

The movement is a work by Pastor Todt entitled *Der radikale deutsche Socialismus und die christliche Gesellschaft*. In this work Todt condemns the economics of liberalism as unchristian, and seeks to show that the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity are entirely Scriptural, as are also the socialist demands for the abolition of private property and of the wage system, that the labourer should have the full produce of his labour, and that labour should be associated. The chief leader of the movement is the court preacher Stöcker, the head also of the anti-Semitic agitation, which is largely traceable to economic causes. Stöcker founded two associations,—a central union for social reform, consisting of members of the middle classes interested in the emancipation of labour, and a Christian social working-men's party. The former has had considerable success, especially among the Lutheran clergy. The movement has met with the most strenuous resistance from the social democratic party and has been greatly hampered by the anti-socialist law of 1878.

Little can here be said of the state socialism of Bismarck,—a very recent movement, which has not yet had time to pass into history. Its leading principles were announced in an imperial message to the Reichstag in November 1881. Besides the repressive measures necessary to restrain the excesses of the social democracy, the emperor declared that the healing of social evils was to be sought in positive measures for the good of the working man. The measures proposed were for the insurance of the workmen against accident, sickness, old age, and inability to work by arrangements under state control. "The finding of the right ways and means for this state protection of the working man is a difficult task, but also one of the highest that concern every society standing on the ethical foundations of the Christian national life." The message then proceeds to speak of measures for "organizing the life of the people in the form of corporative associations under the protection and furtherance of the state,"—a clause which might be taken as an admission of the collectivist principle. As yet the imperial programme has only been partially realized. It will be obvious that such measures can be rightly appreciated only with reference to the general theory and practice of Prussian government.

The acknowledged father of anarchism is PROUDHON (*q.v.*); but the doctrine owes its development chiefly to Russian thinkers who had been trained in the Hegelian left. The great apostle of the system in its advanced and most characteristic stage was Michael Bakunin. Bakunin was sprung from the highest Russian aristocracy, and was born at Torshok, in the government of Tver, in 1814. Leaving the army, in which he served for some time, he visited western Europe, chiefly Paris, where he met George Sand and Proudhon in 1847. For his share in the German disturbances of 1849 he was imprisoned in Russia for several years and then sent to Siberia, from which he escaped, and spent the rest of his life in exile in western Europe, principally in Switzerland. In 1869 he founded the Social Democratic Alliance, which, however, dissolved in the same year and entered the International. In 1870 he attempted a rising at Lyons on the principles afterwards exemplified by the Paris commune. At The Hague congress of the International in 1872 he was outvoted and expelled by the Marx party. Bakunin's activity was most remarkable as an agitator. The international socialism of the Romance countries, especially that of Spain and Italy, has been largely moulded by him. He died at Bern in 1876. Nothing can be clearer or more frank and comprehensive in its destructiveness than the socialism of Bakunin. It is revolutionary socialism based on materialism and aiming at the destruction of external authority by every

available means. He rejects all the ideal systems in every name and shape, from the idea of God downwards; and he rejects every form of external authority, whether emanating from the will of a sovereign or from universal suffrage. "The liberty of man," he says in his *Dieu et L'État*, "consists solely in this, that he obey the laws of nature, because he has himself recognized them as such, and not because they have been imposed upon him externally by any foreign will whatsoever, human or divine, collective or individual." In this way will the whole problem of freedom be solved: that natural laws be ascertained by scientific discovery, and the knowledge of them be universally diffused among the masses. Natural laws being thus recognized by every man for himself, he cannot but obey them, for they are the laws also of his own nature; and the need for political organization, administration, and legislation will at once disappear. Nor will he admit of any privileged position or class, for "it is the peculiarity of privilege and of every privileged position to kill the intellect and heart of man. The privileged man, whether he be privileged politically or economically, is a man depraved in intellect and heart." "In a word, we object to all legislation, all authority, and all influence, privileged, patented, official, and legal, even when it has proceeded from universal suffrage, convinced that it must always turn to the profit of a dominating and exploiting minority, against the interests of the immense majority enslaved." The anarchy of Bakunin is therefore essentially the same as that of Proudhon, but expressed without paradox, and with a destructive revolutionary energy which has seldom been equalled in history. What they both contemplate is a condition of human enlightenment and self-control in which the individual shall be a law to himself, and in which all external authority shall be abolished as a despotic interference with personal freedom. It is an ideal to which the highest religion and philosophy look forward as the goal of man, not as one, however, which can be forthwith reached through the wholesale destruction of the present framework of society, but through a long process of ethical and social improvement. The error of the anarchists consists in their impatient insistence on this proclamation of absolute freedom in the present debased condition of the great mass of the people in every class. They insist on taking the last step in social development before they have quite taken the first. The other leading principles of anarchism will be best understood from the following extracts taken from the programme of the International Social Democratic Alliance. The Alliance demands above all things the definitive and complete abolition of classes, and political, economic, and social equality of individuals and sexes, and abolition of inheritance, so that in the future every man may enjoy a like share in the produce of labour; that land and soil, instruments of labour, and all other capital, becoming the common property of the whole society, may be used only by the workers, that is, by associations of cultivators and industrialists. It looks forward to the final solution of the social question through the universal and international solidarity of the workers of all countries, and condemns every policy grounded on so-called patriotism and national jealousy. It demands the universal federation of all local associations through the principle of freedom. Bakunin's methods of realizing his revolutionary programme are not less frank and destructive than his principles. The revolutionist, as he would recommend him to be, is a consecrated man, who will allow no private interests or feelings, and no scruples of religion, patriotism, or morality, to turn him aside from his mission, the aim of which is by all available means to overturn the existing society. His work is merciless and universal

destruction. The future organization will doubtless proceed out of the movement and life of the people, but it is the concern of coming generations. In the meantime all that Bakunin enables us to see as promise of future reconstruction is the free federation of free associations,—associations of which we find the type in the Russian commune.

Bakunin, as we have seen, has had great influence on the socialism of the Romance countries. The important risings in Spain in 1873 were due to his activity; and the socialism of Italy has been largely inspired by him. In those countries, as well as in France and French Switzerland, anarchist doctrines of the same general type as that of Bakunin are still in vogue, and are advocated by men of mark in literature and science like Kropotkin and Elisée Reclus. The views of the propaganda which they represent were most clearly and distinctly brought out during the great anarchist trial at Lyons in 1883. What they aim at is the most absolute freedom, the most complete satisfaction of human wants, without other limit than the impossibilities of nature and the wants of their neighbours equally worthy of respect. They object to all authority and all government on principle, and in all human relations would in place of legal and administrative control substitute free contract, perpetually subject to revision and cancellation. But, as no freedom is possible in a society where capital is monopolized by a diminishing minority, they believe that capital, the common inheritance of humanity, since it is the fruit of the co-operation of past and present generations, ought to be at the disposal of all, so that no man be excluded from it, and no man seize part of it to the detriment of the rest. In a word, they wish equality, equality of fact, as corollary or rather as primordial condition of freedom. From each one according to his faculties; to each one according to his needs. They demand bread for all, science for all, work for all; for all, too, independence and justice. Even a government based on universal suffrage gives them no scope for effective action in the deliverance of the poor, as they maintain that of the eight million electors of France only some half a million are in a position to give a free vote. In such a state of affairs, and in view of the continued misery and degradation of the proletariat, they proclaim the sacred right of insurrection as the *ultima ratio servorum*.

It is an interesting fact that socialism has taken its most aggressive form in that European country whose civilization is most recent. The revolutionary opinions of Russia are not the growth of the soil, and are not the natural and normal outcome of its own social development: they have been imported from abroad. Falling on youthful and enthusiastic temperaments which had not previously been inoculated with the principle of innovation, the new ideas have broken forth with an irrepressible and uncompromising vigour which has astonished the older nations of Europe. Another peculiarity of the situation is that the Government is an autocracy served or controlled by a camarilla largely foreign both in origin and sympathy. In this case, then, we have a revolutionary party inspired by the socialism of western Europe fighting against a Government which is also in many ways an exotic and is not rooted in the mass of the people. The chief support of the Government is to be found in the reverence of the peasantry for the person and office of the czar, while the nihilists look upon the communal institutions of the country as their great ground of hope. Considered as a national movement, three distinct stages are recognized in the phenomena called Russian nihilism. In its first stage it was a speculative and anti-religious tendency, destructive of all orthodox tradition and authority. It was the spirit of the Hegelian left frankly accepting the materialism of

Büchner and Moleschott as the final deliverance of philosophy; and the time was the early years of Alexander II., when the old despotic restraints were so largely removed,—a period of reform and innovation and comparative freedom. In a country where religion had little influence among the educated classes, and where philosophy was not a slow and gradual growth of the native mind, but a fashion imported from abroad, the most destructive materialism found an easy conquest. It was the prevalent form among the advanced thinkers; it was clear, simple, and thorough; and it suited well the anti-religious mood of the time. By the side of this negative speculation, however, the Russian youth became aware of a new creed, destructive also in its beginnings, but full of the positive promise of future reconstruction and regeneration,—socialism. Here they saw the struggle of the proletariat, so terribly conspicuous in the Paris commune, which attracted universal attention in 1871, a proletariat represented in Russia by a nation of peasantry sunk in immemorial ignorance and wretchedness. At this period hundreds of young Russians of both sexes were studying in western Europe, especially in Switzerland. In 1873 they were by an imperial ukaze recalled home, but they carried the new ideas with them. The period of speculation was succeeded by a period of socialist propaganda, which naturally met with implacable opposition and merciless repression from the Government. As they received no mercy, the nihilists determined to show none; and in 1878 began the terrible duel of the Russian revolutionists against the autocracy and its servants, which culminated in the violent death of Alexander II. in 1881.

How far we are to regard the revolutionary movement of Russia as cognate in principle with anarchism is not easy to determine. In despotic countries, where constitutional reform and opposition to government are not tolerated, resolute innovators are naturally driven to secret conspiracy and to violent action. What distinguishes the Russian revolutionary party from other movements of a like nature is the intensity of the enthusiastic devotion and self-sacrifice with which they have braved death, imprisonment, exile, and privation in every form and the calculating skill with which they have called the resources of modern chemistry to their aid. There is no doubt that the doctrines of men like Bakunin have had great influence on Russian socialism; but so have the writings of Marx, as also of J. S. Mill and other advanced thinkers, who have no connexion with anarchism. It is certain that the leaders of the revolutionary party resorted to violent measures only after their peaceful propaganda was being ruthlessly suppressed. With regard to political reform many of their leaders have declared that they would be satisfied with constitutionalism. In the address sent to the emperor Alexander III. after the death of his father in March 1881, the executive committee of the revolutionary party offered to submit unconditionally to a national assembly duly elected by the people. In this recognition of constitutionalism, as well as in the strongly centralized organization of their executive, the Russian revolutionary party are essentially at variance with anarchism. In economics they advocate a thoroughgoing collectivism.

We have now given a brief outline of the various forms of socialism as they have historically appeared. It may be useful to group them as accurately and clearly as possible. (1) Experiments in socialism conducted by private initiative, as carried on in the schools of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Owen; not that they objected to state help, but that, in point of fact, their efforts were conducted by private means. (2) Productive associations with state help: the programme of economic change favoured by Louis Blanc and Lassalle. (3) The Marx school of socialism, scientific and revolutionary, beyond all comparison the most im-

portant and most influential of all forms of socialism. (4) Anarchism. (5) Nihilism. (6) Christian socialism; inasmuch as the various phases of Christian socialism condemn the principle of competition as operating in modern industry, and favour the organization of labour on united principles, and especially of productive associations with a common capital and an equitable system of distribution, they must be regarded as true forms of socialism. (7) To these should be added the speculative socialism of which Rodbertus is the most remarkable example; recognizing the fundamental evils of the present system and agreeing with the Marx school in holding that socialism is the next stage in social evolution, Rodbertus believed that the period of its realization is so remote that any decidedly practical effort towards that end is inapplicable; hence he could only recommend transitional remedial measures, which will at least circumscribe the mischief inherent in the present economic order and also pave the way towards a better state. (8) And last of all may be added the various forms of state socialism, which are all examples of state action on behalf of the poor, especially of the use of the public resources for that purpose. The word "socialism" is very frequently used in this sense. As the continued use of the word in such a way is almost a certainty, this phase of the subject must be recognized here. It may be described as socialistic inasmuch as it fully admits the responsibility of society for all its members; but in many respects its tendencies are opposed to true socialism. It is a vague movement which has not yet had time to take shape, and cannot be discussed here. "Socialism of the chair" has already been discussed under POLITICAL ECONOMY, vol. xix. p. 393.

The above classification can of course pretend only to be a rough and general one. The various heads of the classification are not exclusive. The first variety has chiefly an historical interest. The American communities (discussed under COMMUNISM) are really cases of the old crude communism. Productive associations with state help stand on the Gotha programme of the social democrats of Germany. They are recommended by Christian socialists, both Catholic and Protestant, and they form an important item in the programme of the "knights of labour" of America. The resemblance in type between the "community" of Owen, the *phalange* of Fourier, the *mir* or commune of Russia, and the free commune of Bakunin is apparent. It is the social unit as determined by obvious economic, local, and historical conditions, and in socialism naturally becomes the point of departure for a new construction of society. It will have been noted that most of the important phases of socialism have been and are international in sympathy and activity. The Marx socialism is spreading in nearly every country of the civilized world, the doctrine being diffused by energetic agitators, and not seldom by men of philosophic and literary culture. In late years this is true both of France and England. It is well known how active anarchism has been. The Christian socialist movement is more or less operative in Belgium, France, Germany, Austria, and to some extent in England.

In this article our aim has been to give an expository and historical account of the various phases of socialism. It is impossible even to refer to all the different questions suggested in our sketch; and to discuss the relations of antagonism and affinity between socialism and the prevailing social and economic ideas and institutions would require a long and elaborate treatise. In the course of the article many obvious points of relationship, and particularly of contrast, between socialism and political economy have presented themselves. All that we can now do is to emphasize a few of the more important of these. The

scope of the current political economy of Great Britain may be broadly defined as follows:—given the existing arrangements with regard to land, capital, and labour, to determine the economic phenomena and the economic laws that will prevail under a system of free individual competition. As we have abundantly seen, socialism is diametrically opposed to the permanent continuance of these arrangements. It looks forward to the time when the present system of individual property in land and capital served by wage-labour will pass away, and when free competition on that basis will cease with the system of which it is a part. It regards the present economic order with the laws and conditions peculiar to it as a passing phase in the historic evolution of mankind, with no greater claim to permanence or finality than other historic eras which have had their day. What enlightened socialism above all demands is that an unprejudiced science should endeavour to distinguish between such economic laws as are permanently grounded in the nature of man and his environment and such as have their validity only in the existing economic order, between such as are enduringly founded on nature and such as are only the accidents or temporary manifestations of a changing civilization. Socialists appeal to history to prove that what the orthodox economy considered the natural and normal order of things, with its distribution of wealth under the three categories of rent, profit, and wages, is really an exceptional phenomenon limited both in extent and duration. It is therefore an obvious error to speak of socialism as roundly controverting economic law. It is no business of socialism to controvert a law grounded in nature, such as the physiological basis of the law of population; but it denies the applicability of the Malthusian precept under the present condition, when wealth is superabundant, but badly distributed owing to causes for which neither nature nor science, but human selfishness and ignorance are responsible. Nor does it lie in the principles of socialism to question the validity of those special economic laws that hold good under the present economic order. Some of these, such as the iron law of wages, socialism is disposed rather to accentuate unduly as a necessity of the present system. It is the aim of socialism to abolish the conditions under which such laws have their validity. Socialists object to the present economic order because of the necessity of results which are opposed to human wellbeing. They object entirely to the existing order with its distribution of the produce of labour into the three categories of rent, profit, and wages, because on it are founded class distinctions, with the consequent antagonism of classes, and the subjection and degradation of the lower classes,—holding that economic subjection involves all other forms of subjection and degradation. In short, scientific socialism as represented by Marx and Friedrich Engels appeals against the existing economic order, of which the orthodox political economy is an exposition and for which it is so frequently an apology, to the higher laws and principles of social evolution as determined by the nature of man in relation to the environment in which he lives and develops.

There is no space here to trace historically the influence of political economy in the genesis of socialism, nor that of socialism on the recent political economy. It has naturally been the tendency of socialism to emphasize the idea of the worth and significance of labour, so prominent in the school of Adam Smith. This was one of the most valuable features of the Saint-Simon school, otherwise so much disfigured with utopianism and extravagance. As we have seen, the socialism of Marx is in some of its most important aspects a development of Ricardian principles. Turning to the influence of socialism on political economists, we need but refer to that exercised by French socialism

on J. S. Mill, as described in his *Autobiography*. The economies of Germany has for the last fifteen years been most powerfully affected by the theories of Lassalle, Marx, and latterly also of Rodbertus. The causes which have produced socialism have also affected economics; but a large part of the change is due directly to the teaching of the socialists, especially of Marx, whose great work is recognized as of the first importance. Without commanding assent to its leading conclusions, socialism has given a new direction to most of the recent Continental research in political economy. The German "socialism of the chair," the influence of which is by no means confined to the country that produced it, is sufficient evidence of this.

As we have already seen, Marx and his school accept in the completest form the doctrine of evolution, which they learned first in Hegel, but finally hold as taught by Darwin; and, in common with most socialists, from Saint-Simon downwards, they recognize three stages in the economic development of society,—slavery, serfdom, and wage-labour,—which last they believe will be displaced by an era of associated labour with a collective capital. But how, it is asked, does this theory of socialism as the next goal of society consist with the Darwinian doctrine of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest? Is not competition, this *bête noire* of the socialists, simply the social and economic form of the struggle for existence? Is not competition, therefore, the very condition of social progress? Is not socialism, therefore, inconsistent with progress? The question suggested is a large and complicated one, to which we cannot here pretend to give an exhaustive or determinate answer, but can only indicate some of the main lines of discussion. (1) In all periods of human development, and especially in its higher stages, progress consists most essentially in a growing social and ethical virtue and in the cultivation of the beautiful both in sentiment and art. With such an enlarging ideal of progress, how harmonize a system of competition like the present, by which millions in every great European country are effectively deprived of the means of development, and even of bare livelihood? The struggle for existence has always been modified by social and ethical conditions. If it is to continue, as it will in various forms, it should be carried on under higher conditions, suitable to a higher and less animal stage in the evolution of man. (2) Human progress has undoubtedly been attained through struggle, especially through the struggle for existence; but the struggle has essentially been one of men united in society, of tribe against tribe, of city against city, of nation against nation, and race against race. Thus it is easy to exaggerate unduly the importance of the struggle of the individual man. History has only too often seen the abnormal development of private selfishness, so overgrown as to weaken, and finally dissolve and overthrow, the society in which it acted, thereby accomplishing its own destruction. This is indeed the open secret of the ruin of most of the communities that have existed. In short, a happy and healthy individual development can be secured only through its due subordination to social virtue and the general welfare. Human progress has been by strong societies with a well-developed social and public virtue. The excessive development of "individualism" within a society has been its weakness and ruin. (3) While emphasizing the extreme importance of the hereditary principle, especially as connected with the fundamental institution of the family, we should also recognize its tendency to abuse in perpetuating the enormous inequalities of property and condition, many of which originated in a less perfect system of society. The hereditary principle has indeed greatly contributed to the solidity and continuity of the social order; but it also gives an exceptional advantage in the struggle for existence

to the privileged few. In this point, therefore, the present system does not best fulfil the requirements of the evolution theory as applied to society. The struggle is not one of merit. It is frequently one of merit against hereditary privilege; not seldom it is one of privilege against privilege without regard to merit at all. (4) In considering the possibilities of human progress afforded by the present system of society in the light of the evolution theory, it is impossible to ignore the fact that the continuance of the race depends most on the less fit members of society, on the lower strata, which are thriftless, the worst fed, and worst educated. While the classes which are most intelligent and endowed with self-control abstain from marriage or defer it, those who have the lowest organization marry early and have large families. Even to perpetuate disease and deformity is not considered wrong. It may be that prohibitory and restrictive laws, even if passed, would prove inoperative and ineffectual in restraining so many hasty and ill-considered unions that only serve to multiply misery and disease; but it is surely excusable at least to inquire whether this abuse of freedom could not be curtailed by strengthening the social union and increasing the pressure of the enlightenment and moral sense of the community. (5) Above all, as the tendency of the present order is to give the victory to cheapness, it may be asked whether competition,—the economic form of the struggle for existence—is really such a sure and potent element of progress, unless most powerfully counteracted by other principles? In short, history is the resultant of many complex forces, and it is easy to push too far the formula of any system. It is out of the balance and harmony of many principles, of which the struggle for existence is but one, that human progress can proceed. (6) The main point is that in social evolution the widest phase of the struggle for existence is between forms of social organization. Hence the great question as regards socialism is whether it is the fittest form of social organization for the time coming? Is it best adapted to carry forward and develop in wider and more adequate form the progressive life of the future?

While many socialists have announced lax views regarding marriage and the family, it cannot in view of popular misunderstanding be sufficiently emphasized that the essence of socialism is an economic change. It enunciates no special doctrine on the relation of the sexes. In common with other social reformers, socialists generally advocate the equality of the sexes and the emancipation of women; they object to the mercenary element so common in marriage; and they abhor prostitution as one of the worst and vilest of existing evils, believing, moreover, that it is a necessary result of the present distinction of classes and of the unequal distribution of wealth. The views of the anarchists have already been noted. In the Marx school there is a tendency to denounce the legally binding contract in marriage. But such views all belong to the accidents of socialism.

So with regard to religion. Socialism has been and still is very frequently associated with irreligion and atheism. The same remark applies to Continental Liberalism, and partly for a like reason: the absolute Governments of the Continent have taken the existing forms of religion into their service and have repressed religious freedom. On religion as on marriage socialism has no special teaching. While the anarchists of the school of Bakunin would overturn all forms of religion and reject the idea of God, the social democrats of Germany in their Gotha programme of 1875 declare religion to be a private concern. As we have seen, Christian socialism is a considerable force in many European countries; and in many of the other schools, especially that of

Louis Blanc, the kinship and even identity of ethical spirit with that of Christianity are unmistakable.

In their revolutionary impatience the anarchists have avowed their hostility to all the existing political forms except the free commune, which alone will be left standing amid the general wreck they contemplate. The Marx school, as represented by its ablest living exponent, Friedrich Engels, also look forward to a period in the evolution of society when the state will become superfluous, and, having no longer any function to perform, will die away. The state they regard as an exploiting institution, an organization of the ruling classes for retaining the workers in economic subjection. The International was an attempt to supersede the exploiting states by a combination of the workers of all countries without distinction of creed, colour, or nationality. When the workers in the name of the whole society seize political power and take over the control of production, the rule of classes, their conflicts and the excesses of the struggle for existence among them, will cease. Instead of a government over persons we shall have an administration of things and the control of productive processes. Obviously the Marx school reserve the realization of this idea till the evolution of society has prepared the way for it. In the conduct of the International they insisted on a strongly centralized form of organization as against the free federalism and the rejection of all authority maintained by Bakunin and his followers. This opposition between centralization and federalism does not concern us here; it is a question common to theoretical and practical politics. It is necessary, however, to say a word about the opposition between the national tendency of the Lassalle school and the international socialism of Marx. As we have seen, a compromise was effected in the Gotha programme of 1875, in which the importance of the nation as an existing form of human society is amply recognized. The question is still discussed in the organs of the social democrats; but the international tendency is decidedly the prevalent one. "Want of patriotism" is one of the current epithets of reproach cast at them. It is needless to point out that as most new movements of importance have been revolutionary, so also have they for good or evil been international. In becoming international the labour movement has only followed the example set by commerce, finance, diplomacy, religion, philosophy, art, music.

We have now reviewed the most important aspects of the socialist movement. As we have seen, socialism is a new form of social organization, based on a fundamental change in the economic order of society. Socialists believe that the present economic order, in which industry is carried on by private competitive capital, must and ought to pass away, and that the normal economic order of the future will be one with collective means of production and associated labour working for the general good. This principle of socialism is cardinal and fundamental. All the other theories so often connected with it and so important in relation to religion, philosophy, marriage, patriotism, &c., are with regard to socialism non-essential. Questions of method, though supremely important, must also be distinguished from the essential principle. At the same time it will be seen that an economic change, such as that contemplated in socialism, would most powerfully affect every other department of human life. Socialism, in short, means that in industry, in the economic arrangements of society, the collective or co-operative principle shall become normal or universal, that all who are able should contribute to the service of society, and that all should share in the fruits of the associated labour according to some good and equitable principle. In such a condition of things the noblest field for ambition will be in the

service of society,—an ideal which is already partially realized in the democratic state. It is in this fundamental sense that J. S. Mill declared himself a socialist.¹ It is in this sense also that Albert Schäffle, one of the first living authorities on economics and sociology, has, after long years of study of the subject, come to the conclusion that "the future belongs to the purified socialism."²

Scientific socialists strongly insist that this economic order of the future cannot be realized by utopian schemes or arbitrary legislation or mere revolutionary disturbance. If it come at all, it must come as the consummation of the dominant tendencies of modern social development; it must be realized under the conditions prescribed by our nature and environment. In discussing the doctrines of Marx we stated that the central point of the question was this—do the strongest forces of the social development of our time really tend towards the superseding of the present economic order and towards the establishment of a new and wider order based on collective capital and associated labour? Socialists maintain that they do, and that there is at present going forward a double process of dissolution and reconstruction,—the dissolution of individualism with a constructive tendency towards collectivism. From the socialist point of view the following may be signalized as indicative of such a process. (1) The tendency towards economic anarchy already explained in treating of Marx's views. Over the whole industrial world we see great crises succeeding each other, resulting in stagnation and depression which now threaten to be chronic and permanent. While the productive forces of the world are enormously increasing, they only tend the more to intensify national and international competition, and to render labour superfluous, precarious, and dependent. Under this system the worker has neither freedom nor security. All this variety of symptoms are only a sign of the break-down of the present economic order both in principle and method. They are the necessary results of the competitive system, which has thus finally revealed its real nature and tendency,—economic and social anarchy. (2) The constant and inevitable tendency towards concentration in industrial operations, which began with the introduction of steam and of the factory system, through which the small producer has been superseded by the capitalist, the smaller capitalist by the larger. And now the single capitalist is being absorbed in the company, a growing proportion of the world's business being so large that only a great company can provide the requisite capital and organization; whilst in the large companies there is a tendency, in case they cannot drive each other out of the field, to bring about a fusion of interests. In all this we see a great constructive process inevitably going on as the result of the inherent tendencies of industrial development. Thus the control of industry will be concentrated in a few colossal companies and their chiefs. It is obvious how this process could simplify the transference of the whole to a collective management by society. (3) This leads us to a third important point, the growing tendency towards state control of industry, and the growing sense of the responsibility of society for all its members, observable in German politics, not less than under the more democratic conditions of France and England. It is apparent how under this influence the existing state might absorb one by one all the large social functions, as has already happened with regard to education, means of communication, &c. Naturally this could be accomplished only through a most comprehensive development of local and subordinate bodies of every kind. Socialism by no means implies that such an enormous burden of

¹ See his *Autobiography*; also his *Pol. Economy*, chapter on the probable future of the labouring classes.

² *Bau und Leben*, vol. ii. 120.

work should be thrown on the central government. Most socialist schools have contemplated a vast increase of communal or local autonomy,—a course which, on the other hand, does not carry with it the subversion of the central government. (4) In England during the last half century we have seen a long succession of efforts, partially successful, towards a new organization of society rendered necessary by the changes due to the industrial revolution. In economics as in other spheres the watchword of the new era has been freedom, the removal of restraint. But it has been found that positive measures of reconstruction were also necessary. Factory legislation carried in opposition to the prevailing economic theory, trades unions, employers' combinations, industrial partnerships, boards of conciliation, the co-operative system,—all these are real, if partial, endeavours towards a new organization of society suited to the new conditions. Socialism claims to be the comprehensive scheme of organization which embraces in a complete and consistent unity all these partial efforts. (5) But the great social force which is destined to work out the vast transformation consists of the human beings most directly interested in the colossal struggle,—the modern democracy. This democracy is marked by a combination of characteristics which are new to history. It is being educated and enlightened in the school and by the cheap press; it is being drilled and organized in large factories, in the national armies, by vast popular demonstrations, in the gigantic electoral struggles of the time. Thus it is becoming conscious of its enormous power, and able to make use of it. It is becoming conscious also of its unsatisfactory social and economic position. The democracy which has become the master-force of the civilized world are economically a mass of proletarians dependent on precarious wage-labour. Having transformed the political condition of things, they are ready now for an economic transformation. But, the inevitable process of concentration of industrial operations already referred to is entirely against the continuance or restoration of the small producer, whether workman or peasant proprietor. Such efforts of continuance or restoration are reactionary; they are economically unsound and must fail. Production and distribu-

tion ever tend to larger dimensions. The only issue out of the present economic condition is concentrated collective industry under the control of the new democracy and its chosen leaders. On the irresistible momentum of these two inevitable and ever-growing forces—the concentration of industry and the growth of the new democracy—socialism depends for the realization of its scheme of transformation.

Such are the tendencies to which philosophic socialists point as already working towards a transformation of society of the kind they expect. It is essentially a question of the future, with which we have no concern in this article. Our duty has simply been to point out the forces which socialists believe to be actually at work for the realization of their theory of social organization; and here we must leave the subject.

Literature.—The literature of socialism is enormous and rapidly growing; besides those named under the special articles we now give a list of some of the leading works which are in whole or in part devoted to it:—Karl Marx, *Das Kapital* (1st vol., 3d ed., Hamburg, 1883; 2d vol., 1st ed., Hamburg, 1885); Friedrich Engels, *Eugen Dühring's Umwälzung der Wissenschaft*, a controversial work, but containing a remarkably clear and able exposition of the Marx position by its best living exponent (2d ed., Hottingen-Zurich, 1886); Albert Schäffle, *Bau und Leben des sozialen Körpers* (Tübingen, 1878; the third vol. of this work supersedes his *Kapitalismus und Sozialismus*, Tübingen, 1870), *Quintessenz des Sozialismus* (7th ed., Gotha, 1879); Adolf Held, *Sozialismus, Sozial-Demokratie, und Sozial-Politik* (Leipzig, 1878); Von Sybel, *Die Lehren des heutigen Sozialismus und Communismus* (Bonn, 1872); Lujo Brentano, *Die christlich-soziale Bewegung in England* (Leipzig, 1883); Von Scheel, *Die Theorie der sozialen Frage* (Jena, 1871); Alphons Thun, *Geschichte der revolutionären Bewegungen in Russland* (Leipzig, 1883); Rudolf Meyer, *Der Emancipationskampf des vierten Standes* (2d ed., Berlin, 1882); Franz Mehring, *Die Deutsche Sozialdemokratie, ihre Geschichte und ihre Lehre* (Bremen, 1879); Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contemporain* (2d ed., Paris, 1883); Paul Janet, *Les Origines du Socialisme Contemporain* (Paris, 1883); Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, *Le Collectivisme* (Paris, 1884); *Le Procès des Anarchistes* (Lyons, 1883); John Rae, *Contemporary Socialism* (London, 1884); Stepniak, *Underground Russia* (London, 1883); Hyndman, *Historical Basis of Socialism in England* (London, 1884). See also the relative chapters in Roscher's *Grundlagen der Nationalökonomie*; Adolf Wagner's *Lehrbuch der politischen Oekonomie* (vol. i., *Grundlegung*, 2d ed., Leipzig, 1879); Mill's *Political Economy and Autobiography*; and Sidgwick's *Principles of Political Economy*. (T. K.)

SOCIETIES. Under ACADEMY will be found an account of the various bodies of which that word forms part of the titles, usually denoting some kind of state support or patronage. The present article is restricted to scientific, archaeological, and literary societies, chiefly those founded and carried on by private collective effort. Certain academies omitted in the previous article are, however, referred to. Governmental, collegiate, and university institutions do not come within our scope, neither as a rule do endowed societies, nor yet institutions which, although they bear the name, carry on no kind of joint literary or scientific work. With a few exceptions here and there, the societies mentioned are still flourishing.

In their modern form learned and literary societies have their origin in the Italian academies of the Renaissance; but private scientific societies have arisen chiefly during the 19th century, being due to the necessity of increased organization of knowledge and the desire among scholars for a common ground to meet and compare results and collect facts for future generalization. These bodies rapidly tend to increase in number and to become more and more specialized. Many efforts have been made from time to time to tabulate and analyse the literature published in their proceedings, as, for instance, in the indexes of Reuss (1801-21) and the Royal Society (1867-79) for physics and natural science, and those of Walther (1845) and Koner (1852-56) for history. A further development

of the work done by societies was made in 1822, when, chiefly owing to Humboldt, the *Gesellschaft deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte* first met at Leipzig. This inauguration of the system of national congresses was followed in 1831 by the *British Association for the Advancement of Science*, which has served as the model for similar societies in France, America, and elsewhere. The merit of introducing the idea of migratory congresses into France is due to the distinguished archaeologist, M. Arcisse de Caumont (1802-73), who established the *Association Normande*, which since 1845 has held a reunion in one or other of the towns of the province for the discussion of matters relating to history, archaeology, science, and agriculture, with local exhibitions. From the same initiation came the *Congrès Archéologique de France* (1834), which was organized by the *Société Française pour la Conservation des Monuments Historiques*, the *Congrès Scientifique*, which held its first meeting at Caen in 1833 (directed by the *Institut des Provinces*), and the *Congrès des Sociétés Savantes des Départements*, which for many years after 1850 held its annual sittings at Paris. The idea received the sanction of the French Government in 1861, when a *Congrès des Sociétés Savantes* was first convoked at the Sorbonne by the minister of public instruction. In Italy Charles Bonaparte, prince of Canino, started an association with like objects, which held its first meeting at Pisa in 1839. Russia has had an itinerant gathering of naturalists since