sense that the natural equality of men is to be understood. They are equal by virtue of the illimited value each personality represents; they are equal in relation to the consideration we owe to their interests; they are equal by their right to live and enjoy life. Only from this standpoint can equality be recognised as the basal principle of an orderly social organisation. Cast off the doctrine of absolute value embodied in human personality, and all democratic demands of our time dissolve into idle talk. The idea of equality of men must therefore be recognised as the fundamental ethical tenet of modern Socialism. It is true that Kant, who laid a solid theo-

retical foundation of Socialism, was himself far from being a Socialist. In his "Metaphysik der Sitten" he defends the right of private property in land and other means of production and attempts to draw it from the inherent right of freedom. But if there be any point which Socialistic criticism established beyond dispute, it is this, that the right of private possession of the means of production, yielding to the operation of the inexorable economic laws, inevitably turns into the right of exploitation of one man by another, and thus alters the innate equality of all into a hollow juridical fiction.

As long as private property of land and capital will exist the landlord and capitalist will remain masters of the working man who does not possess the means of production. In other words, private property of the means of production is incompatible with the right of freedom and equality of the individual. The claim of Socialism, therefore, rests upon the natural right logically tied up with the original and cardinal right of freedom of man.

Kant, as we said, was no Socialist, but the idea of equal dignity of the human personality, which found the most methodical expression in his philosophy, comprehends the theoretical foundation of Socialism, in so far as it rests on ethical principles. Socialism is striving to actualize all those rights which are theoretically recognised on all hands as an inalienable possession, so that what was but a juridical fiction must assume the palpable form of life.

It is not sufficient to proclaim the equality of all men before the law. This equality must be realised by warranting the possibility of its conversion to use; and as individual as well as social life is grounded on economy, beyond which no real guarantee can possibly be given, Socialism is naturally being led to demand a reform of the existing economic system. As long as one class of the community

will appropriate the fruits of the labour of another class, as long as the exploitation of the workman by the wealthy will last, the realisation of equal rights for all, to which Socialism is tending, will not be attained. We can therefore define Socialism as *the social organization in which, owing to equal obligations and equal rights of all to participate in the communal work, as also owing to the equal right to participate in the produce of this work, the exploitation of one member of the community by another is impossible.*

Herein lies the drift and goal of Socialism as a conception of a new economic structure in opposition to the prevailing capitalistic system. This definition compasses all shades and all directions of Socialism, which can be subdivided into several groups, all bearing the leading features of Socialism, on which stress was laid in my interpretation. In a wider sense, Socialism can be subdivided into (1) Socialism proper (Collectivism) and (2) Communism.

The distinction between Socialism, in its narrower signification (Collectivism), and Communism, is commonly thought to lie in that Socialism demands only that the means of production be transferred to the community, admitting private property in objects of use, whilst Communism claims complete abolishment of private property, be it in the shape of means of production or in that of personal use. But this is not quite correct. In the first place, it must be remarked that it is not possible to draw exact boundaries between means of production and objects of use. The chair I sit upon is an object of use, if I am merely using it to take a rest, and a means of production, if sitting on it I am performing some labour. A carriage is an object of use if one drives in it for pleasure, and becomes a means of production if recoursed to in business.

Nor is it correct to maintain that Socialism demands

the socialization of all implements of work, or means of production. Kautsky closes his book "Land Question" by a very eloquent description of the charms of the home. Bellamy in his book "Looking Backward" assigns to every family a separate house, which necessarily requires more or less household occupations, involving individual possession of means of production, as for instance, utensils, table ware, furniture, writing materials, etc., books destined and read not for a pastime,—are all objects the private use of which must be admitted even by a Collectivist orgenization of the community. Thus, even under a Collectivist social order, certain instruments of production retain the quality of private property.

But there are a great many objects the private possession of which collectivist society can by no means grant. Many things serving for immediate use and enjoyment, already form objects of public property, for instance: museums, picture galleries, public gardens, &c., &c. Under a Socialistic arrangement the numbers of free sources of enjoyment needs considerably rise, whilst other objects of use, as for instance, dwelling-houses, turn into social property, and are being let out to private persons for a certain sum. In such a social state there would be three groups of objects of use: one belonging to the community as such, to the use of which all shall have free access; one, likewise social property, the individual use of which shall be granted for a certain compensation; and one shall consist of objects possessed by individuals as private property.

But even Communism does not include in its distinct qualities the complete disappearance of property. The chief apostle of the newest Communism, Cabet, in his "Icary," strove to make everything public and to annihilate individual property, but was far from attaining complete success. The Icarians, living in villages and having their

households, are in possession, as described by Cabet, of separate farms, from which they deliver to the State a fixed quantity of agricultural products, after the deduction of which they freely dispose of the whole remainder, without undergoing any communal control with regard to the use they make of it. This evidently shows that the Icarians are actual proprietors of the products of their labour, of course, without the right of alienation. Individual production naturally engenders individual possession of its fruits. The organization of social production, to whatever extent it may develop, will find on its way many an object of use, which owing to its very nature must be left in individual possession; for instance, clothing. However broadly the principle of Communism may be carried out, it will never succeed in dressing two individuals with one coat at one and the same time, and every coat must therefore, owing to its essential qualities, practically be the property of him who wears it.

The principal distinction between Socialism and Communism cannot, therefore, be said to lie in the criterion referred to. In view of this fact many are inclined to identify Socialism with Communism, or regard the degrees of applying the principle of socialization of economic objects as their distinctive features. It is, however, not impossible to mark out the point of difference between these systems, which difference to my mind consists in the following:

Amongst the different Socialistic systems, in the wider sense of the term, it is easy to discern two fundamental types. According to one, the income of every individual is, in one way or the other, adjusted by determining the sum total the individual may dispose of to satisfy his wants. According to the other, the individual income is not only not regulated at all, but the very notion of income as a determined value is rejected, the immediate wants only

being regulated or recognised as absolutely free. Under the order of the first type the distribution of products proceeds by means of a money system, were it but an ideal one; every individual spends his income, consumes it within the limits of the values it represents, which, in their turn requires a close comparison with the values substantiated in the used objects, so that in this case everything must have its price expressed in units of value. In other words, money, as a standard of value and purchasing power, represents in this type an indispensable organ of distribution; whereas in the organization of the second type, in which illimited freedom of consumption is admitted, and not the income but the use it is put to is being controlled, money as an instrument of distribution is not at all necessary. Social economy of the first type supposes the use of money, while that of the second has no place for money at all.

This deep and essential distinction accounts for the separation of Socialism (Collectivism) from Communism, for wherever we meet with individual income we are in the domain of a Socialistic order, and whenever this condition is wanting we have Communism before us. The usual comprehension of Socialism as an organization in which personal property in objects of use is being admitted, and Communism as a system in which this property is not recognized, is a vague expression of the difference between these two systems. The category of personal income logically presupposes freedom of disposing of one's income to one's own taste, just as this disposition presupposes the personal right of uncontrolled use of the acquired objects; in other words, the category of personal income presupposes personal property, while the absence of the order of personal income presupposes the absence of personal rights to the objects used, therefore the social order of this type indiscriminately rejects the ownership of all economic objects

Thus starting from the given explanation, we are able to trace the precise boundaries between Socialism in its narrow sense (Collectivism), and Communism. Socialism regulates Consumption, according to income. Communism either admits free use, or regulates it by immediate distribution of commodities in kind.

Under the communistic arrangement economical equality, which is the constituent principle of every Socialistic system, means either freedom of individual consumption or equal consumption for all, of course, according to age, sex, state of health, &c., &c. Refraining from the regulation of individual income, Communism denies the necessity of a proportional relation of what each member gives to what he receives from the community.

Socialistic systems—in the strict sense—are, on the contrary, of two kinds. Some, as Pecquent, Bellamy, stand for as rigorous an equality as Communism. The subjecting of the income to rules, in this case, assumes the form of complete equality of income of all members of the society, each having the right to the same amount. In contradistinction to the equalizing Communism, here the equality of income does not undergo the metamorphose into the use of objects equal in kind and quality. Every one spends his income as he lists, and according to his wants. With other authors the system of economic equality is understood as the equal right of every labourer to the produce of his exertions, but since the products of labour of the different workmen can be, and even inevitably must be unequal, in consequence of man's dissimilarity of power and capacity, Socialism of this type does not demand equality of income, which many adherents of collectivism even regard as not at all desirable, as a state in which the labourer is losing the stimulus to increase the productivity of his labour. Thus for instance does St. Simon formulate

his view on this question: "From each according to his capacity, to each capacity according to his work;" in other words, every one is obliged to perform the labour for which he is best qualified, and is to receive the reward according to what he gives to the community.

Socialism, in the sense referred to, as well as Communism, recognises the necessity of organising social labour and production on a consistent plan, which inevitably must bear a more or less coercive character, since the community must be invested with the power to safeguard and secure the effected organization of labour independently of single individual opinions.

On this line Socialism is commonly contrasted with Anarchism, a view which cannot be held with regard to principles. Both Anarchism and Socialism, in the wider sense of the term, are striving to suppress exploitation of man by man, and warrant economic equality of all members of the community. Anarchism also starts from the idea of equivalency of human personality, so that to view Anarchism under the general conception of Socialism proves quite correct. Anarchism distinguishes itself from other species of Socialism by its absolute negation of coercive measures in the organization of labour, and by recognizing the possibility of realizing the ideal of Socialism by means of completely free co-operations. Not only the State must disappear, but every coercive social power; every possible violence of one individual to another must cease. Without any social coercion, without any imposed external scheme, only by spontaneous consent unions and groups of people will emerge, which will conjointly avail themselves of the means of production without encroaching upon the rights of each other; in short, the ideal of Anarchism is the complete autonomy of the individual.

II

Socialism finds the root of our social evils in the economic organization of modern society. Hence the easy inference that Socialism, seeing the pinnacle of human happiness only in material welfare, must in conformity to its nature be hostile to idealism. This deduction is, however, as false as it is generally diffused. If the thoughts of Socialism are really converging towards economic questions and problems, it is not in consequence of lack of susceptibility of feelings or notions of a higher order, but precisely in consequence of being fully alive to such feelings and notions. Socialists fight, above all, against misery, which goes hand in hand not only with bodily sufferings but with spiritual abasement. But spiritual culture must of necessity rest on material culture. Art and science require material means, which are created by economic activity. A certain extent of leisure and release from material work is an indispensable condition of progressive civilisation, and as civilisation of labour would multiply, manifold its productiveness, while the inevitable necessaries of life undergo no change, their satisfaction would, under a Socialist order of economic life, require incomparably less labour than nowadays. In other words, the deliverance of mankind from excessive physical labour will go on increasing, and there is no doubt that the accretion of leisure will be filled up with occupations of a higher order, for all usual motives

at present causing people to engage in such superior concerns will gain in power in a Socialist commonwealth.

The millionaire, the lucky statesman, the commander-in-chief enjoy at the present time by far greater regard, meet with a far greater number of people who would readily bow before them, than great thinkers and artists. It will not be so under a Socialistic organization, where there will be no millionaires, no commanders of armies, even no statesmen, in the modern sense.

The rude physical sway of man over man, generally speaking, will disappear, as will naturally disappear the fascination lying in the use of this power, as will, for want of inducement, also cease every struggle with one another, which the application of the principle of peaceful association will render quite impossible.

But does not this signify that Socialist order means the reign of tediousness and mediocrity? Yes, it would indeed be so if human life consisted of nothing higher than the struggle for power, for the oppression of his fellow creature. Of course, upon people of such a mental cast, the future rules, by which economic life will be guided, make the impression of a vapid and dull existence. But the human soul knows higher motives and higher aims. Redeemed from stupefying excessive labour, mankind will assume other shapes in which its spiritual nature will prevail. In future, as before, the starry heaven will spread over our heads, as before the woods will groan, as before nature will preserve all her charms and secrets and the sources from which the materials of knowledge flow, as well as the susceptibility of the beautiful will never be drained.

It is therefore not to be feared that with the disappearance of rude interests and allurements, life, on the whole, would lose every attraction and delight. Stimulating interests will remain; they will undergo a change only in their

line and character by becoming spiritualized, finer and at the same time deeper, more complicated, stronger and of greater durability. All values will be submitted to revaluation. Fame and honour will be awarded to those who, by discovering new sources of knowledge or of esthetic delectations, will have rendered services to, and promoted the prosperity of mankind. Thinkers and artists will be the leaders of humanity, so that the interest in matters of knowledge and esthetical objects will grow to an extraordinary degree, and thus fill up the life of those that will rise above the level of mediocrity.

The number of such individuals must, under Socialist conditions, necessarily and continually increase. Art and science have been, since mankind exists, the possessions of insignificant groups of wealthy classes. The overwhelming majority of the populations were far from taking any interest in the intellectual life of the wealthy classes. Owing to the coincidence of exceptionally favourable circumstances individuals from among the lower classes of society, endowed with talents, have succeeded from time to time in working their way up from the mass of a nameless and, in history, neglected class of workmen, and in joining the small number of those favourites of fortune whose names are engraved in the memory of mankind. These adventitious occurrences are outcomes of a serial order, which Socialism is called upon to abolish. Intellectual culture shall be made accessible to everybody, irrespective of the casualty of his or her birth in one or the other social layer; and as only talent and capacity will be the means for rising above the mass, an ascent of the human genius above the order of the present time must ensue, attended by the development of, and improvement in, all social concer[illegible] an active part in which will be taken by millions a[illegible] not by thousands as in our days.

The public interest centres at the present time chiefly in questions relating to economic objects. The rise or fall of prices on the Stock Exchange, or of any commodity in great demand, is looked upon as an important event, the intelligence of which is being conveyed by telegraph to all cardinal points of the world, spreading everywhere joy or alarm. The world of the future will dispense with such joys or such agitations; its history will consist of occurrences of quite a different character. In reading the descriptions of the Italian towns at the Renaissance epoch, we can, I think, form an adequate idea of what could have kept awake the interest of the people living under a Socialistic system. The clear, joyful and harmonious view of the world, with its seizing influence upon the minds by feeding the love for art and science, must in future be brought to life again. There will again appear people with that striking spiritual beauty and that powerful mental capacity which form the salient distinguishing features of this marvellous early spring of modern history—people like Leonardo da Vinci, Michael Angelo, before whom our time appears coarse, barbarous aud contemptible.

Mr. Galton asserted, in good earnest, that the capacities of the European nations marching in the van of the modern capitalistic epoch, compared with the mental capacities of the ancient Grecians, occupy just as low a level as that on which the negroes stand if put in parallel with us. It cannot be said that this unfavourable attestation on the part of the learned investigator of the civilization we glory in contains any exaggeration. Indeed, our epoch has invented wonderful machines, as also instruments constructed for the destruction of human beings, but neither the one nor the other can serve as a measure of the intellectual power. A barbarian may just

as well construct a machine, but to chisel a Venus de Medici one must be gifted with a specially nice sensibility for beauty. Now, we must bear in mind the fact that the productions of ancient art, exhibiting to us unattainable models of consummate plastic beauty, were for the most part the work of quite unknown artists, and that, moreover, but an utterly insignificant part of these creations has come to us.

Without the excavations of Pompeii we could hardly have any knowledge of the wall-painting of the ancients; and what was Pompeii? a small, unimportant, ordinary Roman provincial town, almost without any wealthy people in it. Its wall-paintings, nevertheless, contributed not a little to the inspiration of our contemporary great artist—Baecklin. Whoever has been in Pompeii knows how beautiful the domestic life of the ancient world was, how much exquisite artistic taste there was in every household appurtenance, in kitchen utensils, furniture, in the arrangement of the rooms, &c., &c. An ordinary house in Pompeii, with its bronze and marble statues and busts, with its walls covered with rich and various designs in colours of a wonderful gaudiness, with marble columns and basins, appears to us now more as a museum of marvellous masterpieces of art than an ordinary habitation in which common people dwelled, who evidently could not imagine a life in a less embellished state, just as we cannot conceive the life in a miserable filthy negro hut. Not less admirable, though in another manner, were the mediaeval towns, or those of the time of the Renaissance; Florence and Venice will always attract visitors from all parts of the world. It is therefore not to be wondered at that the fall of the famous St. Marc's tower has caused a feeling of the deepest regret in all Europe.

The icy breath of capitalism has, by little and little, de-

stroyed the sense of beauty. In former times, the dwelling house, closely united with the personality of the inhabitants by ties of constant intimate relations to the surroundings, and thus exercising a powerful influence on his spiritual nature, was built to live in and not with a view, to gain. People consequently put their soul and their æsthetic sense into their homes, and regarded them as spiritualized products of human art.

But not only in architecture is the desolating influence of capitalism visible; it penetrated into all other provinces of art, and blasted everywhere the soulful originalities and æsthetic tendencies of life. It is, accordingly, but natural that among the closer thinkers of modern artists, realizing the connection of the dark spots of our contemporary art with the state of our actual social life in general, arose a movement that may be called "Æsthetic Socialism," which found expression in a protest against the capitalist organization, chiefly in so far as it concerns the principles of æsthetics. The most conspicuous representative of this movement, which in England is a very ardent one, is Ruskin. Morris' Socialism is, to a certain extent, of the same origin. The absence of æsthetic feeling, and the growing roughness which distinguish our time and appear as inevitable attendants of capitalism, revolt all such men with a highly developed taste.

Still oftener is censure passed upon Socialism for aiming at the suppression of personal liberty, giving it the appellation "future slavery." Spencer only reiterated what all antagonists of Socialism say. To him the future state of society represents something like a gigantic prison, in which people will perhaps be fed to satiety, but only at the price of the best and dearest good—freedom—a reproach which would in vain look out for a foundation to rest upon. It is true that the prevailing tendency of Socialism demands

a coercive organization of labour as a social function. But it must be borne in mind that, for an overwhelming majority of workmen, labour even now bears the stamp of coercion, with the only difference that under the capitalist system the workmen is subjugated to a stranger—the capitalist, while Socialism subordinates him to his own collective will as his sole master. The capitalistic freedom of competition, taken as a whole, is indeed nothing else but a fiction, behind which lies recondite a more or less complete enslavement.

Taking into consideration the attitude of a privileged individual of the capitalist class—an entrepreneur, we see that juridically his actions are scarcely liable to any limitations. The law does not prohibit nor interfere in any way with the choice of his occupations; he may produce whatever commodity he likes, assign any price he wishes, and remunerate the required labour as he lists. But in all these relations his liberty is only a sham liberty. As a matter of fact, the code does not impede his steps or plans, but the more do the inexorable economic laws of the capitalist system oppress him. He may value his productions as ever he likes, but he is compelled to sell them at the price prescribed by the given conditions of the market. In the coincidence of circumstances, engendered by the capitalistic organization, the entrepreneur finds his rigorous and despotic master, whose power is particularly painfully felt during industrial crises.

The illusiveness of this liberty under the current régime is rendered still more transparent in the case of choosing a calling or profession in any other province of mental labour. The conditions of supply and demand practically confine this freedom in a very sensible manner, for, if under the capitalist social order, there is no consciously acting leading power; its functions are being discharged by the elementary

and not less coercive forces of the general economic struggle, in consequence of which not only the exploited ordinary working-man of the class of proletarians who completely depends on the capitalist, is deprived of his liberty, but the representative of intellectual activity, coming chiefly from the well-to-do classes—the learned, the author and, in general, people of liberal professions, is far from possessing that liberty of action, which precisely for such kinds of pursuits constitutes an indispensable condition of progress and prosperity.

Freedom of idleness will, of course, not be tolerated by Socialism, such freedom being synonymous with exploitation of the labour of others, which Socialism strives to destroy in order to pave the way for every useful, especially mental work, which in the future social arrangement will not only not decline, but will increase and increase in a very considerable measure.

Socialism does not take into its head the senseless idea of subordinating all kinds of human labour to social organization. The social order will subject to its control only such species of economic work by which exclusively social objects are produced, leaving to every labour of a higher nature the most extensive freedom of action, unmolested by the fits and starts or artificial circumstances of the market.

It would, indeed, be absurd—and the Socialists are innocent of this absurdity—to imagine that the creative power of the artist or thinker could be regulated or put on lines by any rules derived from sources lying outside their respective natural spheres. In future, as now, people will follow their irresistible inclinations to search after what is true and beautiful. But in contradistinction to our time, they will not be overwhelmed by economic needs and apprehensions; Socialism will deliver them of the cares and

uncertainties of what the morrow may bring with it, of the continual fear and dread for the future which nowadays torments mankind and exercises a pernicious influence upon every creative activity.

The curtailing of economic labour is in itself already equivalent to the extension of liberty. But Socialists go farther and demand more; they want to attach attractiveness to labour itself. It is the great merit of Fourier to have refuted the common opinion as though every economic work must of itself be disagreeable to man. That this is really the case in society as at present constituted, none will deny. Too long continued labour, performed amidst horrible hygienic surroundings, without being interested in its outcome, cannot possibly be agreeable to the workman. But under other circumstances, when man's inventiveness will take pains to enhance the attractiveness of work, economic activity will cease to be the oppressive weight it now indeed is, and then every external coercion will quit the field, leaving the triumphant entry to real freedom.

Thus Socialism does not signify future slavery, but future liberation of mankind, the release of the human personality; for,—and here we touch upon a very important point—Socialism is not abolition of Individualism but the supreme sanction of its rights. To oppose Socialism to Individualism is one of the most deep-rooted fallacies, chiefly due to the Socialists themselves. Etymologically the word Socialism really conveys a sense contrary to that of the word Individualism. This term was coined in the thirties of last century, in order to distinguish the character of the new movement tending towards social co-operation from the existing economical school, recognising the unbounded freedom of individual enterprise as the ideal of social order. Pierre Leroux

maintained, although without sufficient foundation, that he was the creator of the word "Socialism" as opposed to the conception of "Individualism," and that he understood by Socialism such a social organization in which Individualism is sacrificed on behalf of the *whole*, termed *society*. The adversative sense of these two words is firmly rooted in literature, and is now almost generally accepted by adherents as also by opponents.

On the other side, the history of the origin of modern Socialism points at quite different correlations between Individualism and Socialism. Thus English Socialism, as personified by Owen and Thompson, in its philosophical contents, proceeds on the line of Bentham's philosophy, one of the most conclusive and clear expositions of the philosophical Individualism. Thompson's famous book "An Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth most conducive to Human Happiness," this most remarkable theoretical product of English Socialism, is only championing the application of Bentham's principle of "greatest happiness" to economic science.

The French Socialism was the spiritual issue of the Great Revolution. The individualistic view of the world, which found its thundering expression in this revolution, colours all the works of Morelli, Mably, Babeuf, Fourier, St. Simonians, Cabet, Louis Blanc, and other representatives of French thought.

Schaffle was quite right in saying that Socialism is nothing else but Individualism developed to its utmost extent.

Regarding the means Socialism has recourse to, it is the antithesis of economic liberalism. The first messengers of "Free Trade" sincerely believed that industrial struggle and unbounded competition are the surest means for attaining general prosperity and the most complete

development of the human personality. The optimism of Quesnay and Ad. Smith, placing rosy hopes in the final consequences of economic freedom, was the natural upshot of the social and political circumstances of their epoch. Man's personality protested against the oppression on the part of the historical state which rested on sheer violence; and the liberalism of the eighteenth century, which stepped out to defend the individual personality under the banner of political and economic freedom, was the expression of this protest.

However, very soon events occurred which demonstratively proved that economic freedom—the freedom of private enterprise, is not only not identical with the actual freedom of the human being as a personality, but means just the contrary, the enslavement of labour by capital; in other words, the enslavement of the enormous majority of the population. Having in view precisely the same ultimate goal, namely, the recognition and the defence of the rights of personality, Socialism repudiates the seeming freedom of capitalistic origin, and changes the means only by unrolling a new flag with the motto "Social Organization of Labour."

But when all is said, the habitual opposition of Individualism against Socialism is based upon a mere misunderstanding, which is partly due to the inexactness of the conception of Individualism. Personality can be opposed to community in but a conditional sense, since everything that contributes to and constitutes the tenor of personality is a growth of the social soil, of the community, which is not a simple aggregate or an addition of personalities but a unit of a certain higher order. Sociality is an indispensable condition of the individual life of man. What especially characterises Socialism is its deep conviction of the wretchedness and helplessness of the

single individual, left to his own self without any relation to his fellow creatures. Solidarity of interests and brotherhood constitute, therefore, the ethical foundation of Socialism.

In contradistinction to the operating system of economics, Socialism is striving to transfer the greatest possible proportion of labour from the individual to the community, thus emancipating the personality of man, whose many-sided development constitute, from the Socialist point of view, the final and supreme end of the social union. There was a time when the view of the world fostered and cherished conceptions which, on the supposition that they were of a higher nature, could be put in opposition to the conception of individual personality, as for instance the conception of State, Church, Nationality, &c., &c., to which accordingly man's happiness could be, and was sacrificed. At the epoch of the Renaissance other notions obtained, which, while not denying the value of the maxims which prevailed before, recognised one maxim as superior to all others, viz., man's personality—a maxim to which the philosophy of Kant has laid the deepest foundation.

Modern Socialism is nothing else but a cheerful, brave, humanitizing spirit of intense love of, and a firm belief in, mankind—in the resurrection of the luminary Italian early spring. Herein lies the pledge of the unconquerable power of the Socialist ideal. Herein lies the reason of the enthusiasm distinguishing the Socialist movement from all others, as owned even by its enemies to their great grief. And, indeed, what other ideal can, in our days, inspire man? Liberalism has ended its days—all that is true and valuable in Liberalism has by succession been received by Socialism, which is becoming more and more the creed not only of the proletarian who bears all the dismal con-

sequences of the industrial attitude of our epoch, but also of the more developed and advanced individuals of other classes as, in general, of all those in whom lives the faith in a better future for mankind—in the reign of freedom, peace and happiness.

PART I

CRITICISM OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM

CHAPTER I

EXPLOITATION OF THE WORKING CLASSES BY THOSE THAT DO NOT WORK

SOCIALISM strives to annihilate exploitation of one individual by another, of man by man, in whatever shape it may appear, and regards exploitation of workers by non-workers, as practised by all social systems that have existed till now—except the primitive state of society with its communistic character—as an original sin of the modern society. The doctrine of the exploitation of labour by the owners of land and capital, therefore forms the root of the Socialist criticism, a doctrine which in its historical development passed through two substantially different phases, in the first of which it bore no relation whatever to any theory of value, whereas in the second it closely linked itself with a definitive theory of value, viz., the labour value.

I

In its primitive form the doctrine of exploitation of labour is as old as Socialism itself, or even older. It sufficed to look on the world with ever so little criticism to perceive the striking fact of the division of modern society into wealthy men freed from every work, and indigent labourers. Not less evident was it that the opulence of one, as also the poverty of the other, are but

the effect of the historical development of the social order, and not at all the fruit of personal worthiness, merits or the faults of the representatives of one social class or the other.

The mere accident of being born in a certain class places the one on the highest step of the social ladder, affording him the possibility of living in clover without any personal efforts, whilst the other is doomed to toil and starvation. But wealth being necessarily created by human labour, it is clear that the well provided for classes obtain their affluence through the intensified work of the labouring class. It is just as obvious that such a state is contradictory to the sense of justice recognizing the principle of equality of all men. Thus it naturally follows that the actual economic system is irrevocably condemned by our moral conscience, that the very foundation of this system involves an irrefutable contradiction to the idea of equality; in other words, that the principle of equality requires the abolition of the present economic conditions.

All these considerations are so plain and natural that it does not demand any theoretical mental discipline to set them in general expressions. As a matter of fact, they were asserted by different persons on different occasions a long time before Socialism became a definitive scientific system. With what precision and plainness did the famous John Ball, for instance, proclaim in the fourteenth century, this doctrine. "My friends," he said in one of his sermons, "my friends, things cannot be well until all things shall be in common, when there shall be neither lord nor vassal, and all grades shall be levelled; when the nobles shall be no more masters than we. How ill have they treated us! and why do they thus keep us in bondage? Are not Adam and Eve their ancestors as well as ours? What can they show, and what reason can they give, why they should be

more masters than we? Except, may be, because they make us labour and work for them to spend. They are clothed in velvets and rich stuffs, trimmed with ermine and other furs, whilst we are forced to wear coarse cloth. They have wines, spices and nice bread, whilst we have only rye and straw refuse. If we drink it must be water. They have grand house and homesteads, but we must face wind and rain as we labour in the open; yet our labour it is which keeps up their luxury." This outburst of anger against the manifest social injustice, expresses with utmost clearness what hitherto constitues the basal idea of Socialist criticism of the capitalist order. This idea assumed various forms at different times, but its essence remained unchanged. It is not necessary to enumerate those authors who delivered their thoughts on this subject more or less definitively. It will suffice to mention that in the eighteenth century the belief in the iniquity of unearned income was very common.

The theory of labour exploitation was systematically elaborated by the followers of St. Simon, especially by Pecqueur, now little known, but who distinguished himself from all contemporary Socialists by the lucidity and power of his thoughts.

With the St. Simonians the doctrine of the exploitation of labour assumes the form of a grand historico-philosophical structure. In all economical systems they find one common feature—the exploitation of man by man, and as a necessary consequence an irretrievable antagonism of interests. On the early historic stage the victor kills his captive, afterwards the captive is not killed but turned into a slave and into a serf. In these cases the exploitation of the worker by the owner is so obvious that it cannot but be admitted on both interested sides. "But the exploitation of man by man," the St. Simonians say, "which of

old, in the form of slavery, acted in the straightest and harshest way, keeps on in a high degree in the relations of employers to labourers, of masters to servants. Certainly, the relative positions of these two classes in our time is far from being such as were the relations of the slave-holders to the slaves, of the patricians to the plebeians, of the landed proprietors to serfs. At a first glance it appears that these social phenomena have nothing in common, but looked at closer we discover their real nature and see that the second is only a continuance of the first. In the mutual relations between master and hired labourer we find the last transformation of slavery. If the exploitation of man by man nowadays has no more the rough character it had in days of yore, if it has taken milder shapes, its existence is on that account not less real. The labourer is no more the property of the master, like the slave; his economic position, bearing only a temporary character, is the result of a free agreement between him and his master. But is this pact on the part of the labourer really a free one? No, certainly not, because having no other means to earn his living but his daily work, and being threatened with dying of starvation, he is forced to consent."

It is of an old standing that in politics the privileges of birth have been recognised as incompatible with the dominating moral and legal conceptions. Still the most important social privilege—the privilege of wealth, preserves its former character as something due to man upon the strength of his birth. To the inheritance of wealth is naturally opposed the inheritance of poverty—the class of born proletarians in modern society.

Nowadays people exploit the mass of labourers, who, by their efforts, fructify the property of the employer. The labourer can consider himself as the direct descendant of the slave and the serf. True, his personality is free; he is

not attached to the soil, but this constitutes the whole advantage he enjoys, for although legally enfranchised he has not the possibility of gaining his living otherwise than by submitting to conditions dictated by a small class of people to whom legislation accorded a monopoly of wealth, to wit, the right to dispose at discretion of the instruments of production of wealth, and to idle away his life."

The aim of all revolutionary movements up to this day was to weaken, to minimise, the exploitation of man by man. "At present there is only one revolution that could call forth the enthusiasm of the people—the revolution which, once for all, shall extinguish all forms of exploitation wicked in their foundation." This revolution is inevitable, and will consist in radically refashioning the right of property, which is "the foundation upon which the political fabric rests." The exploitation of man by man is the immediate offspring of the right in private property, in virtue of which the propertied individual can bequeath his possession to his children, from generation to generation, so that one comes into the world rich and the other poor. And since the rich live on the labour of the poor, the right of private ownership itself generates the exploitation of labour. All discriminate forms of income flowing from this right, by whatever name they may go—interest on loans, profit on capital, lease, rent—are nothing but "tribute paid by labour to idleness."

These ideas are still more systematically developed by Pecqueur in his "Theorie nouvelle d'économie sociale" (1842), in which all his reasonings start from the idea of equality. Least of all is he to be blamed for confounding the ethical point of view with the objective scientific. The idea of the equality of all men is his leading star in all his ethical constructions, without, however, preventing him from being the most rigid realist with regard to the in-

vestigations of the causal relations and upshots in social life. "People that have no means of production at their disposal," he says, "cannot live otherwise than by either placing their labour at a certain price at the disposal of the possessors of these means, or by obtaining the means of production from the owner on condition of paying him a certain sum. In both cases the owners draw from their property an income, which, as a matter of fact, is created by productive labour. But to receive or to pay this income means, either to compel another one to work instead of myself, or to work myself instead of another one—in which is involved the fatal Gordian Knot of Political Economy. All this can be reduced to two relations: either to hire out labour, or materials for labour. But what a difference there is between these two species of hiring out. To let one's labour is to confirm that one is a slave; but to let one's materials for labour is to confirm one's freedom, since the labour of a man is the man himself, while materials are not part and parcel of man, although, in the indicated act of letting, they play the same part as human labour, because the owner of such materials receives, in virtue of the law, his share in the product, just as if he himself would participate in the act of production. Owing to this circumstance, people enrich themselves by substituting for their own labour that of others. And thus materials, which by themselves, without labour, cannot produce anything, acquire a magic aptitude of engendering income for their possessors. But to labour for another, and for the benefit of another, is the source of all calamities and privations of the poor."

Thus Pecqueur arrives at the conclusion that the root of the actual inequality and poverty of the majority of human beings lies in nothing else but in the private property of the means of production which leads to the

exploitation of the labourer. What particularly characterises his view is that, while he categorically denies the lawfulness of any form of unearned increment, and even any difference whatever in the reward for different kinds of work, inasmuch as they depend upon the disparity of their productiveness, he is far from absolutely professing the theory of Labour Value. Not only at present is the value of a commodity not exclusively determined by the labour expended upon it, but in the future ideal, commonwealth, the organization of which Pecqueur traces with so wonderful a clearness and precision, with such an astonishing penetration into all particulars of a complete social system, labour cannot, and should not, be the measure of value.

Since the demands for certain objects may by far exceed the possibility of their being produced, and since the principle of freedom and equality does not allow of showing any preference whatever to some of the consumers of these objects, the administrative authority must, in the act of distribution, conform itself to the rule, that the price of such products is to be determined according to the relation of supply and demand of the wants and the possibility of production.

The value created by the labourer must, in its very essence, be strictly distinguished from the labour spent in producing it, since equality of labour does not necessarily involve equality of utility. In the future state, as planned by Pecqueur, all kinds of labour are equally remunerated. "Don't say," he exclaims, "that the product of a more skilful labourer pleases you more, and therefore has a greater value for you. The question is not what value you attach to this object, but what is the value of the labour spent in producing it? I know that the quantity of effort and toil I put into the product is equal to

yours, and that I am equal to you. We both know that the social law relating to me and to you purports, to act on the principle of the strictest equality, so that one hour of my work is worth one hour of yours, if the good-will on both sides is the same."

In the writings of the St. Simonians and Pecqueur the doctrine of exploitation is elucidated in such a manner that it is easy to notice the two different elements it comprises. On the one hand it contains a rigorous logical generalization of the causal relations of social objective phenomena, and on the other it involves ethical moments, which are quite independent of this general view, and belong to a completely different order of argumentation. It is of great importance that these two elements be not intermingled, their strict discrimination being the only way that can lead to a real scientific construction of the theory of Socialism, for which Marxism is struggling, but not always successfully.

Regarding the first element, which forms the objective, scientific part of the doctrine, its coincidence with the realities of economic life cannot possibly be called in question. The actual existence of working and non-working classes is a palpable fact. Just as palpable is the fact that the non-working classes can reap an income only owing to the circumstance that the labourer, deprived of the means of existence and the means of production, is compelled to work for the benefit of those who possess both without working. The causal relation between the produce of the labourer and the income of the wealthy, is illustrated by the fact that stoppage of work is attended by cessation of income.

It is as evident, indeed, that these considerations are exactly in the same measure applicable to all the various kinds and shapes in which unearned income appears in

history. Notwithstanding the contrast in the juridical form of the relations of the slaveholder to the slave, compared with those of the capitalist to the hired workman, we cannot, from the standpoint under consideration, but recognise them as quite identical. The income of the capitalist, as well as the income of slaveholder, is but the fruit of the necessity urging the labourer to work not for himself, but for others. If in slavery this necessity assumes the form of physical violence—the whip under the capitalistic order, the physical violence, is replaced by the threat of starvation. But violence does not cease to be violence!

In its purely scientific part the doctrine of exploitation may thus require some integral definitions, but does not want any emendation or modification. In this part the doctrine is in exact accordance with reality—truth herself, from the sight of which one can recede, since her light proves so pernicious to those who do not see the state of actual slavery in which they keep the people, but which it is impossible not to see if looked at straight in the face. And although, generally speaking, the theory of labour exploitation is far from being recognised by scholars, I should say rather, is almost unanimously denied by all, Socialists alone excepted, it is the most solid possession of the social science of the present time. It is but the power of the conflicting class interests which obliges the scholars to ignore this theory.

We have seen that besides the scientific objectivity with which the dogma of exploitation is being treated, it implies an ingredient of ethics, which must inevitably enter into its composition, were it only for the reason that the very conception of exploitation of labour bears an ethical stamp—a conception which, as has been shown, underlies the Socialistic criticism of the existing economical order,

and of which therefore a clear exposition is necessary in order to understand the essence of Socialism.

The conception of the exploitation of any thing, in its broader sense, is synonymous with the notion of using it for a certain end. In this sense we speak of the exploitation of the soil, railway, heat, &c., &c., &c. It stands to reason that in these cases the notion of exploitation does not include any ethical element whereas the turning to profit of man by man is inseparably associated with the notion of unfairness, of something morally condemnable.

Again, by exploitation of man, we understand also the using of his personality for purposes detrimental to his own interests, which our moral conscience censures as odious. Why? Evidently because we recognise the human personality as sacred as the highest aim in itself, and that man is not bound to serve as a tool in the hands of others on behalf of something outside the province of his personal wishes. The idea of equality, of the equivalence of human personalities, is the groundwork of the theory of the exploitation of man by man.

The theory of exploitation of labour proves that, owing to the present social organization, whole classes of the population are doomed to continually serve as a means of augmenting the welfare of other classes beyond comparison, numerically inferior. Such a situation is directly contrary to the ethical idea of equivalency of the human personality. It is therefore our moral obligation otherwise expressed, the supreme ideal, which a developed moral conscience can recognise, to put an end to such a state.

The idea of the equivalency of human personality thus constitutes an inseparable ethical element of the theory of exploitation. The ancient world ignored this idea. The greatest philosopher of antiquity did not see in the

institution of slavery anything ignominious and morally unacceptable. In this connection the comparison of Plato's social ideal with the Socialist ideal of the present time is very instructive. Plato is often considered as the foreshower of the present-day Socialism. But this is a great mistake. It is true that in his State Plato demanded the abolition of private property, but only on the part of the dominating social class, so that his State represented just the reverse of the actual state of things. In the present society the dominating classes are rich, and possess property of which the subordinate classes are deprived; while Plato intended to deprive the prevalent classes of their property and thus reduce them to poverty, and to turn the inferior classes into property holders. The extinction of private property was, for the father of idealism, a means of forming warriors of its tenants as the best defendants of the country, by quelling in them all selfish feeling and impulses, and by changing them into "*gaunt noble dogs guarding the flock.*" With all other classes, except warriors and administrators, private property was maintained, as also the system of exploitation of man in its rudest form of slavery.

Only the Greeks could not be enslaved, and as to the "barbarians" their enslavement appeared to Plato to be the natural lot of the vanquished. Plato's social arrangement is a completely aristocratic one and, as such, widely differs from the ideal of modern Socialism. If we separate the ethical tenet lying in the equivalency of human personality from the theory of exploitation, the theory loses its practical importance. Of course nobody would think of denying the fact that the labour of the poor constitutes one of the conditions of the wealth of the idle layers of the population, but we can view it as an injustice only in as much as we acknowledge the equivalency of both parties

if we look on the labourer as being such a man as his master.

However, the existence of an ethical element in the doctrine of the labour exploitations does not in any degree lessen the power and significance of this theory. On the contrary; it is precisely this moral maxim, owing to which the teachings under consideration form the focus of the theoretical Socialism, for Socialism is not only a science but an ideal as well; is not only analysing the existing social order, but inciting to social deeds not a misty theory but a living organism. This twofold nature is an inevitable peculiarity of every social theory which pursues a practical, consequently a moral, aim, and does not shut itself up within the limits of a cold, scientific objectivity. It is of paramount consequence that the ethical ideas we put into social science (1) be recognised by us as such, without regarding them as the reflection of an objective reality; and (2) that they be binding, *i.e.*, that they be looked upon, not as our personal arbitrary subjective disposition, but as a necessary consequence of a moral conscience obligatory for all normal men. These requirements are fully met by the theory of exploitation of labour, which at the same time is the fundamental tenet of Socialism, the idea of the equivalency of human personality, as demonstrated by Kant, being a postulate of the practical intellect and, as such, of general obligation.

II

In the discussed form of exploitation of labour this doctrine had no connection whatever with the theory of value, this main problem of the science of economics, on the solving of which the leading thinkers concentrated their efforts from the very beginning of the epoch, at which

observation of economic phenomena set about assuming the shape of science. Now, it is clear that the economists, in their attempts to generalize the elements of value, could not but recognise the great influence of labour on the value of a commodity. Under the colour of the theory of labour value, political economy gained its first victories. Ad. Smith is regarded as the creator of this theory, although in this, as in other cases, he adhered to eclecticism, and adhered to it only within considerable limits. But what cannot be doubted is, that Ricardo firmly stood on the ground of the theory of labour value, which was the starting point of all his speculations. Indeed, he did not share the opinion that labour was the only determining factor of value, but considerations of logical method made him perceive the convenience of setting out from this admission as if it expressed an economic fact.

It is easy to understand to what inevitable conclusions the theory of labour value leads if considered in its most consistent and absolute form. If value, as a whole, is produced by labour, it means that the income of the owners of land and capital constitutes a deduction from the value created by the labourers; in other words, profit and rent, and generally all kind of income without labour, are nothing also but unpaid labour—robbery committed on the workmen. The theory of exploitation of labour thus appears as a logical inference of the scientifically recognised theory of value, and, besides—which is of special importance —of the theory which was advanced and elaborated by the followers of the existing capitalistic order, so that it looks as if the enemies of Socialism themselves unconsciously supplied the Socialists with an indestructible theoretic weapon to fight against the economic conditions we live in.

Immediately after the appearance of Ricardo's famous

work attempts were made to utilise his theory of value in a Socialistic spirit, amongst which William Thompson's book, "An Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth most conducive to Human Happiness" occupies conspicuous place, as it contains the very essential elements of the theory of income, which hereafter, through Marx's writings, was widely propagated and far-famed under the name of "Surplus Value." In all his disquisitions Thompson starts from the principle that "wealth is produced by labour; no other ingredient but labour makes object of desire an object of wealth. The mere utility of a thing carried to any extent, and superadded to its mere existence, or what we call its production, by the hand of nature, does not constitute an object of wealth till labour in some shape becomes identified with it; then it is separated from all other objects of desire, all other means of happiness, and becomes wealth."

Under the present system the means of production are not in the hands of the worker but belong to those who take no part in the effort of production, and from whom he must borrow them if he wishes to produce something. But wherewith can he pay for the use of these means? "The only article the labourer has to offer for the use or the purchase of the preliminaries of production—land, houses, clothes, tools, materials, food is still a portion of his labour. But so great is usually the proportion of his labour demanded for the use or advance of these preparatory articles, by those who have appropriated them under the name of capitalists, that by far the greater part of the products of his labour is taken out of his disposal, and consumed by those who have no further share in the production than the accumulation and lending of such articles to the real operative producer. The idle possessor of those inanimate instruments of production, not only secures to

himself by their possession as much of enjoyment as the most diligent and skilful of the real efficient producers, but in proportion to the amount of his accumulations, by whatever means acquired, he procures ten times, a hundred times, a thousand times as much of the articles of wealth—the products of labour and means of enjoyment—as the utmost labour of such efficient producers can procure for them."

It is true that without the capital in the shape of machinery, materials, etc., the mere labour will be comparatively unproductive, and therefore it is but just that the labourer should pay for the use of that, without which, by whomsoever owned, his mere productive powers would be inefficient. The question is, *how much* of the products of his labour ought to be substracted for their use (the means of production)? Two measures of the value of this use here present themselves: the measure of the labourer, and the measure of the capitalist. The measure of the labourer consists in the contribution of such sums as would replace the waste and value of the capital by the time it would be consumed, with such added compensation to the owner and superintendent of it as would support him in equal comfort with the more actively employed productive labourers. The measure of the capitalist, on the contrary, would be the additional value produced by the same quantity of labour in consequence of the use of the machinery or other capital, the *whole of such Surplus Value to be enjoyed* by the capitalist for his superior intelligence and skill in accumulating and advancing to the labourers his capital or the use of it."

The surplus value is the object for which capitalist and workman have struggled since the dawn of history, and the result of this struggle consists in the capitalist appropriating to himself the greater portion of this value. The urging of

the labourers to have their portion more and more enlarged marks the progress of mankind.

The conception of profit and rent as parts of the value created by labour became, after Thompson, the prevalent idea in the Socialistic literature in England and afterwards on the Continent. The theory of the exploitation of labour was thus tightly bound up with the theory of labour value, of which it is now a logically inseparable part.

For some while this seemed to be a very weighty improvement of the theory of exploitation, its supreme scientific sanction, as it were, having the consent of the highest economic authorities.

Karl Marx developed the theory of surplus value to the last logical limits. On the very first pages of his great work, "Das Kapital," he lays down his theoretical proposition, which he regards as the postulate of the whole economical science, viz., that the socially necessary labour of production is not the most important, determining element of value, but the substance of value itself, which is nothing else but embodied social working time, crystallized labour.

Marx, like Thompson, asserts that the new value which arises in the process of production and forms the profit of the capitalist, like all other forms of unearned income, cannot be the issue of the means of production—raw material machinery, &c., for capital transfers its value to the product, but does not create any value. The only possible source of this value, therefore, can only be labour. But the capitalist did not get the labour power for nothing, he paid the market price for it. To produce the surplus value it is evidently necessary that the labourer should work a longer time than the reproduction of his wages require. The working time, the labourer's working day, is thus divided into two parts, during the first of which he re-

produces the value of his means of subsistences, which is necessary labour time; during the second part the labourer is creating surplus value, which is nothing else but unpaid labour appropriated by the owners of the means of production.

This is the famous theory of surplus value in its simplest outlines, or to word it more precisely, this is the true fundamental idea of this theory (which in itself exhibits an extremely complicated, cumbrous, scientific structure), owing to which the tenet of surplus labour acquired an enormous popularity among the masses of the working people. To grasp its bearing no scientifically schooled mind is required, so that the dullest labourer can, in a very short time, become a convinced adherent and a zealous propagator of this faith.

In stating this, I do not at all mean to say that the surprising success of the doctrine of surplus value and its potent influence on the minds during many a decade, is exclusively due to the simplicity of its leading idea. This idea was formulated by Thompson and other authors long before Marx, without however making any impression upon their contemporaries. The originality and power of Marx consisted in the ability of drawing from so plain a thought such a striking quantity of conclusions. The idea of universal gravitation is also a very simple idea, still it does not prevent Newton's "Principia" from being the greatest work of the human mind.

The theory of the source of surplus value is the kernel of all the economic and sociologic constructions of the "Capital," and as this work, generally speaking, undoubtedly is—all its deficiences notwithstanding—the greatest and most ingenious performance of economic thought in the second half of the nineteenth century, it is not to be wondered at that this teaching played such an

unparalleled part in the history of the Socialistic movement, and became for millions of wage-earners an object not only of conviction but of fanatic creed.

And still, notwithstanding the mental power applied by Marx to the creation of his scientific system, and the significance of the attained results in the sphere of practical politics, the theory of surplus value, as formulated by him, must absolutely be repudiated by science. This theory is neither true nor necessary for practical purposes. It is not true because it is built upon a false basis. Whatever proofs the Marxists may recur to in order to demonstrate the contrary, labour is not the substance of value. By recognising labour as the substance of value, Marx fell into an irrefutable contradiction with facts. By binding its fate with that of the absolute labour theory, the Socialistic doctrine has not only gained nothing, but lost much. In the first place, it must be borne in mind that the theory of value advocated by Thompson and Marx is not in the least the theory of the classical school.

The classical theory, which I define as the theory of relative labour value, and which in Ricardo's writings attained the summit of perfection, does not at all maintain that the value of a commodity is embodied labour. It is true Ricardo lays stress on productive labour, but only as one of many other factors of value, and as we already hinted, only out of considerations of a methodical order. In his analysis of the laws of distribution, Ricardo starts from the supposition that the value of a commodity is proportional to the efforts expended for its production, just as the deductive political economy sets out from the so-called "premise of egotism," assuming that in their economic relations men are guided exclusively by selfish motives. Every economist knows, of course, that men, as they really are, are not managing exclusively their own concerns,

and only for the sake of an easier analysis he recognises this fiction as the foundation of all his constructions.

Exactly so, proceeded Ricardo, consciously not taking into account any other factor of value besides labour. Whether he had any right to proceed in this way is another question; but it cannot be doubted that this conditional admittance was never regarded by him as the expression of an actual state. He always recognised and pointed out that, besides labour, many other factors are bearing upon the value of a commodity, and that even the average price of an article is far from being proportioned to the value of the labour expended. For Marx, on the contrary, proportionality of value to labour is not a subjective conditional admittance. With him labour is the very substance of value, value being nothing else but coagulated social labour, or as he figuratively terms it, crystallized labour. This theory, which I call absolute labour theory, can but nominally be connected with Ricardo's theory, as, in fact, they are separated by an irreconcilable contradiction. For if labour is as Ricardo holds—one of the many determinating factors of value, then labour cannot possibly be the substance of value.

But all these minute, although deep distinctions escape attention; it is therefore not surprising that the Marxian theory of value received recognition by almost all its followers, as well as adversaries, as the logical evolution of Ricardo's views. The author of the "Capital" himself regarded his theory from the same point of view. The consequence was, that the theory of surplus value, which, as we have seen, is the logical upshot of the absolute theory of labour value, was almost unanimously acknowledged as the necessary issue of the theory of value of the classical school, which, in spite of all attempts to weaken its significance, can be looked upon as a lasting acquisition of

economic science. It is only in consequence of a mere misunderstanding that the theory of value of Jevons-Menger, the last word of economic thought of our days, is considered to be opposed to Ricardo's theory of value. As a matter of fact the new theory of value, as it has been shown by different authors many times, is not only in accordance with Ricardo's teachings, but constitutes together with them an indissoluble, logical whole.

However, by inference from what has just been stated, the opinion that the theory of surplus value is founded on the classical value theory, must decidedly be rejected. Its logical basis is quite another one; it sets out from the absolute theory of labour value, which is in complete contradiction with reality.

No logical quibbling can prove that the labour needed for production is the substance of value, since there are a great many things of value, although no labour whatever is expended in producing them, or the value of the objects by far exceeds the cost of production. The illustration of a virgin soil affords an instance of the first case, and that of objects valued for their rarity, for their natural or artificial monopoly, an instant of the second case. Of course, the value of the land may be rated irrationally, as Marx does, but these are only words calculated to exert an influence over those only who forego the right of having an opinion of their own. Value of land may be called irrational or otherwise, this is but a matter of taste; but what is of importance is, that this value is a real, palpable one, a fact which is well known to every landowner who, for the sale of his land, receives hard cash and not an imaginary amount. The buyer of an ancient picture or of a rare vine is also aware of the high value of these objects, which is far from being proportional to the labour used in producing them.

These few instances of the disproportion of the real value to the expended labour are but the most obvious. The list of contradictions between reality and the fallacies of the absolute labour theory has such a commanding length that it would take much time if it were to be produced to the reader in its full extent. But this is quite unnecessary, being a matter about which the adversaries of Socialism sufficiently concerned themselves, and whose theoretical struggle with it, owing to Marx, was remarkably simplified. From the time when Socialistic criticism of the existing social order began to lean upon the theory of surplus value, the theoretical champions of the historical iniquities became masters of the situation. I advise those who do not concur in this view to acquaint themselves with the latest critical literature relating to Marx, proceeding from the bourgeois camp where every impartial reader will find that if there is any question in which the enemies of Socialism are sensible of their consummate victory, it is the question regarding the theory of value. Here the fighting has practically come to an end. True, the Marxists have as yet not laid down their arms, but they stand on their defence almost only to save appearances, and in order to maintain their positions they are making such concessions to their antagonists that the very object of contest disappears.

Thus the attempt to bring the theory of exploitation in relation to the doctrine of labour value, and to turn to advantage the dominant principles of the bourgeois science, has brought about an unexpected result; instead of strengthening the theory of Socialism, it has actually weakened it.

This would be a rather hopeless state of things if the theory of surplus value in the Marxian sense, that is to say, as holding labour to be the substance of value, would

prove indispensable to the Socialistic school, and if the discarding it would be tantamount to the rejecting of the theory of exploitation. Happily, things show another face. The theory of surplus value, as I have already intimated, is not only false but quite unnecessary to Socialism, unnecessary because the chief aim of this teaching, so dear to Marx and his disciples, as the scientific foundation of the theory of exploitation, can easily be reached without it. To prove the existence of exploitation of labour in the capitalistic society, as well as in the historically preceding social organizations, it is not necessary to resort to the assistance of any theory of value without the aid of such a theory. S. Simonians and Pecqueur proved the unavoidableness of labour exploitation wherever the means of production constitute private property. They proved that, respecting the economical tenor, the relations of the capitalist to the wage-earners are identical with the relations of the slaveholder to the slave, notwithstanding the immense difference between them from the juridical standpoint, and this holds true whatever the nature of value may be. The high value of champagne does not depend on the quantity of labour, but on its being rare in comparsion with the demand for it, which, in its turn, stands in direct relation to the rarity of the soil on which the vine grows. Still the rent drawn by the owner of the soil suitable for the culture of the vine is an unearned income, therefore the result of exploitation of labour just as any other rent.

The roots of labour exploitation are not lying in the department of production, but in that of the distribution of the created objects. Exploitation consists in that the produced commodity does not belong to the individual who wrought it, nor to the society as such, but to the idle owner of the instruments of production. In nothing else

but in the possibility of possessing power over men by acquiring power over materials is the source of the exploitation of labour concealed.

The theory of surplus value, formulated by Thompson and Marx as a consequence of the theory of absolute labour value, is therefore by all means to be repudiated. It contains, however, a pregnant and weighty thought, of which the Socialist theory ought to, and can, avail itself. Labour is not the absolute substance of value, but it can practically be counted as the absolute substance of cost. In order to realise this difference it is, in the first place, necessary to grasp the essential distinction of these two fundamental categories—value and cost. By value of an economic object we understand its significance as a means for satisfying certain wants; whereas the cost of such an object is the expenditure required by its production. Cost is something negative, which we shun and do not wish for.

We have seen that the price of an economic object—value being the basis of price—does not depend only upon the effort of production. But which are the factors operating in the determination of cost? The soil has not been called into existence by human exertions, nevertheless it has a price, consequently a value, but does not involve a reference to cost. Hence land in its natural state, not being the embodiment of human toil, is a free gift of nature. In the process of production human labour forms the only absolute expenditure. It is true there are besides exterior agencies in the shape of required means of production; but as they do not constitute a part of the human being, and the expenditure of them does not injure him, while in human labour man expends himself, they cannot be considered as elements of absolute cost. Considerations of this kind, more minutely developed in my book, "The

Theoretic Principles of Marxism," lead to the conclusion that only human labour and nothing else forms the actual substance of absolute cost.

In recognizing labour as the only substance of absolute cost, we recognize labour as the only active agent in the process of production; that is, that the product is the exclusive creation of labour. From the technical point of view, as well as from that of material alterations in the process of production, man represents a mechanical power like any other, so that in this aspect there is no difference between human, animal or mechanical work. But from the point of view of the economist, who is examining the economic phenomena as questions of human interest, the labour of man cannot be placed side by side with the functions of mechanical contrivances, because expending the labour of man is equal to expending his human personality. For this reason, we must acknowledge as productive exclusively human labour; otherwise expressed we must credit human labour as the only active agent of production, with the effectiveness of all other factors.

Thus we arrive at the conclusion that wealth is being produced only by human labour; of course not only by hired labour, but also by the labour of all those who participated in the social work by their creative mind, mental effort, and who in this connection are of special significance.

From this point of view, we can examine all objects of wealth, as certain quantities of socially necessary congealed labour—time, crystallized labour, to use Marx's expressions. We shall not repeat the mistake committed by the author of "Capital," and not affirm that only labour determinates the value of a commodity. Value is, in the highest degree, a complicated social phenomenon, and only partly dependent on the labour of production. How-

ever, whatever the mutual relations between labour and value may be, human labour as such upholds its concrete and independent significance, and science entitles us to examine all economic objects in close relation to human labour, in which sense we can, for instance, say that virgin soil, whatever its value may be, cannot be associated with the conception of cost.

The theory of exclusive productiveness of labour must by no means be confounded with theory of exclusive capacity of labour to create value, advocated by Marx. These theories cannot possibly be logically identified. On the one side, Marx decidedly repudiated the first, as seen by his "Criticism of the Gotha Programme," in which he expressly severely censures this theory as a bourgeois deception; on the other side, many authors, far from professing the theory of absolute labour value, recognise labour as the exclusive active factor of production, as recently, for instance, Lexis.

Starting from the theory of the labour cost, the theory of surplus value can be modified in such a manner as not to be any more in contradiction with real life, and to acquire a positive significance. Certainly the distribution of a social product among the different classes of society is very far from proceeding on the principle of proportionality to the labour cost. It must irrevocably be acknowledged that the labour cost does not rise to the surface of the capitalistic world because the distribution of products is not immediately regulated by the labour costs, but by the price—an economic category which differs in principle from that of the labour cost, and which is none the less necessary to economic science, as the expenditure of labour in the production, and consequently the labour cost of the produce, is a manifest fact. In estimating the offshoots of a given economic system, it is of essential importance to

determine not only the quantity of social wealth created under it, but also the quantity of the labour cost embodied in the wealth; in other words, the price at which this wealth has been bought. The only real and precise measure of economic progress is expressed in the degree of productivity of labour reached by the community, and the rising of which is regarded by economic science as an exponent of improvement. But what is productiveness of labour? It is the same category of labour cost expressed in a reverse form. We call productiveness of labour the relation of the quantity of produce to the quantity of labour expended in producing it, and labour cost of the produce expresses the relation of the quantity of expended labour to the quantity of the produce. Thus continually recurring to the conception of productivity of labour, economists, unconsciously to themselves, adopt the principle of labour cost.

Now, if the labour cost is an indispensable category of political economy, then the theory of surplus labour is also one. Marx was quite right in maintaining that in the labour day we have to discern two parts, necessary and surplus labour. The necessary labour is the quantity of effort requisite for the restitution of the cost of the objects needed by the labourer, more strictly speaking, by all those that shared in the social work; the surplus labour is the whole remaining part of the labourer's work expended in the interest of the non-working classes of the community, and appropriated by them to the prejudice of the working classes.

The notions of necessary and surplus labour complete and improve the doctrine of exploitation, which, thanks to these notions, only gained in precision and positiveness. The St. Simonians convincingly proved the existence of exploitation under the capitalistic system; but from the point of view on which they stood they could not possibly

determine its degree, nor make sure whether in the course of social progress exploitation is diminishing or increasing; in which labour branches, and in which countries it is practised to a greater or lesser extent.

A clear and definite answer can ensue only on taking into account the conception of necessary and surplus labour.

Of still greater importance is another essential emendation of the theory of exploitation, owing to its being brought in connection with the theory of absolute labour cost. The expenditure of labour and the degree its productiveness reached, is a fundamental and decisive fact. Whatever our views on the materialistic apprehension of history may be, no historical or sociological inquirer will deny the signal and important part economic phenomena play in the social organization of men. The relations of social exploitation in its numerous shapes, which hitherto constitutes so essential a feature of all historical forms of social life, is in itself but a derivative phenomenon, traceable to certain conditions of production. The conception of productivity of social labour, or what comes to the same, the conception of social labour cost, forms the bridge joining the doctrine of exploitation with the general theory of social development based upon the growth of productive forces; in other words, the theory of absolute labour cost is indispensable for the theory of exploitation, which would otherwise, as it were, hang in the air, since the dogma of the absolute labour cost is the necessary sociological ground of that of exploitation; and it is just in this that the great weight of the conception of labour expenditure lies, which Marx laid down as the foundation of his social system, and which preserves its importance even in the case of our rejecting the theory of absolute labour value, and our not recognising that labour is the substance of value.

But does not this combination of the theory of absolute labour cost with the theory of exploitation deprive the latter of its ethical character, and thus convert it into an objective principle of economic science. Not at all; for the very notion of labour cost, on which the conception of surplus labour rests, contains ethical elements. In fact, in the process of production not only man participates but the means of production as well. The labour of the horse tugging the plough is not less necessary for tilling the soil than the labour of the man who goes behind the plough. Why then, do we regard the whole produce as the outcome of human labour only? Why do we recognise only the effort of man as the active agent of production? And why, on the other hand, do we, in this respect, indiscriminately identify all kinds of human labour. Why do we regard all categories of such labour as comparable to one another, and unite them into one common conception of social labour? Undoubtedly because we tactily start from the guiding ethical idea of Socialism—the supreme value, and hence the equivalence of human personality, the idea which alone entitles us on the one hand to deny the productiveness of the horse or machine, and on the other to comprehend the different classes of human labour in one social whole. From the point of view of the ancients, who had no idea of the equivalence of the human personality, it would be impossible to draw a line of discrimination between slave and horse, and consequently would require to make a difference between the labour of a free man—the Greek, the master, and the labour of a slave —the barbarian.

Thus the great idea of equality of men is the ground on which the category of the abstract labour cost rests. The theory of labour exploitation, being the root out of which arose and grew Socialist criticism of the existing economic

conditions, once more corroborates the fact that Socialism is permeated by ethical elements, which is the reason that the Socialist ideal is to be recognised as the inevitable, logical, universally binding conclusion of a normal moral conscience.

CHAPTER II

CONCENTRATION OF PRODUCTION AND INCOME, AND THE PAUPERIZATION OF THE LABOUR CLASS

THE end of the eighteenth and the first decade of the nineteenth century are known in the economic history of England under the name of "Industrial Revolution."

There was no period throughout the course of English hisotry in which the economic conditions of life of the mass of the people underwent such a deep change. In the times of Adam Smith, England was a land of small industry. Even at the beginning of the nineteenth century handicraft and domestic industry obtained in the main centres of English industry, and the conception of what a factory is, had not yet entered the mind of the Yorkshire weaver. In the villages, domestic industries of all descriptions flourished affording the agriculturist a decent income during the winter time. A very considerable portion of the land was the property of the communities. Although independent husbandry began to totter, it still played a considerable part in social life. The situation of the bulk of working people was such that Adam Smith could hopefully look on the future. In his famous work he formulated, as an economical law, that the progress of industry and commerce, and the growth of national wealth, necessarily bring about an improvement in the conditions of the labouring classes.

It is, indeed, difficult to imagine anything affording a more striking contrast between expectation and realization than there was between the anticipations Adam Smith indulged in, and what actually ensued after the great economical revolution originated by the growth of the large industry and agriculture. The revolution itself assumed dimensions which far surpassed what could have been expected. In the course of a few decades England had put on quite another face. Everywhere factory chimneys sprung up, and machinery gained ground on family production, handicraft, and rural cottage industry. The power loom discomfited the hand loom. Large factories began and continued to predominate in the production of a long series of staple commodities, and the rapid concentration of production was attended by a marvellous growth of the productivity of labour. In the leading industrial branches the quantities produced increased enormously, and the national wealth augmented correspondingly. However, in spite of the expectations of Smith, this progress, as things went, did not only not raise the level of the labourer's conditions of existence, but elicited relation of an opposite nature: the richer the ruling classes became, the deeper the mass of the people sunk into misery.

The growth of factories has led to the employment of women and children who were treated as slaves. The extension of the working day had no other limit but the physiological possibility for man to work, which after going on beyond his capacity laid the foundation to, if it was not the immediate cause of, a premature death.

In a similar state, although on a smaller scale, were some other European countries during the first half of the nineteenth century. The concentration of production has everywhere enhanced the national wealth on one side, and the misery of the masses of the people on the other.

I

Socialistic criticism recognised this state as the unavoidable outcome of capitalist economy. Already at the beginning of the last century, Fourier pointed to the rising of a new kind of feudalism, "industrial, financial and commercial," which he says "are not less evils than the feudalism of the old régime." He now and again remarks that "the poverty of the people keeps pace with the growth of the national wealth and the development of industry." However, it is not so much Fourier who is to be credited with the final construction of the theory that concentration of production is attended with the poverty of the people, as his disciples, and first and foremost the most conspicuous among them—Considerant, who, in his book, Destinée Sociale, expounded this teaching in a most complete form.

One of Fourier's grandest theoretical constructions is his schematizing of the course of the historical development of mankind. The modern epoch, which he contemptuously calls civilization, has, he says, but a transient character. There are two discernible phases in it, the ascending and the descending. We are passing through the descending phase, through the period of decay of the dominating social order and the birth of a new one. The characteristic feature of the rising phase of civilization was the breaking up of the aristocratic feudalism, and that of the waning phase is the growth of industrial feudalism. Free competition—this economical fundamental principle of the new order—inevitably leads to the victory of the strong over the weak, to all sorts of monopolies. "Capitals," says Considerant, "following the law of its own gravitation proportional to its masses, without counterpoise, tend more and more to concentrate in the hands of potent owners. Wherever the interests are divided, it cannot be otherwise, as

the small manufacture and the small factory cannot struggle with the large manufacture and the large factory; because the small production, in continually dividing and subdividing its operations, cannot grapple with the tools, advantages or the unity of the functions of the large organizations; because all scientific and artistic discoveries are, as a matter of fact, monopolies of the wealthy, and incessantly raise the power of the class; and because, at last, capital invests with power its possessor, and crushes those who lack it. It is not only in the sphere of production where the present conditions are enormously in favour of the large industrial enterprises of the huge proprietors, and pernicious to the small enterprises to small proprietors; the advantage of the position manifests itself with the same striking contrast in the province of commerce and consumption. There is no doubt that in all three departments competition between large and small, or no property, is ruinous for the latter."

The concentration of production takes place not only by the growth of single large enterprises but by way of association of capital, respecting which Joint Stock Companies are of special significance, in so far as owing to this financial method the power of capital is being manifoldly mutiplied. This system of concentration affords the possibility of concentrating in the hands of the financial barons prodigious sums of capital, by the aid of which divers monopolies and privileged capitalist corporations are being created, at the head of which stands barons, counts and dukes, followed by a host of small capitalists, shareholders and vassals at the same time, by whose assistance they manage to get possession of railways, canals, mines, factories and other industrial strongholds similar to the mediæval barons who, by the aid of their vassals, conquered villages and towns.

The new monied aristocracy should, in future, form a force not inferior to that manifested by aristocracy of the old regime. "This new feudalism shall ultimately be constituted as soon as the greater portion of land and industrial property will belong to a minority of the population swallowing up the whole revenue while the immense majority of industrial and agricultural kinds will gnaw at the wages which may be left for them. France could then be looked upon as a vast estate, cultivated and turned to profit by the masses in favour of a small number of omnipotent owners." "The power of large capitals, greatly enhanced and multiplied by combination and concentration, crushes the middle and lower strata of the industrial and commercial classes. The proletariate and the pauper progress in gigantic strides."

In countries in which civilization respecting industrial development is most advanced, for instance England, France and Belgium, the number of the proletarians is the greatest. In the United States of America poverty does not as yet exhibit such a threatening character owing to the abundance of free, unoccupied land, but they follow the same line. It each separate State it can be observed that the greater and richer a town is, the greater is the misery in it. "It is precisely in such flourishing industrial and commercial places," says Considerant, "as Lyons, Manchester, Liverpool, &c., that the position of the proletariate is the most oppressive, as proved by the upheavals which took place in these towns. The nations are nowadays, in general, divided into two inimical camps. Every step forward in science and industry, every success of civilization, aggravates the antagonism of interests and the hostile dispositions of the classes. The tendency of the actual social movement is to rob more and more the

lower and poorer classes for the benefit of the higher and richer classes."

All these thoughts have been readily accepted by the Socialism of the thirties and forties of the last century. They were set forth in the "Communistic Manifesto" elaborated by Marx and Engels, which in many most effective parts presents a reproduction of Fourier's teachings.

The theory of concentration of production and increment, commonly spoken of in connection with Marx's name, has undoubtedly been borrowed by him from the Fourierists, who in the pages of their organs "La Phalange" and "La Democratic Pacifique" solicitously worked out the theory in all its particulars. Only the lack of acquaintance with the old Socialistic literature can account for the fact that the teachings of Fourierists acquired the general reputation as Marxian dogma.

It is very interesting that even the name of "Scientific Socialism" given to Marxism, in contradistinction to Utopian, was borrowed from none else but from the Fourierists, who were precisely those that called their method "scientific," setting it in opposition to the teachings of all other Socialist schools. Fourier they honoured by conferring on him the title, "Father of Scientific Socialism," just so as the Marxists call Marx. However, it required neither genius nor any acumen to formulate the concentration theory. It was quite sufficient to bestow some serious considerations to the surrounding economic world in order to perceive this prominent feature in the development of capitalism, so that, apart from the Fourierists, many writers of the first half of the nineteenth century, Socialist as well as non-Socialists, pointed to the growth of extensive production as a peculiar mark of the industrial revolution. Still more general among the economists of that time, was

the idea of the inevitableness of poverty and misery of the labouring classes.

The dogma of the tendency of wages to fall to the minimum of the means of subsistence had already been formulated in the eighteenth century with the greatest possible lucidity—by Turgot, one of the most remarkable representatives of economic thought in France. The same views were held by the chief representatives of English economic science, Malthus and Ricardo. Malthus regarded the poverty of the masses of the population as a natural law of the existence of mankind; Ricardo likewise contemplated the possibility of an improvement of the situation of the working classes from a very pessimistic standpoint. Adam Smith's disciples could not keep the optimistic ground of the teacher, as the impoverishment of the people, following the industrial revolution, was indeed, too evident. Both the tenet of impoverishment and that of the growth of concentration of production, have in their integrity been adopted and essentially developed by Marx.

The process of the concentration of production is, according to Marx, accompanied by the increasing concentration of wealth in the hands of a continually narrowing circle of capitalists, and simultaneously by the growth of misery among the masses of the population. The more social wealth rises, the lower sink the producers—the worker. The aggravation of the state of the workman is a natural consequence of the fundamental law of capitalistic accumulation—a law, according to which, the more technical improvement progresses the smaller becomes the portion of capital turned into wages, and the greater the portion employed in production. The wages thus absorb a lesser part of the whole social capital, and since only this portion of the capital determines the demands for operatives, this

demand, as a necessary consequence, must decrease in relation to the whole social capital, although it rises absolutely, but, as already stated, at a considerable smaller rate than the growth of social wealth and social capital.

"The capitalistic accumulation permanently brings into being a relative surplus labour population proportional to its energy and the extensions required by the growth of capital in itself."

"Accumulation of capital on one pole is at the same time accumulation of misery, drudgery, slavery, ignorance, barbarity, moral deterioration on the other; that is to say, on the side of that class which produce their own products in the shape of capital." "The laws of capitalistic production call into existence a superfluous population which, with the heaviness of a leaden load, is dragging the labourer into the swamp of misery. With the accumulation of capital created by themselves, the labour population produces in a more and more rising degree the very means which render superfluous a part of the population. This is the law of population peculiar to the capitalistic system of production. Each particular historical system of production, in general, has its proper laws of population, of relative historical significance. An abstract law of population exists only for plants and animals, so long as they are not subject to the historical influence of man."

According to immutable social and economic but not natural or physiological laws, the capitalistic organization calls into existence a surplus population for which there is no room either in the field of social labour or in that of social consumption, irrespective of the rate at which the increase proceeds. This surplus population forms the industrial Reserve Army, without which capitalistic production with its periodical contraction and expansion could not exist."

These quotations from Marx's Capital show, past all doubt, that in his chief work he still maintained the theory of improvements which he enunciated in the "Communistic Manifesto." It is true Marx warmly stood for the factory legislation, and saw in the limitation of the labour day one of the most important aims of the labour movement, greeting the English Ten Hours' Bill as a great victory of the working classes. Some passages can be cited from the mentioned work, in which the author admits the possibility of raising the labourer's standard of life. But his fundamental standpoint is quite opposite, and all his assertions, in any other sense, prove once more the contradictions contained in the capital.

The theory of wages, gravitating to the lowest level of the means of subsistence, received general recognition on the part of the Socialists of the first half of the nineteenth century, as also from the best representatives of the middle class economic science. Lassalle stood spensor to the theory which he baptised with the name of "Iron Law of Labour Wages," and he was fully entitled to affirm that. In insisting upon the existence of this law, he was at one with the best social thinkers of his time.

II

Ever since the second half of the nineteenth century a mighty change is going on in the conditions of the working people. The first steps of capitalism have led to a considerable aggravation of the labourers' position, but the progress made in the course of time by the capitalistic industry, brought with it in some spheres certain advantages for the workmen. The reasons of this change were very complicated. The capitalist system of production calls forth a rise of productiveness which, taken in

the abstract, is propitious to the rise of wages. But so long as the factory production does not play a predominating part, the high productiveness of the operatives of these factories engenders the tendency not to enhance but to lower the wages of the working class. The case being thus, the manufacturers compete with different types of small production, handicraft, capitalistic and domestic system. Every mechanical improvement causes a fall in the prices of factory products, in consequence of which the prices of the competing products of manual labour also fall, attended by a decrease of earnings on the part of the corresponding groups of small producers. So long as these small producers numerically prevail, the growth of the productiveness of labour in the domain of large factory the production exercises an overwhelming influence on economic conditions of the mass of the population, abiding by the former expedients of production. Nor can the wages of the factory operatives essentially rise during this period of industrial development, since the breaking up of the small producers calls forth an influx of labourers into the factories, and thus keep down the price of hands.

All this was observed in the principal capitalistic States of Europe during the first half of last century. In the long run the factory gained the victory, and became, in all most important branches of industrial activity, the ruling form of production. Then a change set in. The continued growth of the productiveness of labour created the tendency towards the rise of wages, as the consequence of the magnified sum total of the products to be divided between the producer and the capitalist.

However, in order that this tendency be turned into reality, it was required that the labourer should have the power to retain for himself, were it but a part of the augmented return of his work. Without this condition the

outcome of the heightened productive labour could be usurped by the enterpriser in his favour. But in this respect also the conditions during the last fifty years have begun to be more propitious for the working classes than before.

The most momentous factors regarding the growth of the economic power of the working classes were, the Factory Legislation, the Trade Unions, and the Co-operative Movement. Thanks to legal measures, bounds were set to the labour day of the adult and youth, as also to the employment of children, which was one of the most crying evils during the incipient period of the capitalistic development. Owing to this restriction, not only the labourers' necessary leisure was being lengthened, and consequently a greater possibility afforded him to devote his free hours to mental and social activity, but the very demand for labourers arose owing to the circumstance that in curtailing the working time, the number of operatives required for the performance of a given work was larger. In the same direction proceeded the Trade Unions. The Co-operative Movement delivered a great number of workmen as consumers from the dependency of the shopkeeper. All these circumstances together afforded the labouring classes the possibility of defending their interests in the struggle with the capitalistic undertaker more successfully than before, and the result was an undoubted betterment of the position of the working class at large. But to discard the theory of pauperization, which in the forties was, as already stated, generally adopted, was difficult for people whose economic views were formed at that time.

However, life vindicated its claims. The middle-class economists first proved the erroneousness of this dogma, the Socialists came after. The hopeless prospects in the future of the labouring classes under the capitalistic economical

system is now hardly shared by anybody. The head of the theoretical champions for Marxism of our days, Kantsky, in his writing on Bernstein, expresses his undivided sympathy with Sydney Webb's characteristic of the change which the conditions of the working classes have undergone since the end of the thirties. "In all respects," says Webb, "it can be shown that a considerable layer of the wage-earners made great progress, whilst others participated very little, if ever, in the general advancement of wealth and civilization. If we take the different conditions of existence and labour since 1837, and fix a level below which the labourer cannot lead a bearable life, we will find that in relation to wages, labour time, lodgings and general culture, the percentage of those that live beneath this level is now less than in 1837. But we will also find that the lowest level reached is to-day just as low as before, and that the sum total of those that live below the level we assumed, probably exceeds that of 1837 in absolute magnitude."

Kautsky, in his last writings, absolutely recants the theory of pauperization, the groundwork not only of the "Communistic Manifesto" but also of the "Capital." But he lacks the courage openly to own it, and masks his repudiation of this theory by attributing to it a new sense. According to his interpretation, the idea of impoverishment of the labourers is to be understood only as the expression of a tendency but not as that of a concrete fact, and as it is, not of an absolute tendency towards the fall of the economic standard of life of the working class, but only towards the relative aggravation of their situation in comparison with the position of the capitalists. The condition of the labourers is growing better, but the income of the wealthy classes grows with a greater rapidity; therefore the contrast between wealth and poverty does not only not

vanish by the modern development of capitalism, but gets rather keener. Although wages are absolutely rising, they are falling as portions of general labour products—the part of the capitalist is increasing at the expense of the labourer; in other words, the degree of capitalistic exploitation is rising. So also grows, what Kautsky calls "the social misery"—the disparity of the demands of the labourer, and the possibility of gratifying them. The growth of pauperism, in this sense, seems to Kautsky to be an incontestable fact. "The bourgeois themselves recognise the growth of misery in its social sense, giving it only another name—pretension of the workers. We do not stick to the name; the fact is, that the incongruity of the requirements of the labourers and the possibility of satisfying them by means of his wages is continually increasing. It is not the physical but the social impoverishing which goes on waxing, and manifests itself in the slow elevation of the standard of life of the worker as compared with the level of the bourgeois life."

All these arguments are, for the most part, quite correct. The growth of the labourer's wants does indeed outstrip the growth of his income. The labourer is conscious of his having the same rights as the capitalist, but as the capitalist does not personally participate in the act of production, the labourer lays claim to the whole of his produce, and will not consider himself satisfied until he receives full satisfaction of his demands.

It is very possible that Kautsky is just as right in his other assertion, that the labour exploitation by the owners of the means of production in the modern times is not only not decreasing but increasing; in other words, that the surplus work appropriated by the capitalists constitutes more and more a growing portion of expended labour, so that the workman more and more toils for the capitalist.

We do not deny this possibility, but there are no convincing facts to prove its evidence, the income statistics being as yet too deficient to allow of a solution of these subtile and difficult questions. The improvement of the conditions of the working classes is, at all events, compatible with the growth of their exploitation by the capitalists.

But Kautsky is wrong in his affirmation that the theory of poverization he developed is nothing else but the true Marxian theory. The pauperism of which Marx treats bears no relation whatever to the pretensions of the working classes as Kautsky interprets this theory, and the growth of misery in the Marxian sense is far from being identical with the growth of the labourer's wants. From the point of views of the authors of the "Communistic Manifesto," there can be no question about the rise of the labourer's wants, since the workman becomes a pauper, and pauperism grows swifter than population."

The growth of capitalistic wealth Marx recognises as having the same significance as "accumulation of poverty, drudgery, slavery, ignorance, churlishness and moral abasement." His language in all these cases is so clear and emphatic that no doubt can arise as to its meaning. He did not speak of the tendencies which may possibly not assume concrete shapes, but of actual laws of the capitalistic development as they are clothed in real historical facts. Marx was of opinion that the greater the productive power of capitalism the sharper and more rampant is not only the social impoverishment but the physical decay; moreover, the capitalistic development does not only reduce the workman to the position of a pauper, but causes also his intellectual and moral degeneration. If Marx here and there utters other views, his fundamental standpoint is nevertheless the above stated.

Now it is evident that the theory of pauperization in its

original form cannot be countenanced by any serious economist. Its inconsistency with the facts of the modern social development is best proved by Kautsky's confession, that no growth of physical misery can be observed in the advanced capitalistic countries. All facts there speak rather in favour of its decrease, although at a slow rate and not in all places. The standard of life of the working classes is, at present, higher than it was half a century ago.

It is doubtful, indeed, whether any one could resolve upon defending the theory of pauperization as expounded in the "Communistic Manifesto" and the "*Capital*." There will be hardly anyone—except people of the opposite camp—who will now assent to the Marxian opinion about the growing ignorance, moral depravity and degeneration of the working classes. Least of all can the social democrats defend this thesis, which would be identical with the recognition of the hopelessness of their cause. Victory in the social struggle cannot devolve upon a class mentally, morally, and economically deteriorating. Victory crowns the strongest, but not the numerically strongest—the strongest in courage, energy, knowledge, self denial, heroism, devotedness to public weal. Degenerated, brutalized, ignorant people, as pictured in the "Communistic Manifesto," would never have the intrepidity and the resolution to fight themselves for their liberty. If the theory of pauperization had any real hold, the gloomy social vision of certain sociologists and novelists, foreseeing the split of human society in two species, two races—in masters possessing freedom and knowledge, and in slaves turned into dull and obedient animals—would be the most likely portrait of the social future. But happily there are many undoubted facts of the economic, moral, and intellectual progressive motion of the labouring classes in modern time,

which go to prove the fallacy of the assertion that the greater part of mankind is on the way to degeneration.

Thus the prognostication of the Socialists of the thirties and forties—their expectation of the growth of poverty and misery, commensurate to the growth of social wealth, has come out as a prediction that does not square with actual fact.

Another opinion must be held with regard to the other dogmatic assertion of the Socialists of the mentioned epoch, viz., the concentration of production. All the latest occurrences in the industrial development splendidly confirm the objective truth of this tenet. It cannot be denied that the small industry in most cases does not decrease in its absolute dimensions or even grows slowly, but its relative significance in the national economy is lowered.

Great industry is everywhere growing faster than small industry, and partly at the expense of the latter, the representatives of which, ruined past hope, merge into the proletariate.

The most marked characteristic of the industrial expansion of capitalistic countries for the last two decades is the prodigious growth of different associations of capital. The time of exasperated competition of the individual ventures with each other is passing. Capitalists have learned from the workmen the importance of mutual agreement, the effectiveness of operating with united forces. The associations and unions of capital, known under divers names, exhibit all transient forms, beginning with the temporary accordance of several capitalists for a determined aim, and ending with the complete fusion of many independent concerns into one huge undertaking, directed and managed according to one common plan. This process of combining and centralizing production on capitalistic lines, has of late assumed quite exceptionally gigantic

dimensions in America, where some industrial branches, spread all over the immense territory, have almost entirely flowed together into one colossal capitalistic enterprise.

But if the concentration theory in relation to industry is, upon the whole, fully confirmed by the latest facts, in relation to agriculture matters stand otherwise. Owing to different technical and economical conditions, to the greater dependence on Nature, the lesser applicability of machines and division of labour, the important part which barter plays in its sphere, &c, &c., the large agricultural production is far from affording such advantages in comparison with the small production, as the industrial huge production does. To this are added different kinds of social obstacles with which the large agricultural production must wrestle, but which, in reference to the small production, do not exist. It suffices to mention but the "labour question" peculiar to large estates, consisting in the deficiency of agricultural working people who change the village for the town. In consequence of these circumstances, on which I cannot here expatiate, agriculture does not show anything like a centralization of production, which is such a characteristic feature of the industrial evolution.

Peasant husbandry is not only not crushed by the large capitalistic land proprietors but is in most cases increasing at their expense. However, this point does not extinguish the significance of the concentration theory in the capitalistic system as a whole, but only weakens it.

Kautsky, in his interesting and important work on the "Agregarian Question," draws in sharp lines the necessary subordination of the agricultural process to the industrial, as observed in all capitalistic countries. Industry is more and more gaining a dominant position in the national household, the industrial population increasing at the same time at the expense of the agricultural population

Experience of all countries shows the inevitableness of this process, by which the conditions of the existence and the development of industry determine, in an ever increasing degree, the line of evolution of the whole economical arrangement of society. Owing to this circumstance, the peculiarities of agricultural development can be entirely absorbed by the prevailing qualities of industrial development. Notwithstanding the division of the agricultural production, the social production as a whole is being concentrated; notwithstanding the growth of the present culture, the number of the proletariate is rising and the number of independent producers is falling; notwithstanding the decline of capitalistic agriculture, the capitalistic method of production more and more follows the line of the capitalistic organization.

It is indispensable to strictly discriminate concentration of production from concentration of income, which is far from being its necessary companion. We have said that production, as a whole, is being concentrated more and more in large ventures, the number of which decreases in relation to the number of labourers employed in them. But is there anything similar to be seen in the sphere of the national revenue? Can we say that the national revenue is being more and more concentrated in the hands of a falling number of capitalistic magnates? Marx thought that the national revenue was being concentrated more and more in the hands of an ever decreasing number of large owners. The middle classes of the population must go down in relation to their number, as well as to the amount of income concentrated in their hands.

Now it is beyond doubt that their expectations have not come to pass, that the number of large owners is everywhere rapidly rising, and that at the same time the number and income of the middle classes is continually

on the rise. On the other side the large groups of the most needy population go on diminishing. Generally speaking, it is averred that the poverty of the lower strata of the population slowly diminishes, that the number of large owners and their income augment, and that the steadiness of the middle classes obtains.

However, though the middle class income preserves its significance, the social character of the corresponding groups of the population undergoes a deep change. In former times, the middle class was chiefly composed of small capitalists and proprietors, whereas now groups of better paid workmen represents its members. The newest phase of the capitalistic development calls into being a labour aristocracy which, respecting its income, differs little from the lower bourgeois groups. But the substitution of labour groups for the former bourgeois is the proletarization of the population, which consequently, by its progressive motion, compels an ever increasing part of the population to earn their living by labour; while, on the other hand, concentration of production and capital goes on getting the upper hand of social industry.

Thus notwithstanding the stability of the middle class income, the antagonism in the womb of the present society does not only not vanish, but grows in intensity; a more and more increasing part of the population is involved into the labour class by the process of capitalistic development, the split of society into capitalists and proletarians is getting wider and, simultaneously, with the growth of the power of capital, rises the social and political potency of the labouring class.

CHAPTER III

THE VICES OF CIVILIZATION AND GENERAL ESTIMATION OF THE CAPITALISTIC ECONOMIC SYSTEM

THE author of the theory of the concentration of production, Fourier, is also the author of the other remarkable theory of the vices of civilization.

The fundamental defect of the modern social structure is, to his thinking, the insignificance of social wealth that can be produced under this arrangement. The civilization does not meet "the very first claim which ought to be presented to a well-organised social state—the claim to create the highest possible amount of wealth."

Under the ruling social conditions an immense quantity of human labour power is either uselessly wasted, or straightly directed to the destruction of wealth. The civilized society consists of no less than two-thirds of productive elements—parasites. Such parasites are:

(1). Domestic parasites; women, children and servants. Three-quarters of the urban women and half of the country women must be considered as unproductive, since their labour power is not sufficiently utilized in the household. The same must be said with regard to three-quarters of children completely unproductive in towns and but little productive in the village, and three-quarters of the domestic servants, whose calling roots only in the complete organization of society.

(2). Social parasites: (a) all kinds of military professions. Armies are fed without performing any productive labour until they are put to use for the sake of destruction. (b) Legions of officials and servants for collecting taxes. (c) Fully half of the industrial workers recognised as productive, but in consequence of the bad quality of their products are relatively unproductive. (d) Nine-tenths of merchants and their clerks. (e) Two-thirds of those that are concerned in the transport business by land and by sea. (f) All unemployed for one reason or the other. (g) Sophists and frivolous babblers. (h) Sluggards, the so-called people *comme il faut*, who wear away their life in idleness, followed by their footman and other servants. (i) Those confined in prisons, representing a class of forced inactivity. Lastly (j) those who, being outcasts of the modern society, entertain an open hatred against it as—impostors, gamblers, prostitutes, beggars, thieves, ruffians and other enemies of society, not in the least diminishing in number, and the struggle with whom requires maintaining a police and administration alike unproductive.

In the number of social parasites must be included the workmen of "negative" products—of products destined not to satisfy natural human necessities but requirements due to the imperfect social organization: for instance, the raising of a fence in order to defend a garden against thieves; the felling of wood necessary to the land, and destroyed by the greedy owners who do not care about the common interests; the establishing of several competing enterprises when one proves sufficient to satisfy the given wants of society, etc., etc.

Fourier thus includes a great part of the population in the number of unproductive classes, which in no way contribute to, and sometimes actually impede, the creation of social wealth; and what is herein especially noteworthy,

is that he considers almost all occupied in commerce as non-productive.

The true vocation of the merchant should consist in bringing the producer nearer to the consumer. But does he perform what he is in duty bound to do? Not at all. The merchant avails himself of the reigning economic anarchy, of the disorganization of production, and brings into bondage both production and consumption. The merchant, says Fourier, damages the community by imposing on it, in his favour, an immoderate tribute; he damages the community by deviating his agents from productive labour; he damages the community by adulterating objects, in order to enable himself to keep ground in the struggle with his competitors. The merchant destroys social wealth by withholding sales of commodities with a view of raising their prices, or simply destroying these articles in order to bring about a scarcity, the underlying principle of the commercial system being unlimited freedom and absolute right to dispose of the products the trader deals in as would best serve his purposes and interests.

The trader injures the community by the loss it sustains in consequence of the dispersed, irregular circulation of commodities in innumerable shops, causing only excessive complications and confusions. He damages the community as insolvent debtor not only by hurting the interest of those with whom he sustains immediate relations, but by indirectly provoking crises which exercises an unendurable pressure on the productive population.

The merchant damages the community by the fluctuation of prices due to the speculations he embarks in, with a view of taking advantage of circumstances favourable to himself and detrimental to producers and consumers, pressing the first as seller and the latter as buyer.

Alike injurious to society is the turning away of capital from industrial and agricultural concerns, as practised by commerce, which, concentrating on the exchange enormous sums of money, has only one aim in view—stock-jobbing.

Commerce, in general, is but complicating and confusing the process of production and distribution of commodities among different social classes. One and the same product changes hands many times before it reaches the consumer. Each transfer calls forth a rise of the price by adding a profit for every trader, which in the long run the consumer has to pay, apart from all expenses incurred by the superfluous transport from one place to the other. "In the face of these facts," says Considerant, "the commercial class in its present aspect can, in reason, be recognised as nothing else but as a parasite, which the productive workers, manufacturers and agriculturists and in general, the consumers, must feed. Commerce is the vampire, sucking the wealth and blood of the social body, on pretence of aiding the circulation of this wealth and blood. From the point of view of the producer, he is the pirate, demanding ransom. From the standpoint of the consumer, he is the spider, extending his cobweb and sucking out the imprudent fly.

"Commerce, historically looked upon, is the offspring of robbery and rapine. The ancient Greek sea merchant was at the same time a pirate, and even to this day the conception of honour, or of what is allowed and forbidden, is with no social class so elastic as with the commercial class. Imposture is till now, an unalterable appurtenance of commerce, and shows that the civilised merchant of our days has preserved many spiritual features similar to those that characterised his remote ancestors.

"In the existing social organization the merchants form

a coalescent band of pirates, a flight of vultures sucking industry and agriculture, and bringing the social fabric into subjection in all directions. However, they cannot personally be made responsible for it since they do not realise the noxiousness of their profession. But if they were to comprehend it, could any spoiler in this civilization be accused of his acts, when the social life in its entirety is but a game of rogues with fools?"

Still, what the contemporary society is to be most unsparingly censured for, is that it is the parent of a numerous class of disowned criminals, beggars, vagrants, and generally not only of people that produce nothing, but of a multitude of individuals who onslaught and destroy society. Who is to be amenable for the existence of such a class if not the present social conditions? And who will assert that, if born and educated under other more favourable circumstances, and cared for by sympathizing fellow creatures, these outcasts could not be useful members of the society they live in?

Thus the very first vice of civilization is the enormous loss of human labour power caused by calling into existence numberless hosts of unproductive or destructive social elements, and what is more, by not being able to utilise the few productive labourers.

Everyone knows the advantages afforded by production on a large scale—advantages chiefly due to the integrate use of the labour power by division of labour, as well as to capital and the application of machines. However, small production still exists even in the most advanced countries, grievously affecting principally agriculture. In France a great part of the territory belongs to small peasant proprietors. What a frightful waste of human labour the peasant cultivation exhibits nowadays! The parcelling economical system renders every common undertaking

with regard to agriculture very difficult, for instance, irrigation, drainage, sewers.

If these hundreds of lots of land were united into one large estate, if instead of hundreds of miserable huts a large building were raised, if the whole land were tilled by the common labour of all producers according to a common scheme and for joint account, there cannot be the slightest doubt that the quantity of products would enormously grow, and that consequently the same area of soil would make the population incomparably richer.

The advantages of large production are still more evident in the sphere of industry, and as small production is alike far from having ceased to exist in this field, we see in all economic departments the incapacity of our civilization to avail itself of the productive powers of society in the best possible manner.

Now, the scattered state of production is not the only vice of the dominating economic organization; the very character of the present economic labour is, indeed, not a smaller drawback. Deprived of every attraction, one consents to perform the given work only under pressure of necessity, need, hunger, and executes it, of course badly, to the utmost. We are so accustomed to it that we consider the very nature of economical labour as something burdensome and disagreeable. But the reason of our being averse to labour lies not in the nature or kind of activity, but in the external heavy conditions of the ruling organization.

We see that people spontaneously and only for the delight they find in it, take upon themselves arduous efforts by far exceeding the most difficult economic work in the expenditure of power. The amateur hunter very often tires himself, and undergoes pains more than any hired workman would endure. Why? because his labour tallies with his inclination, begins and ends when he likes. Every

work is disagreeable if done by constraint, and, *vice versa*, every work including the economic can bring with it great pleasure if it is not of long duration, if accomplished voluntarily, and is answering to the taste and capacities of its executor.

The unattractiveness of labour under the prevailing system, therefore, is due only to its faulty organization. The labourer compelled to work produces a great deal less than the labourer who, finding pleasure in the process of working itself, works with will and pleasure. Thus we see another vice of our civilization leading to the diminution of social products.

But the catalogue of the vices inherent to one civilization is far from being closed. It is admitted on all hands that the labour of the owner by far surpasses in energy the labour of the hired operative. Civilization is placed before the alternative: either labour of the owner and small production, excluding the possibility of availing itself of technical improvements, or huge production and bad and careless hired labour. Civilization has proved itself incapable of uniting for its own advantage the conveniences afforded by huge production with those of non-hired labour.

"Now, in casting a glance upon the actual economic circumstances, as a whole, we see that the tie between the distinct concerns consists in the exchange of commodities, in which the so-called free competition obtains. There is no general plan of social production in existence. Everyone takes care of himself, and is indifferent regarding the interests of his neighbours, the consequence of which is not harmony of interests, as the economists assert, but an exasperating war of all against all, enrichment of one at the cost of the other, ruin of unsuccessful enterprisers, bankruptcies, assuming during

industrial and commercial crises almost an epidemic character, when one factory after the other is closed and the operatives suffer unheard of privations.

We are thus brought to the conclusion that, as Considerant puts it, the actual social order is adverse to the general interests of the individual as well as to those of the people; it impoverishes and starves the social body, and not for want of means to bring about a better state. Land, capital, industry, the power of the machine, arts and sciences, hands and intelligence, are at the disposal of society. The question at issue is only how to organize industry, to propose means and ways, and to ascertain their effects. It is the great question of the fate of society—the question of happiness or calamity, of wealth or misery, and perhaps, as things now are, a question of life and death for modern society.

Having found that the reasons of the insignificance of social wealth, even of the richest peoples of our times, are wholly rooted in the existing social adjustment which fetters the productive forces of society, turns a great part of the population into parasites, and deprives the remaining part of the possibility of fully utilizing their powers, which under a better organization could create incomparably greater opulence, it stands to reason that be the distribution of social income ever so equitable under such conditions poverty must inevitably be the lot of mankind.

Notwithstanding this severe censure of the existing economic order, Fourier knows perfectly well how much capitalism towers above all preceding economic systems. "Civilization," he says, "is an important step in the gradual progress of the social movement, in creating the agency of realizing the future order—associations. Capitalism has brought about production on a large scale, and called into being science and art. Only by availing one's self of these

means is it possible to ascend on the social ladder, and not to remain in this abyss of misery and absurdity."

Civilization changed the technica of production by placing them on scientific ground.

Within the domain of civilization the development of a new arrangement can be observed. Property changes its form; from individual and exclusive it turns into social—joint stocks. Production becomes social, owing to small production being swallowed up by huge production, whereby the elements of a new organization—association, are being called into life.

The whole subsequent Socialist literature added very little essentially new material to Fourier's splendid picture of the anomalies of civilization. As to his mental power, Fourier is, generally speaking, one of the most ingenious thinkers history knows of. It is true, he painted with too dark colours, especially in characterizing the part commerce plays in the march of civilization. In passing so relentless a judgment upon what constitutes the principal factor of modern social life, calling it parasite, vampire, spider, Fourier gave vent to his feeling of moral indignation at the circumventions commerce usually resorts to, and which he knew very well by personal experience.

However, the economist cannot, in the case in question, place himself at Fourier's point of view. The social type of the big merchant distinguishes itself very little from that of all other huge capitalistic enterprisers. In the mechanism of social economy commerce performs just such an indispensable function as in the domain of industry, since without exchange of commodities, under a capitalistic system, production would be quite impossible. The merchant is, therefore, no parasite but a necessary wheel in the actual economic clock-work; it is the hypertrophy of commerce, its excessive growth at the expense of other

branches of human activity—a tendency which is closely tied up with the capitalistic organization—which makes it an undoubted evil; and in this respect Fourier is quite right, just as he is quite right in asserting that, whatever services commerce may render to society, the claimed remunerations are much too high.

The very newest phase of industrial development signifies the tendency to establish more immediate relations between producers and consumers, by avoiding the interposition of the merchant. Different kinds of co-operative organizations successfully displace retail dealers and partly wholesale establishments. In the literature of co-operative movement, which is going straight against the capitalistic trade, one can up to this day meet with discussions and declamations permeated by Fourier's spirit. To many persons indulging in extravagant notions of co-operation, the merchant even now appears in the form of a spider or vampire, so that the ideal aim of the combinations on the co-operative line is to get rid of the merchant as intermediary between producer and consumer.

Industry, in its latest development, pursues the same trend independently of the co-operative organization. By the concentration of production and the fusion of separate small undertakings into gigantic associations of capitalists, these associations gain the possibility of keeping away mercantile mediation from the purchase of raw materials which they draw direct from the producers. It can, in general, be considered as a rule that very large establishments, for instance, machine manufactories, iron works, wharves, &c., &c., are working only to order.

The function of the merchant as a mediator thus loses its former importance, to the great advantage of society that economise in this manner a great quantity of social power.

But as simultaneously with this phenomenon the economic system of exchange is going on, while the barter system more and more disappears, commerce, notwithstanding the tendencies towards losing its significance, is not only diminishing but fast increasing, which, by the way, is proved by the rapid growth of the number of individuals employed in different branches of commerce.

The list of vices of our civilization, unrolled by Fourier, is particularly instructive, in so much as it proves the deepness of the delusion on the part of those who are oppressed by the fear that the Socialist order will lead to a general equality of poverty. This fear lies in their having no conception of the magnitude of productive forces society could then dispose of, and of the insignificance of the productive powers now utilized by the community. Of course, the figures contained in Fourier's enumeration of the different categories of "social parasites" are quite arbitrary, and have in themselves no significance whatever. In his assertion that at least two-thirds of the population go to form such parasites, he has not been guided by any statistical data. But if he erred in his computation, it was more in underrating than in overrating the real number of social parasites.

II.

Considering the grandeur of the conception of the laws to which the development of the modern economic organization is subject, of all succeeding Socialist writers there is only Marx who can be put in parallel with Fourier.

By generalizing the development of historical facts, Marx attempted to elucidate the trend of the modern social movement, and what kind of new social forms necessarily sprout out on the old society, starting naturally

from his philosophy of history, from the doctrine of social materialism, which, in the development of the material conditions of economic labour, recognises the determining, impulsive power of social progress. But if economic relations mould and determine all other social phenomena, the birth of a new social organism must be the natural offshoot of the evolution of the existing economic system. Such a system is capitalism, and so we arrive at the conclusion that the propelling forces of the coming social reorganization must spring forth from the natural development of the capitalistic order.

The capitalistic method of production represents the newest phase in the progress of humanity. The preceding forms of production were, on the one side, the small independent organization, and on the other, the coercive system based upon thraldom. Both forms, looked upon from a purely technical point of view, stand incomparably lower than capitalism, which has exercised a most effective influence on the progress of mankind by promoting the extraordinary rapid development of the social productive powers.

The capitalistic system, however, contains inherent, unsolvable contradictions, which are the cause of the periodically occurring industrial crises, and inevitably lead it to the transformation into a higher state.

The capitalistic industry is doomed to repeatedly pass through one and the same cycle of calmness, briskness, excitement, flatness, stagnation, ending in a crash and crisis.

"Like the celestial bodies, which once put into motion unalterably repeat their rotations, social production once urged forward in the alternate movement of contraction and expansion, continues to reiterate this course. Up to the present time the period of these cycles have taken up ten to

eleven years, but there is no ground for considering these junctures as invariable in their length. On the contrary, the laws of capitalistic production justify the supposition that these periods are changing, and that the duration of the cycles will by little and little get shorter."

Thus Marx persuades himself of the future chronic crises which will completely stem the capitalistic production, and so deal a deadly blow to the whole capitalistic fabric.

The purely economic powers lying in the capitalistic system impel it to convert itself into a higher economical form. Side by side with these blind, elementary forces of economic evolution, there are acting on the same line conscious, social forces, generated by the same capitalistic evolution. Capitalism not only finds itself confronted with an economic conflict which cannot possibly be decided on the field of the present organization of society, and which demands socialization of the means of production, but calls into life a class that has an immediate interest in such socialization. This class is the proletariate.

The enormous raising of the productiveness of socia labour, due to the new methods of performance, constitutes an extremely high merit of capitalism. However, the higher the rise of social wealth the lower falls the producer of this wealth—the labourer. But to what must lead the growth of misery, the increase of the proletariate sinking into pauperism commensurate to the centralization of immense agencies of production in the hands of an ever decreasing group of capitalists; what must these facts, we ask, lead to? The resistance of the proletariate assumes greater dimensions, the conditions of production more and more unite and discipline this class. "The hour for capitalist private property is striking. The expropriators will be expropriated." The capitalist method of production is the first negation of private property based on personal labour.

"Capitalistic production creates its own negation with the necessity of a natural process. It is the negation of negation. It is re-establishing not private property but individual property on the groundwork of the acquisitions during the capitalistic era, viz., co-operation and common property of land and means of production."

This is the general scheme of the Socialistic order which, according to Marx, emanates from capitalism. However ingenious this scheme is, it does not completely square with reality. Thus, as already stated, no reduction of the number of capitalist magnates and the simultaneous growth of misery has been observed. Nor have Marx's expectations, that the intervals between the crisis will become shorter, that a chronic crisis must come, rendering impossible the continuance of the capitalistic mode of production, been realized. Theory and historical facts of the latest crises have refuted this assertion, and proved that the development of capitalism does not bring with it any new embarrassments regarding the sale of industrial products. There is, therefore, no occasion to suppose that capitalism will some day die a natural death; it will be destroyed by the conscious willing efforts of man, by that social class which has been the foremost object of capitalistic exploitation—the proletariate.

Upon the whole, the Marxian scheme of the development of Socialism, as issuing from the very womb of capitalist organization, shows an obvious duplicity in its construction. On the one side, he does all that lies in his power to prove that the change from the Capitalist into the Socialist organization is an organic, elementary unavoidable and unpreventable process; that capitalism, obeying the laws of economic evolution, must necessarily destroy itself, be the relations of the individual or of the organized social classes to this process whatever they may. On the other side, he

insists upon maintaining that the destruction of the capitalistic fabric and the establishment in its stead of a Socialistic order, should be the conscious work of one social class—the proletariate!

Now, if the economic development itself naturally and really leads Socialism to victory, without any conscious assistance of man, why then should the labouring class take part in a struggle and expend their forces to attain an end which, at any rate, must come about without submitting itself to any interference whatever from without?

We are met here by a contradiction lying at the very bottom of the Marxian social philosophy. The author of the "Capital" exaggerated the significance of the elementary side of the historical process, and did not realize the enormous creative power of the human personality enacting in this process. He, therefore, as scholar and thinker, as objective investigator, always strove to put the elementary forces of the economic development in the foreground of historic stage. But he was not only a thinker and searcher; he was a struggler inflamed with hatred against the existing social conditions, a passionate revolutionary who devoted all his life to the cause of revolution. He was not only a man of cold reflection, but a man of a tenacious will, of an intense energy, which he demanded also from others; and to this purpose the thinker was obliged to descend from the height of his contemplations and meditations, and call the people to struggle for their interest, to fight for the Socialist ideal. The part acted by the elementary forces and by the conscientious social influences in the struggle for the realization of the Socialist system, is a question which we think could be decided in the following manner.

It stands to reason that the economic development is an indispensable condition of the success of Socialism, in as

much as it prepares the soil for the new seed by calling into being the necessary modifications, and by organizing the power which has to act the main part in the struggle—the proletariate. Herein is Marx perfectly right, so that the matter at issue is beyond all dispute. But the elementary process alone is not sufficient to lead Socialism to victory; it must be supplied by the conscientious influence of man upon the historical form of society. Only the conscious will of man, leaning on the inherent process of the economic development, can bring about a new, a Socialistic order.

Marx, like Fourier, recognized in the capitalistic economic organization an extremely important step forward, if compared with all preceding systems. But in contradistinction to Fourier, Marx did not analyze the obstacles the capitalistic organization as such is putting in the way of the proper use that can be made of the social powers, which is indeed a point of great weight in the critical valuation of capitalism.

When Fourier promised tenfold to increase the social wealth by changing the anarchical freedom of capitalism into a regularly planned organization of labour in the huge agricultural industrial associations, it could be regarded as a mere fancy—and fancy it was with Fourier. The Phalanstery was too insignificant a means to attain this result. But that the capitalistic order involves conditions which are impeding the growth of productive forces, and exclude the possibility of using them to the full is very far from being a fancy.

The body of the capitalistic commonwealth represents a complicated conglomerate of independent private organisms of separate individual economic arrangements, connected with each other by the tie of exchange. Every organism has within its sphere a certain right of self-government. Every individual undertaker, every individual citizen, can

do what he lists, without meeting with any prohibition, but also without any assistance, injunction or support from the society as a whole. Taken all in all, this social aggregate does not rest on any rational foundation. Blind forces of historical development determine the distribution of the people over the territory, as also the economic system, which, therefore, assumes a multiplicity of forms. In all countries, the most advanced not excluded, we observe an enormous quantity of such types of industrial undertakings which, in consequence of the low level of the productiveness of the labour employed, are absolutely doomed to wreck, but obstinately struggle for life and very slowly die away.

Thus in the industrial sphere of superiority of machine production and of grand industry, in general, over small production, is indeed an immense one, nevertheless small industry not only still exists but goes on increasing. There are, of course, branches of industry in which small production, regarding the application of technical contrivances, proves quite rational, and may therefore exist for a long time yet, or for ever; for instance, the various branches of art industry. However, these industries are employing but an insignificant number of petty producers who, respecting their main bulk, are occupied at such kinds of work which could be performed by the aid of machines with incomparably greater success. But the machines do not penetrate into this province of labour, owing to the economical condition of society as at present constituted, and above all, in consequence of the exceedingly low labour remuneration the domestic workers are compelled to content themselves with.

Low wages are, generally speaking, one of the chief hindrances from raising the productivity of labour and the spreading of machines. But there are other social conditions of capitalism which go to make impediments in the

same direction. Thus, for instance, in the very centre of the capitalistic world, in England, it has been observed in the course of the last years; what at first sight appeared incomprehensible, viz., that in several branches of the clothes trade huge establishments have been disolved, and domestic manual labour substituted for machine work in factories. The heavy demands of sanitary and other conditions by the factory inspectors in favour of the working classes, compelled the employers and the owners of factories to pass over to domestic work which, not being subject to any outside interference, can be freely exploited to the most extreme limits.

Under the system of private industry technical improvements pass by an enormous part of social production without grazing it. Now, what is the use of technical inventions if an immense portion of mankind—in many countries the majority of the population—continues working with the aid of such primitive implements as were used by their great-grandfathers? The hook-plough, spinning wheel, hand-loom, are still in many countries firmly established.

Thus, we see that within the frame-work of private economic management the technical forces, which society disposes of at the present time, are far from being utilized in full measure. Certainly considerable progress is being observed. The more advanced undertakings, in relation to the application of technical agencies in general, are increasing and supplanting if not absolutely so relatively, the less advanced adventures, and finally occupying more and more a dominating position under the capitalistic order.

But this capitalistic order, as a whole, abides in the disorganized, elementary state, in which almost no progress is visible, since the joining of capitalists into

syndicates does not abolish competition between the syndicates themselves, and the national production remains in the same anarchical conditions. There is no guiding and directing authority striving to bring about harmony between the actions of the autonomic economical units which go to form the social capitalistic body, whilst the existing system of exchange in reality binds up their disconnected positions. This chaotic capitalist exchange produces an invisible but still uninterruptedly acting pressure upon production, and represents one of the main conditions checking the development of the productive social forces.

The central power determining the movement of capitalist industry is the market. It is the market which makes the capitalistic world feel the deranging influence of the confused state of exchange upon the magnitude of social production. The technical powers of modern industry are so enormous that in every capitalistic country production could, in a short time, assume extraordinary dimensions, as is best proved by all those astonishing leaps of production in times of highly animated activity in trade and industry. Factories, all kind of industrial and commercial enterprises spring up like mushrooms; whole town-quarters are being covered with buildings; in the New-World large cities rise, as though a magic golden rain showered down upon the country, waking up the sleeping productive powers which amaze all the world.

But this brisk state does not last long. Two or three years pass, and crisis, crashes, bankruptcies, stagnation and general depression reappear. This is the regular unchanging series, in which capitalistic industry develops. But why is this industrial effervescence always of so short a duration, and why does it end in stagnation? The immediate reason of industrial crisis is always the fall of

prices of commodities, as a consequence of the impossibility to find for them a convenient market. The increase of industry ceaess, not because the capitalistic society is unable to produce a greater quantity of objects, but because society lacks the ability of consuming the produced commodities, although an enormous majority of the population stands in need of them.

It is thus just the anarchical system of exchange which restrains capitalistic production and debars it from the possibility of developing incongruity with the technical conditions. The insignificance of the sum total of national wealth even in the richest countries is, as already mentioned, the direct consequence of the capitalistic social organization. Indeed, can national wealth attain any magnitude, when during the whole of the past century each industrial ascent was followed by a fall of not seldom much longer duration; when during the last thirty years the number of those that proved unfavourable for industry considerably surpassed the number of the favourable ones?

A peculiarly marked characteristic of the capitalistic system is the uninterrupted presence of a more or less numerous class of unemployed, longing for and capable to work, without finding it.

In times of crisis the number of such unemployed rises and considerably diminishes when industrial production gets animated, but never disappears entirely. Now, what is it that calls forth those workless seasons of fluctuating duration? Again, not the natural technical conditions of production. There is no lack in implements of work for all unemployed, nor is there any deficiency of materials to work at, or absence of wants to be satisfied with the prepared commodities. Why then do people find no work at a time when the means of production are laid up and

the mass of the people is deprived of the necessaries of life? The answer is, only because the existing economic conditions, depriving the labourer of the means of production and splitting the social organism into millions of independent economic units, fetters social production, which if freed from obstructions could fully turn to profit the immense powers which, discovered by science and practice, lie hidden in the entrails of society.

It is true, that within the pale of capitalism itself a powerful process of combining adventures into different kinds of unions and associations is at work. But these organizations are not only unable to release social production from the trammels and burdensome hindrances, but strive themselves to shackle such production and to keep back its growth, which is the main task of all syndicates, trusts and other capitalistic unions.

This unorganized state of economic relations, which no capitalistic union can remove, generates in its progressive movement an intense friction, which sometimes assumes dimensions that stop the capitalistic advance, as can be observed in time of crises. Sometimes this friction is weaker, but it never ceases and always checks expansion. A regularly planned social organization must possibly minimise this friction, and develop the modern productive powers to their fullest extent.

The consequence must be such a rising of the productivity of the labour of which we can now form no idea. Of course, the results of a new organization of social economy cannot be expressed with the preciseness of figures. A German pseudonymous author, Atlanticus, not long ago attempted to determine the measure in which social wealth could rise if all production were organized according to the principles of modern technical science, and arrived at the conclusion that, for instance, in

agriculture, the number of labourers could be reduced by 60°/₀ whilst the value of products would be doubled. In general, he says, concerning the whole national economic structure, the doubling of labour income and at the same time the curtailing of labour time by half is possible—an assertion which refers to Germany.

I for one do not consider these computations as sufficient to convey any idea of the real growth of social wealth in a Socialistic Commonwealth, the less so as Atlanticus is taking into account only a small part of the economic advantages the transition to the new order would afford. However, even this moderate and extremely cautious calculation proves already the possibility of the multiple growth of the productivity of social labour.

Many similar calculations are to be found in the literature the authors of which in most cases draw more favourable inferences than Atlanticus, but it is not worth while to dwell upon them, as they cannot lay any claim to accuracy. They are only illustrating by figures what an immense rise of productive social labour would take place under a systematical organization of social production, with a view to demonstrate that the great problem of Socialism—the attainment of general welfare by means of a fundamental reformation of the existing economic arrangements—is completely solvable in the nearest future and does not contain anything Utopian. Thus, to sum up, capitalistic economy not only condemns the proletariate to excessive work and a miserable life, but checks the growth of social wealth and obstructs the rise of the productiveness of social labour to the level of the modern state of technical development. An organization of social labour on the lines of a harmonious scheme is therefore requisite not only in the interest of distribution but also in the interest of production. Capitalism constituted a signal progress in

comparison with the economic situation under slavery or feudalism. But now history holds on its course and the mission of capitalism is achieved, social economy must rise to a higher degree, and the capitalist anarchy, bearing rule in the domain of social production, must be superseded by a socialistically planned organization.

PART II

THE SOCIALISTIC ORGANIZATION OF SOCIETY

CHAPTER IV

CENTRALIZED SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

The followers of Marx very sceptically regard the attempts to frame plans of socialistic organization for the future, and in opposition lay stress on the immanent laws of economic evolution, which lead to Socialism without being in any way influenced by human will or wish. Now, if Socialism is actually to be realized only in virtue of the organic development of social life, the active interposition of the conscious will of man in this tendency has, as we stated above, no meaning whatever, and accordingly it remains only to quietly wait until the predicted overthrow of capitalism will be consummated and a new social order born. However, social democrats do not feel in the least inclined to entertain thoughts of such indolent relations to the reality of life, and being a party not of dispassionate contemplators, but of energetic, unremitting combatants, they cannot keep their theoretic ground the moment they find themselves face to face with concrete problems, so that in spite of their rejection of the speculative plans regarding the future, the Marxists cannot dispense with them when called upon to deal with sober realities. This is easily understood when we bear in mind that it is just the projects of the future structure of society, hatched by the head of every Socialist, which makes of him a Socialist. These schemes may be not elaborated, may leave many

questions in a state of obscurity, but something there must be in them which is clear and positive, and excludes every reasonable doubt in the possibility of the realization of Socialism as the future form of commonwealth. Indeed, one cannot imagine a Socialist who could be absolutely ignorant of what a socialistic organization is. If such a one were found, the question could be proposed to him, why he thinks that the disruption of capitalism will lead just to Socialism and not to any other imaginable form of society?

If Socialism be something entirely unknown, a mathematical X as it were, why then give a name at all to what is unknown? In truth, the Marxists are not less convinced of the necessity of adumbrations of the future social fabric than the Utopian Socialists; the difference consists only in that the Utopists delineated their plans themselves at an enormous expenditure of brain labour, whilst the Marxists received them ready made from the Utopists, and it is owing to the existence of such prospects in the tactics of the Marxists that Marxism constitutes one of the various directions of Socialism.

Thus plans form an inevitable essential ingredient of all socialistic tendencies, and can be classed as follows:

Socialism	*Communism*
1. Centralized	1. Centralized
2. Corporate	2. Corporate
3. Federal	3. Federal
4. Anarchical	4. Anarchical

With a view to facilitate the understanding of this classification, the importance of which will be seen in the further exposition, we premise the following:

The difference between Socialism and Communism has already been expounded in the first chapter. But within

the confines of Socialism and Communism four types of social order must be distinguished, according to the degree of subordination of the parts to the whole.

This subordination is the greatest in the first—the centralized type, where the entire economic life of the society is being regulated from out of one central point. In the second—the corporative type, society is subdivided into various autonomous groups of labourers, each performing within its bounds more or less identical work. In the third—the federal type, society is subdivided into separate communities, within which the labourers are executing various kinds of work; and lastly in the fourth—the anarchical type, where the individual, in relation to his economical activity, is perfectly free and independent from any social coercive union whatever.

I

CENTRALIZED SOCIALISM

The centralized Socialism represents the reigning tendency of the socialistic movement of the present time, and is the type which has been more especially elaborated by the St. Simonians. Saint Simon particularly emphasised the thought that the establishment of a social order corresponding to the interests of the working classes, can be brought about only by the aid of the State, in organizing a social economic life on new principles. St. Simon himself was not a Socialist in the strict sense of the term, nor did he leave after his death any determined plan of a social structure of society. But his disciples, and chiefly Bazar and Enfantin, accomplished the labour of the master, and created a well proportionated Socialistic system, permeated alike in its critical as in its positive part by one spirit—the spirit of

solidarity and mutual subordination of men as the groundwork upon which society should rest.

The existing social relations are founded on the principle of free competition; in other words, form a composition of separate concerns contending with each other. The enterpriser under the dominating conditions is to all intents and purposes a completely independent manager of his own affairs, and to a certain extent also of the economical pursuits of the given people at large. He thus performs an important social economic work, and can be regarded as a social servant laid by the community under certain obligations for a certain reward. But where is the security that the undertaker will acquit himself of his social duties? Economists have thought to possess this security in the personal interests of the individual, who, consequently, may be entrusted with the charge of bestowing considerations on questions affecting the interests of the community as a whole. Now, there is not only no such guarantee, but it is apparent that the individual as such, be his personal interest never so great, can by no means satisfactorily perform the social duties imposed upon him, for properly speaking, what does the social significance of the enterpriser consist in? In the satisfaction of the social demands in products, in endeavouring to make social production quantitatively keep in the line of social demand, and in striving to produce only such commodities which society is actually in need of.

But under the rule of unlimited competition no individual engaged in any business knows, or in fact can know exactly, the required quantity and nature of the social demand, or the quantity and nature of the social production; otherwise expressed, the quantities and the qualities of objects produced by his co-rivals are a sealed book to him, so that he performs his socially important work, as it were, hoodwinked. It is, therefore, no wonder that instead of a

confluence of production and demand, a decided discordancy ensues, in the wake of which follow, crises, bankruptcies, want of employment, and misery of the working people. Moreover, under the system of free competition, where there is no social guidance of economic life, the principals of the undertakings are not persons best qualified for the given adventures, but individuals to whose lot it fell to be born in a class which dispose of the required capital, and whose incapacities cannot fail to have a noxious influence on the social body. And, finally, the remuneration received by the enterprisers in the shape of income, does not answer to the social utility produced by each of them, but to the amount of their respective capital. Thus the owners of the instruments of production impose on society a tribute which lies on the working classes as an oppressive burden.

The highest aim mankind is striving to attain is to institute an universal association of the working classes. The modern State, the St. Simonians say, must radically change its character; from following out its thoughts of violence, which is nowadays its chief goal, it must in future be converted into a peaceful organization of labour. The groundwork of this organization consists, according to St. Simon's disciples, in the following measures:

All instruments of production shall be concentrated in the hands of the State, bearing the character of a religious commune, as the St. Simonian State is—State and Church—at the same time. The disposition of these instruments, and their distribution among the sundry localities of the country, belong to the functions of the Central State Administration, which shall be invested with the power of authority as the modern government.

In immediate connection with this Central Office stand the Provincial Boards, which branching out into territorially still more confined institutions, come more and more into

closer contact with single producers and consumers, and together constitute an hierarchy of mutually subordinated various kinds of economic organizations, with the Central State Administration at its head. The local organizations will provide the Central Office with information concerning the magnitude and character of the national demand, according to which the Central Office will distribute among them the instruments of production, after having compared the local demands with one another, and the means of production at the disposal of the nation. Every year a national budget, similar to the modern State Budgets, will be set up, in which the assets will be represented by the sum total of the national products, and the expenditure by the demands on the part of the local organizations, each of which will have to establish its own budget on the same principle. In the opinion of the St. Simonians this must result in a harmonious arrangement of the entire national economic activity, in the oneness of the plan leased on the co-ordination of the parts, and in the complete correspondence of national production to national consumption.

Production must not absolutely be social. The authorities upon whom the distribution of the instruments of production is incumbent, can give them to labourer groups or single labourers. The products, as such, belong to the labourer; but as the instruments of production will not be the property of individual members of the society, but will belong to the whole community, the distributions of these instruments affords the authority in question the possibility of exercising an essential influence on the distribution of the social income.

The Union of the Labourers will form an hierarchical arrangement, in which there will be superior and inferior officials, foremen and subordinates. The principle of distribution will be: "from each according to his capacities to

each according to his work." Thus in the St. Simonian there will be nothing similar to equality of distribution, but on the other hand there will be a strict proportionality between what each member gives to, and receives from, society. All privileges of birth disappear, and only personal merits shall receive reward to the full. Under equal remuneration of work, irrespective of its productivity in the sense of utility, the less productive labourer would appropriate in his favour the fruits of the work of the more productive. The St. Simonians, therefore, assert that it is just their principle of distribution which, more than any other, is in keeping with the lofty claims to equality of rights of all men, the reward according to work and merit being the expression of true equality.

The principle of authority, of voluntary subordination of morally and mentally inferior people under people of higher parts and higher moral conscience, was the basis upon which the St. Simonians built their ethics. It is true they were individualists, in as much as the free and full development of the human personality in all its diversity was their highest ideal. "The aim of all my life," said the dying St. Simon, "has been to secure to all members of society the greatest possible latitude for the development of all their faculties." Herein his followers see the ultimate goal of all social unions, and the means for attaining this end they find in the guidance of the weak by the strong, in the authority of Reason, Morality and Talent. We have seen that the same principle of authority underlies the Socialistic State they projected. But withal sight must not be lost of the religious tincture of the St. Simonian teachings, which is a conspicuous feature of this school, according to which the future State is to be not only an economic association but also a new church.

It was just this peculiarity of the St. Simonian plan of the

social structure which rendered the whole working class averse to its doctrines, so that St. Simonism was never even in the slightest degree a popular movement; it was too aristocratic for that. All his followers were almost, without exception, representatives of intelligence, aristocrats of spirit and talent. The modern democrats are not inclined to bow to authority, and the extreme centralization of the social order planned by the St. Simonians would demand such an iron discipline to which the labourer of our days, with his love and freedom, would by no means willingly submit. Hence the alienation of the mass of the people from this theoretical construction, which had but an indirect influence on the modern Socialist movement, through the medium of isolated thinkers who adopted some of the most important ideas of St. Simonism, but refused to recognize the commanding spirit permeating its teachings. This last labour of reforming and improving St. Simonism has chiefly been performed by Pecqueur, the father of the modern collectivism.

II

The State devised by Pecqueur is like that of the St. Simonians, the sole owner of all means of production, as land and instruments of work. Is is subdivided, similar to modern States, into districts, circuits, cantons and communes, constituting mutually subordinated economically organized centres, and enjoying certain rights of self-government. The extent and the character of the national demands of commodities for the next economical period is being determined according to the quantity of products consumed by the population during the previous period, as also in conformity with the new orders on hand. Acquiring in this manner precise knowledge of the demanded quantities, the national production is being distributed

accordingly. The State, in possession of the means of production, and aided by its subordinated social institutions, organizies conformably to a definitive scheme, the whole national production. The produced objects, however, are not the property of the producers, a condition which reflects the essential distinction of Pecqueur's State from that of the St. Simonians. The products are delivered into public stores for preservation and distribution among all the members of society, which not only disposes of all means of production, as is the case with the St. Simonians, but has in its hands the immediate direction of the production.

The principles laid down by Pecqueur, and upon which the distribution of the products is to be carried through, are as follows: In the first place he is a staunch and inexorable enemy of inequality of remuneration, grounded on the difference of productivity of labour. Starting from the notion of justice, he denies the right of the more capable or more skilled labourer to a higher reward, for the merit of man is not to be measured by the outward results of his deeds but only by his good-will.

The problem of the social authority consists in fixing the normal length of the labour day for every special branch of work, for every special profession, with a view to reducing everywhere the burden of work for every average labourer to an equal magnitude; otherwise expressed, the length of the labour day in every branch of production is to be determined in an inverse ratio to the difficulty or disagreeableness of the work. At the same time the social authority has to establish, wherever it proves possible, a normal standard of product, *i.e.*, determined the quantity of the commodity to be produced during the normal labour time by the average labourer.

Wages in all departments of work must be equal if the

normal task is satisfactorily accomplished. On the other hand, if the labourer, through his own fault, has produced less than the established standard, he receives a proportionally inferior compensation. If he finishes his work in less than the normal time, he is not obliged to work any longer.

In setting the average and equal wages for all, all wants must be taken into consideration, the satisfaction of which, by means of the common national labour products, is incumbent upon the State; for instance, the means required for the subsistence of people incapable of work, sick persons and children, &c., &c. Apart from this a certain portion of the labour produce is to be deducted for the restitution of the national capital expended in the process of production, and also for the enlargement of the national capital in hand. What remains after these deductions is to be distributed among the labourers in equal parts.

As to the distribution itself, it is effected by means of money. Of course, money under a Socialistic order must play quite another part than under the actual social conditions. At present money is a commodity which has its intrinsic value. In Pecqueur's State, money is but a conventional sign, a symbolic expression of value. Money is necessary because Pecqueur intends granting to every citizen the absolute freedom of personal expenditure in the sense of uncontrolled choice of the kind of products to be consumed. Every one chooses for his use what he likes, and as much as he likes. But since the total value consumed by every citizen is to a certain extent limited, it is indispensable to precisely specialize the value of every consumed object, as also the total value of these objects, otherwise, the individual income could exceed the established normal condition. Hence the necessity of money in this

or in any other shape under every collectivist or Socialist system in the narrow sense of the word, as opposed to communistic order.

But will not the use of money in the Socialist State call into being the practise of usury? By no means! for the golden calf has in our days such a fatal power over men, not in virtue of its quality as a medium of exchange but in consequence of the whole organization of society. The present power of money is due, on the one hand, to the possibility of its being turned into capital and becoming a source of appropriation of foreign labour; and, on the other hand, to the needs of the mass of the population, which does not possess it in sufficient quantity to satisfy their bare wants. Neither one nor the other of these cases can happen in the Socialist State, which, in the first place, excludes once for all the possibility of converting money into implements of production, which all belong to the State and cannot pass into private possession; and in the second place, because not only the most pressing wants but even the less indispensable of the mass of the people will be abundantly satisfied, and that consequently there will be no necessity to have recourse to money loans. Only in exceptional cases could attempts at usury transactions be made in a Socialist State, but the law would absolutely prohibit them. The Socialist State cannot grant anybody the right to draw an income from his property, as the exploitation of man by man is inconsistent with the spirit and principles of the Socialistic teaching.

As to any other use of money Pecqueur introduces no restrictions. Every citizen has free scope not only regarding the products he makes use of; he is at liberty to make presents of his money to whom and of whatever amount he lists, keep it himself as long as he likes, or bequeath it to

whom he wishes. In short, the citizen of Pecqueur's State can do with his money whatever may occur to his mind, with one exception—that of fleecing his fellow creatures.

Of course, the right to receive money or any other object of use the individual disposes of, in the guise of a present or bequest, violates to a certain extent the principle of equality, because in this manner the receivers, without any labour on their part, come into possession of a greater quantity of commodities than others. But this violation is so unsubstantial and of so little consequence with regard to the impossibility of converting money and objects of consumption into capital, that Pecqueur does not hesitate to admit it into his system, in order to restrain the personal freedom as little as possible.

Thus every citizen is free to buy with his money from the public stores whatever he may desire, the State charging itself with their supply by administering on its own account, and regulating the exportation to, and the importation from foreign countries the respectively necessary commodities. When Socialism will have encompassed the whole world, the paper money forming the currency of every particular State will be the only universal instrument of exchange. Gold would, in the international transactions, be just as superfluous as in the home trade. Foreign paper money will excite no distrust owing to the fact that its emission will be strictly regulated in conformity with the requirements of the population, and that it will be redeemed by the respective State in commodities. For this reason, the money of every particular State will become an international money.

The prices of commodites, the quantity of which can be reproduced at will, shall be determined in accordance with the labour expended on their production. But in case

of the demand exceeding the supply, the prices must accordingly undergo a change. The prices of rare commodities will be regulated exclusively in keeping with the existing demand and supply, for if the prices of such products were to be kept on a level with the expended labour, only a part of those who desire to possess these objects could obtain them, whilst the remainder of the population would be empty-handed, which would be a manifest injustice. The rise of the price of such objects reflects economic justice, and embodies the principle of social equality only when it reaches the level on which the lines of demand and supply meet.

Starting from the principle that everyone can freely dispose of his income, Pecqueur proffers an original solution of the question: what part the literary efforts, the labour of artists and of every other producer of a higher creative order, are to play under Socialistic conditions of economical life? The immediate support of all species of such productive and valuable social labour is of the utmost importance to the State. The State itself must publish on its own account books recognised as good and useful, place at the disposal of the learned the necessary means for investigation, the utility of which will be acknowledged by the State, &c., &c. However, this support involves a very great danger. The labour of the thinker and the artist must be completely free and independent of any control whatever. Even the most civilized society has no competency to appreciate this kind of labour, because the thinker or the artist tower above the crowd and outstrip their time. The social control of such specific work as that of the scientific and artistic labourer, cannot but paralyze the creative powers of their faculties. But how can this countenance be given without any control? It would not do to publish on social account every book

void of meaning; there must consequently exist a social authority to decide whether the book deserves to be published or not.

The issue of this difficulty lies, in the opinion of Pecqueur, in the following consideration. Everyone has the right to publish what he likes at his own expense; the State printing offices are open for all those who are ready to pay the expenses of printing, as every one can lay out his money for a scientific, artistic or any other aim. In this way, alongside the science, literature and art countenanced by the State, will exist the free activity in these spheres, neither limited nor hampered in any way whatever.

The State naturally must take upon itself the education and instruction of the young generations, and their sustenance up to the age at which they are able to be set to some productive labour, granting however the parents the right to maintain their children themselves up to a certain age, or to place them out in a State boarding school. It is, moreover, incumbent upon the State to maintain those members who are incapable of work, old men and the sick.

The question of the individual choice of occupation is generally the stumbling block in every Socialist system. If this choice were left to everyone, the more attractive pursuits would be glutted, and the less attractive studiously shunned. Moreover, if everyone could avail himself of the freedom of choice, society would have no guarantee that the required social work would be performed just by those who are endowed with the highest special abilities.

On the other hand, a certain degree of liberty in the choice of a profession involves the necessary condition of personal freedom in general. How is this contradiction to be reconciled? Pecqueur makes the following

proposition. Everyone having chosen a certain kind of occupation must prove that he is the best fitted for this profession, by undergoing a special examination on the part of competent persons, and by being elected by the population. In appointing someone to a social function, preference is to be given to those who enjoy general sympathy and stand higher than others in their qualification, a condition on which also depends the rise in the social hierarchy—the right to fill up higher and leading public offices.

Less talented persons, with whom the population does not sufficiently sympathize, will fill inferior places and perform the duties which meet with a lesser number of volunteers. But sight must not be lost of the obligation of the social authority to take all possible measures to ensure that the burden of work in all branches of industry, and the remuneration as before remarked, be equal on all steps of the social ladder—a circumstance which is highly instrumental in diminishing the friction which cannot fail to ensue between individuals choosing their particular professions. In our days the question of the choice of a calling is for the enormous majority such a fervid one, because the various occupations are bound up with various comforts of life. In Pecqueur's State, where equal remuneration and equally minimized irksomeness of labour obtain, there is no room for such differences. The only motive which incites a man to choose a certain occupation and no other, will therefore be his stronger inclination in this direction than in any other, and stronger dispositions generally go hand in hand with greater abilities. Thus if the Pecqueurian system cannot grant full liberty in the choice of a profession, it at all events warrants this liberty in a far greater measure than the existing social organization, under which this choice is often but the child of an

accident, and often the outcome of an exasperated competitive struggle in which, for the most part, not the most apt and accomplished, but the economically stronger, *i.e.*, the possessor of the larger capital, carries the day.

Many people will find it strange that Pecqueur postulates the equality of reward in all kinds of labour. We are wont to think that the so-called higher categories of work must receive a higher meed. According to the widely spread opinion, such a general equality would kill every liking of creative work and, therefore, would sap the progress of civilization at the very root.

In answer to this it can be asserted that no work of a really creative genius has ever been performed for money. The learned, the thinker, the poet labour for the delight they find in the act of creating, or in obeying the call of a nobler aim than that of material advantage. Of course, mental labour requires a certain minimum of economic comfort and leisure. But the Socialist community must secure for all much more than minimum of welfare; it must secure for all real wealth and real leisure. Under such conditions, it is incomprehensible to what purpose surplus reward for mental exertions can be claimed. This category of labour will, without this surplus, receive the most valuable extra remuneration, which is of great importance as a cogent motive for this kind of activity requiring the strain of the whole personality, as honour admiration, renown and love on the part of his fellow citizens. The advantageous side of the equal remuneration of all kinds of work—apart from its justice, for man is responsible for his good-will and not for his natural abilities and talents—consists also in that, in this case, the choice of profession will be determined only by the very nature of the calling and not by circumstances lying outside, and

having nothing in common with the character of this calling. People will choose concerns which they like most, and not those which yield more profit, and herein is included the guarantee that every work will be executed by those who are best prepared for it.

The Pecqueurian plan of a Socialist State is highly remarkable for the harmonious combination of organized social labour with the principle of personal freedom, a plan which is completely free of the chief sin of the St. Simonism—the immoderate vindication of the principle of authority, which rendered the adoption of the St. Simonian association by modern man impossible. The Pecqueurian State is the ripest fruit of French thought on Socialism.

Pecqueur, recognizing the principle of equal reward of all labour irrespective of any difference in quality, denies however the right of the labourer to his whole produce, and considers all endeavours to realize this right under whatever social arrangement it may be, as absolutely vain efforts.

The Socialist State designed by Rodbertus is, on the contrary, an attempt to bring about the realization of this right.

III

Rodbertus and Pecqueur both start from the supposition that all implements of production are at the disposal of the State, as the only administrator of the national economy. Rodbertus also holds that all citizens have a right to choose the objects of use, and that the extent of their participation in the national consumption is determined by their incomes, which, however, in his mind, are not to be equal for all kinds of work independent of its quality, as Pecqueur planned, but in strict proportion to the labour product.

Every working man receives from the community, after deduction of a given part to cover the requirements of the State, precisely so much value in the shape of useful objects, as the community received from him in the shape of expended labour. The relation of the individual to the community rests on the principle of equality between service and reward.

To this end, Rodbertus commends the fixation of a general normal working time, with which the actually expended labour in each branch of production is to be compared.

In the case of skilled labour one hour of expended effort is calculated as surpassing the normal working time, and one hour spent in simple labour, or in production of a lower quality, is estimated as below the normal working time. The possibility of such a comparison of qualitatively different kinds of labour is, according to Rodbertus, proved by the fact that nowadays, under the capitalist organization, the competition of the workmen has a similar result; in different branches of industry, wages depend on the differences of the productiveness of labour.

Reducing qualitatively different kinds of labour to the corresponding normal working time, and knowing the average product of each kind of labour, it will be easy to determine the quantity of working time included in, and the labour value of every product.

The distribution of products will take place in the following manner. Every workman will receive labour money—a check-book in which the amount of the labour value he produced will be noted down, and which entitles him to the acquisition of necessary objects to the same amount, the value of which is expressed in labour units. In this way a complete conformity of national production

to national consumption will be effected, and simultaneously the right of the labourer to his whole produce realized.

Such is Rodbertus' scheme, the erroneousness of which is easily proved. In the first place, the reduction of qualitatively different kinds of labour to a single normal working time, which entirely covers the Marxian conception of socially necessary working time, is unattainable. The reference to the existing differences of labour pay is anything but convincing, since the actual enormous differences the difference of economic conditions in the competitive in the remunerations of various trades is founded chiefly on struggle, and not on the differences of the productivity of the labourer. Where the labourers are relatively stronger in their struggle with the employers, there the wages are higher, and, in general, the productivity of labour in various professions, in the very nature of the things, allows of no comparison. By what standard, for instance, could the productive work of a judge, a physician, or a farmer be rated? How many working hours are included in the work of a poet, or what quantity of "normal working time" is equal to his labour of one hour?

It is clear that all such attempts to reduce different quantities to a general unit ought to be given up. A system of equitable distribution must aim not at warranting to every labourer the whole of his produce, but at the possibly greatest agreement of the distribution of products with the fundamental ethical principles of Socialism—the idea of equivalence of the human personality.

The great philosopher is, in this respect, not more than the last journeyman; both therefore must enjoy equal rights to live. The right to help on the part of the community, is not to depend upon the concrete results of the individual, but is to be recognized by reason of his good-will, and of his readiness to serve society.

Just as the community is morally bound to sustain the sick and the unable to work—who are but an encumbrance—as it sustains the productive labourer, so it is bound to remunerate the inadequate but conscientious work as that of greater productivity. The right to equal reward for conscientious labour can be limited only in relation to the painfulness or disagreeable feeling it engenders. It cannot be denied that there are kinds of labour so irksome and repugnant in themselves that it is very difficult to find people willing to undergo the trouble, be the external conditions whatever they may. In such cases the principle of equality will not be infringed upon, if such labour will receive in consideration of its onerous nature an additional recompense. But as the coarse work of the day-labourer requires the most burdensome efforts, the less productive kinds of labour, as distinct from the higher categories which are joyfully taken up, can under the Socialistic system receive the highest remuneration. It is evident that in the case under consideration the principle of securing the right of the labourer to his whole produce is out of the question.

This right of the labourer, generally speaking, and as Anton Menger set forth, is chiefly significant in a negative sense as the denial of the right to an unearned income. In its positive sense this right relates to the society as a whole, but cannot be applied as a guide to the distribution of products among the individual members of the community. At the bottom of this distribution, under a Socialistic organization, another and a higher principle must be laid down—the principle of equal right of all men to life, happiness, and free development of personality.

The plan of a Socialist state sketched by Rodbertus, entirely resting on the recognition of the right of every labourer to his whole produce, must, were it but for this

reason, decidedly be rejected. This plan involves besides another foible—the determination of the price of the product in conformity with the expended labour. As Pecqueur pointed out, the consequent carrying out of the labour principle in relation to the settlement of the prices of products is identical with encroachment on the principle of equality; in other words, conveys the idea of depriving one part of the population of the necessary commodities, in favour of another part which accidentally succeeded in acquiring these products before. If the prices of commodities were always to be kept on a level with the expended labour, society, in case of the supply exceeding the demand, could not possibly dispose of them. The superfluous quantity of objects would glut the State stores without any advantage. The only means to throw these commodities into the stream of consumption, would be to lower the prices and, of course, the community would be put to the necessity of reducing the prices of those products which do not meet with an adequate demand. Under socialistic or capitalistic economical conditions the prices of commodities must, therefore, mirror the coincidence of the respective supply and demand, an expedience required by a sound economy. Immovable prices alongside fluctuating supply and demand, is the greatest economic absurdity imaginable.

IV

In the face of Marxism denying in principle the utility and importance of the schemed structure of the future society which it regards as "Utopian," it is not to be wondered at that on this head nothing conspicuous has been produced by it. There is only one thing beyond doubt, namely, that although Marxists refuse to avow that the coming commonwealth could be called State, the socialistically organized

economic conditions of the future must, in their opinion, bear the character of a centralized order, but without the attributes of the State, in the modern sense of the word, in which the State is an organized domination of the wealthy classes over the necessitous, with all the consequences of class contradiction and class war, which in Socialism have no reason for being. It is true the central authority will not be the administrator of the whole social production. Production serving to satisfy mere local requirements, can be transferred to local communal institutions. "But the main group of the means of production must be handed over to the State, just as the modern State only can furnish the frame for the socialistic society, and also create the conditions under which communal or co-operative enterprises can become the links of social production." (Kautsky.)

The Marxists picture to themselves the future socialistic commonwealth as an immense association, more or less in congruity with the modern State, and standing in certain economical relations to other similar associations, as no modern State can dispense with importation of foreign goods. Relations of such a nature between independent Socialist States cannot be regulated by any higher authority, and each State will, with reference to the other, be, as it were, an independent enterpriser. On the basis of free agreement the Socialist State will balance their export and import trade, and also their mutual engagements, by means of products. In this manner, though the internal economic relations of every State will be subjected to a concordant, consciously elaborated plan, the economy of the world as a whole will be free from any organization whatever. From the point of view of Socialism striving to submit the entire social organization to the conscious will of man, the absence of design and precepts in the economy

of the world as a whole is an obvious defect, in consequence of which Kautsky figures to himself in the future the fusion of all individual socialistic associations into one colossal union encompassing the whole world. Then only will the Socialist reform of the modern economic life attain its natural perfection.

The dominating form of production under the Socialist order of industry will, on the strength of its advantages in comparison with the small types, naturally be on a large scale. But this does not mean that individual petty production will completely go by the board. On the contrary, in some departments of work it will always remain. To mention only the artistic productions and some other spheres of handiwork and agriculture. However, the small producer of the Socialist community will radically distinguish himself from the same producer under the capitalistic system, by his being neither undertaker nor owner of the implements of work, or of the produce of his labour, both of which will belong to society, the small producer only enjoying the same right to a reward at the hand of the community as every other productive labourer.

As to the distribution of products among the members of the society, Marxists are inclined to recognise the principle of equal remuneration independently of the kind of labour, admitting a deviation only in favour of the more disagreeable class, and pleading at the same time for the recognition of the principle of obligatory labour.

But it must not be imagined that the Socialistic State will be a kind of gigantic despotism riveting iron bands around the whole life of the population. The centralization of social production is quite compatible with the widest development of local autonomy, which is an indispensable condition of the regular working of the whole economic mechanism, since owing only to this condition the central

administration remains in uninterrupted touch with the concrete phenomena of life. Generally speaking, the public power in the Socialist society will lose everything which now appears in it, endangering the national freedom. If the representatives of the public authority do not enjoy any prerogatives in comparison with the other citizens, and are continually under the control of a free people, there is no ground for dreading that power will allure ambition and be instrumental towards oppression of the personality. In consequence of the absence of classes and class differences and contradictions in the Socialist society, occasions for collisions of the economical interests of the various groups of the population will be reduced to the last conceivable minimum, and every cause of persecution or violent measure, on whichever side, will disappear. The representatives of the public power will, in a word, not be commanders but executors of the will of the people—the servants of the people.

I have already mentioned that Marxism contains no determined plan of the future social structure, and also pointed out that it cannot entirely dispense with such schemes. It is therefore not surprising that projects of this kind continue to come to the surface without any direct concurrence on the part of the theoretic advocates of Marxism. More especially in modern times has a luxurious growth of so-called "Utopiae" been observed, the usual form of which is a legacy from the common ancestor—More's Utopiae—a narration in the shape of a novel or story. Of late years it was Bellamy's "Looking Backward" that met with the greatest and well deserved success among similar prefigurations, and contributed to the propagation of Socialism among the masses of the population more than any other book during the last twenty years.

This book is interesting on account of the intuitive,

clear, and minutely elaborated form, in which the practical plan of a Socialistic State is exhibited, wholly resting on the usual principles of centralized Socialism as on its groundwork. All economic work is performed by an industrial army, consisting of all those who are capable of work, if for one reason or the other they are not exempt from it, from the age of 24 to that of 45 years. At the expiration of the obligatory period of 24 years of work, every citizen receives the fullest freedom to do what he likes, or even to do nothing. The national production goes on according to a strictly centralized organization, and is adjusted by the representatives of the public authority to the national demand. Up to the age of 21 years every citizen is receiving instruction, and is not obliged to enter upon the duty of economic labour. The choice of employment Bellamy endeavours to make as free as ever possible. Every kind of occupation is bound up by the social authorities with such conditions, which make supply and demand of labour in every kind of activity lie level. This is attained, in the first place, by the different length of working time in various industries. The less attractive a given labour is—the more wearisome oppressive, dangerous or disagreeable it is—the sh r a is its length. If the number of those who seek employment in a certain concern goes beyond the possibility of locating them in this sphere of activity, the working time is extended, which rendering the respective labour less attractive, causes a falling off of the offers for the work, thus reducing them to a level with the demands. The deficiency of offers for given kinds of work conduces to the application of the inverse measure, the number of labour hours is lessened, or any other means for enhancing the attractiveness of the labour is made use of, and the offers of working hands increase.

This simple method affords the possibility of distributing the labourers in all departments of national industry in a certain proportion without in any way infringing on the freedom of choice, at the bottom of which lies the principle that all men, whatever their abilities or tastes may be, enjoy the same rights and that, therefore, social labour in all its various forms, divisions and subdivisions, must be equally attractive for all employed in them.

But this free choice of avocation relates not only to the hierarchic organization of social labour. The industrial army must have their officers and generals, more experienced and able labourers, leading the economic process. These guides must have sufficient power over their subordinates, as only under this condition the social mechanism can be brought to work normally and successfully.

On the principle of equal rights for all members of society rests also Bellamy's system of labour remuneration, which in all categories of activity must be the same. Moreover, even persons who are incapable of work, or whose work period of 24 years has run its course, receive for their subsistence just as much as the productive labourer. The right of every man to claim his share of this national produce, says Bellamy, lies in his human nature; "the basis of his claim is the fact that he is a man."

To every citizen a credit corresponding to his share of the annual products of the nation is opened on the public books, and a credit card issued, with which he procures at the public storehouses whatever he desires. The card is issued for a certain number of dollars. The value procured on this card is checked off by pricking out of the tiers of squares the price of the demanded commodity. The indication of the prices in the money units formerly used merely serves as a symbol, since the real dollar as an object of a determined intrinsic value, in point of fact, does not

exist, and the term "dollar" is only an expression of an ideal money unit by which the values of the products are compared with one another.

Thus notwithstanding the equality of income the free choice of the object of consumption is in no way hampered in. Every one chooses whatever he may want according to his taste, provided the total value of the objects correspond to the amount of the granted credit. Dwelling-houses and other buildings belong to the State, which levies for their use a determined payment according to the conditions of the lodgings, so that nothing resembling monotony of life is to be found in Bellamy's commonwealth.

The organization of the international exchange is nearly the same as that adopted by Pecqueur, as also the principles of regulating the prices, which are to be determined conformably to the labour value of the products, and only in cases of the equilibrium of supply and demand being distributed a degression of this formula is admitted. Therefore prices of rare objects are to be settled according to the congruity of supply and demand.

Like Pecqueur, Bellamy admits the freedom of every individual to dispose of his property, excluding only the resale. Every one is at liberty to give or to bequeath to others the objects in his possession, and he very reasonably entertains no fear that this will evoke any economic inequality, since the accumulation by some of more objects of embellishment or domestic comfort on one hand does not bring with it any danger, the less so, as these objects cannot possibly be sold or turned into capital with the intention of drawing an unearned income. Besides the preservation of such things requiring additional room, additional expenses, and more trouble and care, they will hardly meet with any particular motive to be given, bequeathed or received.

It is highly interesting how Bellamy is solving the problem of securing the freedom of mental labour. The book publishing, as all other productions, is a function of the community. The printing works, however, are open for everyone consenting to publish books at his own expense. The book published in this way is being offered for sale in the public stores at the prices consisting of the cost of the edition plus the author's fee, the determination of which is left to his discretion. The fee thus received by the author acquits him for a certain time of his obligatory labour, so that he can live as now, exclusively on the income drawn from his literary works, which naturally must have a run. But in contradistinction to our times, the income of the author cannot exceed the common standard for all. The income he receives entails only the remission of obligatory service, but does not raise its normal level.

The publication of periodicals takes place in the same way as nowadays, by subscription. The subscribers pay to the State the cost of the journal and the fee to editors and contributors, by freeing them of their obligatory labour, which method of reward is being applied to some other spheres of mental efforts.

Bellamy does not, by his book, add to other Socialist schemes anything that could be regarded as new from the point of view of principle, to mention only Pecqueur. What is new in it is the minute exposition, and the successful overcoming of some secondary difficulties of the organization of a Socialistic society. Written in a light and vivid style, the book could not but exercise a strong influence on the mind. During the first years following its appearance Bellamy's socialistic novel agitated and interested practically the whole civilized world, and rendered Socialism a great service, owing to the fact that it contains nothing Utopistic in the usual sense of the word, whereby it considerably

contributed to the dissipation of prejudices against Socialism, and to the growth of the Socialistic movement in the whole world.

II

CENTRALIZED COMMUNISM

All the discussed plans for the organization of the society of the future must be considered as standing in relation to Socialism in the restricted sense of the word, as collectivism. All of them are far from presupposing uniformity of consumption, and agree in admitting the fullest liberty of choice and disposition of commodities according to the income of each individual. Communism, on the contrary, is marked by the removal of the category of income as a determined value at the disposal of the citizen with regard to the satisfaction of his requirements. The ideal of Communism consists in unlimited freedom of personal consumption of products drawn from the common stores according to his wants. But as the realization of any similar organization for the nearest future is impossible, Communism usually demands full equality and uniformity of usance by all members of society, commensurable as a matter of course to sex, age, state of health, and to all other natural differences between man.

Cabet's "Icary" is a direct inspiration of More's "Utopia," and represents a type of centralized Communism. "Icary" is a communistic state, so named in honour of its founder, Icar, in whose view this order is to embody the ideal of a rational social organization, and in consequence of which it does not contain anything accidental, incomprehensible, or originated by history, but is throughout permeated by the conscious will of man. Every intrinsic

peculiarity of this State had its logical foundation. Such a character has, in the first place, the territorial division of the country. The origin and the growth of the towns, villages and provinces of the modern State are but the fortuitous immethodical outcome of the elementary process of historical development. Not so in "Icary." She is divided into a hundred provinces, not more and not less. Each province encompasses an equal area, has an equal population, and consists of ten equal communes. In the centre of each province is the provincial town, and in the centre of each commune the communal town. On the territory of each commune are scattered in equal proportions, villages and farms. In the centre of the State lies the Metropolis "Icara," where the marvels of symmetry and harmony reach the culminating point. Even the bed of the river which flows through the town is, by means of artificial construction, following a straight line of almost geometrical regularity.

The principle of absolute equality of all is the fundamental law of the social structure in Icary. The community takes all possible measures to stifle in the birth every inequality. All citizens receive from the State all objects of consumption; to all alike houses and furniture are assigned, clothing of the same cut and quantity delivered, all are fed in social boarding-houses in like manner, &c., &c. If the quantity of a given object of usance does not cover the general demands, the State, in order not to infringe upon the principle of equality, lets nobody have any part of it, and does not produce it any more. The law determines all particulars of personal usance, and a special committee works out, for instance, the fashion of the dress, its colour, &c., which is regarded as binding.

But taking into consideration human foibles, Cabet admits the free choice of colour of the dress: for the females

of fair hair and complexion the blue, and for the brunette the red colour. But there are other differences in the form of clothes, since in Icary they do not serve only as coverings against cold, or as ornaments of the body, but are destined to play a more essential part. "The peculiarity of clothes," argues Cabet, "must indicate all circumstances and positions of men. Childhood, youth, ripe age, majority, the state of the single or married man, of the widower or the re-married, the different professions and various functions, all this is to be indicated by the dress. All individuals of the same position wear the same clothes, but a thousand different forms answer to a thousand diverse positions."

Thus in Icary it will be impossible for any one to hide his age, to deceive any one by feigning to be a bachelor. To cast a glance on an Icarian will suffice to convince every one of what he has to say to him.

In his solicitude for the morality of his citizens, Cabet goes so far as to subject the female sex to certain rules, with regard to the age at which they have the right to wear flowers, feathers on their hats, jewels, dresses of sparkling colours, and at which they are to pass to a more modest dressing. Everything in Icary must be reasonable and contribute to the common welfare.

There is but one difficult question: how is the diversity of the physical constitution of men, which, alas! cannot be removed, to be dealt with? Icary does not know what it is to work to order, according to the physical conditions and tastes of the bespeaker, the whole of the required quantity of clothes being manufactured in special works and distributed ready-made among the population. But the author of "Icary" overcomes this difficulty. The clothes will be made of elastic materials "so that they will be used by people of different age and constitution."

Such will be the reign of weariness and community of

property, which its creator looked upon as the ideal of perfection. Of course there will be no liberty of the press, as it cannot be allowed that everyone publishes whatever comes into his mind at the expense of the community. On this nice question Cabet makes his citizens hold the following dialogue:

"The Republic," says Eugene, "publishes the approved of works in order to distribute them free of expense, as all other things, either only among the learned or among all families, so that the library of every citizen consists but of the best books.

"All right," said Valmore.

"And the Republic," I added, "could retouch all useful but defective books, as for instance the national history, and burn all ancient books which were considered as dangerous or useless."

"Burn the books!" exclaimed Eugene. "You could be accused of imitating the ferocious Omar, who burnt the library of Alexandria."

"To this accusation I would answer," said Valmore; "that we do for the benefit of humanity what the oppressors did against it. We kindled a fire to burn bad books, while robbers or fanatics lighted pyres to burn innocent heretics. However, we preserved in our great national libraries several copies of all ancient works in order to show the ignorance and the madness of the past, and the progress of the present."

"And the happy Icary," exclaimed Eugene, growing warmer and warmer, "the happy Icary made gigantic steps in the progress of humanity. There is nothing bad, nothing middling, and perfection is the character of almost everything."

The Icarian press can serve as a sample of this almost absolute perfection. Contemning the lying, corrupted

press of our time, the Icarians established instead the following order:

Each commune, each province, and the State as a whole, are permitted to publish only one single paper, a commercial, a provincial, and a national one. As to the editors of each of these papers, they are elected by the people, whose special confidence they enjoy. But that is not all, as the elected person may possibly not be qualified for this high function, and be guided in it by his personal taste and opinion concerning the current events. "In order to root out this evil," says Valmore, "we decided that the paper shall bear the character of simple records, noting facts without any critical review on the part of the journalists."

In perfect harmony with this arrangement in Icary is the choice of vocation which cannot be considered as free. "The child of the agriculturist is at liberty to choose another pursuit if any town family consents to adopt him, just as the child of the town can follow husbandry if any farmer will receive him in his family. But the children of the agriculturists, as a general rule, prefer being agriculturists like their fathers;" consequently hereditary profession—something like a caste!

Cabet's Icary is just the embodiment of the "coming slavery," of which the enemies of Socialism speak. The centralized Communism of the Icarian type is, generally speaking, in the mind of those who see in the free development of the human personality the highest good, an absolutely inadmissible social fabric; whilst the Socialistic organization of society, as formulated by Pecqueur and Bellamy, does not offer economic security of the mass at the expense of the individual freedom, but on the contrary, serves this freedom as a steadfast support. It is, therefore, precisely to this form of Socialism the future belongs.

However, from the imposition of restraints in the individual consumption by the centralized Communism, it cannot be argued that the principle of communistic usance is, upon the whole, to be rejected. Communism, in point of fact, sets down two different rules of distribution. As an ideal, it demands complete freedom of consumption according to the wants of each individual, whilst for the nearest future quantitative and qualitative equality of consumption is decreed. Such an equality amounts to complete enslavement of the human personality by society. But Communism, on the other hand, stands on the point of free consumption, thus laying down also a higher principle concerning distribution, which indeed might appear as quite inapplicable in practical life.

Man's requirements are almost unlimited. If liberty be granted to every one to extend his wants, would not this lead to the seizure of a great portion of the social wealth by some citizens, to the detriment of others who would be forcibly put in a position of having to content themselves with what remained as their portion? Since social wealth has its limits, there should be, it appears, some outward confines for consumption also, which, left to itself and unrestricted, would strive to a boundless dilatation.

However, these considerations are by far not so decisive as may appear at the first glance. In the first place, not all consumptions are capable of assuming an unlimited expansion. The most urgent physiological necessities, for instance nourishment, are easily satisfied, and cannot therefore infinitely grow. Only in the sphere of the so-called luxurious requirements something resembling boundless growth of usance may be observed, so that their full satisfaction is, as a matter of fact, not to be attained. The main point is that the power brought to

bear upon the rationally limited usance of the objects of consumption must by no means bear the character of an external coercion. Man can voluntarily, out of consideration of the interests of his neighbour, or for fear of public opinion, confine his wants without any legal compulsion or obligatory rule. He that trespasses on the limits of consumption to the point of causing damage to others, must needs incur the anger of his friends. Considerations of a similar nature may prove quite sufficient to prevent the liberty of consumption from turning into a usance detrimental to the community, especially when it is supposed that the members of the given social union have risen to a certain moral height.

Finally, what must not be lost sight of is, that there are provinces of social life in which the fullest coincidence of personal and social interests is being observed, and where society is not concerned in the limitation of individual consumption, as in the higher spiritual wants. Society not only does not lose anything, but positively gains by the attraction which libraries, museums and educational institutions exercise on a great number of visitors.

Thus the absolute freedom of individual consumption does not imply in itself any impossibility, but the realization of a perfect communistic commonwealth, in which every one could make use of what he requires, demands first of all a thorough re-education of mankind. So long as the mass of the population is not pervaded by a due regard to foreign interests, and does not feel in itself the readiness, when necessary, of making their personal advantages subservient to those of the community, so long as this mass is not trained to the practice of self-obligation, so long will the necessity prevail of regulating personal consumption by compulsory social rules. But these rules must be such that the unrestrained choice and use of all

objects be not put down. The socialistic system which regulates the earnings of the individual without laying any restraint on the freedom of choice, represents, therefore, an incomparably higher type of social union than Cabet's communistic plan, according to which it is not the income but the consumption of the individual which is subject to control.

Thus the ultimate ideal of a social adjustment is Communism, the ideal for the next future—Socialism, or more correctly expressed, a certain copulation of Socialism with Communism. Even in modern society we see large fields of communistic and free consumption : public parks, museums, libraries, picture-galleries. Public instruction bears also, more or less, a gratuitous character. Gratuitous medical and veterinary assistance are already now prevailing in those Russian villages in which the Semstro is instituted. The sphere of free communistic usance will, under a socialistic organization of society, undoubtedly be extremely enlarged. By way of addition to our outlines of Pecqueur's and Bellamy's schemes, we may here observe that the main defects of both projects lies in that they did not bear in mind this circumstance. Not only must the education and instruction of the rising generations be wholly re-organized on communistic lines, but also those common requirements of the population, which will not awaken the fear of an excessive growth of wants. It is possible that the alimentation under socialistic order will be proclaimed as free; every one will receive from the community objects of food gratuitously, and in such quantities as he may wish. Transport charges can also be abolished without incurring any danger in relation to public interests. The whole range of indispensable consumption can be declared as free from social control and regulation. It can, consequently, be foreseen that the future social state will be a

combination of communistic and socialistic principles, and that the further development of social life will manifest itself by Communism gradually supplanting Socialism in its restricted sense, until social economy will evolve into a complete communistic organism.

CHAPTER V

CORPORATE AND FEDERAL SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

I

CORPORATE SOCIALISM

THE most conspicuous representative of the socialistic tendency—which I call corporative—is Louis Blanc, whose followers at present are Jaures and Hertzka. The centralizing Socialism aims at the concentration in the hands of the organized social authority the guidance of the whole process of social production, whilst the corporate Socialism intends to commit the social production to organized professional unions, to labour corporations.

Louis Blanc was well aware of the importance of the rôle the State has to play in the reconstruction of the existing economic fabric. He was far from being an adherent of socialistic experiments on a small scale, but at the same time did not believe in the aptness of the State to direct the enormously ramified and complicated industrial economy of a society. His problem was to reconcile the conflicting principles: State interference and liberty of individual initiative. The essential traits of his scheme are the following:

The motive power effecting the rebuilding of the social structure on a socialistic ground is the State Authority, which with this end in view, concentrates in its hands

all those branches of industry which by their very nature admit of, or even require centralization, as the entire credit and insurance concerns, rail roads, metallurgic works, as likewise the wholesale and retail trade. Disposing thus of all these powerful economic means, the State uses them in order to gradually supplant the capitalistic private adventures by enterprises of labour associations, co-operate unions, by affording support to all voluntarily founded associations of this kind.

It stands to reason that the State will lend a helping hand not to all labour associations, but to such only which will answer to certain conditions. The associations which receive succour from the State, must in the first place have a labour character; otherwise expressed, must consist exclusively of working men, who enjoying absolutely equal rights under strict interdiction of wage work, run their concerns themselves by the best fitted persons freely elected from among them. The leading functionaries can be appointed by the State Authority only for the first year after the foundation of the association, during which the workmen themselves are not yet sufficiently acquainted with the qualifications of their members. As to the remuneration of labour in such associations, Louis Blanc recognizes its equality relating to the nearest future as an indispensable although unjust temporary concession. Even-handed justice would demand that every labourer should work according to his capacities, and be rewarded according to his wants.

The productive associations of such a type, availing themselves of State assistance, will, in Louis Blanc's opinion, within a very short time supersede private organizations, and in this way concentrate the whole national production, which does not form a part of the special economy of the State, in their hands. As soon as

this process will be accomplished, further steps in the line of the organization of national production will be taken. In the wake of the Union of the working people into associations, must follow the assimilation of the separately organized associations producing the same commodities, and in the long run the confluence of the associations of the same class in one organism, administered from one common centre, will ensue. Competition between homogenous branches of labour shall then disappear, and the national production will proceed in separated industrial pursuits internally united, but free in their mutual relations.

However, the organization of national production has therewith not yet attained its end. Availing itself of the deductions in its favour from the income of each professional body, the State must organize a certain reciprocal assistance between all branches of industry. In view of this object the State must, out of the common national funds, support those branches of labour which, in consequence of unforeseen circumstances, fall into derangement and are in need of a helping hand.

This scheme was afterwards borrowed and advocated by Lassale in opposition to the labour organization, based on self-help as proposed by Schultze-Delitzsch, and for the realization of which he asked from the treasury one hundred million thalers.

In this manner corporate Socialism draws the following picture of the future economic organization of society. Each branch of production lies in the hands of organized workmen, who, liable almost to no control, dispose of the agencies of production belonging to them. The agriculturists use the land, the weavers the weaving manufactories, the machinists the mechanical works, etc., etc. The finished products are being exchanged—bought and sold. Each organized labour branch appears on the market as

an independent undertaking, and distributes among its members, after deduction of the portion due to the State, the net proceeds.

However advantageous such a social reform may be, it is easy to see that it does not answer to the Socialistic ideal, as it does not secure economic equality to all members. Under the sway of corporate Socialism the implements of production would not belong to the community as a whole, nor to the people, but to separate groups. The labourers in those branches, which would happen to be more advantageously situated, could avail themselves of their comparatively superior position in a way detrimental to the interest of the other parts of society, and thus commit an act of exploitation.

The contention between the clashing interests under such an economic order does not cease, but changes only its individual, private form into that of organized groups in which the struggle can assume an even more cruel character.

The corporate Socialism leaves the national production as a whole, in a planless, unsettled state. Each labour group is carrying on production, without taking into consideration the wants or wishes of the other groups—a situation which could be brought into relation with that of the modern capitalist associations, the trusts, with the only difference that it is not founded on capitalistic principles.

Now, just as trusts lack the power of averting industrial crises, and of preventing the economic frictions which under the reign of capitalism hinder the growth of national wealth, just as impotent will they be to organize social economy and the productive labour unions.

Louis Blanc takes the view that the State is obliged to support the independently operating branches of production which happen to be in distress. In this case,

the labour associations are granted the right freely to dispose of the social means but are exempt from all responsibility for any unsatisfactory management of the enterprise, which cannot possibly contribute to a successful development of the social economy.

Many an argument of a similar practical weight could be brought forward against the corporate Socialism, but there is no need to do that, since this type must, were it but from the point of view of principle, be rejected and not recognized as the highest economical ideal.

The socialistic ideal cannot admit that the rights of society, as a whole, be limited by exceptional rights of individual social groups. The means of production, being at the same time the means of subsistence, must be the undivided property of the whole nation; consequently, the disposition of them must belong to the people, and not to a professional group.

The corporative Socialism can be of very great importance as a temporary measure for the transition of a more improved form of Socialism. In this relation the productive labour association may prove to be an irreplaceable form of undertaking during the period of transition from Capitalism to Socialism. The corporative Socialism, generally speaking, implies certain dangers, by fostering a professional egotism among the labour classes and thus disintegrating their unity.

The German social democrats put all their strength into the struggle with the narrow spirit of the trade unions, in opposing the interests of the proletariat as a whole body. Every thoughtful Socialist must avow that, in respect to the question under consideration, the advisers of the German social democrats are guided by the true socialistic idea, by the accurate comprehension of the ultimate aim of Socialism.

Looked at from the standpoint of my classification, the discussed schemes of social reorganization, in premising the category of income, bear relation to the corporate Socialism. As to the corporate Communism, it can be realized only within a determined productive group; but between separately organized groups no relations on communistic principles can be established, since the inter-exchange between them is being effected by means of commodities necessarily subject to evaluation, which means economy based on currency.

II

FEDERAL SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

The federal Socialism, in the wider sense of the word, strikingly distinguishes itself from the centralized and also from the corporate Socialism. Centralized Socialism demands the organization of the entire national economy within the boundaries of the State—and as an ideal of the economy of the whole world—in one linked, proportionate whole, in which all parts perfectly harmonize with each other. The centralized Socialism is, in fact, compatible with an extended freedom of local economic organization, but only in so far as the authority and power of the central administration is recognized.

The federal Socialism, on the contrary, repudiates in principle the necessity of uniting separate socialistically organized communes in one body, whereby it signally contrasts with the centralized and simultaneously with the corporate Socialism, which bases the division of society on the peculiarities of profession and on the nature of their productive labour. The economic unit in the corporate Socialism is formed by the group of labourers bearing

relation to each other by their callings. The federal Socialism, on the contrary, strives to unite different professions and pursuits into one organization; and its economic unit is the socialistic commune, which includes as far as possible all categories of labour, producing by their own means a great part of the various commodities required by their members.

The corporate Socialism comes up to the centralized in so far as it rests upon the widespread division of labour, and presupposes the existence of a close tie between all groups of professional labourers, as each single group alone cannot possibly satisfy its wants without the aid of other groups. The federal Socialism, contrariwise, dividing society in many single communes, very loosely cohering with one another, is already gravitating towards Anarchism. Carried out to the last logical deductions of its principles, the federal Socialism almost covers Anarchism.

The representatives of the federal Socialism, in the wider sense of the term, are Owen Thompson and Fourier, and among the modern writers Duhring and Oppenheimer. In Owen we see a typical advocate of federal Communism; in Fourier such a vindicator of federal Socialism.

Owing to his amazing practical energy, Owen occupies an exceptional place in the history of Socialism. He called into existence a series of enterprises, some of which, for instance—the societies of consumers, served as starting points to many social movements which acquired a highly important historical significance. The practical organizations carried out by Owen, or which he had in view, had a very different character, and everything considered, cannot be dovteailed into any harmonious system. For the present, however, we are not concerned with the practical measures proposed and partly tested by him, who in all

reason may be regarded as the father of English Socialism, the ultimate ideal of which he traced in the following manner:

The existing separation of towns and villages, industry and agriculture, must disappear. The community of the future must combine agricultural with industrial labour. Economic work will be performed conjointly on social account, and the produced commodities will belong to the community, so that there will be no private property not only in the instruments of production but also in the objects of consumption, which will be placed at the disposal of the individual only for the time during which they will be made use of. Thus we are face to face with the purest Communism, in which the income category is entirely set aside, as absolutely useless, since there is no need for anybody to buy anything. Every one chooses the labour according to his inclinations and tastes, and performs it conjointly with others, whilst the commune takes all possible measures to render the efforts as attractive and agreeable as ever possible. The disagreeable, unwholesome, and too heavy work must be left off and replaced by the application of mechanical means.

With a view to avail themselves of all advantages not only of production but also of consumption, the members of the commune are lodged in the communal central building—a splendid palace, in which each family occupies a special separate lodging. The children from their earliest age are educated together, in conformity to a definite method aiming at the highest accomplishments of the human character; that is to say, on rational principles which would completely remould man, and form a being free from the vices and foibles of our times. In all his books and articles relating to the reorganization of the present society, Owen lays, therefore, particular stress on education,

on which he based his main hopes. The number of the members of such a co-operative commune can fluctuate between 500 and 300. The administration of a commune of a greater number of members would be cumbersome, and that of a lesser number not of sufficient magnitude.

Each commune disposes of a certain district of land for its own use, of which, to begin with, not more than one to two acres per head are parcelled out. In future, with the growth of the more intensive agriculture to the point acquired by horticulture, one half or even one third of an acre would be sufficient.

The social organization of production and consumption will afford to each commune such benefits that not only the well-being but the wealth of every member will be secured, and of which they will avail themselves in a perfectly equal measure. The modern States will disappear; the communes themselves will be quite independent of one another, and works lying beyond the power of every single commune will be performed by their uniting themselves to act in concert. These unions will be absolutely free from any coercion whatever.

By little and little, Owen hopes, the whole earth will be covered with co-operative communes, which will become the only form of human society. The world will bear quite another face. The few modern cities with their overcrowded population will cease to exist, and the palaces of the co-operative communes with their gardens and blooming fields symmetrically scattered.

The communes will foster an active intercourse between themselves. Each member will have the right to pass over to any other commune if there be room for him, so that they will be internally banded, and at the same time their own masters and authority.

The organization and the internal administration of each

commune will take place by dividing the whole population into groups according to their age, and from that of the twelfth year the children will be instructed in various economic industries, the theoretical teachings of which terminates at the age of twenty.

All the economic work will have to be performed by people of both sexes chiefly of the age of twenty to twenty-five years. At the age of twenty-five to thirty years people will work daily only two hours, to be afterwards exempt from any labour whatever.

The administration of the internal affairs of the communities will rest upon all its members from thirty to forty years of age, and that of the external matters on members of forty to sixty years of age. This peculiar system of administration, founded on groups of members of different age, Owen proposes for the reason of his repudiating all systems of election; for "elections are demoralizing electors and elected, and fraught with innumerable evils to society; the worst passions and all manners of frauds are created by these contests." Instead of the election system, Owen strives to organize social administration by imposing it on the whole adult population.

Thus the necessity of any elected government whatever ceases, and people practically acquire not only economical but also political freedom. Any power whatever of one man over another becomes superfluous, and therefore useless. Every one knows that after having reached a certain age he will participate in the administration of his commune just as all other members.

An ardent defender of Owen's schemes was his famous disciple, William Thompson, who as a theoretic thinker stood considerably higher than his tutor. It is very interesting to observe the modifications he introduced into Owen's plan. It did not escape Thompson's attention that

the absolve communistic equality obtaining within the commune does not yet secure the equality of the members of the separate communes. On the contrary, it is absolutely inevitable that some communes will exist under more favourable economic circumstances than others, were it but for the natural differences between their respective localities. Thompson was as zealous an advocate of equality as his teacher, but in order to establish this freedom he was compelled to re-establish the State abrogated by Owen. He proposed that the State should assess a special tax on the communities, in proportion to the difference in the fertility and other natural advantages of the soil each community disposes of, whereby the inequalities of the conditions and positions will be neutralized, and the collected sums could be employed for the benefit of all communes of the State, in sustaining and developing all those economic adventures which happened to be too great for the frame of one commune.

Thus in developing the very same principle of equality from which Owen started, Thompson arrived at the recognition of the necessity of a central organization placed outside of and above the commune; otherwise expressed, arrived at the negation of the federal Communism in its purest shape—a result of great weight as a proof of the inner contradictions between the federal order and the principle of equality; that is to say, the fundamental idea of Socialism.

Fourier's picture of the future social structure is in some respects similar to that under consideration, but adversative in as much as Fourier was a Socialist and not a Communist. However, for both Owen and Fourier the social question is a question of the best organization of the commune.

Even in modern society, says Fourier, the commune is

the most important element, but in consequence of its not being organized social economy is in a bad state. Communes are the stones of which the social edifices are built. If the stones are not hewn and not fitted to each other a great quantity of cement is required to fasten them, while properly hewn stones want but little fastening material and hold by their own weight. A bad or deranged organization of the commune requires a great number of functionaries—a powerful authority, a complicated administration, without which the social mechanism cannot work. In a commune in which order prevails the government has not much to do. The commune produces wealth and not the government. It is for this reason that social reformers ought to direct their main attention on the commune. Hence the unsubstantial purposeless efforts of the political revolutions, tending to remodel the form of government, and leaving untouched the most significant social element—the commune.

The most momentous problem to be solved by all systems of social organization is the creation of wealth—the material groundwork of progress. In contemplating the economic state of modern society, we find two different kinds of industrial pursuits: one on a large scale by means of wage labour, and one on a small scale resting on the labour of the owner. Both kinds have their advantages and their defects. The huge production stands higher in relation to technical agencies, but deprives the labourer of the interest in, and the result of his work, which as an inevitable consequence is badly performed. The small production, inferior in mechanical equipment, has the advantage that the outcome of the workers' efforts belongs to him; in a word, that he works for himself. Now the question is, how are the advantages of the huge industrial concerns to be turned to profit without incurring the loss

of the advantages afforded by the small ones. An exemplary commune must meet the following conditions:

(1) Its property must not be scattered. (2) All lots of land and all industrial branches of the commune must be worked conformable to a common plan. (3) The system of hired labour, under which the labourer is not concerned with its issue, must make way for the participation of all in the product, in proportion to the participation of each in the act of production.

It is necessary to create an association of several hundred families (Fourier takes 300) capable of running an economic concern which does not involve the necessity of depriving whomsoever of his property. By transferring his property to such an association, against which he receives shares that will yield, as Fourier calculates, an incomparably greater income than the separate individual disposition, the owner does not lose his possession.

Such a commune, organized in comformity with his plan, Fourier calls Phalange, and the social palace destined for the residence of the members of the Phalange—Phalanstery. The economic arrangement of the Phalange will not bear the stamp of Communism, which denies freedom and rejects the difference of consumption and the income in the shape of money, and counts upon attaining general welfare, not by the consonant development of all human passions, but by the suppression of some of them, and chiefly of those that mostly contribute to the material and intellectual progress the aspiration after superiority, ambition, longing after riches, &c.

The ground principle of Communism is but one half of the social idea, namely: the tenet of collectivity, of association, though in its rude, undeveloped form, just as the fundamental thought of the existing order the doctrine of personal initiative forms the other half of this idea. The

concordant combination of these two deficient elements into the highest and complicated union, must form the groundwork of the association of the future—the Phalange.

Private property is not abolished in the Phalange, it assumes but another shape—the shape of the right to participate in the general income instead of the right to the exclusive use of one or the other instrument of production; a right, which naturally has no reason for being, since production in the Phalange is going on conjointly, whilst the objects of consumption can form personal possession. Generally speaking, personal freedom knows no restraint whatever in the Phalanstery. Every one lives as he lists, can dine at his own fireside and not participate in the common table if he does not wish it, although his personal advantage must dictate to him not to exclude himself from the collective organization of consumption, which affords advantages as enormous as the collective organization of production. It is precisely with regard to these advantages that both production and consumption in the Phalanstery will be organized on social principles. But nobody will get anything gratis. Everything will have to be paid for to the Phalange, upon which the regulations of the whole of the economic relations will be incumbent.

Fourier gives a detailed description of the immense savings to be effected by substituting one big kitchen for hundreds of small ones; if hundreds of wash-rooms, pantries, cellars will be united into one enormous whole in the future commune. Political economists usually cast a despising glance on the organizations of domestic economy as being too trifling and insignificant an object to be taken into consideration. But as a matter of fact it is difficult to compute what a mass of capital and labour is uselessly lost by want of organization of consumption.

As to the advantages tied up with social production as organized in the Phalange, they must necessarily assume still greater dimensions. It is admitted on all hands that industry on a large scale supplants the small one, owing precisely to the greater productivity of labour in the large establishments. The Phalange will have one momentous advantage over the modern large adventures, namely, the possibility of conveniently introducing new machines—such improvements in the contrivances of production—of which the present industry is not in a position to avail itself; on the one hand in consequence of the low level of wages, owing to which manual labour produces cheaper than mechanical; and, on the other hand, on account of the resistance of the working men to the introduction of new machines. The machines will cease to be the enemy of man, which under the modern defective conditions of society it actually is, and become his assistant and servant.

On the same line will agriculture be refashioned. The combination of agriculture with industry in the Phalanstery will afford the possibility of avoiding one more enormous deficiency in the existing economic order, the compulsory idleness of the agriculturist during the winter time.

Not less evident are the advantages of the Phalange in the sphere of commerce. Purchases by retail, in small quantities at short intervals, and at a great loss of time, will be done away with and replaced by a regularly organized system of acquiring the commodities the Phalange will need, and of selling its own products.

All these immense savings, due to the harmonious social organization, will create wealth to a degree which we now cannot possibly imagine. Instead of the present huts, luxuriously arranged palaces will be erected, on the description of which Fourier dwells with particular fondness. The splendid edifice of the Phalanstery, the plan of which

he draws with the most careful minuteness, is surrounded by gardens, alongside which industrial workshops and agricultural buildings are so arranged as not to spoil the symmetry of the general aspect. The Phalanstery, which holds also a temple and a theatre, is connected with all buildings by a roofed gallery, through which the life of the Phalange circulates. This gallery abounds in light and air, and is so spacious that meetings, exhibitions, balls and concerts take place there.

Every one chooses his lodgings in the Phalanstery according to his taste, with the option of furnishing them himself or of receiving from the Phalange the whole furniture at a certain price.

But how will the labour in the Phalange be organized? This crucial question of the whole system of Fourier is solved by him in an extremely original manner. He does not recognize any injurious passions or impulses. Man is so made that all his passions naturally form a harmonious series. Our passions are an unalterable steady element, while the social forms are changeable and transitory. Therefore it is not the passions that should adopt themselves to the social order, but the social order should be such as to afford the possibility of directing these passions to the advantage, and not to the detriment of society. The organization of the labour in the Phalange must consequently coincide with the principle of free scope for all members to choose their employments. The innate capacities, sympathies, habits, knowledge are to decide what kind of vocation each member will fix upon.

As all work in the Phalange will be performed in common, labour groups of identical pursuits will naturally arise, and in order to explain how such groups spring forth, Fourier instances pupils when free from occupation. They do not disperse separately but intuitively unite into groups accord-

ing to the nature of the game or any other object of common interest. Each joins that group which appears to him most attractive.

Just the same will come to pass with grown persons if they will be left to their individual impulses, if they will not be under the pressure of an opposing power from without. The modern organization of labour, which renders such natural labour groups impossible, must be, were it but for this reason, recognised as worthless. It calls forth a repugnance to efforts which is so characteristic a feature of our epoch, in contrast to which the harmonious commune will leave every one to choose his calling and to join that group which pleases him most.

People usually think there are certain kinds of work, which by their very nature are disagreeable to man. But they are wrong. The labour of the Danaides cannot be attractive, but not because it requires exceptional exertion but only because it is to no purpose. The highest problem of social organization—the all-sided and concordant development of the human powers—will be solved only when a means for rendering all work attractive will be discovered. The Phalange will afford this means. Each group of producers of the Phalanstery works not more than two consecutive hours. The moment labour becomes fatiguing and loses its stimulus, the group stops working, and its members enter a new group, where they set to the new work with new energy.

What now is termed laziness is, at bottom, nothing else but aversion to monotonous work. This feeling of reluctance will not weaken but enhance the energy of exertions in the Phalange, just as the ambition for supremacy among the labourers kindles their activity. Forces which in the state of civilization have a destroying effect, will in the Phalange serve to promote the interests of the commune.

Now how will the products there be distributed? The total amount of the produced objects will be divided into three unequal parts, $\frac{5}{12}$ will be assigned to labour, $\frac{4}{12}$ to capital, and $\frac{3}{12}$ to remuneration of talents. Although all works will be performed in common, no equality of reward will obtain, and though the labourers' income compared with the present state will rise to a considerably higher level than the income of capital, the capitalist will undergo no loss whatever. The income of the labourer will increase six to eightfold, and that of the capital three to fourfold, besides the multifold reward of talents.

Although Fourier admits interest on capital, he considers the rise of a class of idle capitalists as impossible, because, on the one hand, all labourers in the Phalanstery will be capitalists, their income being so large that the saving of a part will not be difficult; and on the other hand, because all capitalists will work, since labour will be a pleasure and not a burden. Fourier did not, in general, attach particular importance to the process of distribution, being of opinion that the Phalange must dispose of such an enormous productive power that the wants of each member will be to all intents and purposes sufficiently satisfied.

I am not going to dwell on the description of the charms of the life in the Phalanstery, which enraptured Fourier himself and his disciples, and which pictures as an uninterrupted, bright, joyous festival, unclouded by any sufferings or discord of any kind, a situation which can be attained to by the organization of production and consumption on a large scale, and by increasing the energy of labour through its attractiveness, thus promoting the creation of wealth to such a degree that nobody will ever be exposed to, or suffer any want or privation.

After having minutely elaborated the plan of the economic adjustment of the Phalange—the cell of the future

blessed society, Fourier could not but take into consideration its political organization. At the head of each Phalange are freely elected persons, with the chief—the Unarch, also freely elected, but without being invested with any power, as in the society imagined by Fourier there will be no reason for the existence of any political or other authority. The office of an Unarch is therefore but an honourable title. What can political authority be applied to in the Phalange, where all means of violence are absolutely useless, where no clashing interests, no enemies exist; where the main springs of crime in the existing social order, poverty and misery, will go off the stage, and where all requirements of every citizen are satisfied? Who will resort to thievery, where everyone has the possibility of easily obtaining what he may be in need of? There is evidently no room for anything like a government.

The foundation of the first Phalange will, owing to its delightfulness, exercise such an alluring influence on the other parts of the population that little by little, without any violence or coercion, new Phalanges will arise, until by degrees they will cover the whole earth, turn Sahara into a fertile soil, populate the deserts of Siberia, and call into existence the earthly paradise. Man will bless his destiny, and convince himself by experience that his lot in this world is unlimited deep happiness, for misfortune, sorrow and evils are not rooted in the human nature but in the imperfect social organization.

Concerning the mutual relations of the Phalanges, they are to be completely independent and free from any external organization, so that each Phalange represents a separate uncontrolled undertaking which exchanges with, purchases from, and sells to all other undertakings its products, without being in any way restrained in his economic activity.

Fourier's social ideal borders so near to that of Anarchism

that the question arises, whether he should not be considered as a representative of the anarchistic doctrines, the distinguishing feature of his system being, indeed, the positive repudiation of authority and compulsion whatever.

Fourier goes in this respect so far that he denies even the necessity of moral obligation. He is a thorough-going amoralist, and as such, he is the forerunner of Nietzsche and of the Amoralism of our days. The problem of the social arrangement his fancy ushered into the world consists in leaving the human passions and impulses the widest possible scope, and in putting them into such a concord that their free play by itself could secure the greatest happiness of all. "All philosophical fictions, called obligations," Fourier writes, "have nothing in common with the real human nature. Duty is created by man, passions derived from God. Therefore, if you wish to know the divine views you must study the nature of these passions, passing over "Duty," which alters its character every century and in every country, whereas the nature of passions was, is, and always will be, unchangeable in all nations."

Fourier believes that he succeeded in solving the problem of the greatest happiness for all, by unbridling the human passions. It stands to reason, that if a similar situation could ever be brought about, the necessity of an outward and internal compulsion—social authority and moral obligation—would be thrown overboard. But is it possible that such a state will ever be attained? Is a human society without authority and moral duties capable of ever assuming a concrete form? Scientific criticism can easily destroy this castle in the air, the construction of which has absorbed so much high-gifted intellectual power and artistic feeling of its architect.

It is evident that Fourier's Phalange does not embody

the harmony of the human passions, which is conditional on the harmony of the inclinations and the identity of the interests of all individual members, but by what means this state could be brought about in the Phalange remains incomprehensible. Every labourer of the Phalange performs the work which he likes most, very well; but what is to be done if the commune does not want this work and is in need of objects, for the production of which the number of willing operatives proves rather insufficient? Fourier holds that a certain mutual adaptation exists between the bias of men towards exerting their labour powers, and the nature of the requirements of the community. Only under the supposition of such a correspondence between the willingness of the labourer and the wants of the community, could commodities of a given kind and a determined quantity be produced.

Now, it is obvious that such a correlation does not, and indeed cannot exist, since the individual bent towards a certain employment and the social requirements of certain commodities are incidents of an entirely different order, and depending upon entirely different reasons and conditions. An increased demand for given products does not at all coincide with the labour itself being particularly attractive. The pearl as a jewel has a high value, but the effort of getting it out from the bottom of the sea does not include anything attractive.

This simple consideration demolishes the pretended harmony of the Phalanstery. For garden culture and other occupations in the open air, many a volunteer would present himself in the Phalanstery, but not all kinds of work are alike agreeable by themselves, who would take upon himself the performance of such labours in the face of the ground principle—demanding only obedience to one's inclinations? Without external, consequently compulsory

adjustment of the various economic factors, they cannot possibly be brought consonantly to operate in the social organism, a vital condition of which it constitutes.

Thus Fourier has not solved the question of reconciling social interest with individual, but evaded it by recognizing it as already solved. Moreover, in leaving the relations between the single Phalansteries in a completely unorganized state, he retained all the defects of free competition with all their consequences. The Phalange will wage war with each other in the same way as the capitalistic undertakings of the present day; nor will the Phalansteries be equally situated regarding the economic power each of them commands, be it in the different quality of the soil, in the different amount of capital, or in the different character of their respective members. The result will be just an anarchical struggle of all with all, as that which constitutes so great an evil of the existing economic conditions—a struggle in which the feeble must be conquered by the strong.

Nor will the harmony in the mutual relations of the Phalanges be such as the ingenious Utopist fancied. However fruitful many of Fourier's critical and positive ideas may be, his system as a whole cannot be accepted, as federal Socialism in general cannot be accepted.

The most perfect organization of the communes does not secure their economic coalescence. The federal type is of vast importance as a counterpoise to immoderate centralism. The greater the centralization of social economy, the greater is the danger for the liberty of the individual. Centralism always brings with it, bureaucracy, severance of the social mechanism from real life, and disregard to individual disparity, in keeping with which views the principle of coercive power is more and more practically applied.

But centralization has, on the other hand, a beneficial side; it creates order and establishes proportionality between the various parts of the whole social structure. Without centralism there can be no regularly planned social constitution; the main condition of its existence consists in the subordination of the distinct component parts to, and their converging towards, the focus of the aim in view.

Broadly speaking, the beneficial sides of centralism considerably outweigh the prejudicial ones. But as these last still remain, society must endeavour to weaken and neutralize their obnoxious influence, which can be accomplished by introducing into the system of centralism the principle of federalism, but only as a principle which is destined to play a subordinate part regarding its influence. Centralism must not hinder the widest development of local administration and be confined to what appears actually indispensable, leaving all the rest to the discretion and judgment of the narrower economic organizations. The socialistic commune is to represent the cell of which the social organism is built up, but these cells considered in themselves must not be entirely independent, autonomic units, or a shapeless agglomeration of individuals. They must be rationally and judiciously consolidated in one coherent structure, resting on the doctrine of subordination and agreement of the interests of the distinct social groups.

CHAPTER VI

ANARCHICAL SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

Anarchism is the extreme opposition to Centralism. Looked at from the point of view of Anarchism, the ideal of social order will be embodied when the empire of man over his fellow men will be swept away, when all will be alike free from subordination to a master. The power of the majority over the minority the anarchist recognises to be just such a violence over the human personality as the sway of minority over the majority. The free will of everybody is to be the only law of society; everyone must be at liberty to do what he thinks necessary, and it is but upon voluntary agreement between single individuals uniting for the pursuance of a common aim, that the system of common life and common activity can be based.

As the first foreteller of modern Anarchism, rather in the communistic form, we may regard Godwin.

This distinguished author submitted the capitalistic organization as contrary to justice and equality, to the most rigorous criticism, and at the same time repudiated all obligatory common production and consumption. "To what purpose are common meals?" Godwin asks. "Am I to be hungry at the same hour as you? Am I to leave the library in which I work, the place where I give myself up to meditation, the observatory in which I contemplate the wonders of Nature, and appear at a determined hour when

dinner is prepared?" Nobody is to be compelled to work together with other people, since everyone has propensities and tastes of his own, and man is not a machine to act without his will and consent. Again, labour in common with others, has its prejudicial sides. "It is indispensable to restrain this kind of work as much as possible. The question whether it will always be necessary to make many people labour in concert, is a knot we cannot untie. At the present time the efforts of many people are required, to fell wood, to dig a canal, or to build a ship. But will it always be so? Look at the wonderful machines invented by ingenious minds, the numberless factories, the different looms and steam engines! Is it not astonishing how much work they perform? Who can say where the further development on this line will lead to? It is at all events not impossible that at some day one single man will execute the most complicated work; to cite an example in point, that the plough will do its work in the field without any attendance by man. In this sense the famous Franklin said, "The day will come when the human spirit will acquire omnipotence over matter."

In former times rough and heavy work was performed by slaves. The hour will strike when machines will carry out these operations, and then general welfare will be attained, without in any way infringing on personal liberty. Laws and prohibitions will be impossible in the future society where no private property will exist, not because it will be legally forbidden, but in consequence of the fact that nobody will entertain any desire of exclusively availing himself of objects which other people may be in need of. "Whatever I possess I may in reason call my property if it satisfies my wants. But if I am in possession of an object which I do not want, how can I retain it, even if it was the fruit of my own labour?"

As to dwellings, they will, in a certain sense, be as inviolable as now. Nobody will take up the fancy to occupy my lodgings, when everyone can have his own. "But there will be no locks, no bolts; everybody will have the right to use my implements of work, in so far as he does not obstruct my own using them. Not being habituated to such a state, we instantly imagine the numberless litigations that must arrive under such conditions. But as a matter of fact no quarrels whatever will happen, which are but the offsprings of immoderate and envious self love. Do you want my table? Make one yourself; or if I am more qualified for it, I will make it for you Do you want it immediately? Let us consider who is more in need of it, and then we will decide in good reason."

The division of labour will, of course, not disappear in the future social arrangement. Everybody will be employed in that industry to which he will feel the strongest inclination, so that people being possessed by different propensities, will produce different things, which however will not be exchanged as now. Everybody will enjoy the freedom to take from his associate whatever he wants, if the owner of the object in question does not require it himself. The motive of exchange will lie not in self-love but in the principle to do as one would be done by. Everybody will willingly work for the other, and therefore freely avail himself of the labour of the other.

This was Godwin's social ideal—an ideal full of anarchical Communism. Our Utopist set out not only from the premises that the whole physical nature of man will undergo a radical change, that charity will definitely supplant the egotistic feelings of man, but also form the supposition of a not less deep transformation of technics, which will enable man to perform the most difficult work by his single personal power. Then only, when these two

conditions will become concrete phenomena, will, in Godwin's opinion, dawn the dominion of justice, of unlimited freedom, and the lording it of one man over another will disappear.

Godwin's ideal anarchical Communism did not meet with sympathy on the part of his contemporaries, nor call forth any social movement. A movement on this line dates from an author of a later period—Proudhon.

Proudhon, like Godwin, recognizes voluntary consent as the only admissible form of social co-operation. He therefore regrets all forms of historical States and all kinds of government indiscriminately.

Democracy—the rule of the majority of the people—in his view, is just as oppressive a sway as monarchy. The necessity of government, or broadly speaking, of violence in wielding authority in social life, is due to the circumstance that the economic forces of society are in a confused state, and do not harmonize with one another. But if by means of voluntary agreement people attain a conciliation of the conditions of labour, the necessity of any coercive interference under whatever government it may be, totally disappears. There are but two radical social principles, the principle of freedom and the principle of authority. Government rests on authority, a principle which permeates every form of State. The society of the future gives up this principle and bases itself wholly on the principle of freedom. Every government, whatever shape we may give it, inevitably assumes a hostile attitude towards the freedom of the people. The general liberty of voting does not guard the national liberty; on the contrary, this liberty is an injurious self-delusion of the people, who think that trusting the elected with their power, they nevertheless hold their fate in their own hands. In reality, the elected immediately turn into rulers of the people, as is proved and demonstrated

by the whole course of modern history. It is therefore not the amelioration of the government, but the abolition of all governments, no matter of what form, that should be striven for. The course of history is leading in this direction, and it is but the lack of realising this truth which induces mankind to exhaust their powers in fruitless revolutions.

Thus the future anarchical structure of society must rest on the principle of free agreement, the realization of which is conditional on the adoption of Proudhon's proposed transformations of the existing economic situation, and which consist in the introduction of the gratuitous credit system and the organization of the exchange of commodities without the intermedium of metallic money.

At present the producers suffer from the deficiency of the means of production—capital, and from the difficulty of finding a market for the produced objects. Now, this difficulty is not due to these commodities not being wanted at all. The mass of the population suffers in consequence of their lacking the necessary products, but they have not the means wherewith to buy them ; in a word, they have no money. On the other side there is no deficiency of capital, but the owners do not yield it without a tax in their favour—interest. As a remedy for these evils Proudhon proposes to found a Bank of Exchange, which will make gratuitous advances to producers of commodities, not in coin but by means of its own paper currency, that will be accepted as payment by all customers of the bank. The amount of each advance will be determined according to the price of the produced object. These bank notes can be exchanged against every other commodity produced by the members of the bank, so that the whole exchange of commodities will proceed through the medium of a gratuitous credit organization.

As soon as the operations of the bank will arrive at th

state of encompassing the whole national production, it will be possible to acquire whatever goods one may desire by means of these bank notes, in consequence of which all other money tokens must cease to circulate. This national exchange, through the Labour Bank, will be effected to the general benefit and without any pressure being brought to bear upon the producers, who will be at full liberty to produce whatever they may think proper, and be sure of the sale corresponding to the social wants.

Thus the anarchical social organization in Proudhon's mind is closely connected with a determined order of exchange of products without the aid of modern money, which is not anarchical Communism, as with Godwin, but anarchical Socialism, preserving as it does the category of income and that of money, though not of modern metallic money. Proudhon was, in general, an enemy of Communism in principle, and his plan of arrangement of social relations contains, therefore, no communistic elements whatever.

Among our contemporary anarchists, Leo Tolstoy indisputably occupies the most conspicuous position, but although his social ideals leave not the slightest doubt as to his anarchical tendencies, he cannot be regarded as a theorist in this sphere of thought; we can therefore here take no further notice of his arguments. On the other hand, among the theoretical representatives of the anarchism of our days stands foremost, by his intellectual faculties, accomplishments and scholarship—Kropotkine.

Kropotkine stands for that tendency of Anarchism which he himself typifies as anarchical Communism, whereby he distinguishes himself from Proudhon, whose hostile attitude in relation to Communism we have just referred to, and who recognized the necessity of retaining the right of the producers to private property in the outcome of his efforts. Kropotkine, on the contrary, repudiates without any

restriction every private property, as well as the right of the labourer to the produce of his toil, in opposition to which he asserts the right of everybody to subsistence conformable to human dignity. He regards every coercive organization of social labour, of whatever form it may be, as absolutely unnecessary, and the opposite opinion as an inveterate prejudice. People usually think that it is impossible to institute a complicated social order, of whatever nature, without any compulsory authority. But is this really so? Are we not aware of many instances of very complicated organizations, based only upon the free agreement of those that participate in it? Of such a character of necessity, are all organizations extending beyond the boundaries of one State. For instance, the universal postal union, or the organization of the international railway communication. But these organizations embrace hundreds of thousands and millions of workmen, and require the utmost mutual compatibility of their efforts. Nevertheless they rest wholly upon voluntary consent; every state, every railway company which participates in this arrangement is acting spontaneously without any compulsion from without. Hence we can evidently infer that compulsory power, in spite of the opinion of the collectivists, is by no means an indispensable, vital condition of a complicated co-operative social system.

Kropotkine is adverse to any organization of exchange and to any money system whatever. Under the anarchical social order exchange will take place in the simplest possible manner. "Let the town produce those objects," he says, "which the peasants are in need of, instead of manufacturing various gewgaws for the embellishment of the bourgeois woman. Let them in Paris use their sewing machines for providing the village population with clothes for work and dresses for festivals, instead of sewing dowry

apparels. Let them manufacture in their factories agricultural machines, instead of waiting until the Englishman will send them to us in exchange for our vines. Let the town send delegates to the villages; not commissaries girt with red or tricoloured scarfs, informing the peasants of the decree to deliver their products at a given place, but friends, brethren, who would say to the peasants: bring us your produces, and take from our stores the manufactured objects which will please you. Then the agricultural products will be brought to town in abundant quantities. The peasant will leave to himself only as much as he wants for his living, and send the remainder to the urban labourer, in whom, for the first time in history, he will see his brother and not the fleecer."

By this simple method the exchange of products will proceed without any organization from without. Production will be just as free as exchange. Everybody will produce what he lists and fully satisfy his requirements in case of over-stocked stores, and in an equal measure with others if the quantity of products be not sufficient to meet the wishes and wants of all.

Besides this confused depiction of general freedom, Kropotkine sets forth a somewhat different plan of social economy in proposing that every member of the society from the age of twenty-five to forty-five years shall voluntarily agree to work five hours a day in such branches of labour as will be considered necessary by the community, in return for which the fullest competency and the free use of the products of social labour are secured to every one of them. But what if there be members that will not be inclined to work? In such a case the society recognizes its agreement with the non-working individual as infringed upon, and considering itself exonerated from any obligation whatever leaves him to his own self, and he may then do what he likes.

This is the anarchic order which Kropotkine figures to himself. It is easy to see that our theoretic anarchist is vacillating between two opposite points of view. In his capacity as anarchist he demands absolute freedom, consequently the right of every individual to apply his exertions to whatever he may choose, how he may choose, as much as he may choose, or even not to work at all. But at the same time he understands that such a state is in obvious contradiction to the claim of equality, since the unconscientious and he that will not be disposed to work will live at the expense of the labourer and conscientious member. Thus, in order to avoid this form of labour exploitation, Kropotkine proposes that all members spontaneously engage themselves to work five hours a day, and that those who eschew this obligation have nothing to do in this community. But since there is no issue for man from human society but the grave, it is evident that the proposed free agreement of the individual with the community is the same coercive power of the society over the personality, against which Kropotkine takes the field.

It is not difficult to show the delusiveness of the circumstances he instances in order to prove that the most complicated social co-operation can be founded on a voluntary accord. Neither the international railway communications, nor the universal postal union is based on free agreement, but on coercive social power. True, single companies, single states, spontaneously enter into unions. But Kropotkine forgets that these companies, these states carry on their business by the aid of salaried operatives, who do not work out of love for labour, but out of fear of starvation. It is only owing to the subjection of the army of the working men to iron rules and precepts that the individual railway companies can bring about a perfect adjustment of their trains. It is indeed incomprehensible how Kropotkine

could see in the free combination of capitalists disposing of a compulsory force over the hired workmen, an argument in favour of the possibility of a complicated economic organization without any commanding rule.

If Kropotkine had offered an example of a spontaneous union of hundreds of thousands of labourers without any social control and compulsory guidance, it would indeed be a convincing proof of the possibility of an anarchic society. But such an example Kropotkine could not possibly adduce, since a through and through anarchic system is, as must firmly be avowed, an absolute impossibility. The impossibility of an anarchic order is not rooted in the human nature, but lies still deeper. Human nature is variable, and it can, for argument's sake, be admitted that one day the feeling of selfishness will entirely disappear; men will place common interests higher than personal, and will be prepared for all possible sacrifices in favour of society, however remote that time as yet is. However, a society of men, possessed even by self-abnegation of the highest degree, can never be organized on the economic principles of Anarchism, because the indispensable condition of social economy is a strict proportionality of its component forces. Society wants a determined quantity of bread, meat, texture, iron, glass, wood, etc. If the quantity of produced iron, wood or meat, is greater than that required, the residue is—relatively at least—superfluous. Under the conditions which lie at the bottom of the capitalistic system of the present day, this proportionality of the productive powers is carried into effect by the complicated expedient of the market, by the fluctuation of market prices. When the capitalistic economical arrangement will vanish, the relative adjustment of production will have to be worked out by means of the distribution of labour, according to a plan digested only by a social controlling rule of the whole

process of industry, without which no social economic order can possibly be conceived. If everyone will produce whatever may come into his mind, as all anarchists imagine, Proudhon not accepted—whose Exchange Bank proved untenable just in consequence of the fact that the organization of exchange does not secure the proportionality of production—commodities will be created, neither qualitatively nor quantitatively squaring with the requirements of the community, which, in the persons of producers and consumers, will have to endure privations due to the absence of a systemized control of industrial pursuits. The anarchy of production in the future society, lacking the influences which at present, though in but a rough form, insure a certain proportionality in the economic factors, is identical with the destruction of economic order in general, and consequently with death.

Anarchical production is conceivable only under one condition, namely: that everybody by his own personal efforts creates all objects he requires, a condition which is identical with the extinction of every economic coalescence whatever precludes *eo ipso* the necessity of establishing rules relating to the upholding of a ratio. Godwin exhibited an acute understanding of the matter in promising, as one of the conditions of his anarchical society, such a gigantic progress of the technical science that will enable every individual man to perform the most difficult work without any aid from others. But here we completely break away from actuality and enter into the province of boundless fancy.

There is consequently no reason to think that humanity will at any time land in Anarchism—unlimited personal freedom from social control. On the contrary, it is rather to be expected that while society will exist, the necessity of controlling economical relations, of the organization o labour, will obtain.

However, Anarchism is not destitute of a certain positive significance. Centralized Socialism, as I have already shown, involves the danger of a despotic sway of the majority over the minority. The principle of absolute liberty of the individual and his complete independence of the will of the majority, which forms the backbone of Anarchism, affords, like the federal Socialism, a counterpoise to this danger. Every human society virtually includes, and ever will include, an irreconcilable antagonism between the individual and society. Society consists of individual men, but the individual personality is being created and grows by the social organism. Therefore, just as it is impossible to form a conception of a human society without personal freedom, in which the self-aim of the human personality is transformed into a simple organ—a special tool of society, as observed in some animal colonies, for instance in those of some Medusa, where some individuals discharge the function of the organs of nutrition, some act as the organs of procreation, and some play the part of the organs of attack and defence, just so inconceivable is a society consisting of individuals entirely independent of each other and altogether free of any social control. Between these two immutable principles of human society—the personal and the social interest—is an internal imperishable antagonism. On the one side the individual striving to throw off the social bonds in order to free his movement as much as possible; on the other side, the society endeavouring to subordinate the individual to its interest to the utmost possibility. But as both these principles are alike inherent in human social unions, the struggle between them can never lead to the complete triumph of one over the other. A society to be perfect, to have all that is requisite to its nature, must consequently be so organized that the widest

possible personal freedom of the individual can go hand in hand with the greatest possible security of the interests of the community as a whole.

Anarchism does not recognize the inevitableness of the duality in a social union, reflecting the conception of subject and object of I and Thou, and believes in the possibility of the complete emancipation of the individual from social coercion, no matter of the form it can take. This belief, however, is due to a delusion—a wrong notion of the real nature of human society. But though theoretically untenable, Anarchism can nevertheless be of substantial importance by virtue of its opposition to the movement of converting personality into instrumentality. The issue of the contest of these two adverse currents of thought must be the socialistic structure of the future society with a view to solve the problem, not by subordinating personality to society, or society to personality, but by the fullest possible and always relative reconciliation of these conflicting social elements, by creating the most favourable conditions for the most expansive and intensive development of the human individual in all its multifarious propensities and capacities, but without prejudicing the fellowmen of the same commonwealth, which in its ideal embraces the whole human race.

There is but one province of human activity in which unlimited freedom is possible and indispensable: it is the province of the higher intellectual creative labour, where no authority of the majority over the minority can be tolerated. Any attempt to subject mental labour products of the human brain to social control inevitably leads to the reduction of its fertility and thence to an enormous loss for the community. Besides, this sphere of labour does not require the maintaining or the observance of proportionality of production, which constitutes an imperative

demand in economic adventures. Society does not suffer any adversities if at one epoch a given kind of art prevails, and at the other another kind. If the number of pictures is more or less than the social demand, it is only the artists themselves that gain or lose. At all events any external measures would, in either case, be of no avail. The unions of artists, scholars and men of letters, bear already the stamp of voluntary agreement, and thus embody the anarchical ideal. In communities of the future such free anarchical associations will naturally grow in number and dimension, but will never serve as the groundwork of the economic fabric, for freedom of personal option, of self-will and strict social proportionality are incompatible, and an economic organization resting on the division of labour is, without proportional relations of production, inconceivable.

PART III

THE REALIZATION OF THE SOCIALISTIC ORDER

CHAPTER VII

MEANS FOR THE REALIZATION OF THE SOCIAL ORDER
SOCIALISTIC TACTICS

EVERY accomplished social system consists of three parts: of the criticism of the existing social conditions, of a determined conception of the future organization, and of considerations regarding the ways and means by which its principles are to be carried out in actual fact. If this last part cannot pretend to theoretically be the most important, practically it comes to the fore. The usual division of Socialism into Utopian and scientific, can by no means be applied to the critical and theoretic parts of the Socialist systems. In the domain of criticism of the capitalistic order, and the more so in that of constructing the ideal of the future, the so-called Utopian Socialists created a great part of what now forms the scientific Socialism, which cannot be asserted in relation to the practical side of Socialism. In this reference, the principles have, since Marx, as a matter of fact, undergone a radical change. The practical method of modern Socialism is in many respects at cross purposes with the tactics of the Socialists of the first half of the nineteenth century. In so far as practical politics are concerned, the claims of Marxism on the exclusive scientific character of its teachings have a certain foundation.

I

The tactics of the Utopian Socialism are well-known, and their peculiar features have many times already been brought to light. They consisted in peacefully propagating the idea of the necessity of a socialistic refashioning of society among all classes of the population and—that was all. Some of the earlier Socialists endeavoured to spread this conviction among the masses of the people, while others still more simplified their task, considering it sufficient to inculcate their belief to the legislators. The first great Utopist, Thomas More, for instance, could not imagine that the new social order can possibly be instituted otherwise than by the spontaneous will of the Sovereign. The revolutionary spirit was absolutely foreign to him, and of popular movements he was deeply distrustful. The disposition of the Utopian Socialists of the first half of the nineteenth century was rather more democratic, although the majority of them were not at all hostile to monarchy, and dedications to the king were no rare adornment of the first pages of their writings, still they knew perfectly well that the Socialist organization cannot be inaugurated simply by command of the monarch. They exerted all their powers towards awakening the interest of the widest possible social circles in the realization of the new plan of social life.

The tactics of all great Utopists of the epoch bear resemblance to each other, notwithstanding the remarkable originality of their advocates, who acted quite independently of each other. Every one of them invented tactics of his own, and if, after all, they proceeded analogously, it was due to the circumstance that their methods in a like manner were rooted in the conditions of their activity—in the absence of a socialistic movement

which they had but to call into existence. Each author strained his brains, created a socialistic system of his own, by which he expected to save mankind. Every one of them believed in the incontestable, convincing power of his arguments, into which he put so much enthusiasm, trust, and luminous thought. Every one of them stood by himself at the beginning. "Against me the whole world: for me only the truth discovered by me," must every Utopist have said to himself. Supported only by his own individual powers he challenged the Colossus of the old world, accused the historical culture of a thousand years, called to account all creeds and convictions. The bulk of the people, the working classes, in whose interest the Utopist entered the arena, were just as far from him as those classes that enjoyed life in leisure and wealth, for, it must again be pointed out, the inception had to be performed by him alone.

The most rational method under such circumstances was the peaceable propagation of the new teachings, and this method the Utopists adopted. But within these common tactics themselves essential differences arose. The usual opinion that the socialistic systems are homogeneous and similar in their main features is an absolute fallacy. We have seen that in the Utopian Socialism two fundamental tendencies must strictly be discerned: the federal and the centralized. Fourier and Owen regarded the autonomous commune as the very cell of the socialistic organism. The St. Simonians prefigured to themselves social society only in the frame of a whole nation, in the shape of a State. These differences of general views could not fail to exercise their influence also on the special conceptions of the nearest practical problems.

Fourier's practical programme, as also Owen's, the groundwork of which is most clearly and definitely laid

down in the "Manifeste de l'école Societaire" (1841), is, first of all, standing for social experiments. In this remarkable booklet containing the profession of faith of Fourier's school, it is sought to prove that the solution of the social question consists in nothing else but in the establishment of socialistic communes. "We are social engineers," the authors of the Manifesto say. "We lay before our contemporaries the plan of a new social mechanism, which in our opinion will utilize the whole energy of the motive power lying in the human nature without allowing the slightest particle of this energy to be applied under this new system to fruitless, noxious, or dangerous efforts. We are far from demanding the violent overthrow of the existing bad social mechanisms. We are striving to obtain the necessary means for the creation of a model upon which to try the new system, and to practically show its real value to society, which will accept it or reject it with a full knowledge of the matter.

Fourier's school, as maintained in the Manifesto, recognizes as the surest way to the triumph of their views the practical trial of building socialistic communes upon the principles they profess. "Every theory of social reform or social progress must admit, at the risk of being censured as senseless, immoral or antisocial, its testing by local experiments, and be capable of winning over mankind to the adoption of the new order by spontaneous imitation."

Every violent act, with a view to embody a new social adjustment, proves that the advantages of this innovation are not so great as to incite people to join it voluntarily; otherwise expressed, proves that this order has no sufficient intrinsic value. All revolutionary doctrines are founded on violence, consequently revolutionary ideas are false in their very essence, and "the government could

easily bring into disrepute all demolishing theories, and reduce them to zero by compelling them to avow their voidness and falsehood simply in summoning their advocates to prove that their plan can sustain the examination by a special experiment, and is capable of calling forth voluntary imitation."

Such a summons would convince society of the futility of revolutionary teachings, none of which could give a satisfactory answer, since their power lies only in negations and are destitute of all positive elements that could be relied upon in the construction of a new social fabric. Fourier's school (l'école societaire) is not a political party. Political parties are characterized by their pretensions to a direct influence upon the legislation and the government of the country in order to command the means for the realization of their favourite ideas, to attain their aims by legal compulsion. The economic reform proposed by this school does not require any moral, civil, political or religious modifications, nor the overthrow of any power.

Fourier's school holds that a successful experiment on establishing a socialistic commune will convince society more than any theory could do. The nearest problem, therefore, is to gather money for the erection of the first Phalanstery, which, once organized, will lead to a radical transformation of the commonwealth, and to willing imitation by all mankind.

"Now, let us loudly proclaim, so that the whole world can hear," exclaimed Considerant in his book "Destinée Scoiale." "The seed must be broadcast in the national soil—the commune; violation and revolution have here nothing to do. Revolution can assert one interest against another, crush one party by the power of another party, one dynasty supersede by another, change monarchy into republic or republic into monarchy, but it cannot

marshal and reconcile the new inimically acting forces. This is a matter of science. It is only by some scientific social discovery that the means for attaining this new result can be acquired, and this science must start from the organization of the different kinds of labour in a common work-house—in the commune."

Thus the social trial crowned with success is, in the opinion of the Fourierists the crucial test of the practicability of the socialistic organization. Owen held exactly the same views. Notwithstanding his having been so sorely tried in his life, and the failures of his practical experiments with a view to create a communistic commonwealth, he remained true to the convictions of his youth. He also regarded any coercion of the will of man as absolutely objectionable. "The change from the ignorant, repulsive, unorganized and miserable present, to the enlightened, attractive, organized and happy future, can never be effected by violence, or through feelings of anger and ill-will, to any portion of mankind." He wrote shortly before he died, (The Revolution in the mind and practice of the human race, 850) "No, this great revolution in all human affairs can be finally accomplished only through the development of great fundamental truths, declared to the world in the spirit of peace, kindness and charity, and explained with untiring patience and perseverance by those who have been enabled to acquire a practical knowledge of human nature and society." The supplanting of the old forms of social life by new ones, argues Owen, must go on gradually and without any violence to whomsoever it may be, just as gradually and without any violent act as the railway supplants the former means of communication. True, under the influence of the disappointments encountered in his trials, Owen, towards the end of his life placed his hopes in the aid of the government, which

convincing themselves of the advantages of the communistic associations, could acquire at the market price lots of land, and place them at the disposal of such communes, providing them with all necessary economical means. There ought not to be any compulsion to become a member of these communes, and Owen does not entertain the least doubt that people will readily rid themselves of the former conditions of life and turn members of the commune, the whole structure of which will rest on the principle of the most rigorous equality. This confidence on the part of Owen, as well as that of Fourier, was due to their being convinced that the advantages afforded by the new economic conditions are so great that even wealthy people will prefer becoming members of the projected communes, the growth of which on the one hand, and the decay of the old economic forms on the other, will result without any coercive social authority.

"Under the new arrangements great surplus of wealtb will be annually produced, an incalculable amount of useless expenditure will be saved, a very superior character will be created, and progress towards excellence in all things will be ever progressive. And the extraordinary advantages of these united arrangements will speedily become so obvious to the public that all classes will soon desire to possess them with the least delay."

His reliance on the easiness of the realization of the new order goes so far as to make him hope that already in a few years the whole world will be covered with new communities. Only the first step in this line is required, and then these institutions will go on developing by themselves with increasing velocity.

From this point of view Owen proclaims both conflicting parties, the European governments and the revolutionary Socialists, as alike silly. He exhorts Queen Victoria,

persuading her that it depends upon her government, consequently upon her person, to totally destroy the social evils, to change all that is now wrong in society, and gradually and peaceably to supersede it by all that is right and most beneficial for everybody. Simultaneously he addresses himself to all Red Republicans, Communists and Socialists of Europe, offering reasons in proof that they also are wrong, and that they court delusions just as their enemies do. Both antagonists believe only in the force of social compulsion, whereas the true power lies in free conviction. "You deem," he says to them, "violence the most effective instrument for this purpose, while I am compelled to believe, that reason and kindness are not only the most just and rational weapons with which to overcome errors, but are also the most powerful and effective in influencing men to change their opinions and conduct."

The revolutionary Socialism of 1848 attained political power, and its shortlived triumph ended in a complete defeat, in consequence of its not being able to create any palpable improvement. What the revolutionaries called forth was but Anarchism, and the people preferred to return to the former despotism. This fact led Owen to the conclusion that only a rational plan of social organization can guide a people to a lasting victory, and if this plan is really a rational one, it does not require any violence to come off with flying colours.

I am not going to dwell at any length on the attempts of various socialistic schools to call into being their different communes. All of them—inaugurated in America, where the abundance of unoccupied land and free social institutions afforded the reformators of old Europe the most favourable field for experiment—proved, in general, miscarriages. The relatively greatest success was that

which attended the communes of the Icarians, the followers of Cabet.

Cabet was just as great an antagonist to social revolutions and violence as the other Socialists of the first half of the nineteenth century. "Violent revolutions," he writes, "are wars with all their contingencies. They are extremely difficult, because a government on the strength of its existence disposes of enormous power in its organization, in the influence of the aristocracy and the wealthy classes, in the possession of the legislative and executive authority, in the treasury, army, national guard, tribunals, jury, and the police with its thousand means of plotting and bribes. It is not only now that people desire revolutions. Since the beginning of history, not one year, perhaps, has passed without every people feeling the necessity of shaking off the yoke of the aristocracy in order to recover their natural rights, and still how few are the attempted revolutions in comparison with the number of the desired ones; and among the attempted revolutions how few were successful, and among these last how few attained the goal without being either mutilated or afterwards annihilated by the aristocracy."

But a revolution even with a successful issue is in Cabet's view anything but desirable. The employment of violence by the poor against the rich is just as great an anomaly as the use of violence by the rich against the poor. Communists must follow the example of the first Christians; their only weapon must be a peaceable but energetic, untiring propagation, inspired by enthusiasm and self-abnegation.

"If Communism is but a vain fancy, a free discussion will suffice to pass sentence upon it, and the people themselves will reject it in order to adopt another system. But if this doctrine is truth herself, it will have numerous proselytes

among the people, the learned class and the aristocracy, and the more adherents it will have, the more will their number increase every day. The future belongs to Communism owing safety to Reason and Truth, and however slow public opinion may be in bringing on its triumph, it will bring it on faster and with greater solidity than violence would."

It is very interesting to observe in what a categorical manner Cabet declares himself in his "Icaria" against partial attempts to realize the communistic projects, the success of which, he says, cannot do any good, but the failure of which will almost surely do much harm. "Proselytism only, and always Proselytism until the whole mass of the people adopt the principles of Communism."

In repudiating any partial social experiments, Cabet remains true to his doctrine of centralized Communism. Socialist organization of labour, as planned by Fourier and Owen, found scope within the frame of a separate commune; whilst Cabet's conception of Communism comprehends the boundaries of a State as a whole, in consequence of which he could not expect anything convenient from trials, to set on foot communistic societies of small dimensions.

But such attempts evidently originated in the conditions of the Socialist movement of that time, so that Cabet likewise could not uphold his theoretical position. His propagating activity in France was attended by a prodigious success. In all important towns, circles of his followers were founded, in which courses of lectures on Communism were delivered, the special literature widely spread and new partizans enrolled. According to Cabet's assertion the number of his adherents amounted to 400,000, a success which turned his brain and made him in 1847 issue a proclamation to his party, calling on them to set to

work for the realization for the communistic society. "Let us go to Icary," he exclaimed, in an enthusiastic frame of mind, pointing out that Icary is very near in the endless heaths of Texas, which at that time was almost wholly unoccupied.

Three weeks before the February revolution, the vanguard of the Icarians set sail for America. Although the revolution diverted the attention of the socialistically disposed operatives from Cabet's enterprise, there were nevertheless several hundreds of enthusiastic believers in Communism, among which Cabet himself, who crossed the ocean, and in spite of various impediments and considerable difficulties founded a communistic society.

At the beginning the Icarians endured great privations, their life in the country they had parted with having certainly afforded them more comfort and agreeableness. But little by little they succeeded in acquiring a certain welfare, and according to the description by visitors to Icary, it reminded one of the monastery in which truth and strictest equality prevailed, together with the tedious monotony of monastic life.

After several years had passed the commune dissolved, in consequence of internal strifes. Cabet, and the minority that remained true to him were excluded from the colony. Soon after that Cabet died, but the colony continued to exist. The excluded minority attempted to set on foot a new community, which after a passing success, also fell to ruin. The first colonists, soon after the schism, emigrated to the State of Iowa and settled there in the virgin woods far off from all peopled lands, and went on improving economically. In 1876 this colony counted only seventy-five members, and disposed of movable and immovable property amounting to about a million of francs.

One of the visitors of this commune gives the following description of it: I see before me a dozen neat little houses forming a square; in the centre the great main building with a common kitchen and dining saloon, which is used also for meetings, amusements, and theatrical presentations. Not far off, the bakehouse, the washhouse and numerous little timber houses, reminding one of the former scanty life of the commune. The moment the bell rings all hasten to the dining saloon, in which all seventy-five members assemble, seating themselves around small circular tables with genuine French cheerfulness. Over the doors on one side is written in large letters "equality," on the other "freedom. The nourishment is satiating and wholesome, but extremely simple. In the evening the members assemble again in the same place, where they chatter, sing, and play on various instruments. The most interesting are the Sunday evenings, when they read chosen passages from the works of the great Icarian apostle, Etienne Cabet, sing songs, and young men deliver speeches filled with enthusiasm for Socialism.

In 1877 a division of this colony also occurred, which was due to the difference of opinion regarding the principle of admitting private property within the commune. A part of its members stood for the admission and founded the commune "New Icary," counting in 1884 thirty-four members who enjoyed a certain prosperity but turned almost wholly into ordinary American farmers. The other part, more radically organized, emigrated to California, where they also met with a considerable and favourable result of their economical activity. In 1884 this colony counted fifty-two members, with property estimated at sixty thousand dollars. But this community likewise rejected the strict communistic principles, admitted hired labour, and thus changed into a capitalistic adventure—into

something similar to a joint stock company, and ended in disruption.

I deviated from my intention and dilated on the history of the Icarian communes, because I consider them to be instructive in many respects, showing as they do what the socialistic communes turn into, even under the most favourable conditions of existence. The perseverance of the Icarian communes, which the numerous mishaps notwithstanding were capable of rising again in a new shape, demonstrate better than anything else that the Icarians who left France actually possessed exceptional moral qualities and have not been simple adventurers. They were the best individuals of the capitalistic societies permeated by enthusiasm, and capable of pertinacious struggle for their social ideal. They did not mind privations, and without any material support from without they could, by the work of their own hands, gain a certain economic well-being.

But after all is said, how moderate were the economic results of their efforts! After all they did not attain more than what an ordinary American farmer generally comes to, and, of course, there is no reason why a Communist society consisting of healthy people that do not shun toil, should not gain the modest sufficiency which the great mass of the American population enjoys.

But what has this to do with Socialism or Communism? "Icary" disappeared in the heaths and woods of Western America and brought no new light into the social life of this country, and in fact could not do it, since the Icarian organization did not impart any prominent advantages in comparison with those of the existing petty and large capitalistic enterprises. If this organization were fraught with such like advantages, its fate would have been another one.

In his Communist novel, Cabet describes in glowing colours the sumptuous life of the future communistic State as pictured by his imagination. But the Real Icary, during the most favourable time of its existence, was something rather different: a few little houses, coarse nourishment, moderate competency, and complete absence of anything bearing resemblance to luxury. The neighbours might regard the Icarians as honest and highly respectable people, addicted to their ideal, but they could find nothing to envy them for, or to learn from them.

The propagating influence of the "Icarian" communes was almost of no significance. But it could at least maintain itself several decades, in spite of continual cleavings. Other attempts to build up socialistic communes could not boast of even such a modest success. Communes in Fourier's and Owen's spirit, of which not a few were established in America, very soon fell to pieces; only some of them prolonged their existence for several years. However, we know instances of Socialist communes which existed tens and even hundreds of years. To cite the Amana commune, in the State of Iowa, which—founded in 1843—is now in a flourishing state. The number of its members, according to the census of 1901, amounts to 1767, who own twenty thousand hectares of land and a number of factories, some products of which, especially woollen textiles, have a market extending over the whole country. Of not less interest are the Hutterish Societies, in the mountainous part of the State of Dakota, recently described by Robert Liefmann. These communes of Anabaptists dating from the epoch of the religious persecutions during the middle ages, and founded in the course of several centuries, live under conditions of an entirely communistic nature, and prove practically that Communism is quite compatible with a regular economical organization.

The generally entertained and widespread opinion that the attempts to organize Socialist society have proved its impossibility, has no foundation. The only thing that can be affirmed is that communes established by individuals of the intelligent class, under the influence of Socialist ideas, commonly miscarried; and on the other hand, that Socialist communes called into existence by under-currents of religious thought, proved in some cases to be bodies of great stability and vitality.

The indisputable fact of the failure of Socialist communes lacking a religious character is usually adduced by the enemies of Socialism as an inductive proof of the impossibility of putting into practice the social doctrines. In reality this fact only demonstrates the expedience of the practical programme of the Utopian Socialism. In this connection we find the abortive efforts of Fourier, Owen and Cabet regarding their communes very instructive, and it is worth while to dwell on their peculiarities.

Fourier calculated that the socialistic organization of production and consumption would manifoldly enhance the productiveness of labour, and secure to all members not only sufficiency but such luxury of which we now can form no idea. Starting from this assertion, he did not doubt that the Phalanges would shoot up like mushrooms after the first successful attempt. The same view was held by the other Utopian Socialists and, in fact, if the economic outcome of the communal organization of labour and production would have proved in reality such as it appeared in theory, the practical programme of the Utopian Socialism would not contain anything irrational. Nobody is his own enemy, and be the inertion of the crowd ever so great, the most inveterate bourgeois prejudices could not withstand such palpable arguments as the charm and splendour of the life in the Phalanstery.

But we have seen that reality bears another face. The communistic societies in general did not yet develop into Phalansteries, and those of them which were less complicated and so to say colourless, could only secure their members the bare necessaries of life—which can be attained in America without any Communism. It is therefore easy to understand why these organizations did not awaken any imitation nor dislodge the ordinary capitalist enterprise, and, as a rule, fell to pieces themselves.

What motive could retain the members within the boundaries of a commune, which only clogged the energy of enterprising individuals, without offering them anything economically interesting in substitution? Evidently only motives of an ethical character endeavours to arrange life in keeping with the strict moral ideal. But people with such a greatness of the soul are a rare phenomenon in modern society. Only when united with religion can moral interests in the mind of an average man arrive at such a potency as to become the rule of his conduct. It is, therefore, obvious why only religious communistic societies were capable of a lasting existence, and all other Socialist or Communist organizations quickly dwindled away.

The economic advantages of the socialistic adjustment of labour and consumption within a small community are by far not so great as the early Socialists imagined. Such a community precludes the possibility of any important division of labour or of production on a large scale. Again, an isolated socialistic community cannot be a self-sufficient, closed economic world for itself; it must inevitably enter into relations of exchange with the surrounding capitalistic world, and form a small cell of the capitalist organism. A community of this kind stands in a similar dependency upon the market, as every other economic enterprise. All incidents of the market, fluctation of prices, disturbance of

trade, industrial crises, etc., etc., all destructive powers of capitalism must infallibly strike the Communist society as any joint-stock company. Retaining the communistic character in its internal relations such a community is, with regard to its external intercourse, a commodity producing enterprise like all others.

If the communist society prospers, and its economic enterprises grow, its members incur the temptation to resort to hired labour, to exploit foreign efforts, and to avail themselves thus of their economic superiority, which can be hindered only by motive of a moral nature, since hired "hands" can be employed by every wealthy entrepreneur; and in this case this Communist society turns into a simple capitalist company, nourished by the toil of other people, while to the labourer it is all the same who is his master, the Communist or the Capitalist. In case the socialistic community meets with a failure it dissolves, and their numbers return to the fireside of the capitalist order, and not as exploiters but as exploited.

The Socialist organization can develop all its inherent enormous forces only when its frame encompasses the size of a modern State. Even now some economic enterprises assume a national character, and sometimes go beyond the frontiers of a separate State: for instance, many syndicates and trusts of capitalists. The capital of the Steel Trust in the United States of America amounts to one milliard dollars. The very idea of a Socialist community consisting of tens or hundreds of poor members, armed only with enthusiasm and coping with such powerful capitalistic organizations, availing themselves of all the innumerable advantages of a gigantic production, the very idea is, to say the least, rather naive. No communistic arrangement can supersede the economic enterprise of capital, and in modern society the capital belongs to the capitalist class; otherwise

expressed, only the expropriation of the capitalist, the passage of the agencies of production into the hands of society, can compass the socialist economic order which will unfold all modern technical forces. The experimenting with Socialist communities on a small scale, which owing solely to their limited dimensions and the absence of capital must stand a long way behind the huge enterprise in the application of machinery, is absolutely unable to bring about any great change in the present economic conditions.

II

That trend of Socialism which can be called federal Socialism, naturally puts all hopes of bringing the Socialist system into actual existence in the construction of model communities, towards which, in the long run, Cabet inclined, although such a practical programme is strikingly contradicting the theory of the centralized Communism of which he was the representative. But Cabet's mind was affected with the dominating tendency of the Socialism of the first half of the last century—a tendency which was in immediate connection with the utmost exaggeration of the economic advantages of the collective organization of labour and consumption in a small socialistic community. To this optimism was due the other distinctive feature of the socialistic tactics of this epoch—the aversion to every violence, to class struggle on the strength of the belief in the possibility of gaining over to Socialism not only the working people but also the big proprietors; in a word, all classes. Experience proved that this hope was a delusion. The millionaires Fourier was waiting for, in order to establish the first Phalanstery by their aid, did not come, and the socialistic sermon awakened sympathy only in the bulk of that class of society upon which the whole weight of the capitalistic order is pressing—the proletariate.

Federal Socialism transfers the centre of gravity of society into the single commune, so that from this point of view, State organization proves a quite superfluous and useless, even a pernicious mechanism, which must be done away with. Hence the negation of the availment of political struggle, and the faith in the possibility of carrying out the transformation of society by means of legislative measures. The centralized socialism, on the contrary, believing that the Socialist order can be inaugurated only within the framework of a State, must naturally look upon politics quite otherwise, and push into the foreground the legislative activity of the State as the means for actualizing the Socialist idea. The modern centralized Socialism dates from the St. Simonians and Pecqueur. But owing to a strange inconsequence, or rather affected by the then dominating Socialist spirit, they abhorred the political struggle, and in general, every violent or coercive measure, in the same degree as Fourier and Owen. "The St. Simonian doctrine," we read in the chief work of this school, "Doctrine St. Simonienne," "does itself not possess, nor recognize in others any other power to lead the people than persuasion and conviction. Its aim is to build and not to destroy! The St. Simonian doctrine, we repeat, will not bring about a disorder, a revolution, but a transformation, an evolution which it foretells and strives to accomplish. It is a new education, a definitive regeneration which it offers to the world. Up to this day the great evolutions through which mankind passed have had, it is true, another character; they were all violent ones. But since humanity, thanks to St. Simon's teachings, has learned to understand the laws of its development, every violence is superfluous and useless." "Therefore," Bazar and Enfantin continue, "when we proclaim a future change of the social organization, when we forebode, for instance, that the present

condition of ownership must clear the way for a totally new order, we wish to say and prove that the passage from one state to the other will not—cannot—proceed suddenly and violently but peaceably and gradually, because it cannot be conceived and prepared but by simultaneous action of the imagination and demonstration of enthusiasm and reasoning, because it cannot be realized but by men animated by peaceful feelings of the highest degree."

The great service St. Simon and his school rendered to science consists in a clear and precise formulation of the doctrine of class-struggle, as an essential process of universal history. One should, accordingly, think that the St. Simonians would also consider the triumph of the socialistic organization as the issue of this struggle. However, this idea was quite foreign to them and they strongly repudiated it. From the point of view of this school, this can be accounted for by the belief that with the proclamation of their teachings a new epoch in history must begin, in which the class struggle will be quite unnecessary. Their doctrine must become a new religion, a new transformed Christianity. And as a religion, its exclusive means of dominion must be peacefully worded sermons and persuasion. Thus, although recognizing class struggle in the past history, the St. Simonians did not draw from this postulate any practical conclusions with regard to the present, and produced no new socialistic tactics.

The same assertion holds good as to Pecqueur. And this great Socialist, who so clearly conceived the impossibility of the realization of Socialism otherwise than within the conditions of a national State, had also no idea of the necessity of class struggle, of political contention for the triumph of the order he advocated. His practical schemes were just as Utopian as that of all other Socialists of that epoch. In his book, "De la Republique de Dieu" (1844),

he proposes to found religious brotherhood of "Philadephs," with the aim of changing society on socialistic lines. The members of this brotherhood must untiringly propagate the new doctrine and strive to gain over as many followers as possible in the whole world. The conquest of Socialism is to be but the consequence of the regeneration of mankind. "Purify the will of man," exclaims Pecqueur, "and you will enrich and enlighten the poor, for the wealthy will consider it as their duty and feel themselves happy to help the unfortunate, and will agree to the conditions of the general welfare and moral elevation. Certainly the misery on earth is great and deplorable, and there is almost no hope of ever eradicating it; but if material riches are lacking, still greater is the want of moral riches, and all reasonable people must avow that the deficiency of the riches of the first kind is but the consequence of the deficiency of those of the second."

The brotherhood "Philadephs" should accomplish this moral regeneration of mankind, and this was the concluding word of one of the most remarkable representatives of the Socialism of the forties. It cannot be wondered at that this Socialism gave no practical results, and remained in the sphere of abstract theory and powerless social experiments.

The Utopian Socialism, the theoretic merits of which are immense, proved unable to create any rational tactics serving the purpose of Socialism, in consequence of which it was deprived of all practical significance. The tactics of modern Socialism were created not by learned theorists, but by life itself, the forerunner of which on an expanded field was the potent movement of the English proletariate in the thirties and forties—the Chartism.*

* Babœuf and his adherents, long before the Chartists, clearly saw the necessity of a political revolution, of the seizure of power by the Socialists as a means forthe realization of Socialism.

Chartism stood in opposition to the Utopian Socialism tn many respects. Utopian Socialism was brought forth by ihe imagination of a few thinkers; Chartism was a popular movement of an almost elementary character. Utopian Socialism was strong, owing to its theory elaborated to the highest degree of logical perfection, as also to the amazingly deep penetration into the future, in which the mental eye of the Utopists viewed things as clearly and distinctly as if they were realities visible to all the world. But at the same time they were, in most cases, utterly weak and helpless when questions were started touching the actual situation and the ways and means for attaining that future.

Chartism on the contrary stood on no theory whatever; or more correctly expressed, its theory was to the utmost a bad one. The strong ranks of the Chartists marched under the strangest of banners. Their first national petition, signed by more than a million partisans, was paper money!

The most popular leader of the movement, Feargus O'Connor, saw the salvation of the English people from misery in the famous "Landplan," demanding the purchase of lots of land at the cost of the factory operatives, and changing industrial England into an agricultural country.

As to theoretical tenor, Chartism was as poor as the Utopian Socialism was rich. On the other hand, Chartism was powerful by its acts. It was the first true movement of the proletariate as a class that recognized the necessity of conquering political power in order to be able to accomplish the economical enfranchisement of the working classes. The only essential object in all the programmes of the Chartists, and the only thing they consciously strived for and attained, was the "People's Charter;" in other words, the democratic rebuilding of the political structure based on the right of universal suffrage. The ideal of the

future with the Chartists was a very misty one, and in fact they did not much concern themselves about the future, all their thoughts being absorbed by the nearest goal—the possession of political power.

The Chartists did not preach nor lecture on universal love, nor on the moral regeneration of mankind, but on the pertinacious struggle of the oppressed class with the oppressors. They did not expect the extinction of poverty from the love of the rich for the poor, but from the knowledge of the poor of his interests, and of his readiness to defend his human rights. They did not dread a revolution; on the contrary, they saw in it the only means of releasing the overpowered people.

The Chartists were the first to proclaim the dogma that the liberation of the labour class must be achieved by the labourers themselves. O'Brien, the most gifted and clever of the Chartist leaders, wrote many times that, if a revolution is to benefit the proletarian class, it must be the work of this class.

These were the tactics of Chartism differing *totocaelo* from those of the Utopian Socialism. The theoretic Socialist preserved a hostile attitude towards Chartism for a long time, and only after Louis Blanc the conviction spread among the Socialists of the European continent that experiments will not solve the social question, and that Socialism will conquer not by love but by political and economical struggle.

"It is necessary to strive for economic reforms," Louis Blanc writes in his book "Organization du Travail," "but it is not less necessary to strive for political reforms. If the first constitutes the aim, the second are the means. Of what avail is the scientific organization of labour, according to the rules of reason, justice and love, if there is no possibility of substantiating and methodically fructifying

the discovered principles? Political authority is an organic power, backed by Parliament, courts and soldiers, *i.e.*, by the threefold force of the law, the prison, and the bayonet. Not to avail one's self of this power as an instrument, means to make of it an obstacle against one's own endeavours. Besides, the liberation of the proletariate is a too complicated matter, connected with too many questions, and stands in contradiction to too many customs and interests—although these interests are more apparent than real—to allow of the hope of settling that matter by way of single efforts and experiments. Such a solution can only be attained by State authority. The proletariate requires for its liberation the possession of the agencies of production, and the problem of the State consists in handing them over to the working people.

Regarded from this standpoint, Louis Blanc was far from sharing the repugnance which prevailed during the thirties and forties against a strong State power. "We demand," he said, "a strong Government, because so long as we live under the yoke of inequality, there are feeble individuals who need for their defence the support of society." "The day will come when a strong Government will be superfluous, as there will be no oppressed social classes, but till then it is impossible to dispense with a strong protecting authority. Socialism can be fructified only by the breath of politics."

The Parisian proletariate, as also their English colleagues, more instinctively than consciously understood the whole futility and the weakness of the classless sermons of the new social gospel. The Socialists taught the proletariate to see in the rich their brethren, to avoid politics, and above all to shun revolution. But the politicians that sympathized with Socialism, like Louis Blanc, could not maintain themselves on this practically impossible position,

and were forced to recognize the necessity of the political struggle of the proletariate for its economic liberation. This seemed to be a great heresy; and the same Louis Blanc, who set forth the indispensableness of political action, endeavoured in every way to mitigate the effect of his proclamations of social struggle by numerous and pithless addresses to the wealthy, whom he still hoped to persuade to voluntarily forego their privileges. Having said that "Socialism can be fructified only by the breath of politics," he begins to demonstrate that "the sacred cause of the poor is also the cause of the rich," that the rich are not less interested than the poor in the deliverance of the proletariate. Thus the new tactics, Louis Blanc's, cannot clear themselves of the influence of the wonted old forms of thought and, all told, are far from being a concordant logical whole.

Life is more potent than theory, and the masses of working people, permeated by Socialist ideals, applied them in practice in quite another manner. Instead of establishing Phalansteries, the Parisian proletariate upset the throne of their king and possessed themselves for a short time of the political power. From thence the Socialist movement is closely bound up with the political struggle of the proletariate. The proletariate, the class of direct producers of wealth exploited by capital, became the colour bearer of the classless ideal of Socialism.

The new tactics of Socialism received their theoretical expression and foundation in the "Communist Manifesto." The so-called Utopian Socialism, as a scientific system, is in many respects not only not inferior but superior to Marxism. But regarding the tactics Socialism had recourse to before and after Marx, there is indeed, a chasm between them which cannot be bridged over. Chartism does not represent any finished scientific doctrine.

Louis Blanc's special tactical considerations also proved insufficient and contradictory. Only the "Communist Manifesto" gave Socialism what it lacked—rational, judicious tactics; a clear knowledge of those means, modes, and nearest stages by which Socialism could attain its final aim.

The Socialist movement before Marx made only instinctively, and in spite of the opposing admonitions of its theorists, the first uncertain steps in that direction, which it now firmly and straightway pursues. In the "Communist Manifesto" the way is shown with surprising clearness in expressions of plastic beauty, and the concluding words of which have for ever become the pass-word of Socialism in all the world. Nothing equal in accomplishment and power to this Manifesto was produced by Marx after that.

Now, what does this new way discovered by Marx consist in? In the ingeniously simple assertion that the aim of Socialism can be reached only by the struggle of that social class on which the entire burden of the capitalistic system is weighing, which is inevitably growing with the process of capitalistic development, and which is the only steadily progressing and revolutionary element in the bourgeois society—the proletariate. Every step forward of capitalism multiplies and makes the ranks of the proletariate join closer. But in fighting for their interests, this class fights for the interest of all oppressed and exploited classes of the capitalist society. The victory of the proletariate is therefore identical with the conquest of all the victims of arbitrary power of every kind. The Socialist movement thus becomes blended with the class struggle of the proletariate.

Now, every class struggle is a political struggle. The State being the organ of the class domination, the only means for the oppressed classes to rid themselves of this rule is to lay hold on the power of the State.

In former times political revolutions led to the substitution of the sway of one class by another, the proponderance of one minority yielded the place to another minority. The proletarian revolution must bear another character. Consisting of an enormous majority of the population of the lower classes of society, the proletariate cannot ascend without overthrowing the capitalistic class structure which presses heavy on its shoulders. The conquest of the proletariate, the producer of all material wealth, must lead to the annihilation of all kinds of labour exploitation, and consequently to the extinction of every class domination.

The immediate task of the Socialist movement thus consists in putting the proletariate in possession of the political power and of the authority of the State, which being the organized proletariate itself will take into its hands all means of production now belonging to the wealthy classes.

This is the ultimate aim of the conscious proletarian exertions of all countries independently of their historical or national peculiarities. The process of the capitalist growth creates everywhere the same conditions of life and the same conditions of the increase of the proletariate, which accounts for the confluence of the separate national struggles of the proletarians in one imposing movement.

"Proletarians of all countries unite!" with these words the "Communist Manifesto" concludes. The Socialist movement, pursuing the nearest aims which were pointed out, passed from one victory to another, growing and spreading more and more in all directions, and swelling into a mighty historical, worldwide unresistible torrent. Since the publication of this Manifesto more than half a century has elapsed, in which the new policy of Socialism triumphantly produced most convincing experimental demonstrations of its expediency and fertility.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PASSAGE FROM THE CAPITALISTIC SYSTEM TO THE SOCIALIST

PRACTICAL PROGRAMME OF SOCIALISM

I

The "Communist Manifesto" put a stop to the Utopian method of Socialist experiments of small dimensions. The paramount aim of the Socialist movement was not the establishment of a model community, but the conquest of political power in the existing State, and the means for attaining this end was not the peaceable propagation of the new doctrine but the social struggle. The elements which this movement concentrated and leant upon, was not a hotchpotch classless group of intellectuals, enthusiasts and philanthropists of different social layers, but a vividly stamped social class—the proletariate.

But the possession of political power by the proletariate is a more remote goal of the Socialist agitation of our days. The practical day-by-day policy of Socialism sets to itself other and more approximated aims, which can be reached under the existing social conditions. The force of Marxism as a system of practical policy lies just in its having combined the struggle for a far off socialistic ideal with the contention for immediate interests of the labour class.

The practical programme of Marxism points out a series

of measures in favour of the working classes, which are at the same time preparatory steps to the inauguration of the socialistic organization. Viewed from the standpoint of Marxism, this order cannot simply be the issue of the seizure of the political power by the proletariate. The new economic organization must simultaneously be prepared by the natural evolution of the capitalist system which lends to production, by way of concentration, a more and more social character, and by legal and other measures which, under the capitalist order, are already contributing to raise the proletariate and to lay the foundation to the future economic structure. The practical programme of the Socialists of our days consists precisely in the demand of such measures.

It is interesting to note that in relation to this view the earlier Socialism prepared the field for Marxism. Owen was a practical social reformer and one of the first champions of factory legislation before he became a Socialist. Other early Socialists also conceived the importance of social reforms as paving the way for Socialism. Certainly, there was a certain contradiction in their reasonings. If the first Phalanstery or the first co-operative community has the power to reorganize the whole existing social fabric, for what end are reforms required? Nevertheless not only Owen but other early Socialists—federalists; insisted on reforms. Their practical policy had a twofold character. On the one hand they enthusiastically preached in favour of the establishment of Socialist communities, and on the other, held forth a programme of social reforms which could be affected under the capitalist system. In the first case their endeavours had no practical result whatever, and ended in a total wreck of all their attempts, and in the frustration of all their hopes; in the second case, they laboured not in vain, as they laid down the basal principles

the practical policy of the modern Socialism is acting upon.

Fourier developed the doctrine of social reforms with a really astonishing wideness and acuteness of perception, with a philosophic intentiveness and a clear-sighted penetration into the future which were peculiar to him. Not one social investigator was endowed with such a marvellous capacity to read in the time to come as if in an opened book, as Fourier. How many of his forecasts have already become actualities, and how many will become such! It is true no Phalansteries as yet exist. But the period of the passage from the capitalist organization to the Socialist, foreseen and described by Fourier under the name of "Guarantism," has undoubtedly long ago begun. The historical epoch in which we live does actually reflex the criteria of the "Guarantism," of which Fourier drew up a statement nearly a century ago.

Fourier firmly believed that the first Phalange will decide the fate of mankind, and in a short time bring about the supersession of all other forms of economic unions. But he was not only a visionary, he was a profound thinker and philosopher. In his sketch of the "Philosophy of Universal History," he points out that every phase of the history of mankind is the product of the evolution of the forces of the preceding phases. Civilization—the non-ruling social order, is subject to the same law of development. Under the influence of the social forces originated by our civilization, it must change into another social form, "Gurantism." But Fourier's own discovery—the Phalange and the Phalanstery, must in his opinion break off this natural development of civilization. In this way he arrives at the following peculiar historical construction. He pictures the past of mankind and its nearest future as it inevitably would have ensued if the social development

proceeded in a normal manner, without external influences consisting in the discovery of a harmonious social order. Humanity would attain this order without this discovery as well, but only through a gradual and slow development. However, the structure of the future is much too different from that of the present to directly proceed from it. Some intermediary, transient form must be between them, and this is Guarantism. The discovery of a concordant organization eliminates the necessity of Guarantism. Without this discovery, Guarantism would be the unavoidable link in the historical development of mankind, of which contingently falling-off phase—as Fourier looks upon it—he gives a striking characteristic.

Guarantism is such a social state, in which the security of collective interests is opposed to private interest. Thus under the domination of Guarantism the State-insurance of the members of the community against all possible misfortunes will largely develop, and the relations of the capitalist employers to the labourer will have to undergo social regulations in favour of the latter. Again, the State recognizes its obligation to assist the unemployed and to set on foot institutions for procuring occupation for those that have none.

Under the empire of civilization, ownership bears the character of an unlimited and private right; under Guarantism it will become a collective and limited one. "The interests of personal property will be subordinated to social requirements, a principle which is nowadays already recognized in cases of war. Everything that prevents the defence is unhesitatingly razed or burned, and by right, because general welfare is at stake, before which all egotistical pretensions and the simple right in property, which are less than anything else in harmony with the spirit of liberty, must go by the board. Civilized customs

do not admit the appliance of this principle in any other cases, but in those in which war, roads, canals are taken into consideration. Everybody opposes his caprice to the general welfare, and here intervenes the philosopher in supporting the personal liberties at the expense of the liberties of the community. Such is the principle of private property, of the right to arbitrarily injure the general interest, in order to satisfy the individual fancies." (Fourier)

Under the sway of Guarantism this right will disappear. Wherever public interests will require, private property will be limited by the State. To cite an instance, everybody now is at liberty to raise on his land whatever edifice he likes, in consequence of which the modern towns are so unwholesome and unæsthetic. Under Guarantism the towns will put on quite another face, as only such buildings will be allowed which will be in keeping with the general plan of the town, and which, regarding outside appearance and interior arrangements, will meet the requirements of beauty and comfort.

One of the most potent means for the security of the general welfare under Guarantism will be the foundation of institutions which Fourier calls Commune Offices, which we now would call co-operative societies of a pretty complicated character. These Commune Offices aim at, (1) affording their members the possibility of acquiring the commodities they are in need of at the lowest possible price, without the intermission of the trader, which correspond to co-operative stores; (2) supporting their members by advancing them money, which is identical with the co-operative credit societies of our time. These offices must, moreover, serve as stores for the preservation of the agricultural products of the members of the community, on the deposits of which they can receive advances, as is

the case with the modern elevators. The offices will also conduct the sales of the warehoused goods, and form a productive association, procuring employment for all that are in want of it. In junction with these offices consumption on a social basis can also be organized.

Such offices, Fourier thought, could serve as centres for the gradual remodelling of the modern economic conditions. They should, bit by bit, concentrate in their hands the whole trade of the country and supersede all private commercial enterprises, organizing simultaneously production on a large scale, and thus prepare the population for the future production of the Phalange.

The distinguishing features of the epoch of Guarantism consists in the regulation of private economic life by social authority in the interest of the whole community, in the creation of associations with a view to organized production, consumption and exchange on collective principles. Guarantism, being a system of social securities in opposition to the self-willed private economic enterprisers, must necessarily supplant the ruling system of unlimited freedom of competition, provided humanity will not clear this phase of history by directly passing into the (societaire) socialistic arrangement—into the state of harmony.

Fourier's hopes that humanity will find it possible to avoid the transition period of Guarantism have not been accomplished, but his foresights concerning this period have fully come true. The modern legislation with regard to the protection of labour is nothing else but the system of social insurance against the abuses of the capitalistic régime as foreshadowed by Fourier. The Commune Offices have found their expression in the various forms of co-operative associations and municipal Socialism, the number of which rapidly increases in our days.

Fourier can also lay claim to the paternity of a very

important idea which has played a prominent part in the history of the social question—the idea of the right to labour. During the historical period which preceded civilization, says Fourier, the populations enjoyed natural rights, securing their livelihood as the freedom to hunt, to fish, to gather fruit and to pasture cattle, without which the then populations could not exist, so that these rights could be regarded as natural rights.

Civilization, confirming the institution of unlimited private property, deprived the people of these natural rights, which ought to be compensated by guaranteeing an equivalent in the shape of the right to labour. "The Scripture says that God has condemned Adam and his posterity to work with the sweat on their brow, but He has not condemned us to be deprived of the work on which our life depends. We therefore, regarding the human rights, can demand from philosophy and civilization not to wrong us of the source which God has left us as an alternative and chastisement, and to secure us at least the right to that kind of labour to which we have been trained."

But the right to labour, which is closely bound up with the securance of a necessary minimum of means of existence for the whole population, cannot assume concrete shape in modern society. Under the rule of civilization the insurance of a minimum is identical with doing away with the stimulus of productive labour, since no one being sure of his sustenance without work will consent to perform any labour at all which has not some attractive power in itself. But it is not charitable donations the people want but work of such a nature that would make them joyfully sacrifice their leisure hours. Besides, the securance of a minimum necessary for existence is impossible without an enormous accretion of the national wealth, which in its

turn requires a new organization of the social labour, a harmonious adjustment of social relations.

Fourier opposes the right to labour as the primary human right to all political rights of man, which have been proclaimed by the French revolution, without any real significance. The supreme authority of the people, freedom, equality and brotherhood, and in general all merely political rights, cannot be substantiated for the bulk of the population so long as its subsistence is not secured. The modern philosophers, in treating of the rights of man, have forgotten to lay at the root the right to labour, which indeed cannot be enacted under the domination of civilization, but without which all other rights are useless.

This was Fourier's standpoint. His disciples, however, looked otherwise upon the matter, and brought forward the right to labour as a practical measure to be demanded in favour of the working class under the existing economical system.

"When, generally speaking, industry will be organized," Considerant wrote in 1839, "or even when the Government will organize regular works in a sufficient quantity, the recognition of the right to labour will instantly become an accomplished fact, and this will not only be humane and just but beneficial to society at large, as the consequence will be the palsy of the theoretical attacks on property, the prevention of social revolutions and even of the individual attacks, which property undergoes every day as thefts of all kinds, generally engendered by misery and the forced demoralization of the fleeced classes."

During the forties the idea of the right to labour acquired an extended popularity among the masses of the working people in France. The revolution of 1848, when the Parisian proletariate became master of the position for a short time, has led to the solemn recognition of this right

by the Provisional Government, which organized National Workshops for different kinds of industry on large scales, thus performing the engagement they entered into—to provide the unemployed with work, whose number, owing to the industrial crisis and the stagnation of commerce, increased immensely.

The history of these National Workshops is well known. They can by no means be regarded as a serious experiment on the part of the Government to organize industrial labour. The majority of the members of the Provisional Government entertained a very hostile disposition to the workshops, and only for fear of the Parisian operatives recognized on paper the right to labour, secretly cherishing the aim of proving the impossibility of running such undertakings. The result was that the Parisian proletariate recieved the means of subsistence from the State without performing any valuable work. It is not to be wondered at that the Government abrogated the National Workshops as soon as it felt itself growing in strength, and declined to acquit itself of the obligation it took upon itself at a heavy hour—obligation which, in fact, could not be fulfilled. Thus Fourier looked deeper into the matter than his disciples, in asserting that under the existing social conditions the effectuation of the right to labour is an absolute impossibility.

It is interesting to pursue the further fate of the idea of the right to labour. The German social-democracy, as personified in its prominent representatives, totally disclaimed this idea. Thus Kautsky, having minutely examined into the claims of the French Socialists of the forties, arrived at the following conclusion: "The essence of the right to labour is identical with the recognition of the right of the labourer to claim from the State the supply of work at the usual remuneration, when private

employers, for whatever reason it may be, cannot or are not willing to offer such work. But the deficiency of work is a characteristic feature of industrial crises, which in their turn are engendered by overproduction of commodities, and by the impossibility of finding a suitable market for them. The want of work is but the consequence of overproduction. It is at this time the Government is being demanded to give work to the unemployed; otherwise expressed, that demands are addressed to the Government to enlarge the production of objects on its account, at a time when the conditions of the market dictate its reduction, the only consequence of which must be—State bankruptcy.

Chronic and periodical wants of work, necessary results of the capitalist, economic system, can be avoided only by a regularly planned organization, in which case it ceases to be a capitalistic economy. We see that under capitalistic order the right to labour cannot possibly be practically applied, and that under the socialistic organization of industrial activity this right has no reason for being, and is therefore quite superfluous.

The idea of the right to labour is, nevertheless, not dead. Not long ago an attempt was made to sanction this right by law. At the congress at Solothurn, in 1892, the Social-Democrat party of Switzerland passed a resolution to propose to the people of Switzerland the question of the right to labour. A like resolution was passed by the largest organization of the Helvetic Labour Unions, the so-called *Grütli-Union*.

Both these organizations drew up a proclamation to their countrymen, in which they were called upon to sign the demand of supplementing the constitution of the union by the recognition of the right to labour and its formal enactment, with a view to secure it to every Swiss citizen.

According to the organization of the movement, this end could be attained by legally shortening the working day, by adequate measures for providing employment for those that are seeking it, by protecting the labourer against being discharged by his employer without any reason, by securing him against want of work—partly directly out of public means and partly by the aid of private insurance institutions, by absolute freedom of coalition of the working people, by strengthening their legal position in relation to their employers with the tendency to a more democratic organization of labour in social and private adventures.

This proposition of the Swiss labour organization counted more than 50,000 votes, being the number required by the Swiss constitution for a bill to be brought into the Confederate Council and then to be put to the general vote. However, the proposition was repudiated by the Council and rejected by the plebiscite by 308,289 Noes against 75,880 Ayes.

If by the right to work is to be understood a series of economic measures tending to secure the interests of labour, the facilitation of finding employment, and the weakening of the consequences of the want of employment, it can, of course, be regarded as capable of being carried into effect even under the actual capitalist organization. But conceived in this sense it loses its original meaning, and the provision of employment for all wanting, it ceases to be binding for the State.

The principal significance of Fourierism in relation to practical life lies not in the proclaimed idea of the right to labour, and in general not in the sphere of politics, but in the mighty impulse it imparted—together with Owenism—to all the various kinds of co-operate movements. The system of legal measures promoting the gradual refashioning of the modern society on new lines,

could not be fully and systematically developed by Fourierism or by the other trends of federal Socialism, for the sole reason that negating the State, the federal Socialism looks distrusfully upon the system of State intervention, in general. The idea of Guarantism is in obvious contradiction to the fundamental principles of the federal Socialism, and this duality of the practical policy of Fourierism could not but impair its harmonious unity and logical consistency. The centralized Socialism, on the contrary, recognizing in the State the fundamental agency for the embodiment of the Socialist system, naturally demands the systematic elaboration of the legal measures conducible to this aim. The modern minimum programmes of the Socialist parties are a direct inheritance of the earlier representatives of centralized Socialism, who adopted similar programmes.

Thus the St. Simonians demanded with a particular tenacity of purpose one exceptionally important legal measure, which really could serve as a powerful instrument for gradually concentrating in the hands of the State the whole social wealth—the abrogation of the right of inheritance. Let the private propertied individual enjoy his wealth during his lifetime, however illegitimate its acquisition may have been, but he ought to be deprived of the right to secure the unjust possession for ever. The only heir of all social wealth must be the society as a whole. But in passing from the abstract point of view to that of practical policy, the St. Simonians did not go so far, and instead of the total abolishment of the right of inheritance they demanded its repeal in relation to collateral lines, and the imposition of a high and progressive tax on direct lineal heritages.

Again, the St. Simonians proposed a radical reform of taxes—the replacing of direct taxes by a progressive income

tax (Decourdemanche, in his article in the Journal La Globe, 1832).

Pecqueur likewise noted a series of legal measures for the sake of inaugurating the Socialist arrangement. He proposed, for instance, the enactment of a law in virtue of which all entrepreneurs, the number of whose labourers exceeds a certain figure, should be deprived of the right of further managing their concerns, the running of which should pass over to the respective labourers employed in them, and the capitalist to receive a certain percentage for his capital. The wages should be determined by social authority and the whole surplus income placed at the disposal of the community. The State should take care of finding or giving employment for those labourers who through no fault of theirs could find none. For this end the State concentrates in its hand all reports relating to supply and demand of work. In case there be no private adventure in which the workless labourer could find employment, the State provides him with work in its own factories or other establishments, or in the absence of such opportunities, secures his subsistence until employment will be found. The regulation of wages by social authority as a means to secure a competency to the labourer, was set forth by many Socialists of the thirties and forties of last century.

The practical programme of Louis Blanc demands the centralization in the hands of the State by purchase of railways and mines, by taking into its hands all kinds of credit and insurance institutions, as also all wholesale and retail trade. The means drawn from all these sources are to be applied by the State to the support and establishing of productive labour associations, until the capitalistic enterprises unable to compete with these associations, will be forced to quit the field.

II

The order to be pursued with a view to realize the Socialist organization as delineated by the Communist Manifesto, is almost entirely a reproduction of the demands contained in the programmes of the Socialists of the thirties and forties.

According to the authors of this Manifesto, the transition from the existing economic state to the socialistic structure of society, after the seizure of the political power by the proletariate, could be brought about by the following measures:

(1) Expropriation of private property in land and the application of the rent to the exigencies of the State.

(2) Rapidly increasing progressive taxes.

(3) Abrogation of the right of inheritance.

(4) Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

(5) Centralization of credit in the hands of the State through a national monopolized Bank, on State capital.

(6) Centralization of all means of transport in the hands of the State

(7) Augmentation of national factories and instruments of production by the State, and cultivation and amelioration of the land according to a determined general plan.

(8) Obligatory labour for all. Institution of an industrial army, especially for land cultivation.

(9) Combination of agriculture with industry as a measure for the gradual extinction of the difference between town and village.

(10) Public and gratuitous education of children, putting an end to the present form of using the labour of children. Combination of education with material production.

The first of these claims, the nationalization of the land,

has been borrowed from the programme of the Chartists, whose left wing fought under this banner in the forties. The demand of land nationalization did not play an important part in the French socialistic programme, although Pecqueur decidedly adhered to this measure. Small peasant proprietors prevailing in this country, the idea of the nationalization of the land could not awaken any sympathy in the mass of the people.

The origin of the 10th point of the programme can also be traced to the policy of the English Socialist movement, while all the remainder is a reproduction of the claims of the French Socialists, among which the influence, especially of the St. Simonians and Louis Blanc, is perceptible.

The modern Socialist parties, as I have already intimated, concern themselves very little in questions connected with the idea of immediately carrying out the Socialist arrangements. Their attention is mainly directed to the struggle for the improvement of the position of the working classes under the existing conditions, so that the present socialistic movement can be divided into three integral parts: in fighting in Parliament for legislative measures in favour of the labourers, within all provinces and in all directions; in developing Trade Unions, and in promoting co-operation of every kind. To this may be added the so-called Municipal Socialism of those countries in which democratic organization of the municipalities prevails, which, concentrating in their hands various economic ventures which but shortly before have been objects of private enterprise, realizes the supplanting of the capitalist system by the social within a given economic domain. Under a democratic organization of the municipality, the labouring classes weigh heavy in the scale of local self-government. Now, the number of Socialist muni-

cipalities striving to develop their economic activity to the greatest possible extent in the interest of the labouring classes is continually rising, thus tilling the soil for the future Socialist community.

The co-operative movement of our days is acting the same part, chiefly by acquiring objects of consumption without the mediation of the trader, and by more and more organizing its own productions. The Co-operative Stores are, in this case, enterprises in relation to the labourers employed in their shops and works, but enterprises of quite another kind than the capitalists. Serving the interests of the working class the Co-operative Stores stand, or shall stand, upon the same ground of watchful attention to what concerns the workman when they appear as employers and hire labour.

Abreast with the Co-operative Stores goes the development of the associations of various petty producers, among whom are very important, the growing associations of peasants, producers of agricultural objects. The associations of producers and consumers enter into connection with each other; the producing associations begin to work not for the market at random, through the aid of a trader, but for the associations of consumers—the direct buyers of their products. In this manner the whole turnover of a given department proceeds conformably to a planned corporate organization. The co-operative arrangements, like the municipal Socialism, pave the way for the Socialist economy by casting into the very womb of capitalism the seed of the future social organizations. The Trade Unions, in their turn, promote the growth of the Socialist movement by organizing, disciplining themselves, and by strengthening the solidarity and enhancing the power of that class which supplies the chief fighters for the Socialist ideal —the proletariate.

However important all these modern Socialist movements, Parliamentary Struggle, Trade Unions, Co-operative Associations, Municipal Socialism may be, they do by no means eliminate the necessity of the seizure of political power by the proletariate—a power which at all events is an indispensable condition of the conquest of Socialism. In this sense the Communist Manifesto cannot be considered as absolute, it requires but some essential complements. In the preface to the edition of the Manifesto in 1872, Marx himself remarks, "that history proves that the working class cannot simply possess itself of the ready-made State machine and work it for its own purposes." If the seizure of this power by the proletariate is to be the starting point for the Socialist reorganization of society, the economic relations of the society must be prepared for the new forms and conditions—and the labourer must be up to the mark—of the extremely difficult problem of calling into being a new social organism, the solution of which in this case falls to his lot.

The organic unfolding of the capitalist economy prepares the field for Socialism; but those elementary functions alone are not sufficient, they must be completed by the conscious will of man. The creation of new economic forms, which could serve as supports in the reconstruction of the present social fabric, is indeed of extraordinary importance. The purely political programme of the Communist Manifesto therefore imperiously demands the insertion of Municipal Socialism, Co-operative Movement, and also Trade Unions, as expedients for the education of the masses and which taken together constitute an essential condition of the success of the proletarian revolution.

This foundation once laid, the passage of the political power into the hands of the proletariate must lead to the

Socialist adjustment of the economic factors of the community, attended by sacrifices on the part of the propertied classes, the nature of which sacrifices will, in the first place, depend upon these classes themselves, upon the position they will occupy in the coming great revolution.

Marx and Engels did not repudiate the buying out of the means of production from the private owners. Vandervelde looks at this question from the same standpoint. "Kautksy in his little work," On the day after the Social Revolution, minutely states the consideration inducing him to be unreservedly in favour of the expropriation by purchase and not of confiscation of the instruments of production.

The abrogation of the right of inheritance, together with the progressive tax on unearned increment, must render this operation possible without in any way oppressing the community. There is no necessity whatever to introduce Socialism at once to its extreme limits. On the contrary, it is to all intents and purposes by far more rational to gradually remould the existing economic structure by slowly infusing into it the spirit of the new order. The land and enterprises of national importance as railways, credit and insurance institutions, as also all capitalistic associations, trusts, syndicates which extended to large proportions, can immediately pass into possession of the State without any technical difficulties, and as to inferior concerns, the majority of factories and mills can be transferred to labour associations or to local municipalities; whilst industries of small means must abide in their independence for a more or less long time, which is fraught with particular significance in reference to peasant proprietary, as the triumph of Socialism demands that the peasant should know that the new order does not directly threaten his independence.

The most difficult task for Socialism will be to adjust supply to demand; in other words, to establish a propor-

tionality between production and consumption. Under the actual reign of unrestricted industrial activity and private enterprise, this problem is being solved by the ruin of those undertakings, the products of which exceed the social demand and the rapid growth of such concerns, and the increasing profits they yield are due to the demand for their products being greater than the supply.

Under the Socialist organization of production, the income of the labourer employed in a given branch will not bear any direct relation to the consumption of the return of his labour, his fixed income being at all events secured. The elementary forces of the capitalist system, the influences of the fluctuations of the market, must be replaced by a special mechanism to be introduced and worked by Socialism, in the form of most detailed statistical data regarding production and consumption, and the elaboration of a rigorous organization of the employment of labour in different branches of industry on a level with the social exigencies. This organization must, on one side, secure the proportionality of social production, and on the other hamper personal freedom as little as possible—the freedom of every individual to choose his profession according to his taste.

However, the Socialist system will not wholly escape the regulating influence of the fluctuations of the market, in so far as under the reorganized State, commodities will be bought and sold at prices dictated by the ratio between social supply and demand. In the Socialist community, just so as in the capitalistic, the price of a commodity will rise in the case of demand exceeding supply, and fall in the inverse instance. In this manner, the market price of a product will serve as a graduator of the proportionality of social production with the society of the future, as it serves with the society of the present time. The difference will consist only in the price; retaining the quality of a regulator

of social production and consumption, under the Socialist arrangement of economic life, it will cease to be the regulator of social distribution.

The inauguration of the Socialist organization will, generally speaking, not meet with any insuperable obstacles. What must peremptorily be recognized and firmly kept in mind, is that Socialism is not a dream of a Paradise never to be realised, no leisurely hatched speculation, nor the issue of an idle vagary, but such a social structure which, though not to be accomplished at a stroke, to its utmost extent, can yet at the present time be a substantial aim of practical politics. Of course, no revolution recorded in history, no social movement, can possibly be compared with the magnitude of the coming social transformation, which will, in fact, be a regeneration of mankind. The conviction that this radical recasting of society is not only possible but unavoidable, is by no means a blind belief, a self-deception, as the adversaries of Socialism pretend to know. The faith in Socialism rests on scientific ground, and is inevitable because its existence is a logically necessary completion of democracy. The bourgeois economists have for a long time tried in vain to prove the impossibility of overcoming the technical obstructions Socialism must encounter in the attempt to reshape the actual economic relations, and we now witness how the conviction of the approach of Socialism is spreading among their ranks. The number of deserters from the bourgeois camp is increasing, and their most capacious heads gather around the new colours.

Socialism will come, because capitalism itself, as proved by science, is dressing the ground for the new seed; because apart from its scientific groundwork, it is deeply rooted in the minds of all toilers as an ideal, as a creed, which at the same time is faith in progress, in a better future for mankind, in the disappearance of violence and exploitation, in

the conciliation of social reality with our moral ideal. The Socialists believe that life will be beautified, that the happiness of one will no more be bought with the misery of another, that poverty will cease to be hard upon man, and that truth will triumph.

One frequently now meets with people who believe in and expect Socialism, but fear and hate it, and what to Socialists appears as the reign of a bright spring, is in their sight the rule of absurdity and vulgarity. At the bottom of this dread and hostility lies simply the feeling of aversion to the crowd, in the want of confidence in and the presumptuous disdain of the people. But Socialists do not fear nor contemn the people, and joyfully hail the rising sun of a better and nobler future.

THE END

W. JOLLY & SONS, PRINTERS, ABERDEEN