

LIBRARY OF RATIONAL SOCIALISM

LIBERTARIAN SOCIALISM OR INDIVIDUALIST ANARCHISM AND RATIONAL SOCIALISM

AGATHON DE POTTER

In issue 7 of *La Question sociale*, published last October, M. Octave Berger equates rational socialists with individualist anarchists and libertarian socialists, including Proudhon. It is important not to allow such confusion to develop; and that is why I will examine several passages from this issue of *La Question sociale*, as well as the letter that an individualist anarchist did me the honor of writing to reinforce M. Berger's assertions.

Let us first reproduce the passages to which I refer:

“Two great thinkers, among others, have developed a system of this kind: PROUDHON and COLINS. Both valiantly attacked any socialist system that does not leave entirely intact the autonomy and initiative of the individual and of associations. Both fought fiercely against the sovereignty of force, the government of majorities, the authority of capital or of numbers; advocated the sovereignty of each individual, the government of Justice *alone* or of the sovereign principle of equal liberty for all, the *impersonal* Authority of Reason *alone*.

“Both, finally, energetically rejected communist socialism, where everything is organized by the community; where the individual is reduced to submitting to the superiority of the state: which alone owns all the instruments of production, distributes them among the citizens under its orders, thus finding itself the sole producer, exchanger, dispenser of consumption; which annihilates, in a word, all autonomy, all initiative, all individual property, ‘this sole shield of personality,’ among individuals or associations.

“Finally, at the present time, *three different schools* defend and deepen, with real talent and not without success, this ANTI-STATIST socialism:

“The *anarchist-individualist* school which admirably expounds, according to Proudhon's ideas, scientific, philosophical, or evolutionary anarchism, and whose remarkable organ is the bi-monthly Review: *Liberty*, of Boston. — The *individualist* school, which comes fairly close to philosophical anarchism and has several very well-made organs in England and America. — Finally, the *collectivist-libertarian* or rational collectivist school of the Colinseans, whose two excellent organs are: *La Philosophie de l'Avenir* and *La Société nouvelle*.

“Without ignoring or underestimating that there may be certain more or less considerable divergences between these three schools: anarchist-scientific, individualist, and collectivist-libertarian, we nevertheless consider them to be very close relatives, sharing striking similarities, and we intend to make all three known and to present here a sort of synthesis; for what all three want and propagate equally is, fundamentally, the same doctrine: libertarian socialism.”

I will divide my work into four parts:

1. What is individualist anarchism or libertarian socialism?
2. Was Proudhon a libertarian socialist or an individualist anarchist? Did he fight the sovereignty of force, the government of majorities, the authority of capital or of numbers?
3. What is the difference between Proudhon's socialism and rational socialism?
4. What is the difference between individualist anarchism or libertarian socialism and rational socialism?

FIRST POINT

What is individualist anarchism or libertarian socialism?

— “There is nothing in common,” my honorable correspondent writes to me, “between the revolutionary communist anarchism of *la Révolte*, of the *l'Homme libre*, etc., and individualist anarchism.

.

“It (individualist anarchism) does not advocate absolute equality.

“Nor does it demand absolute liberty.

“It does not at all preach the absolute autonomy of the individual, nor the ‘do what you want’ of communist anarchists.”

— This tells us what individualist anarchism is not and proves that, in certain respects, it is less illogical than communist anarchism. By not demanding absolute equality, it shows that, at least in this respect, it demands neither the impossible nor the absurd.

If it doesn't demand absolute liberty, for example, liberty from theft and murder, it is probably because it wants limited liberty. But limited by what? By a rule, obviously, indicating what must and must not be done; consequently, by sovereignty, force or reason, which prescribes this rule.

It doesn't want the absolute autonomy of the individual. Perfect. It therefore recognizes that the individual must receive from outside, and not from himself, the laws he obeys.

Now that we know what individualist anarchism is not, let's see what it is.

— “It (individualist anarchism or libertarian socialism) is in no way, in philosophy, a dogmatic materialist; it simply admits its ignorance, whether temporary or forever, of the true nature of the soul; it is not unaware of the necessity of a certain moral value in individuals for the social order to be real, etc.”

— The ignorance with which libertarian socialism struggles, regarding the nature of the soul, amounts, in practice, to the assertion that the soul is material. And therefore I do not understand how this kind of socialism dares to speak of morality or why it calls itself libertarian. Can liberty and morality be conceived in that which is exclusively matter?

I do not understand what follows either, and for the same reason.

— “But what it (libertarian socialism) knows is that liberty is the mother of order, and not order of liberty, that all authority is disastrous; that everything must be done through liberty.”

— To speak of liberty when one begins by, if not denying, at least questioning the essential condition of liberty, is already a sign of a lack of logic.

Maintaining that liberty is the mother of order is further proof of this. Indeed, there is order under despotism, or with the sovereignty of force, when this force can hide behind the anthropomorphic fallacy. Does this mean that the daughter then exists before the mother?

The true mother of order is obedience to the common rule of action.

Order and liberty coexist only under the reign of reason, a reign that cannot be conceived in the materialist hypothesis.

All authority is disastrous, says individualist anarchism. Even the authority of reason? So the so-called libertarian socialist finds himself unhappy having to maintain that two and two make four?

— “It is, also (it is still the defender of individualist anarchism or libertarian socialism who speaks), absolutely egoistic, knowing that everything in man is determined by personal interest.”

— He is right, in his capacity as a practical materialist, a practical denier of real individuality. If he were not, he would have recognized that the motive for actions is not personal interest, but individual interest. But then, basing order on the conflict of personal interests!

— “...does not count at all on altruism, the spirit of devotion, sacrifice; it denies all of this outright, without denying that with such humanity progress is difficult.”

— I believe so. There is only one conceivable progress under these conditions: that which leads to nothingness.

— “... It must admit that if it were proven that there is a law of moral order, it would be infinitely better and would singularly raise the dignity of man, from the rank of animal to that of free and entirely responsible being.”

— This is the admission that, for libertarian socialism or individualist anarchism, there is, in practice, no moral order, no absolute distinction between man and animal, no free will and no real individuality. So, by what right does this socialism adorn itself with the name libertarian, this anarchism take the epithet individualist?

It appears that the editors of the Boston newspaper *Liberty* and the New York newspaper *Twentieth Century* are individualist anarchists who, my honorable correspondent points out, are much more scientific in method than rational socialists. I would have liked to give an idea of what one of them, Mr. Hugh O. Pentecost, thinks about social organization; but the summary of what he provides is very extensive. And besides, what's the point? It's a *creed*, infinitely longer than the Catholic *credo*, and society, which no longer wants and could no longer base itself on any religious faith, will not want or be able to do so on the materialist faith revealed by Mr. H. O. Pentecost.

After reading his summary, I still don't know what the new revelator knows, or what he could possibly teach us.

Let us nevertheless take two articles of his creed.

— “I believe,” he says, “that rent, interest, profit, and taxes are theft.”

— To which one could perfectly well reply:

You believe that; it's possible. But in our age of incompressibility of examination, it's no longer a matter of believing, one must know.

Or again:

You believe that, that's fine. But I believe the opposite. The most curious thing about the matter is that Mr. H. O. Pentecost also believes the opposite.

— “I believe,” he says in a lower voice, “that no one should be taxed in spite of themselves, in favor of the government.”

— Which obviously means:

I believe that one can be taxed in favor of the government, when one voluntarily submits to this taxation, which, then, is not theft.

All of the above is certainly sufficient to legitimize the following conclusion:

So-called individualist anarchism has no right to call itself individualist;

So-called libertarian socialism has no right to call itself libertarian.

Therefore, let us move on to the...

SECOND POINT

Was Proudhon an individualist anarchist or a libertarian socialist? Did he fight the sovereignty of force, the government of majorities, the authority of capital or of numbers?

What does Proudhon think of unity, indivisibility, individuality?

— “The *one* is only a hypothesis,” he says; “the self is not a being; it is a fact, a phenomenon, that is all.”

— And what does he think about psychological liberty?

— “All of us, as long as we live, are, without realizing it, and according to the measure of our faculties and the specialty of our industry, thinking springs, thinking wheels, thinking pinions, thinking weights, etc., of an immense machine which thinks thus and which runs all by itself.”

— This is indeed the affirmation of universal automatism, and consequently the negation of the existence of psychological liberty.

Denying this liberty, he logically had to proscribe social liberty. And this is what he does by rejecting the collectivity of the soil, outside of which this liberty does not exist.

— “All the socialists,” he said, “Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen, Cabet, Louis Blanc, the Chartists, have conceived agricultural organization in two ways: either the plowman is simply an associated worker in a large agricultural workshop, which is the commune, the phalanstery; or, with territorial property being recalled to the State, each cultivator himself becomes a tenant of the State, which alone is the owner, the sole rent-earner. In this case, ground rent counts in the budget, and can even replace it entirely.

“The first of these systems is both governmental and communist: for this double reason, it has no chance of success. A utopian, stillborn conception...

“The second system seems more liberal... I confess that, for my part, I dwelled for a long time on this idea, which allows a certain amount of liberty, and in which I found no legal irregularity to criticize. However, it has never

completely satisfied me. I always find in it a character of governmental autocracy that displeases me; I see in it a barrier to the liberty of transactions and inheritances, etc...”

— In short, Proudhon discovers so many supposed drawbacks to the collectivity of the soil that he does not want it and thus deprives himself of the means to establish social liberty.

Proudhon fought for the sovereignty of force, for the government of majorities and for the authority of capital, just as he had fought in favor of individual ownership of the soil.

— “Such is the prestige of force,” he said, “that, where it exists, the vulgar are inclined to admit that there is authority and consequently right.”

— This is precisely what happened to Proudhon; he sided with the vulgar in this respect.

— “I am now saying,” he affirmed, in effect, “that there is a right of force, by virtue of which the stronger has the right, in certain circumstances, to be preferred to the weaker.”

— And since the strong will always, naturally, take care to claim that circumstances are favorable to them, it is quite permissible to see, in this declaration of Proudhon, that he was a supporter of the sovereignty of force.

— “There does not exist,” he said again, “a right of man and of the citizen, by virtue of which the individuals who make up the population of a country can, by the sole fact that they are men and citizens, demand from their government respect for their liberties, if they do not possess at least the qualities which make the citizen and the man, strength, courage, understanding of the law, domestic virtues, frugality of morals, love of work and, above all, the firm resolution to sacrifice goods and life rather than allow their dignity to be undermined.”

— For Proudhon, the right of man means only the right of the *strong* man, and true sovereignty is that of force.

And this sovereignty of force, he naturally transfers from the social domain to the domestic domain.

— “My opinions on the family,” he says, “are closer to Roman right than to any other theory; the father of the family is, for me, sovereign; his rights over his wife and children are almost *unlimited*, and if the family principle is weakening among us, I attribute it above all to our legal prudence, which has restricted the authority of the leader and created, in practice, a host of loopholes for the insubordination of children and women.”

— And again:

— "It is not wrong to use *vigor* when necessary, vigor of speech, of will, of action, *even of gesture*... Man has FORCE, it is to use it; without force, the woman despises him, and it is still a way to please her, to fascinate her, to seduce her, to make her feel that one is strong."

— And again:

— "It is necessary that the man, in his relations with her (the woman), know how to make her feel that he is for her, not only a lover, but a father, a leader, a master; *above all a MASTER*."

— Force, always force! This is all that is found in Proudhon. This right of force necessarily has as its corollary the government of majorities, the supremacy of capital or of numbers. And this is indeed where Proudhon arrives.

— "Let us suppose in a country," he said, "two races of men mixed, one of which is physically superior to the other, as man is to woman:

"Assuming that the strictest justice presides over the relations of this society, which is expressed by the words: equality of rights, the strong race, with equal numbers and all things considered, will obtain three shares out of five in collective production: that is all for the public economy.

"But that is not all: I say that for the same reason the will of the strong race will weigh, in the government, as three against two, that is to say, with equal numbers it will command the other, as happens in limited partnerships, where decisions are taken by a majority of shares, not of votes: that is all for politics."

— It is impossible to assert more bluntly and cynically than the fact that the most severe justice consists exclusively in the right of brute force, that of muscle and that of money.

— "All public limited companies," he also says, "in which the industrial and commercial action of a country is distributed, must form a harmonious whole whose expression is government."

— And again:

— "For the future, liberty, security, wealth belong to big capital."

— Come now! Is it possible to seriously regard Proudhon as the adversary of the authority of capital, of the sovereignty of force?

Let us conclude, then:

It is not permissible to call Proudhon an *individualist* anarchist or a *libertarian* socialist;

It is not permissible to consider him as having fought in favor of the sovereignty of reason, against the right of force or majorities, against the crushing of man by capital.

THIRD POINT

What is the difference between Proudhon's socialism and rational socialism?

It would be appropriate first to agree on the expression: *socialism of Proudhon*, for there are few subjects on which the famous publicist did not write in both black and white.

But let us skip this difficulty and content ourselves with noting the differences relative to the points discussed by M. Berger in his *Question sociale*. For the convenience of the reader, I will reproduce part of the quotation I gave at the beginning.

“Two great thinkers, among others, have developed a system of this kind: PROUDHON and COLINS. Both valiantly attacked any socialist system that does not leave entirely intact the autonomy and initiative of the individual and of associations. Both fought fiercely against the sovereignty of force, the government of majorities, the authority of capital or of numbers; advocated the sovereignty of each individual, the government of Justice *alone* or of the sovereign principle of equal liberty for all, the *impersonal* Authority of Reason *alone*.

“Both, finally, energetically rejected communist socialism, "where everything is organized by the community; where the individual is reduced to submitting to the superiority of the state: which alone owns all the instruments of production, distributes them among the citizens under its orders, thus finding itself the sole producer, exchanger, dispenser of consumption; which annihilates, in a word, all autonomy, all initiative, all individual property, "this sole shield of personality," among individuals or associations.

— Colins valiantly attacked, in fact, any socialist system that does not leave the initiative of individuals or associations entirely intact. This is why he first established that man is truly capable of initiative, and then fought Proudhon, according to whom, as I have shown, we are pure automatons.

Colins, in fact, fought against the sovereignty of force, against the government of majorities, against the authority of capital or numbers; and in this it is impossible to find the slightest resemblance between him and Proudhon, who, as I have shown, defended the sovereignty of force, the government of majorities, the authority of capital or numbers.

Colins, in fact, advocated the sovereignty of reason; but it was for this reason that he rejected the sovereignty of the individual, on the principle that the coexistence of two sovereignties is absurd. Proudhon, on the contrary, fought against the sovereignty of reason. I have already proven this, and the reader will be able to verify it again by reading what follows.

— “If,” says Proudhon, “like the bee, each man brought at birth a fully formed talent, perfect special knowledge, an infused science, in a word, functions that he must fulfill, but if he were deprived of the faculty of reflection and reasoning, society would organize itself. We would see a man ploughing a field, another building houses, this one forging metals, that one cutting clothes, a few others storing the products and presiding over the distribution. Each, without seeking the reason for his work, without worrying whether he is doing more or less than his task, would follow his ardor, bring his product, receive his salary, rest at the hours, and all this without counting, without jealousy of anyone, without complaining about the distributors, who would never commit injustice. Kings would govern and not reign, because to reign is to be a *proprietor* of manure, as Bonaparte said; and having nothing to command, since everyone would be at their post, they would serve more as rallying points than as authority and advice. There would be a meshed community; there would be no reflective and freely consenting society.

“If suddenly, reflection and reasoning were to be added to the blind but convergent and harmonic instinct of a swarm of bees, *the little society could not survive*.

“First, the bees would not fail to try some new industrial process, for example, making their cells round or square. Systems and inventions would continue until practical knowledge, aided by learned geometry, had demonstrated that the hexagonal shape is the most advantageous. Then there would be insurrections: the drones would be told to provide for themselves, the queens to work; jealousy would arise among the workers, discord would break out, everyone would soon want to produce for their own benefit, finally *the hive would be abandoned, and the bees would perish*.

“*Evil*, like a snake hidden beneath flowers, would have slipped into the honey-producing republic, by the very thing that should have been its glory, by reasoning and *reason*.”

— Society can therefore only subsist, according to Proudhon, through automatism, outside the sovereignty of reason.

Colins, in fact, energetically rejected communist socialism, where everything is organized by the community. And this is why he fought Proudhon, who himself defended universal regulation, in these terms:

— “Society must regulate the exchange and distribution of the rarest things, as well as the most common things, in such a way that everyone can claim and enjoy them.”

— Thus, regulation, by society, of the exchange and distribution of wealth. Now for the regulation of wages.

— "It is painful to say it," wrote Proudhon, "but I regard this declaration as a duty, because it contains the truth: one of the first reforms to be made among the working classes will be to reduce the wages of some while raising those of others."

— Wages must therefore, according to Proudhon, be fixed by law. And what about labor? Well, labor must be regulated like everything else.

— "The idler, the debauched person who, without performing a social task, enjoys the products of society like anyone else, and often more than anyone else, must be prosecuted as a thief and a parasite; we owe it to ourselves to give him nothing, but since he must nevertheless live, to keep him under surveillance and force him to work."

— One would go far with such a system. One could have claimed, for example, that Proudhon did not work or, worse, that he did harmful work; that, consequently, he should be prosecuted as a parasite and thief, sentenced to surveillance, and put to forced labor.

But, however far the system recommended by Proudhon may lead, one never succeeds, by following it, in establishing the initiative of the individual and removing him from the superiority of the State.

We can therefore conclude:

The difference between rational socialism and that of Proudhon is the same as that observed between affirmation and negation, or between being and nothingness.

FOURTH POINT

What is the difference between individualist anarchism, libertarian socialism and rational socialism?

I will not repeat why anarchism cannot call itself individualist, nor why so-called libertarian socialism does not deserve this epithet. I have already given my reasons, and there is no need to dwell on them.

I will examine the other differences that separate anarchist theory from rational socialism, and I will take as my theme of discussion the letters that M. Octave Berger's friend, an individualist anarchist like him, wrote to me on November 5 and 10, 1891, to explain the differences he believed he had discovered between the system of which he had made himself the defender, and the one we are trying to propagate.

Let us first make a remark.

I do not deny that there are more or less numerous points of contact between the theories of Proudhon and certain anarchists, and that of Colins. This is all

the less surprising since, as Colins often claimed, he advanced nothing that had not been said before him. Moreover, there has never been an absolutely bad social system, that is, one containing only errors or absurdities. Colins's merit was to discover and recognize truths where they were hidden, and to coordinate them in such a way as to form a logical whole. The defect of other social theories is to lack a rational basis.

That said, let us look at the main passages of the letter in question:

– “Individualist anarchism simply demands the progressive abolition of the State, monopolies and compulsory taxes.”

– Individualist anarchism here confuses the State and government. The State, under the sovereignty of force, is the ensemble of the *strong*; under the sovereignty of reason, it is the aggregate of all. To seek the abolition of the State, in this latter sense, is like demanding the extinction of the sun: it is an absurdity.

Taxes, under the sovereignty of reason, are always freely consented to, as, moreover, under the sovereignty of force masked by sophistry. Taxation, or social income, is the price of order, and since everyone understands that order is indispensable to social life, the payment of its cost is as voluntary as that of any object one purchases.

– “The land, to those by whom it is used personally,” continues individualist anarchism.

“Certainly, it is only fair that, in compensation for the free enjoyment of the land, isolated individuals or associations recognize that they morally owe something to society in exchange.

“But they must recognize this themselves, through voluntary taxation.”

– From the moment an individual or an association is authorized to exploit a portion of the land, and the entire land belongs to the community, the tenant owes it rent. This rent is voluntary, since no one, in the future society, will be forced to rent land.

I don't understand what it means to *morally* owe something to someone. But what I do understand very well is that, if we recognize that we owe something to society, it is to society that we must give it, and not to a mass of associations separate from the community, as individualist anarchism apparently proposes.

– “Instead of paying 200, 400, 500 francs to the community for the land he cultivates,” he says, “the individual will pay, for example: 50 francs per year to the free association, which will take care of the instruction and education of the children; 50 francs to the one that will care for the sick or the elderly, etc., etc.”

– The system of individualist anarchism consists of saying: I recognize that I owe you, society, such a sum in exchange for the use of your land. Well, I will

give you nothing. Is this what he calls a *moral* debt? In any case, this means of paying off a debt is hardly moral.

And then: the individual tenant of society will pay so much to one association, so much to another, says individualist anarchism. I am not certain. I even lean toward the opposite opinion. Isn't this rent, in this system, voluntary, taking the word in the sense of optional, arbitrary, subject to whim? One would have to have a very poor opinion of individualist anarchists to believe that they would pay anything in order to obtain what they can have for free.

— “Then the State, this great monopolist, will have given way to 'free' associations.”

— Libertarian socialism has, once again, failed to notice one thing: when the State is composed of everyone, it will no longer be either a large or small monopolist, because a monopoly benefiting everyone is no longer a monopoly, strictly speaking.

Then, another question: Who has an interest in ensuring that the young generation of each era is raised and instructed in the knowledge of the truth? Is it the community or a particular association? If it is the State, it must bear the burden and responsibility of providing education and instruction to children. Who has an interest in ensuring that communications are made numerous and inexpensive? Is it the community or a particular association? If it is the State, it must do what is necessary for this. But let us note that this in no way prevents individuals or associations from collaborating with the State in these matters, whenever possible.

— “To regulate, for example,” says libertarian socialism, “the allocation of lots (of land), there will be an association charged with this task.”

— Charged? And by whom, please? If it is by the State, why abolish the State?

— “Individualism in no way denies the need to administer things; what it denies is only any territorial or civil service centralization, any imposed hierarchy, not voluntarily consented to.”

— Which means that individualism accepts any hierarchy voluntarily consented to, or imposed by reason. This is very good. What is no longer so is that it rejects any administrative centralization. Where interests are identical, the administration must be one.

— “And why should we not have the right to call this rational anarchy or libertarian socialism?”

— But for the simple reason that individualist anarchism accepts, as you just said, freely consented hierarchy, and that anarchy and hierarchy are two mutually exclusive expressions.

Let us continue our examination of individualist anarchy and its contradictions.

I have shown, in discussing the first point, that individualist anarchism, which also calls itself libertarian socialism, differs from rational socialism in that it claims that everything in man is determined by *personal* interest, while in reality, everything is determined, as the latter type of socialism demonstrates, by *individual* interest. I have further shown that socialism, which prides itself on being libertarian, begins, if not by denying, at least by questioning the existence of liberty in man. There is no need to dwell on this. But, I would ask my honorable correspondent, how could he have found so many points of contact between the theory he defends and rational socialism!

I take the liberty of raising a difficulty for M. Berger and his friend.

According to M. Berger, individualist anarchism demands the substitution of the “majestic sovereignty of reason” for that of force. According to my honorable correspondent, on the contrary, individualist anarchists demand:

— “The sovereignty of the individual and of associations, replacing that of the State, of a privileged class, of capital, of numbers, of force, of *science*.”

— I don't really see how the sovereignty of reason, however majestic it may be, could exist outside that of science, or rather, I don't see any difference between these two expressions.

In his second letter, M. Berger's friend summarizes the major analogies he has observed between individualist anarchism and rational socialism; and he concludes this statement as follows:

— “Individualist anarchism is Colinism, minus:...”

— Be careful, at least. We will see how little this less amounts to.

— “1. The collection of a rent by the community;

“2. Instruction and education monopolized by the State;

“3. Public services monopolized by the State, etc.

.

“The Colinsians say: Collective ownership to the maximum.

“The individualists say: Individual ownership for each. As for collective ownership, *if it is truly necessary*, let it emerge from the initiative and solidarity of individuals and groups themselves.”

— And this is how the great analogy between the two theories is demonstrated. And my honorable correspondent seriously asks me if I do not agree with him that the individualist doctrine has many points of contact with rational socialism! But it is absolutely as if he had said, in his summary:

individualist anarchism and rational socialism are two similar theories, only they differ in every respect.

Conclusion: What separates individualist anarchism from rational socialism consists of the following:

1. Individualist anarchism attempts to build its social edifice without basing it on an unshakable foundation: the existence of psychological liberty. Rational socialism, on the contrary, begins by establishing this foundation and then deduces the entire social organization from it;

2. The first theory recognizes (and still not always, as I have just shown) that the land must belong to the community, and that those who exploit it are required to pay a usage fee in exchange; but that it is not the owner of the land who should be paid... when one agrees to pay. The second theory, on the contrary, claims that land rent is due to the one to whom the land belongs;

3. Individualist anarchists do not want the State to be responsible for educating the younger generations. Rational socialists maintain that since the State, that is, everyone, has an interest in ensuring that they are educated, it is up to the State to take charge of this task.

I could list many more differences between the two social theories, but I believe the preceding ones, which are essential, are amply sufficient to demonstrate the unfoundedness of the claim of individualist anarchists or libertarian socialists.

I therefore conclude my work by giving the following

GENERAL CONCLUSION

M. O. Berger, in issue 7 of his *Question sociale*, had no valid reason to place Proudhon and Colins on the same line regarding the social systems that each of these thinkers expounded; nor to consider individualist anarchist and rational socialist theories as very closely related; nor finally to put on the same level, as organs of libertarian socialism: *La Philosophie de l'Avenir* and *La Société nouvelle*, on the one hand, and on the other: *Liberty*, *Twentieth Century*, *The Herald of Anarchy* and some other publications of this kind.

Originally published as “Le socialisme libertaire ou anarchisme individualiste et le socialisme rationnel,” *La Société nouvelle*, 7 no. 83-84 (novembre-décembre, 1891): 555-568.

Working translation by Shawn P. Wilbur; last revised May 30, 2025.

A CORVUS EDITION