

[*Eugenics of a Free Society*, partial revision (1932)
Max Nettlau]

I.

Very many people of all classes of society, slaves of routine and interest, have no ideal aims before them but the conquest of wealth and power and the enjoyment of what these will buy. The pages following are not concerned with them, but with the very considerable number of people who, however hardened and battered by modern life, still do not believe that mankind in every sphere of life must forever be composed of a few conquerors and a great many victims. They indulge at times in dreams of free and easy fellowship of all. Only whilst they are conscious themselves of possessing the capacity to lead an unselfish life and offer even some longing for such a life, they lack confidence in similar qualities among nearly all their neighbors and contemporaries. So they keep their feeling to themselves, yet in many cases they try to create a small sphere of ease and happiness around them or they drift into a friendly milieu of this kind.

A harmonious little family, a circle of friends, specialization in work, study or hobbies with disinterested contact with amateurs or experts of similar disposition, nature and art, all provide free and friendly milieus for those who are not entirely fallen victims to vulgarity and greed, nor quite broken in spirit by drudgery, misery and hopeless despair. They realize their own utopia, however diminutive its scale may be, anticipating that large, general happiness and freedom which combined effort and a real collective will would make as practically realizable as individual effort and will make a good deal of individual hopes and wishes realizable even today!

But most of these excellent people are unaware of each other's disposition, they are suspicious and diffident and as a measure of ordinary protection, to avoid their being considered as naive and candid, they hide their real opinions and repeat the old accepted commonplaces that there must be governments to protect people, capitalists to enable workers to earn wages, a God to keep going his creation, etc. Propaganda, however intense and progressive, is almost thrown away on these people, as their distrust of their fellow men makes it impossible for them to see where the forces are to come from which will unite to overthrow the immense present organism of State-protected property. So they keep for themselves in those innumerable free associations, in touch with each others or not in an infinite variety of degrees and modes which we call Private Life or Life in General.

This state of things looks dark for those who believe in coarse and primitive forms of socialism, [3] parking of men into Parties today, into a Socialist State tomorrow, it looks hopeful to the believers in free and complete

socialism which expects that men for greater efficiency and mutual protection of their freedom will group themselves into units, small or large, co-operating as friendly and freely as disinterested members of a family, friends or comrades do today in that infinity of inter-contacts which forms the solid and normal, not the deformed and morbid part of present life.

We all know that Private Life is already a great achievement of civilization, and it will as well be the foundation stratum of coming general freedom. Did freedom and solidarity exist at all in that primitive age when tribal hordes were small and land to roam in and food to hunt for existed in profusion? Probably ignorance common to all created prejudices and customs, operating as laws and preventing the development of freedom, whilst the ordinary abundance may not have favored the growth of solidarity—or it might have survived the terrific assault by greed in a somewhat later period when the increasing population and other factors brought about these crises ending in the privilege and supremacy of some and the spoliation and enslavement of all the others. This disruption of mankind into rulers and subjects, rich and poor, supported by the treachery of great quantities of strong and intelligent men who as the military and priestly castes, later also as the technical staff, ranged with the rich and those in powers and became their tools, sharers of the spoils and watchdogs, this disruption is still lasting. It is perpetuated by brute force, but it laid also hold of the intellects; ignorance, submissiveness, dissimulation, hypocrisy, distrust undermined the better feelings of most men. If under such unfavorable circumstances yet the private life of man has by and by acquired more gentle features, this is an important and hopeful fact, showing evolutionary tendencies towards greater freedom hard at work. We can see none of these tendencies at work anywhere else, in the sphere of property and power: these, transmitted from generation to generation, are kept up as ever by force and ruse, that is by brutality and fraud or prejudice, as ready to resort to fascism and massacre today as in any of the dark ages of history. So progress operated by the free and associative elements which manage to free themselves from the primitive Conquest of humanity by Usurpation and Privilege, a Conquest which is as old established fact, just as e. g. the Norman Conquest of England (1066) is, which entailed consequences, as the Norman Conquest did, which still last, but which in the history of mankind will have been some day an episode of the past, as so many other Conquests have become. [4]

A continued evolution, a gradual awakening of mankind to a conscious desire for freedom and ever-extending practice of solidarity (association and reciprocity) must, then, be expected and it cannot be incorporated in passing and decaying organisms as State and Property are, but only in the living portion of humanity at large. This portion of mankind is not a unique mass nor a class, but is infinitely subdivided according to the strength and the rhythm of the evolutive possibilities which descendency milieu have shaped in individuals or more or less connected groups of persons. This differentiation, hindering the success of so many attempt of a too-sweeping, generalizing, simplified character,

will, if properly recognized, become a beneficent factor, ensuring the natural expansion of the new life in forms adapted to the special features of everybody. Every progressive effort, be it as well reasoned, thoroughgoing, vividly presented as ever possible, touches really vibrating chords only in some, often in many, never in all, and unanimous response may resound in the momentary cheers of a crowd, but in reality the impression caused will be different for most people.

There is, in my opinion, a relatively very large waste of good effort in all popular propaganda and there are also many opportunities missed. This is of small importance to the coarse authoritarian mind of those who consider man a gregarious animal, easily induced to go to the manger or to the shambles by being led by the strongest. This is done today, the impulses given by ambition and imitation being worked upon and the illusion of progress arrived at in common being thus created. That is not enough to generalize new ideas. It might be compared to the role of electrical appliances in modern life; a limited number of people understands them, all the others have but learned to press this or that button, or so. Efforts in a really liberal direction must be more subtle, differentiated and intense, if they shall not lead to much disappointment.

For the most gifted, devoted and disinterested are easily attracted, also ambitious men who may lack in depth and perseverance. But far too many of the others are given up as hopeless, because they fail to be persuaded by certain too general forms of propaganda, lectures, papers, pamphlets, etc. There is often much of the take it or leave it spirit in strenuous propagandists, they admit of no half-hearted or qualified adherence. It is far from me to advocate slackness and trimming, I see only that if some few become convinced anarchists and libertarian revolutionists by "love at first sight," others do not and their greater slowness or hesitation sometimes meets with impatience and scorn which makes them stay away altogether. Incipient sympathizers meeting a broadminded propagandist and made welcome may be won by and by; meeting a rigorists they will not feel comfortable and may never be seen again.

It is a fact deeply depressing to the believer in progress that so many people, seeing the gorgeous display of wealth and power and the continuous readiness of the masses to toil for their masters and exploiters, really believe that mankind is constituted like this and for this purpose. This must exasperate the propagandists and courageous defiance of the enemy gives very often rigid, absolute, sweeping form to their propagandist utterances. This gives also to their forecasts of a future free society often a too narrow character, the same to their opinions on means and methods. All concerning these and the future is for ourselves still under discussion and can be modified by criticism and still more by coming political experience. The newcomer may in some bases be fascinated by an utopian hypothesis; in other cases he will look critically at too much affirmation.

Thus it seems of first importance to me that a large milieu of general sympathizers be founded by the broadest and least sectarian presentation of the

libertarian idea. When a stony, arid desert contains but a limited number of oases, these are not likely to spread and cover the whole desert some day with vegetation. Only when climatic and other influences change in a favorable direction, producing moisture, the desert may permit a gradual spreading of vegetation all over it.

This means that progress and prosperity of the most advanced movements are quite inseparably linked up with all other manifestations of progress. To hold up insufficient progress to shame, to despise it, is a shortsighted and costly policy for the advanced sections of opinion. "A healthy mind in a healthy body" operates in society as in man and the coming of a free society has the same claim to the most eugenic gestation and birth that every other organism has. Before all, however thorough a social revolution may operate, the population will be much the same before and after it, and whichever qualities and energies of value slumber in it before the great crisis, will be awakened and expand, let us hope so, during and after the crisis, building up the new society. The mere talk of the rotten society which will be replaced by a resplendent new society does not fit the situation, is materially inexact,—just as if some one, not familiar with human life, were talking nonsense of a rotten mother and of the helpless newborn as the resplendent new humanity. No, such talk is revolutionary mythology and makes us overlook elementary facts. As a diseased mother will bear a diseased child, so [5] unhappy tsarist Russia has bred the unfortunate bolshevist abortion, and the nationalist Italy has bred the fascist monster. Are these not the most terrible warnings, to provide for the eugenic birth of a free society by awakening all the best forces of man, that coming freedom shall be the unfolding of these forces? How could it be otherwise, as the fruit must always be the resultant of the seed and of all the influences for good or bad acting upon the seed?

Such considerations prompted me to examine the progressive and retardating factors at work in present society at some length before I discuss the possibilities of an anarchist society.

II.

The intellectual workers and the professional classes.

The present state of things in civilized countries is characterized by rapid progress in science and its technical applications since hardly a century, by critical methods in these and other branches of research in use and growing perfection since about the same time, whilst the average mentality, customs, laws and institutions hail back in unbroken order to the ages of primitive man and preceding animal stages. The connecting link between these two immensely wide apart spheres are the intellectual workers, the scientists and technical experts, together with the descendents of the clerical caste, rightly still called "clerks," be they employed by public bodies or by property holders, the lawyers, etc. All these instruct and supervise the descendents of the prehistoric enslaved

masses in working for the profit of the descendants of the prehistoric select few, the strong and rich. Neither of these two immensely old classes, the poor and the rich, underwent a serious change in all these ages, since all efforts of emancipation of the masses have been frustrated up til now and since usurpation and privilege, of course, show no disposition to abdicate. But the once propertyless intervening class, the priests who lived on their wits, juggling with an exploiting the masses and the classes and suppressing competition and independent thought by religious monopolies and censorships, these could not entirely control human intellect and make it stationary: intellectual effort created rudiments of science which could not altogether be made subservient to theology. Henceforth those who served the old beliefs and institutions, religion, the State, property and traditional institutions (the law) saw aside of them arise science and useful applications of science which gradually changed so many external features of human life, but left all other human relations [7] and the general mentality of the two large classes virtually unchanged. Thus the intellectual class still helps the rich against the poor and as it alone possesses the exact knowledge of institutions and the technical skill to organize and supervise human labor, it keeps the old system practically up and no rebellion has as yet changed this situation.

Animal instinct produces very sensible actions which can only be based on an early original reasoning, founded upon practical experience, yet in historical times—as long as we know animals—instinct cannot cope with entirely new situations and is at least very slow to change (we are not justified to affirm that it never changes.) The explanation is, in my opinion, that instinct is inveterated routine so forcibly imposed and transmitted that independent thoughts became relatively disused in animals. (We cannot affirm that it does not exist, since it is considered to exist in man and, besides, our observation of animal life is still very deficient in this respect.) In man also the instincts of religious credulity, domineering, property-clutching and sullen submissiveness (the servitude volontaire of La Boétie) are of the earliest date and are still powerful, besides a single good instinct, mutual helpfulness as the result of an early insight in the usefulness of joined effort, appertaining to animals as well, which is derived from the protective measures ensuring the life of animal offspring.

Animals, thus, are preeminently victims of authority, transforming them by routine almost into automatons and stemming their independent intellectual life (as far as we believe that we know.) Man nearly had the same fate; he is still enthralled by the above mentioned principally stationary, that is reactionary instincts, euphemistically called beliefs, traditions, customs, general mentality, but independent thought, presumably very small in early ages, became more active, acquire skill by continuous experience and gave the impulse to the technical perfection which surrounds us. But though this independent thought also perfected ethical conceptions and often and loudly called for personal and collective freedom, it was unable as yet to alter and uproot the old evil instincts. It is hard at work and the history of mankind alternates between dark

ages when instinct prevails and periods of enlightenment when intellectual life is in the foreground.

The struggle is hard and the characteristics of instinct, routine to the stunting and almost extinction of independent thought, explains this. We can but retrace a very short spell of human history, some 12 to 15000 years at the outmost, before which lay a period of from 150,000 to 200,000 years—if it is not a much longer period—when man is considered to have existed already as an animal species, definite from [8] that time onward until now and as evidence shows undergoing an evolution which we call progressive by consent and which, indeed, gave him a technical mastership over most things on the globe, but up to the present only in exceptional cases a real intellectual and moral will to lay the foundations of a free and happy life for all, reestablishing that state of equilibrium which the animal ancestors of man had already reached and which all animals seem to have maintained, but which humanity has lost.

In those unrecorded countless myriads of years before history, periods of blackest ignorance and superstition and only exceedingly slow mechanical progress, yet the bulk of customs and convictions, even functions and institutions, must have been formed which at the present day for the intellectual and moral contents of the brain and impelling factors of action of the average citizen, the 100 of law abiding inhabitant of any country, his dearest property aside of material wealth. For from any of the oldest monarchies of oriental despotism, the daily life of which cuneiform or hieroglyph scripts reconstruct for us, one could straight step into any modern State and Church, workshop, administration, law court or barracks and, some more perfect tools excepted, would not find any real change. All along authority is cultivated, made to triumph and reaping spoils—the stronger robs, enslaves or destroys the weaker, be they individuals or tribes, nations, peoples.

Thus dominating agglomerations arise, incorporating, assimilating the weaker organisms around them, imposing their laws and customs, often their language upon the conquered. Records show this happening in the Euphrates and Tigris and in the Nile valleys, along the great Chinese rivers, but it must have happened everywhere by means of the more favored location of some tribes or peoples which increased their strength and prosperity and made smaller and less favored units dependent on them. This processus reached an acme in the Roman domination of the whole Mediterranean basin and of western Europe from Portugal to Scotland and of considerable parts of central Europe. On the wave of Caesarism the Roman Pope's spiritual Empire continued this worldwide domination, aside of which the rising Northern capitalism and imperialism a thousand years later, founded the Protestant spiritual Empires.

During all this time and, no doubt, in the prehistoric times as well, State dictatorships, wars, conquests and extended domination, defeats and enslavement, alternated without the slightest manifestation of a will to put an end to this endless round. A strong organism wished only to become stronger, then symptoms of decay became visible and it was as systematically destroyed

as it had been built up, and the old game was restarted—we are still in the midst of it, concluding apparently on one side the liquidation of the Roman Empire—by the translation of the Turkish Centre from Constantinople to Asia Minor, and building this Roman Empire up again in the Centre of the Mediterranean, in Mazzini's and Mussolini's Italy of today. [9]

Meanwhile tribal, national and imperial patriotism were constantly the highest duty of men, education and public life were entirely placed in their service, and this mentality exists today in every part of the globe as it existed in the days of Rome, of the Pharaohs and of Babylon.

Discontent and revolt have been powerless to shake off this yoke. Progress, the work of individuals capable of absorbing by intuition or assiduity greater than usual parts of past general experience and transforming these raw materials in a new way, increasing their general utility,—such progress was almost always made to serve the interests of the rich and the privileged, leaving the people scarcely to drain the dregs of it. It increased comfort, prosperity, production and this gave before all another impulse to conquest for the expansion of commerce. The intellectual discoveries of no immediate marketable value were also almost the exclusive property of that learned class which felt superior to the people and pandered to the rich; only crumbs of knowledge were accessible to the people from the most ancient times to this very day.

Art also was thus monopolized. Its origin lays in the urge to express elated feelings in the breeding seasons, as with animals singing, dancing, volitating when courting. By and by single individuals excelled in such feats and were admired by others, or also collective exercise of this kind accompanied the short spells of security and happiness enjoyed by the family group or the tribe, feasts and ceremonies. But at a certain stage the priests must have seen the influence of such collective fraternizing upon the people and they snatched it away from them, reserving it for the cult of their idols, and so did the rich and the powerful, reserving art of every description to beautify their own life of idleness and enjoyment, alternating with feuds and wars. Artists must always have had very weak characters, for what they gave to the monopolists mentioned as sacred poetry, printing, sculpture, music, dance (the ritual of the churches is such dance) and architecture, as patriotic and laudatory poetry (all the famous epics are nothing else), as amusement for the idle hours of the rich and partial and flattering productions in the interest of the State, exceeds by far their independent productions, genuinely felt lyrics, songs of revolt and satire. To the people arrived but scanty remnants of all this, mostly in an indirect way, as rumors and incomplete or garbled reports used to reach faraway people or as unsalable fashion goods used to be shipped to outlying districts.

What a tragedy was popular education through all these ages! It was simply non-existing for endless periods and analphabetism is by no means extinct today. But a few generations ago the teacher was the village pariah, poorer than the poorest peasant and doling out miserable mites of knowledge of which he himself possessed only the barest rudiments. A semblance of art was

represented [10] by colored prints, gaudy dress materials and the organ grinder—is it better today when real art still remains the privilege of the connoisseur with an educated taste, whilst for the people the picture show, the Sunday editions of the dailies, the gramophone and the radio are all the art they are likely to see? Museums are open to them everywhere, no doubt, but they feel not at home there, as they feel that so much essential information is inaccessible to them.

I do not think that I mix up carelessly or purposely the oldest and the most recent times: they bear really a striking resemblance to each other. Authority's sway, power, conquest and woe to the vanquished, everything for the rich and the offal for the poor, systematic perpetuation of all this by education, religion and every form of public life—all this is sempiternal up til now, is vaunted, intensified before our eyes in the fascist and fundamentalist countries—and what is apparently done in a contrary sense, is, if controlled by the State, public education and all that, a cruel mockery, and, if supported by the progressive elements, still a very small beginning, not quite hopeless, but very weak.

From all this will be seen that the governing classes at all time to their political and economic monopolies—the State and Property—added the equally sacred intellectual monopoly by enlisting all intellectual and artistic forces in their service, excluding the people from real education as rigidly as from State power and productive Property.

Up till now, unfortunately, only a small part of the intelligentsia realized the part they have to play to ensure the permanency of the present system, and how little the role of the modern civil servant, teacher, technical aid, judge, politician, journalist, artist, etc., differs from that of the ancient providers of useful help, advise and amusement for the rich and watchdogs and slave-drivers for the poor. The learned Greek slave in the household of the Roman patrician and the learned professor of Greek who professorship is paid for by a modern American patrician, rank about equally in the estimation of the rich.

It is a task of prime importance to wrest these indispensable auxiliaries from the capitalist system and the State, at least the living portion of them. For a considerable part of them are so hopelessly tied up with the State and with Property, that they put all their strength in perpetuating them in their bureaucracy, lawyers, politicians, journalists, the clergy and all other âmes damnées of every legalized form of chicanery, fraud and quackery and loather and obstruct useful work.

They cherish the well-founded hope that every State will want to employ them, and it means little to them, if an old State is cut up in several [11] new States—on the contrary, this means a multiplication of the bureaucracy and heydays for lawyers, politicians and all other interlopers—or if Capitalist Property is from now dubbed State Property and the State, absolutist, constitutional, republican, is henceforth called socialist. They work for them, and that is sufficient.

To these parasites endemical on the State the free life of voluntary federated associations or similar arrangements of a free society, are an horror, and after a real change in this direction they might rush about in mad despair as Justice Nupkins does in William Morris' interlude The Tables Turned or Nupkins Awakened (1887), until they come in by and by and try to do some work. Bakunin suggested (1868) that those who would not become victims of the first impulse of popular vengeance, made innocuous by the lapse of their property, their inability to make others work for them, should, if they wished to remain outside the new communities, receive wherewith to live and be left to themselves. It is scarcely worthwhile bothering now with such details, though, as Russia has shown since 1917, they may become of actual importance any day after a great crisis. We can only say that neither a system which gives them employment in their present capacities must be installed, nor a coercive system, purporting in the beginning to repress them, and very soon repressing everybody (vide Tche-Ka and G.P.U. in Russia.) Both methods are strange to libertarians and their method would be: to make the new system so attractive that by and by even the less social elements be attracted by it. This would mean the narrowing of this problem to the small number of absolutely unsocial elements, whose treatment according to their behavior might vary between that given to incurable lunatics and to mad dogs, whilst to thorough egoists and others who are not aggressive, the social means to live in their own way apart from the general social life would not be refused nor stinted.

The great number of really useful scientific and technical auxiliaries of the present system, and all who are of general use to humanity, as medical men, teachers, authors and artists of value, etc., is in quite a different position. Before all they do real work and know the value and importance of this work. Being intelligent, they also understand the unity and interdependence of all real work, manual and mechanical, intellectual and artistic. They often do new work, creative and routine work and to remain efficient they keep pace with study and progress in their special domain. This must make them see very often that their present work is [12] curtailed, incomplete, sometimes hopelessly and absurdly hampered, by being subordinated in the last line to the interests of their employers and not at all taking into account the interests of those who will use the products of their work nor those of the community at large.

All this makes them very competent critics of the present institutions and arrangements, and skeptical of the public spirit and general utility of their employers. The doctor sees quite well that his poorer patients require much less bottles of medicine than good food, clean air and rest, which he cannot prescribe for them. The teacher feels that starved children with wretched homes are hopeless material of education. The architect must dance to the tune of the rich client and will design hovels for the poor, if ordered. The scientist is well aware of the limits of research discretely stipulated by the State, religion and other powerful interests. They all feel that the courtesy, compliments, emoluments extended to them by present society, but thinly veil the stern command that

their labor should give a minimum of attention to the poor and a maximum of support to the governing classes, or they will unflinchingly be cut short in their career, become masked men, and not everyone has the mettle to suffer martyrdom. So most of them abandon youthful ideals of pure science and unselfish social service very quickly and drift into conservative routine.

There are always some who act differently, who openly break with the bourgeois interests and side with the people. This is still an event of comparative rarity and as such is often the beginning of new complications which frustrate good intentions at the last moment. The workers meet them with suspicion as transfuges from the bourgeois camp and are to some degree entitled to such distrust by past and present experience principally in the authoritarian socialist (social democratic) ranks where the "academicians," as the German socialists call them, are not slow to enter careers as functionaries, journalists and members of elected public bodies, which lead them soon to the top and possibly to seats in a ministerial cabinet. Then there are socialist doctrines, from Plato to Auguste Comte, which proclaim the government of the wisest, a government by scientists which Bakunin rightly considered the worst of all governments, as being caught from the beginning in the cobwebs of abstraction and farthest from the realities of human life.

But all these are concomitant features of authoritarian socialism, to which necessarily authoritarians are drawn as flies are drawn to sugar. In the antiauthoritarian socialist movements there is no room for leaders and very many young intellects also, from Malatesta and Cafiero to Gori and the two Molinaris, from the brothers Reclus to Louise Michel, from Bakunin to Kropotkin and [13] Tcherkesoff, from Max Stirner to Gustav Landauer, to F. D. Nieuwenhuis and Voltairine de Cleyre and so many others, gave their unselfish and unlimited help to the anarchist movements of all countries. If we deduct their effort from what has been done, we can verify this statement.

If, however, a much greater number of intellectual workers and experts are to join the libertarian movements, some slight modification of the mentality of the components of the movements must precede this, I believe. If the workers are diffident, the intellectual also are in their own way.

Education, knowledge, experience naturally produce a critical spirit, some skepticism and a dislike for simplified solutions, unless warranted by proof. They have learned as doctors to dose their medicaments carefully; as engineers and architects they calculate to a nicety the proportions of a structure, the necessary strength and quality of each part of it, etc., and they must feel on the whole that a State socialist organism, directed by socialist bureaucrats is inevitably an incompetent, wasteful machinery likely soon to be clogged altogether and repairable, for a time, at ruinous cost only,—but they must also feel that for instance the immediate complete free communism, the prise au tas (taking from the heap) would, at the beginning of a new society, be a proceeding exhausting the existing stores in a sort time and then creating want and thus leading to unfavorable conditions for the reorganization of production. Here the

faithful enthusiast would presuppose the quick invention of labor-saving machinery, whilst the technical expert might think that such possibilities or eventual probabilities are not necessarily realities. Such lack of precision, then, must be as repulsive to exact thinkers as the cocksure assurance of bureaucrats ready to regulate production from above by official order and circulars.

Socialism missed too much really competent technical help, and plunging into statistics could not in the least replace such experience. For statistics are illusive materials and require the most varied knowledge, seldom concentrate in a single person, to understand them properly, and, before all, they are mostly State-produced, the indifferent byproduct of officialdom. So those who would not believe a single affirmation by the State, often paid their reverence to very much State-colored statistics.

Thus however ethically perfected a libertarian plan might be, it cannot be exempt from the technical demands upon every sound structure; it [14] may neither be top-heavy nor have plumb in the wings nor be weighed down by lead in the bottom. Here technical knowledge represents the control and verification that the recognized "natural laws" are not ignored, a fact which, in the construction of a bridge for existence, probably only calculations can verify thoroughly and not the guesses of the most skilled riveters.

A technically perfected, anarchically inspired social system would thus be the most attractive to the intellectual worker who is quite aware of the slow and arduous development of every real science. He knows that the genial generalizations, the sweeping would-be solutions which characterize the comprehensive work of the first pathfinders of a new branch of science, are in most cases recognized as fallacies, as conclusions jumped at far too quick, as special research continues—and he will never believe that it should be different with socialism, that any of the many socialist authors of the last hundred years (and which of them?) should just have hit of the way of future development by some genial intuition or superhumanly keen reasoning. This is simply more than improbable and to the man of science socialism (in the widest sense) can only be a working hypothesis which criticism, study and experience modify and bring nearer to a considerable degree of probability, and not a system ne varietur, zealously guarded by believers.

We have the more good reason to make our socialism widely acceptable by, and attractive to the intellectual workers, as the capitalists do what they can, to corrupt them and make them their accomplices altogether. They induce them to poison people's minds by the current literature and press, to poison people's food wherever possible, by skillful adulterations devised by experts, to prepare wholesale poisoning of cities and nations by abusing that splendid science of chemistry to the lever of poison-mongers of the Exili and Brinvilliers type, by inventing poison gases—which the chemical workers, not less traitors to humanity than the chemical students and experts in this line, not less the vilest of poisoners than these, then produce wholesale in most countries. In short, the fair name of science is always more defiled, dragged in the mud, by such

abominable work of technical experts for the most infamous capitalist aim and the present generation of scientists is fast losing the moral standard which was [15] developed in men of science in the centuries of their gradual ascendancy, when persecutions, sometimes martyrdom, left them undaunted and they worked with a will for human progress and intellectual emancipation. When Leonardo de Vinci designed his airplanes, when Montgolfier first rose in his balloon, they thought that they worked for human perfection, friendly inter-communication, not for human extermination by bombs and poison gases. So did the great chemists and all other men of science up to a certain date, when some of them struck the flag of humanity and then began to use their intellect in the service of the eternal enemies of mankind. Let us not lose time and make a bid for the souls of those who still remain true to science!

They would see that free associationist socialism—and anarchism is nothing else—would be the ideal milieu for the unfettered growth of science and intellectual work of every description. Besides the reconstruction of production on lines independent of all private and national interests which now obstruct it, immense work of sanitation and education, decentralization in housing and transmittable productive energies, the raising of the standard of living of the great majority, all this and a growing demand for new labor-saving inventions awaits the most intimate friendly cooperation of manual and intellectual labor.

In bolshevist Russia it was believe for a time that the bureaucracy and the workers alone could carry on production, that technical experts could be improvised by rapid technical education given to workingmen, etc. All this was tried with no regard to cost, with dictatorial energy and profiting at the same time of the continued scientific effort of all other countries and of an immense number of imports from these countries. All to very little result, for improvisation and hothouse forcing are makeshifts which will never produce normal, durable and satisfactorily improving results. This is a great warning not to make socialism so repulsive that genuine intellectual help remains withdrawn from it. The capitalists, averted by the General Strike in England (1926) and other events, are busy to organize the technical intellectuals as strikebreakers providing emergency work in case of a crisis; by this they just show them that they hold real key positions. It would be terrible, if bolshevist arrogance and autocratic fussing were to foul again public sentiment in a coming crisis and drive every person of finer feelings to active or passive resistance to a bolshevist revolution. This would only produce general fascism and ruin a century's socialist hops and efforts for an indefinite period.... [16]

To prevent all this, a special effort should be made to acquaint the intellectual workers with the possibilities of free socialism which differ so absolutely from the now palpable impossibilities of and incongruities of artificial, dictatorial pseudo-socialism. The intellectual workers merit no more the reproach to uphold the capitalist system, than the manual workers themselves, collectively and individually—or: they equally merit this reproach, both. Who is more shabbily treated by the capitalist—the worker to whom a decent life is well-

nigh denied, or the technical intellectual who usually can lead a moderately decent life? Why should therefore the latter feel driven to revolt, when the manual workers has not yet revolted? No manual worker in the main countries can pretend today not to be aware of the claims of labor, of organized labor, of socialist action and the possibilities of great socialist changes. They have all heard of this, only they lack confidence in their great majority and prefer to remain on the safe side—and so do the intellectuals and the professional classes from the ranks of which after all many excellent socialist have come at all time, a greater number of valuable men perhaps one or two generations back when socialism seemed broader, more humanitarian, less a class and party matter. Of the most recognized socialists who originated the main currents of socialism, Babeuf and Buonarroti, Godwin, Saint-Simon, Fourier, Robert Owen, William Thompson, Blanqui, Cabet, Louis Blanc, Pierre Leroux, Lamennais, Tolstoi, Lenin, by the way, Proudhon alone was a workingman, and the best known comrades and continuators of the initiators mentioned were probably in equal parts intellectuals and manual workers almost everywhere.

The task before socialism is so immense, meaning the replacement of secular authoritarian or obedient instincts by the free play of the intellect, that obviously only the elements grown free intellectually can really cooperated to a good purpose, and far less the disparate elements, some free, some unfree, cast together by destiny in a class. A homogeneous smaller body seems more fit to stir and go ahead than a heterogeneous large mass. Such a mass placed in new conditions will not evolve spontaneously or miraculously in a wonderful and sudden way; rather, if galvanized by the initiative and courage of a minority, it will relapse into incohesion and will always be a tempting object for dictatorial methods, the only “excuse” for which is just the lack of initiative of such an unwieldy mass. The “dictatorship of the proletariat” is bitter irony: it is just because the proletariat as a mass is unable to do anything, least of all to be a dictator, that a minority usurps a dictatorship over it ad with the help of its brute force, over everybody else. Usurpation may last an indefinite time, but never for a moment can it be called socialism. [17]

So a frame should be created large and wide enough to enable the cooperation of all mentally free and socially disinterested persons. Organizations and parties hold together people of the same opinions, but separate them as well from so many others who are near to them, yet so much apart. All this leads away from real life. We fritter away our chances by dogmatical and class isolation. But before all, as I tried to emphasize in this chapter, the workers and the intellectual elements must be wielded together in frank friendship: then, the moment the support of both is withdrawn from capitalism, the present system must collapse, as the parasites alone, State officials and Property holders cannot live; no parasite can live without a Nährboden [culture medium] and the living and working portion of mankind will refuse someday to be the permanent Nährboden of parasites.

III. Workers, peasants and class socialism.

Mankind is far more divided into people in whom progressive or reactionary tendencies are predominate in ever-varying degrees, than into classes which are agglomerations of a relative homogeneity of position, but of considerable diversity in disposition and tendency. Let us consider the non-capitalist classes,—workers and the minor categories of clerks and assistants, small peasants, farmers or tenants and, in the European continent at least, many categories of small artisans, independent home workers, very small agents and petty officials, etc. Some of these own their tools and earn no wages, but they are certainly not capitalists on this account: their position is hardly better, sometimes worse and more insecure than that of the worker, and to rise into the ranks of real capitalists is out of the question for them. All these form a mixed world with every so many ups and downs, small places in sunshine and many back corners and endless monotonous stretches, a barren and rugged country in which they have got, by small improvements and are glad that they are not still worse off. Class consciousness is a very recent bookish word and sentiment imported into this ancient world of the dispossessed and meaning little to them; they knew all along that they are poor, have small chance in life and must make the best of it, but they have been driven by the hard struggle for existence to look out for themselves best and all round solidarity within their class goes against their acquired habits and mentality. The outside observer, the faraway statistician see them as a class, just as we may see mountains from a large distance as white or gray or brown and green colored slopes. [18] But these mountains are full of clefts and chasms, ravines and crevices, and so the non-possessing class contains many hierarchies, careers and possibilities of which the persons composing it are far more aware than of the solidarity suggested to them with strangers in a relatively similar position to theirs, but who to them are either rivals or indifferent or people whom they consider to be beneath them. Every trade considers neighboring trades its superiors or inferiors, possibly also sometimes its equal, but this recognition of equality is rather reserved to faraway and quite indifferent trades. Every workingman sees certain chances before him to rise and is careful to avoid to sink to what he considers a lower state. He will make a bid, according to this stamina, for a higher position in his trade and further advancement or at least for a snug berth, relative security of employment and a have of rest for his old age. He will often try to give his children a better chance by education and may hope that these children, rising from their class, may later provide for their parents. He has very often not severed links connecting him with his people in the country, small farmers, and may see a chance of returning there in his later days and so on. There is much self-seeking in this, but also much very natural effort to improve the hard lot which would condemn a man to pass his life slaving at the same job like a life prisoner in a cell. Class solidarity is an empty word to the

people described here and they may do lip service to it, but it strikes not at their heart.

Very many others have given up the struggle to improve their situation individually, as hopeless: to these class consciousness, class solidarity are invigorating promises, hopes and ideals, cheering them up a renewal of the feeling of solidarity which religious communion used to give.

The point is whether this sentimental unification, to class consciousness of the non-possessing class by individual effort will prevail, which factor is the stronger and whether one of these factors will be able to eliminate the other or nearly so?

The question permits us no sweeping answer one way or the other and, of course, the situation is extremely different according to localities and periods of time. Class consciousness also must lead to something—to the Socialist State or to the free libertarian society, and its advocacy is connected with the movements of these two tendencies: therefore the results are also dependent on the interest taken by the workers in one or the other of these conceptions. There is, of course, a third tendency, that of the immediate practical labor struggle, forced upon the workers for their own protection against their utter ruin by greedy capital,—trades-unionism pure and simple.

Then there are reforms and improvements, [19] partly enforced by trades-union action, partly imposed by general legislation as a minimum of precautions against the physical and other decline of the producers by overwork, underfeeding and absence of hygienic protection, etc. Such measures, organization, education, the situation of industries and trade, etc. differentiate the categories of workers, paralyze nascent feelings of solidarity, stave off revolts and bring about a century's social history of ceaseless efforts with no definite results.

There is, of course, an immense difference between the state of things in 1828 and 1918, yet the dead weight of the past paralyzes the masses now as then, only in other forms, and whatever happens, after a generous start is being vitiated, frustrated, brought to naught. Be it the Russian Revolution, the Italian and Spanish renascent hopes in postwar years, the German revolutionary convulsions of these year, fresh American efforts, the English General Strike of 1916, various advanced efforts in France, etc.—all ended in failure and led to ferocious repression in new forms like fascism which no one would have considered possible only a few years ago. I prefer to see these facts in the eye instead of being fascinated by the statistical growth of membership in parties and organizations and the unbroken faith and enthusiasm of many devoted comrades.

The fact is that too many of the working classes are only very lukewarm, if not altogether recalcitrant, indifferent and negative elements in the great struggle. Vulgarity, narrowness, routine, callous indifference are their characteristics, they have no faith in social progress and will not take any risks. They may be made to case socialist votes and to become members of large,

almost obligatory organizations, they may be attracted by labor sport, labor hawking and they may have a look at the sporting columns and comic corners of labor dailies, but here their interest ends and very many do not go as far as that even. They will work for capitalism to the last our of that system and submit to dictatorship the next hour after. No authoritarian socialist propoganda seriously wishes to change this state of things from two reasons: because their numbers of voters and nominal members might be reduced, if they bothered these stragglers and camp-followers with higher demands and because the authoritarians have learned by experience that better informed socialists begin to think and often become libertarians: so long since intense propoganda is not at all their most important task. [20] As the less numerous libertarians are before all absorbed by expanding their ranks by really intense propoganda, touching mainly those best proper for it, they must also leave the elements in question untouched and so the years pass along, seeing the most numerous people of Europe, subject to bolshevism, the 40 millions Italian people subject to fascism, other countries entirely in capitalist hands.

The working classes even develop the tendency to divide into a downtrodden mass of real pariahs, kept under what even in U.S.A. was called Cossack rule, private police of the employers and other black gangs, and into better paid skilled workers enjoying a certain comfort and who are only anxious to keep on this higher level and to keep out of labor difficulties, unpopular socialism and syndicalism and all that. In other countries artisans and others may still acquire a certain independence in latter life, becoming small employers. Everywhere the most ambitious have a chance to become foremen and overseers, others slip into the permanent staff and land in some quiet backwater. Very many are in various ways absorbed and sidetracked by family life. All this greatly reduces the possible number of real militants, the fighting strength, of the working classes and explains the inefficacy of so many efforts. This is real life and as such it has a direct hold on people—and only activities rooted in real life also can counteract this, not a varnish of class ideology overlooking so many difficulties.

I am speaking from observation of ordinary life which, as at the back of rich houses lanes of mews and hovels are often found, also shows next door to socialist meeting places entire indifference, ignorance and hostility to socialism. As often as I have seen audiences listen to socialist speakers, as seldom, hardly ever, have I seen socialist ideas mentioned in private life, socialist conduct,—outside the intime milieu of socialists who know other, of course. I do not expect the impossible and I take into account the several well known reasons for reserve. But between this reduced quantity and an almost nothing, there is a very wide difference and this I can only explain in the above way. Vertical elevation by some advancement, not horizontal expansion by solidarity is still the stronger trend and we should recognize that fact, if we wish to be well informed and not under an illusion.

Socialism has so very quickly become what is called respectable, an indoor matter, be the indoor locality a meeting hall or a drawing room. The propagandist ardor of a Robert Owen, of the Saint Simonians of 1831-31, of Cabet and Weitling, the intense contact with all question of public life which was characteristic of Proudhon, the unceasing effort of Bakunin to promote revolutionary activities in his inner circles, Kropotkin's devotion to the Révolté, the paper inspiring the anarchists of all countries, the street corner and park propaganda of the English socialists of the early eighties, in William Morris' time, [21] the bold open propaganda in Paris in the eighties and early nineties, Louise Michel's best years,—all this is extinct and considered more or less as youthful vagaries. It created the best stock of socialists ever existing, but then—under conditions and from reasons which it would take too long to discuss here—these frank outspoken habits were abandoned, organization seemed to be all sufficient and socialism and anarchism almost dropped from the sight of the ordinary public, of those who would like to hear and to see for themselves and to whom indoor lectures, parliamentary discourses and socialism in books and papers are nothing. The Christian religion underwent a similar transition from the ardor to profess of the early Christians to the organization of religious service by a well appointed hierarchy” only this transition from fervor to routine seems to have been much quicker in the case of socialism, which is disappointing.

Therefore the first wave is really ebbing away and it is high time for a new wave to gather strength and to rush onward; for the capitalist stronghold will not fall when only touched by the latter and latest oscillations of an impulse which is not repeated with constantly increasing force.

In all this we have not taken into account the great mass of agricultural producers, in part direct owners of the land (large proprietors and peasants or farmers), inn part working on the land as tenants or as laborers. They have in all ages carried on organized production of food so efficiently that they fed themselves and all the rest of humanity, all the workers and all the parasites (I except details as hunting, homegrown vegetables and poultry, etc. and the domestic economy of exotic tribes.) For a long time they produced also their housing and clothing and many, one might say most articles of their immediate use. That a large part of humanity entirely abandoned the production of food and safely relied upon its regular forthcoming by the efficient work of the agriculturalists, is indeed the first collective effort of humanity, satisfactorily realized on a gigantic scale and it is inevitable that these arrangement have struck very deep roots and are very difficult to modify and ameliorate.

The men of brute force of primeval times who enslaved their fellow me and kept them in ignorance and fear by the priest and the military castes, handed over the land to the serfs perpetually tied to the land and who in the course of ages to this day, have been exclusively connected with the land and cut off from the great majority of cases. To the fatal division of intellectual and manual workers this other fatal division of town and country was added; mankind thus

progressed by a variety of [22] rhythms which prevented solidarity and spread distrust and hierarchy, mutual contempt and domineering. Town-bred people felt superior to the peasant and the peasant reciprocates this feeling. He knows the outside world mainly in the form of landlords and merchants, soldiers, lawyers and tax-collectors, besides the parson and priest, and he hates a society which leads quite another life, has another domestic economy, intellectual and artistic interests, all things inaccessible to him or for which he has no use. At the same time he is quite aware that no food is grown in cities and that he wields the most powerful monopoly, the production of the vital parts of the food supply: this makes him stick to the land by all means and exact the largest price he can get for agricultural produce. Such mentality and will make him extremely distrustful of and hostile to socialism and obstruct at the same time the practical realization of a complete socialism in the most awkward way.

Under such conditions rebellions of the peasants in the middle ages and later met with no response of the town workers and vice versa and the peasants were often the best help of reaction to crush progressive movements. They were cruelly defeated in their large revolts in France, England, Germany, Russia and other local revolts in Italy, Spain, etc. and since then they stir only in the wake of revolutions, not by their own initiative. This applies in my opinion to the French revolution where agrarian revolt, the burning of castles, etc. only began with the cry for reforms was general, the financial breakdown imminent, the defiance of royal power spreading in Paris and other towns. Later they obtained much of the land as private property and from that time their policy was to support the strongest autocrats, the two Bonapartes, lest the royalist of the restoration and the bourgeois of Louis Philippe's time take the land away from them.

In Russia neither the general progressive effort of the later fifties and early sixties, nor the socialist propaganda of about 55 years and more, the beginning of the sixties to 1917, awakened the peasants from their apathy to any extent, but when the tsarist power broke down, they seized what they could get hold of, of the land and since then they are well aware that the new system depends on them for the food supply and cannot wrench the land from them in favor of a socialist collectivity or a socialist State. They showed their teeth when force was used against them, at least by passive resistance, the strangling of their production, and they are not to be inveigled by cajolery and flattery either, nor does propaganda interest them. Of cooperation they accept, as the Scandinavian, the Swiss and other peasants do, what is useful to them to [23] produce marketable good fetching the best prices to their own personal profit. In the same way the dozens of millions of Russian peasants will sooner or later make other arrangement controlled by the State and public bodies serviceable to them, the means of transport, commercial treaties, subventions, etc., just as the agrarian parties of all countries do for some generations now.

The English revolution of the seventeenth century did not touch at the land monopolies dating from the Norman conquest and farther back, Winstanley and

“the diggers” being promptly suppressed. The French and the Russian revolutions let the peasants take most of the land as their private property. the European liberal movements and the political revolutions of 1848 abolished what was left of feudalism and established peasant proprietorship of the land, England excepted where the land system was little changed, as food imports from all parts of the globe make the population increasingly independent of local agriculture.

In the United States unlimited quantities of land were settled individually or became company property, all on the principle of absolute proprietorship of the land. Thus the peasants as exclusive proprietors of the land have won on the whole line, in Europe, the British Empire, U.S.A. and probably the whole of the three other continents. I except South America where companies and individual appropriators of large areas of land seem to dispossess the Indians and early settler, a procedure which threatens the weaker peasants everywhere. This created the powerful agrarian parties which usually pursue a policy of exclusively personal material interest at great cost to the whole community and nearly always to the profit of general reaction and perpetuating the acute tension between town and country, intellectual life and industry, and agriculture.

I do not overlook the peasant revolts in parts of Eastern Europe, and of Italy, in the South of Spain, the struggles of the Irish tenants, the Mexican agrarian revolt of twenty years ago; renewed by the desperate stand made by the Yaqui Indians, the Bolivian Indians', the Java natives' and other recent attempts at revolt. But all these are struggles by small peasants or tenants or, in Mexico, local populations with more or less communist customs and institutions among themselves, against large absentee landlords, companies and other nominal, that is legal appropriators of the land and the State protecting them against the real local occupiers who work on the land. The aim is in all cases the uncontested possession of the land by the local population, that is the recognition of private property in land as an inviolable principle. No doubt the peasant who works hard is a more sympathetic owner than the absentee landlord or the shareholder in a land company, but both sides are pack and parcel [24] of the private property system and are fundamentally unsocial and practically one as antisocialist as the other.

Every variety of socialism claims the land and the means of production as collective property of the whole community, and the often repeated cries: the land to the peasant, the mine to the miner are very superficial and purely sentimental exclamation which run in the teeth of all real socialism. Their meaning to intelligent socialists has always been that parasites have no claim on the means of production and their output, that shareholders who never descend into the mine, landlords who may never go near the land should be ignored and thus eliminated. The meaning of these words cannot be, however, that peasant should own the land, miners should own the land—for in that case every category of workers would become the exclusive owners of the machinery

of their trade and a new society would consist, not of competing owners and shareholders as today, but of competing corporations of workers—an utterly undesirable and antisocial state of things.

Consequently peasant revolts conquering their exclusive property of the land cannot lead to socialism, but lead away from it. They imply a redistribution of private property and the denial of every right of the collectivity to the land. This excludes at one stroke the most useful part of the globe from socialist cooperation after a social revolution, leaving over the townships and gardens, parts of the forests and mountains (where not used by peasants), the mines and the barren land used for industrial purposes. Socialism thus will be incomplete in the beginning and it is quite evident that free communism cannot be realized when the food supply depends of the peasant landowners who, if they take up a friendly attitude, will at the outmost barter limited quantities of agricultural produce against industrial products, an exchange in which they will dictate the terms and not the industrial producers. Or else there will be coercion, fighting and an authoritarian system will be confronted by passive resistance, the strangling of cultivation.

This awkward problem cannot be solved nor attenuated to an important degree by the production of food by the workers themselves, intensive culture, agricultural settlements, etc. For every piece of good ground is used long since by agriculture and what is left cannot be made to produce normal quantities without extraordinary effort, loss and disappointment. A new society cannot begin competent production without competent instruments and these, the land, would not be accessible, as the peasants hold it.

This is a fact produced by historical developments which are accomplished facts and cannot be undone and should not be ignored, but boldly faced. For long ages the property-holding and the property-less classes were neatly separated, landlords, manufacturers, merchants here—serfs or tenants and workers there, with quantities of independent artisans and free peasants aside of them. In industry this situation remains and became just the system which a social revolution will have to overthrow, if it is [25] to be changed in the interest of the real producers. But in agriculture the bulk of the serfs and tenants have become free peasants and, like the free artisans, the small employers, are now on the side of property, its rights and its defense.

Being divided of old, town-workers and countrymen never made simultaneous moves and have thus slid apart. A new social crisis will again prove this: the peasants and laborers in the wake of a social revolution in the industrial world will seize everywhere what land they have not yet got and will confront the town population, as they do in Russia, as a solid block commanding noninterference, ready for profitable business and otherwise not interested in the aspirations of the revolutionists.

How later solidarity may be awakened and established is a far-reaching subject which does not call for discussion here: the point is that now and until that great new start may be made, such solidarity does not exist and cannot

exist. Possibly the example of real fraternity practiced in the townships and emanating from them will melt the diffidence and the egoism of the peasant proprietor, or when international solidarity will be a real fact—and food produced wholesale and in abundance by collective effort in districts taken over from lapsed companies, great landlords and the State, will be circulated everywhere, such competition will make the individual peasant's business insolvable,—under such new conditions the peasants might be induced to revise their mentality and live as men with men in the new society. But of all this not even a beginning has yet been made and the ultimate ideal, the combination of intellectual, industrial and agricultural production in varying degrees in every individual, is still far off.

For the present the peasant indeed is—or if he is economic depressed, at least wishes to be—the diminutive image of the lord of the manor, the junker, combined with the petty tradesman and the speculator. His life is intellectually absorbed—as that of the usurer is on money begetting money—on animals breeding animals, grains rendering tenfold the seed, land being added to land as diplomatists and statesman dream to do,—in short property and profit make up his life interest and the intellectual life, the moral aspirations, the artistic delights of mankind are Greek to him. Whether the acquisition of some pianos and the installation of radio and local picture shows in American farmhouses and villages—in Europe too—will alter this mentality, I cannot say, but do not expect; it may assimilate the farmer to the merchant and other property holders in the cities, but certainly not to the advanced elements preparing a free society.

I doubt whether the laborers have yet conceived social ideal different from those of the peasant who, as a practical and often very hard worker, is so near to them, whilst as a hard taskmaster who reaps everything for himself, he is hateful to them. It is difficult, if not impossible, for them to form an independent mentality on a solidarity basis. [26]

By this time no workingman can fairly be unaware of the main aspiration of socialism, social justice, of the existence of socialist parties, organizations, papers, etc., though not inconsiderable numbers are outspoken enemies of socialism, whether they understand it or not under the influence of clerical, nationalist and similar parties. Another considerable portion strictly refuses to take notice of anything serious and is absorbed by vulgar ungacity, sometimes also by sport or hobbies. Then there are millions who may cast votes and enroll as members and subscribe to daily paper, but to whom socialism is not worth a further effort. If it comes, well and good; if not they are not likely to hasten its coming. They feel that they are powerless either way and that there are so many leaders who will be looked after by the more militant socialists and will act when the time has come. Thus the years drag on and little is done, for there is no general widespread enthusiasm, only lukewarm passivity of the millions and the turmoil of party life for a very much smaller number whom I will call the hundred thousands.

These believe in socialism, do local work, but before all are voluntary slaves to "party discipline." They feel that they had expected quicker progress in past years, but the millions of voters fascinate them and they keep the game up, from congress to congress, from election to election.

Within their ranks there are the thousands of really militants, those who make the hundred thousands move in the desired sense and who thus keep somewhat in check the recognized leaders, the inner circles, who must give some satisfaction not to large quantities of members, but just to small numbers of jealous and ambitious militants eager to enter themselves the inner circles. What happened in governments with ministers and their inner circle, the notabilities of the party, the rank and file, the permanent officials, the conventions of delegates and the voters, no doubt happens in the inner life of all the socialist parties and the result is the great sterility of them in thought and action, initiative and original moves and a wasteful continuity of routine, intrigue and interest—a dreary life which if further made more bloodless and shadowy by its keeping pace with that of the other large parties and of governments, since these socialist parties are always ready to step in their place, a prospect which by no means makes them more lively and daring, on the contrary it emasculates them further, since it will require before all pliability, compromise and all the well known virtues proper to "statesmanship."

In such a case the main problem of a "socialist" or "labor" government is to hunt with the dogs and to run with the hares, to ménager la chèvre et le chou, not to hurt the bourgeois, to give some nominal and cheap satisfaction to labor and to put an extinguisher on all [27] leftwing socialists who are so naïve to expect that a labor government would act otherwise. Even then they are usually given a very short shrift.

If the many Communist parties display a well-calculated recklessness, whatever they may say or do carries no conviction, as they are generally considered the puppets of Moscow policy and Moscow aims. Whatever they take in hand loses the true ring, becomes artificial and withers.

There is really no socialist life in all the large parties and organizations—the shadowy millions do not stir and inside scheming and intrigue means stagnation also. Was such a deadlock really inevitable? Perhaps it was, for these two facts might explain it: socialists of full conviction and a socialist will and energy cannot be multiplied ad libitum, and overlarge masses are unwieldy. Thus millions of votes carry no real weight, because there is no corresponding energy behind them, and this energy, so completely latent and unawakened 150 or 200 years back, still seems to be awakened only in the tens or the hundreds of thousands, certainly not in the millions. In the libertarian sense the proportions are much smaller still: here also we must not believe occasional sympathies and enthusiastic local reels capable of continuous libertarian action.

From all this the small probability of large, unique, simultaneous, homogeneous changes results, in my opinion. Even the initial decisive acts, the revolutionary victories, are usually the action of a minority, endorsed by

general consent when it has been successful. From that moment the effort of universal homogeneous action provokes dissensions, strife, majority rule or dictatorship, and the coercion of the dissidents. This leads to the strengthening of authority and either a revolutionary dictatorship or, when authoritarian acts have isolated the revolutionary governments, to its final fall by a counterrevolution. If such was the fate of political revolutions, it will be so much more the fate of social revolutions imposing all-important social changes. The larger these changes are, the more they require careful, not summary treatment of the situation, a eugenic and not a brutal or haphazard handling.

Socialism cannot be largely the outcome of a situation imposed to a non-socialist population by a minority of convinced and militant socialists. It is the cause of mankind, not that of a class and must be realized in the first instance by the elements belonging to all classes which are capable of free and solidary feeling, initiative and action. [28] This means that we must far more than is usually done, call for the cooperation of all these elements and not be hypnotized by quite formal units like classes which, aside of class-conscious minorities, contain refractory majorities. Let us, from dogmatic exclusivism, return to the facts of real life.

IV.

Socialism must be thorough and complete, otherwise it could never emancipate mankind from mental and material serfdom imposed upon its major part by minorities which are far from being free themselves, but which are in a position to indulge in domination and exploitation, protected by the organization of force in their favor and by the dumb submissiveness of large masses.

Historically, authority and property may even have had an inoffensive, nay somewhat progressive origin. Protection and instruction of the weak and ignorant—as between mother and child, father and child, teacher and pupil, expert and apprentice—create relations of voluntary submission to stronger and better informed benevolent useful elements and on this basis such submission to superiority may have extended its sphere, until it degenerated into customary obedience to authority. Property can have one of its origins in a reasonable care for objects of personal use and familiarity—favorite tools and weapons, wives, etc.—which even some finer organized primitive savages might have wished to exclude from promiscuous use. It had probably a further root in the diversity of natural surroundings providing food and shelter, when with population increasing settler in favored sites were unwilling to make room for new arrivals from poorer districts. Be this as it may, authority and property by wildest abuse overgrew long since any original palliative reasons of their existence and have become the source of universal tyranny and usurpation, privilege and parasitism, and the progressive part of mankind wishes to put freedom and solidarity in their place.

This will never be done by half measures and less, skindeep partial solutions tainted themselves with authority as a means and handing over property to a new abstraction apparently, a socialist State or similar organization, to a new category of elected and bureaucrats in practice, thus withdrawing it again from general use by the living people. This denial of freedom and interception of property by a new class, authoritarians by profession, the social democratic State, the sovietist State, the fascist State a medieval clerical State a [29] workers' corporatist organization and similar attempted or planned systems, is essentially reactionary and can only be realized by misdirecting and stunting the beginning efforts of emancipation of the people.

Therefore those who stand up for real socialism, cannot have anything in common with these deformations of social ideas, and must go their own way, recognizing the hard facts that very many who sincerely believed to be socialists, have been under a self-illusion and are merely content to struggle in the penumbrous wilderness where social democrats, bolshevists, fascists, corporatists, clericals and others waste their useless existence as would-be opponents of a system to which they are tied by the authoritarian infection, inveterated in all of them. This means not isolation of the anti-authoritarians, if they only open their eyes and look out for contact with the living part of humanity. This would imply that they recognize incipient stages tending towards their aims, and do not expect to see their aims realized at one stroke by a magical transformation scene, a shifting of curtains taking away one system and improvising another.

Small beginnings are proper to all organisms, but incomplete beginnings lead to nothing. To use a trivial comparison, from an egg however small under favorable conditions a new organism will grow, but if an egg however large, is cut into small pieces, of these mutilated and dead parts nothing will grow. The first comparison applies to the man incipient stages towards a free society which I hope to see realized by and by, the second applied to the authoritarian socialist attempts and plans of re-composing socialist bit by bit after they have cut it into pieces and killed it. at the outmost they may succeed in attaching such morsels to the present system which is large enough to assimilate and to reabsorb them; the masses were in turn called slaves, serfs, wageworkers, they may fit in as well with the same system as organized corporations under authoritarian rule, bearing another name and enjoying a minimum of reforms keeping them in good working order.

I am the last who might wish to undervalue the importance of reforms. Being a positive improvement a sensible reform removes obstacles and clears the way to fresh advance. Only this is as obvious as ordinary regulations of a normal healthy life are, it has nothing to do with socialism, must not absorb the almost exclusive care of many socialists and be mistaken and misrepresented as instalments of socialism wrestled from capitalism. This elementary struggle was a dire necessity to preserve their very lives, forced upon the workers in the

early days of the factory system (second half of the 18th century and first half of the 19th) when men, women, girls and boys and indirectly infant children were thrown into the jaws of the [30] factory hell as fuel is thrown in the mouth of a furnace, and left this kind of life in early age in their coffins or as wrecks. Then organization (trades unions), destruction of machinery (luddites), the so-called trade outrages against black sheep, hopes put in democracy (Reform bill, Chartism), factory inspection, labor legislation and shorter hours, anti-Corn laws and free trade, etc.—all became means to the end of re-establishing relatively tolerable conditions of work, such as had prevailed for centuries among artisans and in early manufacturing times, or better ones. In this everyday struggle socialists took a fair part and often a leading one—well and good, but when they compared the still small numbers of real socialists and the large numbers of workers who could be recruited in the course of reforms, as organized members, as voters, etc., they were tempted to identify their cause with that of these large masses and to put aside socialism and become the leaders of large reform parties was more attractive to very many of them, than to profess real socialism. So they practically constitute reform parties, essential and inevitable for the daily struggle, with very nominal professions of socialism somewhere in the preamble of their programs.

This led to their nominal aggrandizement and there would not even be an objection to it, if they had openly state that this kind of activity, the uncompromising defense of the workers in their every hour's need, was a social activity interesting them more, or appearing to be of greater importance to them, than real socialist propaganda and action. Being absorbed in this way, they ought the more have been glad to see others pursue thorough socialist activities aside of them. This is exactly what they have not done and scorn to do.

They pretend to be the unique socialist current and they masked their dogmatism which has all the characteristics of a religion, with the name of science, thereby spreading more confusion than the religionists themselves who, at least, were honest enough to derive their dogmas from "revelation" (whatever that may be) and to claim their acceptance by faith. Science is based on quite different foundations, observation and experiment and conclusions or hypotheses deducted from these by the best available methods. Yet by one more of their many usurpations, those socialists who cater for the support of the greatest possible number of workers in order to become the leaders of dictators of this large number, usurped also the name of science, "scientific socialism," for their very vulgar struggle for power by all means which has nothing to do with science nor, except as leading away from it, with socialism. [31]

Retracting and summing up the early expressions of socialism, we can surmise that for endless ages men had before them the spectacle of cooperation in family groups and in moments of danger or enthusiasm cooperation of large units, then the severity, the outrages, the idle life of hard masters and the eternal drudgery of the poor also the hopelessness of individual revolt against

injustice and exploitation and the insufficiency of collective revolt on a small scale, bands of robber, etc., also.

From all this and the hopes held out by the priests of a happy after-life, compensation and retribution in an imaginary heaven and inferno, from observation of the waste in competitive production, hierarchal organizations, non-producing castes (the military caste), etc.,—when abstract reasoning was originating at all, at a rather late period, then, (early Greece, etc.)—systems of society were excogitated based on justice and equality and ensuring general happiness and a modicum of freedom.

Freedom was little known by practical experience at that time, in the centuries when only tribal chieftainship and the amalgamation of tribes to the kingdoms of oriental despotism were before those communities in which, under favorable conditions, civic life, intellectual effort and higher forms of art first developed—the Greek communities in Asia Minor, the islands, the maritime parts of continental Greece and Greek colonial townships in the form of local tyrans was gradually weeded out by the cooperation of the public spirited citizens, whilst in social matters slavery, helotism, the enslavement of women, continued. On this basis the early conceptions of socialism necessarily implied ideal republics with collectivities of enlightened citizens guaranteeing social justice by wise authority and protecting the community against tyranny from above and disorder from beneath. Freedom was an unwelcome additional element, meaning criticism, doubt and disobedience, and eliminated in the ideal commonwealths, as it was in real life by the destruction of refractory thinkers like Socrates and later by the isolation of undesirable critics as philosophic sects of bad odor.

The social ideas were by and by relegated from practical life and transplanted into a remote and regretted, but dead past (the golden age) or into an unknown future (heaven; the day of judgment), whilst the demands for freedom were elevated in the domain of abstraction as the right of nature, that precursor of the rights of man, well known to almost everybody, but never realized anywhere to any extent.

Thus the social and liberal expectation and demands of man were always known, but, strange to say, until the latter part of the eighteenth century very little effort was made to join hand to realize them. [32] Hardly one of the many thinkers and men of action during two thousand years and several centuries devoted himself entirely to these ideas; they were rather obscured by men and collectivities whom other circumstances had placed into isolated and often desperate positions of persecution or rebellion, and they never spread at any time outside such limited milieus, never were taken up by public opinion at large. The reason no doubt was that everybody was deeply rooted in his milieu, penetrated by its special mentality and is so still.

Only the extraordinary concurrence of favorable factors in the latter eighteenth century produced collective sympathies for social and liberal progress. Such factors were the beginning regeneration of science and emancipation from priest-rule and protestant orthodoxy on the European

continent, the spectacle of an immense national emancipation, the declaration of American independence, the financial and moral bankruptcy of royalty and the ancien régime and hopes of democracy; all this generated hopes of radical betterment, political, social and intellectual on the continent of Europe and under such auspices began the French Revolution, desirous in its best representatives to lift humanity to a higher plane, but meeting the greatest obstacles which devoured much of its energy and made it end with very unequal results, in the matter of social justice with complete failure: for the property standpoint and the authoritarian standpoint were reaffirmed and immensely strengthened, witness the bourgeois and the peasant proprietors and the centralized bureaucratic and military State replacing the older forms of exploitation and loose-jointed royal despotism.

In this revolution the Anglo-Saxon world did not participate; neither the English workers and tenant farmers, smarting under beginning capitalism and deep-rooted landlordism, nor the Americans, liberated politically, but not socially, and with slavery in their midst, did join the Revolution in its beginning years when no wars were yet raging; sympathies existed, victims fell, but a real popular effort to join was not made. On the continent [manuscript ends]