

Per Year . . . \$1.00
Six Months . . 50 Cents
Three Months, 25 Cents

The Socialist

To Organize the Slaves
of Capital to Vote Their
Own Emancipation

Ninth Year—No. 423

Seattle, Washington, Saturday, May 29, 1909

Price Five Cents



HAYWOOD DATES

Sedro-Wooley May 23, Olympia 24, Tacoma 25, Aberdeen 26, Elma 27, Centralia 28, South Bend 29, Buckley 30, Wilkeson 31, Edmonds June 1, Bellingham 2, Blaine 3, Friday Harbor 4, on the road 5.

Dates to be filled: Seattle June 6, Stanwood 7, Burlington 8, Anacortes 9, Roslyn 13, Cle Elum 14, Ellensburg 15, North Yakima 16, Sunnyside 17, Walla Walla 18 on the road 19, Spokane 20, Colville 21, on the road 22, Davenport 23.

THE WOMAN

By Bessy Fiset

Two weeks ago I said I would tell about the women's street meeting in the next issue of "The Socialist." This I failed to do owing to the fact that last week's paper was only half size and there was not room for "The Woman." (Isn't it awful how women are pushed out of the way on the slightest pretext?)

But that meeting! Well, it was a success, all right, from start to finish. The women scorned the help of man and "the long and the short" of the women comrades lugged (there is no other word for it) the portable speaker's stand to Fourth and Pike, opened it up, screwed on the gas pipe legs, set it in place and set up the gas pipe frame for the banner.

All this little preliminary work held great interest for the male passers-by, so that by the time we were all ready to begin, the small crowd kindly donated by a S. L. P. speaker was decidedly augmented by a hundred or so curious ones.

Finally the moment arrived; the gong sounded and we were off in a bunch.

One of our women boldly mounted the stand and paved the way for the main speaker (I came very near saying "guy"). This latter was no other than Comrade Hattie Titus. Now, some of you may not know Comrade Titus, and for those who do not I will say that Mrs. Titus is a very substantial person and has no use for any foundation that is not secure. Also Mrs. Titus is not very tall and as the stand is inclined to wobble at times, and as it is fully two feet off the ground, the problem it presented was a serious one.

They graciously accepted the services of Joe Biscay to help them out and actually allowed two of the men comrades to carry the stand and literature.

One of the women got up, after a half hour of sea-sickness and a queer feeling in her legs, and gave a short talk on the "Progress of the Millionaire." After that the women's part of the program consisted of selling literature to the amount of \$3.70.

Maybe you think this is a setback. Not a bit of it! The women are more determined than ever and have made up their minds that they are going to speak on the streets and make a "success" of it, or die trying!

The Woman's State Committee is planning to hold a big street meeting in Everett some time during the convention. Don't you think that will be fine?

By the way, speaking of Everett, the Women's Study Club of that place has gotten out the following card:

WOMAN WILL VOTE.
Will She Vote Intelligently?
Does She Realize Her Needs in Society? Her Economic Wants?
You Are Invited to Join the
WOMAN'S SOCIALIST STUDY CLUB.

This card, printed in bright red on a white card, is very effective, I can tell you.

With a club doing good work, as I am sure this club is, and with the women who come to the convention from various parts of the state, we should have a splendid meeting.

Dr. Matthews says:

"The real mothers of the country realize that the country's greatest need is workers. The real, refined, influential Christian mothers are not asking for an extension of woman's sphere. They are not asking for the privilege of mixing in politics or casting a ballot. They realize their sphere is all inclusive and that the throne upon which they sit is the one to which the world must come and pay homage."

Isn't that beautiful?
I am just finding out that it is occasionally possible to get \$10,000 a year for being "a Idjit" with the gift of gab. Among the things a mother—a Christian mother—is to teach her boys is to "Shun the woman who spreads the net and uses enticing measures to capture the innocent boy," but not a word about warning the girls against men (of his own type) who live off the virtue of the working girl.

Same old thing! "The woman gave me of the apple and I did eat."

At Alla Nazimova's marvelous performance of "The Doll's House" on

ON TO VICTORY!

Once again "THE SOCIALIST" is late but this time it is not because of financial stringency. Job printing came in upon us the latter part of the month to such an extent that we were absolutely swamped. But we are all happy, nevertheless, for it means that with another month of work like the one just passed we can send out the word to you that we are out of the woods for good, and from that time on it will only be a matter of building the paper up and making it the best in the country.

We are solving our financial problem through the job printing department, but we must not forget that the paper in order to be of any use, must have readers, and readers are of no use unless they are enough interested to pay for their subscriptions. Therefore, it is up to you comrades on the outside to get the readers. We are going to give you a bigger and better paper from now on and we want you to reciprocate by giving us a bigger and better audience.

Next week we will publish in full Karl Kautsky's brilliant pamphlet on the "Historical Achievement of Karl Marx", complete in one issue of the paper. This feature of the paper is becoming popular, and we shall from time to time, regularly if possible publish like pamphlets.

Our next extra-special edition will be dated August 14, and will signalize the completion of our ninth year and the beginning of our tenth. There will be a page of historical matter—a story of the development of the Socialist press and of this part of the Socialist press in particular.

We want to begin our tenth year with just one thousand more subscribers than we have now. You will have to get them, because you know just who needs to read "The Socialist" and you can reach them—we can't.

You have two months to work. Begin now.

her opening night in Seattle there was applause at only one point in the play, and to me that applause was very significant of the change in people's attitude toward what constitutes woman's sphere.

As she is leaving her husband he asks her how she can take the step she is taking; how she can set aside her marriage vows and if she does not consider her first duty to be toward her husband and her children. Nora replies that she does not; that her first duty is to herself; that no one else can educate her, she must do it herself.

The time is not far gone when a woman who would interpret a play which expressed such sentiments would be branded a "bad woman." B. F.

AT TACOMA

HAYWOOD HEARD IN BRILLIANT SPEECH.

Noted Labor Leader Addresses Large Audience in Eagles' Hall.

William D. Haywood, the noted labor leader whose sensational trial and acquittal in Boise two years ago of conspiracy to murder Governor Steunenberg attracted the attention of the entire labor world, addressed a huge audience at Eagles' hall last night, and with his wonderful magnetic personality instilled into his hearers even a greater spirit of social equality than had filled their veins before.

The large hall was filled to capacity with laboring men, followers of socialistic ideas and men who had been drawn to the place out of curiosity to hear the famous labor leader's eloquence.

Haywood took for his subject "The Conspiracy of Labor." He began slowly, elaborating clearly on the more intricate portions of the machinery of the labor grist mill. He told of methods being used to down the laboring man, and of keeping him down. He spoke of the thousands of men who are refused work on account of class differences. And finally, he launched eloquently into a voluble discourse on socialism.

Haywood did not appeal to his audience. That is not his style. He stated facts and then made his demands upon his hearers, and when he was through the entire audience rose in a body and cheered until the rafters vibrated. A vote was taken at the close of the meeting to send a petition to President Taft asking the abandon-

ment of military law in times of labor trouble.—Tacoma Times.

TACOMA NOTES.

The Temple of Music has been secured at a rental of \$10 for Sunday, June 6th, for the debate between Comrade Comley and Mr. Hughes.

Comrade Howell, organizer of Local Tacoma, sent in his resignation as organizer on account of leaving the city.

The Recording Secretary, was instructed to ascertain immediately, from the State Office, how many delegates Tacoma will be entitled to at the State Convention. The Secretary was also instructed to notify all members that the election of delegates to

the State Convention will take place at the regular business meeting Tuesday, June 1st.

It is reported on good authority that E. N. Reynolds, formerly of Centralia, now of Tacoma, who was very active in the Provisional Organization, which stood for Mills and his fusion tactics, has asked Chairman Barth to use his influence as a member of the Executive Committee to have him (Reynolds) elected State Lecturer of the Socialist Party of Washington.

It is planned by the active women in Local Tacoma to put forth a special effort to dispose of a good many of the Special Women's Stamps at the Haywood meeting. Women's Stamps sold to date, \$4.10.
ELEANOR MAURER HERMAN.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY

By J. W. McSlarrow

Dr. McSlarrow, even when sick and confined to his house, wrote the following crisp letter to the Seattle "Daily Star," under date of February 5, 1909. It shows the man most admirably. Note the verse at the end.—Ed.

Editor Star: I am a newcomer in Seattle, and I need help. No, it is not old clothes I want; I have plenty of those; but I want to find an appropriate recitation for a schoolgirl for Lincoln's birthday. They are planning some kind of a celebration of Lincoln's birthday at the Cascade school, and my daughter, who is a pupil in that school, was directed to "get up" something to recite upon that occasion. Of course the girl applied to "papa," and papa, in his guileless ignorance of what would be appreciated in patriotic Seattle, selected the following single paragraph from Lincoln's New York speech, delivered in 1865, believing that any latest utterance of the "Great Emancipator" himself would be an appropriate recitation for his birthday. But, alas, I soon learned my mistake! When the girl submitted my selection to her teacher she was informed that it wouldn't do at all—that it was "not suitable for the occasion."

Lincoln's Words.

"In the early days of our race, the Almighty said to the first of mankind: 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread,' and since then, if we except the light and air of heaven, no good thing has been or can be enjoyed by us without first having cost labor. And inasmuch as good things have been produced by labor, it follows that all such things belong of right to those whose labor produced

them. But it has so happened in all ages of the world that some have labored and others have without labor enjoyed a large portion of the fruits. This is wrong, and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any government.

"It seems strange that any man should dare ask a just God's assistance in wringing bread from the sweat of other men's faces."—Abraham Lincoln.

In a subsequent search for something which would be "suitable," I have consulted the Declaration of Independence, the Sermon on the Mount and the sixth chapter of Micah, 6-8, but found that in each case the sentiments expressed would be objectionable.

I had thought of offering as a substitute the following poetic effusion, but concluded to submit the whole matter to the Star and its many readers:

"This day we celebrate the birth Of the great emancipator;
Few men like him have lived on earth,
But what he said in sixty-five Possesses little merit;
It sounds too much like a rebuke Of our Seattle spirit:
'Get wealth, dodge work, graft all you can,
Whoever may produce it;
If you would live a gentleman,
Just learn to swipe and use it.'"
Yours truly,
J. W. McSLARROW.

1633 Terry Ave.



DR. J. W. McSLARROW

He died a Proletarian and was proud of it. He might have been a Capitalist, but he was too social a man. With the strongest individual characteristics, a positive thinker with an aggressive will, yet his altruistic instinct dominated him.

He spent the most of his life of 66 years practicing medicine in the swamps of Missouri and Arkansas, where the Doctor must go at any hour of day or night and for any call from poor or rich alike. He was a well-read and skillful physician, always keeping in touch with the latest discoveries and devoted to his profession. Yet he was more man than physician. He was always public-spirited in the best sense. He joined the Odd Fellows because the spirit of Fraternity seemed to him to find expression in that order. He even learned to set type, and opened a printing office for the purpose of publishing a monthly magazine in the interests of Odd Fellowship.

In pursuit of the same unquenchable impulse to be a Social man, Dr. McSlarrow gave his heartiest support to the Knights of Labor and to the "New Church," subordinating his professional duties to the larger mission.

But he was never fully satisfied till he found the literature of Scientific Socialism and identified himself with the Proletarian Socialist Movement, to which that literature introduced him. Though past 60 years of age, he gave himself heart and soul, to furthering "The Cause."

He literally died for the Wage Cause. When Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone were kidnapped from Colorado to Idaho, Comrade McSlarrow canvassed the entire district in Arkansas where he lived, secured hundreds of signers to Petitions of Protest, and organized an Indignation Meeting. At that meeting he spoke with such intense feeling that he was stricken on the spot with apoplexy, and carried home unconscious. He never recovered from that stroke. Broken physically, knowing he had chronic heart disease, he came with his family to the State of Washington, where his Socialist son John had lived for several years, and spent every energy in building up the Socialist organization in this state. In the neighborhood of Porter and Elma he held school house meetings and organized Locals. In Seattle, where he lived the last few months; he joined the Local and soon became a member of the Executive Committee. He listened to all sides, investigated and decided for himself. He supported the Proletarian course of Local Seattle throughout the late attempt to restore the Middle Class element to membership.

Though he was well aware, as a physician, that public speaking was dangerous to his life, he courageously took part in hot debates and insisted on taking his turn on the "soap box" at the street corners. The last time he spoke on the street his breath gave out and he went home, never to reappear in public.

Socialism meant everything to Dr. McSlarrow. He wanted to live 10 years longer because he saw in "The Cause" so much to live for. In it he recognized the fulfillment of his life-long purpose, the relief of human misery. He was proud to die poor, because he had spent himself to make others richer.

The Socialist Party had entire charge of his burial, the Comrades singing about the open grave the triumphant stanzas of the English Socialist and Poet, Wm. Morris:

ALL FOR THE CAUSE.
Hear a word, a word in season, for the day is drawing nigh,
When the Cause shall call upon us, some to live and some to die!
He that dies shall not die lonely, many an one hath gone before,
He that lives shall bear no burden heavier than the life they bore.

Nothing ancient is their story, e'en but yesterday they died,
Youngest they of earth's beloved, last of all, the valiant dead.

In the grave where tyrants thrust them, lies their labor and their pain,
But undying from their sorrow, springeth up the hope again.

Mourn not, therefore, nor lament it, that the world outlives their life;
Voice and wisdom yet they give us, making strong our hands for strife.

Some had name and fame and honor, learned they were and wise and strong;
Some were nameless, poor, unlettered, weak in all but grief and wrong.

Named and nameless all live in us; one and all they lead us yet,
Every pain to count for nothing, every sorrow to forget.

Hearken how they cry, "O happy, happy ye that ye were born
In the sad slow night's departing, in the rising of the morn.

Fair the crown the Cause hath for you, well to die or well to live
Through the battle, through the tangle, peace to gain or peace to give."

Ah, it may be! Oft meseemeth, in the days that yet shall be,
When no slave of gold abideth 'twixt the breadth of sea to sea,
Oft, when men and maids are merry, ere the sunlight leaves the earth,

And they bless the day beloved all too short for all their mirth,
Some shall pause awhile and ponder on the bitter days of old,
Ere the toll and strife of battle overthrew the course of gold.

Then 'twixt lips of loved and lover solemn thoughts of us shall rise;
We who once were fools and dreamers, then shall be the brave and wise.

There amidst the world new-bullded shall our earthly deeds abide,
Though our names be all forgotten, and the tale of how we died.
Life or death then, who shall heed it, what we gain or what we lose?
Fair flies life and amid the struggle, and the Cause for each shall choose.

CARD OF THANKS.

My mother, my brothers and sisters join with me in the desire to make some expression of thanks to the Socialists of Seattle, who so nobly stood by us in our late bereavement. This expression must needs be short, for mere words, no matter how artistically combined, can never express the deep appreciation we have of the spirit of true comradeship, which alone prompted the many kind and even self-sacrificing acts.

Though he was a good New Churchman, though he was for more than thirty years an Odd Fellow, though he had given many years of his life to working for his church and fraternal order, yet in his last days, when overtaken by poverty and disease he was forsaken by both, and it remained for that much-maligned group of undesirable citizens composing Local Seattle S. P. to voluntarily assume the cares and duties which others had sworn to perform but did not.

All of which is but another chapter in that bitter lesson which we all should learn, the Proletariat should expect nothing from any kind of an organization, no matter what its professed character; if that organization is the least bit influenced by that class with which we are waging a relentless war, the Capitalist Class.

Once again let me say, Comrades, from the bottom of our hearts we thank you one and all.
JOHN McSLARROW.

ANARCHISM

By GUSTAV BANG

Translated from the Danish in "Social Demokraten" by Arthur Jensen

1 Socialism and Anarchism

The general conception of Anarchism is, that it is more far-reaching in its demands than Socialism, in other words, that it is an extremely radical and revolutionary movement.

That is correct only in as far as its outward appearance, its revolutionary sounding phrases and the violent means employed by it, are concerned. It is not an expression of a proletariat, which, boldly and fully conscious of the mission it is called on to perform in the history of the world, strives forward toward a new and higher social order, which shall release the restrained forces in Capitalist society; but that of a petty bourgeoisie, which feels itself stunted and subdued by the superior power of organized Capital in society, notes its own decay advancing further year after year, and, in its hopeless despair, seizes at every possibility, which apparently may revive the old conditions of the age of handicraft, when the petty traders and shopkeepers were unhampered by Capital—seizes at every idea reflecting such a possibility, and clings to it with the same passionate impulse of self-preservation, as that of a drowning person who grasps at every piece of timber floating toward him.

First Difference.

The first and most important difference between Socialism and Anarchism lies in the absolute opposite premises, from which they respectively strive toward the overthrow of existing social conditions.

While Socialism is saturated with the doctrine of evolution, bases its whole conception and all its practical activity on the fact, that the social structure is constantly changing form in accordance with certain determined historical laws, and therefore inquires into the nature and mode of operation of these laws, observes how they appear in existing society and sees how, with the certainty of a force of nature, they move in the direction of a new society, in which the means of production will be collectively owned as well as collectively used, a society the advent of which should be facilitated and hastened—not because it will mark the maximum of human welfare and human culture, for such an absolute impassible height will never be reached, since development is constantly moving forward, past newly gained results; but because it will mark the next great advance in the history of civilization and will convey a higher degree of welfare and culture, than it is possible to attain under present conditions—while Socialism thus is in absolute harmony with all scientific thought, Anarchism is purely Utopian in character.

It does not endeavor to investigate the social conditions, which, naturally, will be brought about as an effect of economic development, but arbitrarily seeks to construct a future society as the ideal, the one which is most in harmony with human nature.

Historical evolution is the basis of all Socialist investigation, while the abstract human nature is the basis of all anarchist thought.

Human Nature Variable.

Anarchism does not comprehend that human nature is a product of historical development. Aside from a small number of the most elementary natural instincts, that whole gigantic composite idea, which we encounter as "human nature," is extremely changeable, being wholly determined by the social environment, in which man lives. Note how differently we think, feel and act in the modern industrial city from what we did in the mediaeval villages, in the ancient Greek trading centers, or in the prehistoric dwelling place; how different the various interests, passions and desires are which animate man; how differently we judge about good and evil, honor and dishonor.

A deed, which under certain social conditions is considered as most honorable and conveys the highest regard to the person who performs it, because it is in harmony with the interests of society, may under different social conditions be condemned as detestable, because of its anti-social character. Among certain primitive tribes a young man is not considered worthy of associating with adults, until he has committed a certain number of thefts; mediaeval chroniclers laud the warriors who on their crusades to foreign countries murdered peaceable peasants, speared babies, disgraced women and tortured their victims in every imaginable manner; and I wonder how some of our shining lights in society, for instance the stock gambler, the industrial baron, or the military officer, will be regarded in the eyes of the future.

But it is not alone the changing social forms, which each makes its impression on the mind and breeds its peculiar form of human nature, but the same difference is again found between the various classes within each society; the Capitalist and the Laborer maintain entirely opposite views on a great many various phenomena; their ideas of right and wrong, and of good and evil are divergent on a number of points; what to one seems the most natural thing in the world, fills the other with abhorrence; what leaves one perfectly cool and unmoved, arouses deep felt joy and admiration within the other—their every thought and feeling, their whole nature, is influenced by and formed in accordance with the social conditions under which they live and work.

Without understanding this constant transformation and change, the anarchist regards human nature as something eternal, something unchangeable, something which is and always remains in the same form, with the same qualities, like a mathematical quantity. The thing which he sets out to do, is to discover that form of human association which best corresponds with human nature

and then to announce this discovery as a gospel; people will flock around him, will be seized by the new idea, because it corresponds with their innate nature, will make the new thoughts a reality and adapt themselves to the new social order—and then the maximum of social welfare and culture will have been reached, never to be exceeded.

Capitalist Human Nature.

But when the Anarchist thus labors with abstract human nature as a basis for his theory and when he endeavors to discover a new social system which forever and for all eternity and not alone under certain given historical conditions, will best comply with the inborn, natural desires of all mankind, he becomes a victim of self-delusion. That human nature which he uplifts to the position of something general and imperishable, is neither general nor imperishable; it is nothing but what is bred by the peculiar surroundings and social conditions of the class which he himself represents, the petty bourgeoisie—that petty bourgeoisie, which is being impoverished and subdued in competition with organized Capital, and now with sad reflection looks back at the independence and liberty it enjoyed in the good old days. When the Anarchist imagines that he is advocating the cause of all mankind, he is in fact only making himself spokesman for the class instinct of the petty bourgeoisie; when he imagines that he is presaging a future stage of society, he is in fact only describing in a glorified and beautiful form the old conditions prevailing during the age of the guilds; when he regards himself as extremely revolutionary, he is in fact at bottom deeply reactionary.

Vacillating Bourgeois.

The petty bourgeoisie, within which the Anarchist ideas have been generated stands between the great bourgeoisie and the proletariat and it has on its character the impression of this intermediate position. Karl Marx in his book on revolution and counter-revolution in Germany, has given a splendid analysis of the class character of the petty bourgeoisie, an analysis which, in spite of the more than fifty years passed by, still holds good in every respect.

The petty bourgeois feels homeless in existing society, he swings between the hope of rising into the well situated classes and the fear of sinking down into the proletariat or deeper yet into the almshouse. He becomes vacillating in his politics, can be loyal to humiliation before a strongly feudal or monarchical form of government and form one of the strongest pillars of reaction, but on the other hand can be carried off by violent democratic movements, when the question is to combat a purely capitalist regime. He is a victim of constantly changing and apparently conflicting feelings, without firmness or consistency in his efforts, one moment inclined to combat the proletariat in conjunction with the ruling class and the next moment taking the opposite position—just because his own social position, being undefined, draws him in opposite directions. He will not find his permanent place in the modern class struggle, until his untenable position gradually becomes clear to him, and he gives up all political independence and steps into the political organization of the proletariat.

Anarchist is Bourgeois.

The anarchist idea is one of the convulsions which are the natural effect of the peculiar class position of the petty bourgeoisie. It reflects a series of feelings and emotions passing through the mind of the petty bourgeois.

When he dreads the fall into the proletariat it is not so much the length of the workday nor the size of his income, that he reflects on—many a small trader and shopkeeper is chained to his work for a longer period per day and receives a smaller income in the course of a year, than the majority of skilled workmen—as it is the loss of his economic independence. While a wage worker is employed in a shop that belongs to somebody else, dependent on the working rules, compelled to work a certain number of hours under certain set conditions, the petty bourgeois in his own business needs account to no one but himself, regards himself as a free man, as master of his own household. It is this economic independence and personal liberty which appears to him as the most precious gem, when comparing his own lot with that of the proletariat. And when he can not help but plainly notice how all this, through economic development, is more and more becoming a mere sham, a self-delusion, how his own existence is being undermined in his competition with organized industry, he is seized by a desperate hatred toward factory industry, the great department stores and the whole modern Capitalist system, with the state, the Capitalist state, as its foremost representative. But being tied by his class instinct to the old form of society and ensnared in its tradition, he can not, as the proletariat, look beyond the limits of existing social conditions and acknowledge that personal independence can no longer be maintained in the old form, but must be given an entirely new form in accordance with modern conditions. He reaches back and shapes his ideal in the image of the old guilds, where the individual traders lived as free men, each in his own shop, worked and exchanged their goods, enjoying the full product of their labor.

But in order to realize this ideal, the state with all other institutions in Capitalist society must be abolished and absolute "Anarchy," i. e. complete lack of government, ushered in. This goal once reached, unhampered human nature will bring forth social conditions as natural and as worthy of human association as possible.

In the next article, we will view the first and most prominent of all Anarchist philosophies, the Frenchman, Proudhon.

2 Proudhon

Various authors have at different times, more or less clearly and consciously, declared some sort of Anarchy the ideal form of society, but the Frenchman, Proudhon, was the first to attract general attention with his Anarchist philosophy, in the early forties. Proudhon is with good reason called the father of the Anarchist movement; all later Anarchist philosophers have based their conclusions on his thought. And right here, at the fountainhead of Anarchist teachings, the middle class origin is seen plainer than anywhere else.

In 1840 Proudhon published his first and also his best and most valuable piece of work, entitled, "What is Property?" a question which he answered with the famous sentence "Property is Robbery."

OPPOSED SOCIALISM.

This is a shrewd agitator's clever phrase, in general of doubtful scientific value, and in the particular connection in which Proudhon in his entire activity as an author places it, indubitably false. Simultaneously with his setting off of this literary bombshell against property right, which he thus brands as a crime, he appears as the most zealous defender of private ownership in the means of wealth production, and the most offensive opponent of all Socialist proposals of collective ownership. He attacks only the financier's right to property in interest bearing capital and the landowner's right to property in rent yielding land, while on the other hand, the property right of the small peasant and the petty trader in their means of production, he sets out to reinstate in its old glory and dignity, for this, he holds, is the very basis of every ideal, happy and just human society.

DEFENDED SHOPKEEPERS.

Being a thoroughbred representative of the petty bourgeoisie, Proudhon sees the social problem through the visual angle of the Parisian retail dealer and shopkeeper; the competition of the factories and department stores against the small shopkeepers and dealers, the heavy interest charged by the banks, the oppressing rent; these are the conditions which are reflected in his criticism. He does not find the source of social misery in the mode of production, in the form, through which owners of capital are enabled to control the labor power of others and lay claim to the product of their labor, but in the mode of exchange, the form by which commodities circulate and are exchanged.

PROUDHON'S ARGUMENT.

The value of commodities is determined by the amount of labor required for their production, and if they were only exchanged according to this, their value, everything would be in the most beautiful order; each individual producer, when disposing of the product of his toil, would receive the full equivalent as compensation therefor. But that is not the way it is done. In practical life the price of a commodity is constantly swinging away from its value; a small minority of men is ever enabled, by virtue of their wealth, to fool the rest of the people and cheat them out of a part of the values they have created, and which rightly belongs to them. It is this property in great Capital which thus incessantly gives occasion for theft and therefore is theft in itself.

It is seen, how fundamentally different this view is from that of the proletariat. When attempting to analyze the social evils in modern society, Proudhon does not place himself in the factory among the workers, who must slave, exploited by Capital; the conditions prevailing there he regards as only a variety of the general social conditions, the conflicts arising there, he regards as only a variety of the general social conflicts. He takes his starting point in the exchange of commodities, in the shopkeeper's stock of goods; he sees, thinks and judges as the small storekeeper who, when offering his goods for sale, finds that the market is glutted with factory-made products, which are offered so cheaply, that he himself must sell at a loss, besides having the rent and the interest to the bank hanging over him. It is the viewpoint of the petty bourgeois which he applies to the social problem—and the same thoughts, which involuntarily force themselves upon the petty bourgeois, under circumstances as related above, also stand before him as the solution of the entire social problem.

PROUDHON'S IDEAL.

The question is to find a social order, under which commodities can be justly exchanged, so that equal values may be exchanged for equal values. Once such an order is found and the social problem will be a thing of the past; every producer will get what he earns without deduction in any form, and general happiness, liberty and justice will prevail. The value of commodities must be "constituted," i. e. made a reality, made the governing law of exchange. With "the constituted value," a harmonious relation between man and man will appear. The individuals will be free producers, independent of one another, exchanging the products of their labor with those of others, always getting the same value back as they have respectively produced, through their creative labor. All fraud and injustice will be things of the past. Reciprocity will rule, that "mutuality," which is the basic principle of neighborly love will become the guiding one; every individual will do unto all others, as he desires that all others should do unto him.

ECONOMIC BARBARISM.

This is the ideal society as imagined by Proudhon. It

is in fact only an idealisation of the present Capitalist society, a transformation in such a way that the interests of the petty bourgeois become the underlying interests of the entire social household. While Socialism aims to abolish production of commodities for sale and replace it with social production of things for use, for the immediate supply of the social wants, Proudhon aims to immortalize commodity production and only regulate it, amputate its irregularities and unnatural outgrowths. While Socialism will conserve and further develop social production with its systematic co-operation, (brought about by Capitalist development, thus multiplying the productivity of human labor, Proudhon will go back to the primitive production of the past, separating the single individuals from one another, as isolated, economically independent producers, each manufacturing his special kind of product in his own shop; he has a terror of machine production and fiercely attacks factory industry, not because of its exploitation of human labor power, but because of a principle, because it deprives the individuals of their freedom of action; he does not comprehend, as the Socialist wage worker does, the great future possibilities it presages for the welfare and culture of mankind, but as the reactionary petty bourgeois, sees only the shadows cast by it. Proudhon's "Constituted Value," which shall remedy all social injustice and evil, means in fact the absolutism of production on a small scale, means economic barbarism.

ABSOLUTE ANARCHY.

"The ideal society," thus transforming everybody into absolutely free independent commodity producers, will abolish the state and all its institutions and introduce political Anarchy, the absolute absence of all authority and all government.

Proudhon makes a distinction between the social and the political constitution and places them in sharp antagonism toward one another. The social constitution depends on the equilibrium of the various economic forces and interests, it is inbred in every human being and forms the condition of human progress. The political constitution, on the other hand, rests on authority, oppression and rule, it is used in want of a satisfactory social constitution, which singlehanded could regulate the mutual human intercourse, and it is in its very nature anti-progressive, reactionary. But when the social constitution is carried out to its highest degree of perfection, by virtue of the "constituted value" and the just value exchange, the political constitution will become superfluous and disappear—there will no longer be any use for princes, judges, administration or representation; absolute Anarchy will be the only natural form of human association.

PURE UTOPIANISM.

The purely utopian character of Proudhon and the entire Anarchist doctrine, its complete lack of conception of historical development, is in but few instances shown as glaringly as here.

Socialist philosophy also makes a distinction between the political and the social constitution and admits, that conflicts sometimes exist between them, but it does not regard them as absolute contrasts; on the contrary, the political forms are only the natural reflections of the predominating mode of production, of the economic conditions, the social constitution; with the mode of production developing to a new and higher stage, a conflict arises between the social and political constitution, a conflict, which in the end results in the disappearance of the outlived political forms and the appearance of new forms to fill the requirements of the new time. The Anarchist sees things quite differently. From his viewpoint all human history has hitherto been one great mistake, people have not understood the law of reciprocity, which is the only natural basis of human association, and as a miserable makeshift they have been forced to resort to the state in all its forms, from the despotic monarchy to the democratic republic, in order to hold society together; after the Anarchist philosopher once has discovered the laws of true social life, humanity can rid itself of the state and all its institutions and introduce a state of Anarchy, which is the natural element for human nature.

IGNORES CLASS STRUGGLE.

Proudhon's utopian view of society corresponds precisely with his complete lack of conception in regard to the significance of the class struggle in social evolution. The introduction of Anarchy should not be a result of a proletarian class struggle, but of a peaceful co-operation between all strata of society, between laborer and manufacturer, between the propertyless and the propertied classes. By virtue of its "justice," its "ideal," and its "logic," Anarchism appeals equally to everybody; it expresses the general want of abstract human nature, and not that of the oppressed and exploited classes. Here again is the instinct of the petty bourgeois appearing, the petty bourgeois, who is not directly involved in the great social struggle between Capital and Labor, but, standing with one leg in each camp, thinks himself elevated above the social contrasts.

HIS "PRACTICAL" MEASURE.

On a single occasion has Proudhon given vent to the idea of a measure, which might make the transition to the ideal society. A "bank of exchange" is one to be established to issue loans without interest, to any one, for the purpose of founding independent enterprises. The loans were not to be paid in cash nor in common banknotes, but in the form of checks, which were to have full validity between all members of the bank, and it should not be necessary to return any part of the loan, until the business had been worked up to a paying basis. With these checks, the debtor could then buy tools, raw ma-

ANARCHISM

terial, shelter and personal necessities of life from other producers, and would thus be enabled to create for himself an independent business, that would yield him a livelihood. The access to the loans being free to anybody, regardless of his economic conditions, and since there was to be no oppressive burden of interest, everybody would free themselves from economic bondage. Wage workers would leave the slavery of the factories and establish themselves as independent shopkeepers, while those who remained in the factories, would be able to bring up their demands, until their wages would equal the income of the shopkeeper. All dependence of and exploitation by both industrial and financial Capital would cease. Being free producers, the individual members of society would be enabled to exchange the products of their labor among one another at their full value. The social problem would be a thing of the past.

These, briefly stated, are the ideas expressed by Proudhon in the early articles, and later placed before the public in a great many various essays, in which he besides became entangled in a constantly increasing confusion and self-contradiction. They never attained any practical significance. The revolution of 1848 rent asunder his chimera, as the storm rends the spiders web. But his philosophy has long exercised a certain influence on the French people, and all other Anarchist philosophers have built on the foundation laid by him. In Proudhon's writings the key to all later Anarchist doctrines is found.

In the next article we shall dwell on a couple of the doctrines, which have exercised great influence on the Anarchist movement.

3 Later Anarchist Doctrines

BAKUNIN AND KROPOTKIN

In the last article an endeavor was made to present Proudhon's economic theories, in as far as it is at all possible to bring order into the chaos of confused, self-contradictory assertions and thoughts, which he in his many years of activity as an author, has given expression to. This mental uncertainty is not accidental. Being a typical representative of the petty bourgeoisie, he entirely lacks firm foothold in the development of Capitalist society, is drawn from one side to the other, governed by constantly varying emotions and swings from extreme radicalism to extreme reaction. Proudhon's works have their historical value, not as a means to a clearer and more exact knowledge of the laws of social development, but as the basis of later anarchist doctrines.

These doctrines are manifold and extremely varied. The lack of regularity and law, which the Anarchists demand introduced into society, they also practice in their teachings. Each one of their philosophers has his peculiar view of both aim and means, and within each particular school, a multitude of various offshoots is found.

THEIR COMMON AIM.

However, they all aim at the breaking up of prevalent forms of society, the abolition of present institutions and the razing of the old social order, without any planned efforts towards bringing into being anything positively new—under Anarchy human nature will find the best solutions of questions arising in the new form of society.

They also all agree on their rejection of and contempt for the tactics employed by the Social Democracy, such as the exercise of the right of suffrage and the industrial and political struggle for various reforms, that gradually will teach and strengthen the proletariat and enable it to ultimately strike the decisive blow against the ruling class—Anarchism will strike the great blow momentarily, without transition, as the masses gained over by the influence of oral and written propaganda will rise and overthrow the ruling powers in society.

BAKUNIN'S ARGUMENT.

Anarchist ideas displayed great activity through the influence of the Russian Bakunin, a man of noble birth, who for many years had taken part in the revolutionary movements in various parts of Europe, until seized by Proudhon's ideas, which he changed into a new independent system of thought.

His Anarchism has a strong political color; he aims his attacks first of all at the state. The state always signifies oppression and injustice; even the apparently most democratic state is despotic, letting the majority tyrannize the minority and the rich and cunning oppress the poor and ignorant. The state in every form must be abolished, before true freedom can prevail. "When the state disappears, the right to hold property also disappears, there being no longer any power to guard its inviolability. A new, happier and more just society will then come into being, by virtue of the feeling of that solidarity, which everybody possesses, making it impossible for anyone to enjoy liberty as long as he knows that there are others who are not free.

This feeling of solidarity, this inborn brotherly love, will under Anarchy be the law which shall govern all conduct.

Free groups of individuals will combine in order to co-operate wholly or partly in the performance of labor and to exchange their products between one another, and the various groups may form federations of a more or less loose character.

But everything will be done under absolute personal freedom, any one will be able to join or leave whichever group he sees fit, no one will have any right to prevent anybody from doing whatever he pleases, or force him to do anything contrary to his will.

BAKUNIN'S ACTIVITY.

At the close of the 60's and in the beginning of the 70's, Bakunin, with an enormous agitating power, attempted to spread his ideas—and with great success. It was just at the time when the working class of the entire civilized world had begun to stir. Labor parties were formed in various countries, and the "International" was the center from which new impulses constantly went out to the proletariat.

But young as the movement yet was, it was also indefinite in its substance; many remnants of bourgeois thought were still haunting men's minds; the masses of workers were not as yet fully conscious of their transition from the old system of handicraft to the modern system of organized industry.

There was therefore a rich soil for such petty bour-

geois-radical thought as that expressed in the Anarchism of Bakunin. Bakunin was successful in gathering a considerable following, especially among the workingmen of the Latin countries, and opened then a sharp conflict with the Socialist wing, which mainly stood under the influence of Karl Marx—a conflict, in which he shunned no means, regardless of their nature. These skirmishes led to the dissolution and complete extinction of the "International" before the middle of the 70's.

DIFFERENCE IN TACTICS.

It was not so much the actual difference between the Socialist and the anarchist interpretation of society, that caused this dissolution—for the "International" stood open for every movement, which had for its aim the consolidation and strengthening of the workers in the proletarian class war, regardless of their political or economic ideas—but aside from Bakunin's personal jealousy, it was first of all the difference in tactics.

While the Socialist wing aimed to organize the workers for the political struggle, by encouraging them to exploit those political rights which they already possessed, and to strive for the seizure of new additional rights, so that within existing society, they could work to bring about the new order, the Anarchist wing tried to utterly blacken and render suspicious this tendency.

The elective franchise was immoral and self-destructive, a treason against the cause of the people; for the great mass would constantly remain oppressed and ignorant, easy victims of speculations of heartless tyrants; any one casting his vote at an election of legislators would thereby sanction the existence of the state, the deadly enemy of liberty, which should be annihilated. The only means to progress was the taking of the law by the people into their own hands, open rebellion with steel, lead and fire as weapons, together with the application of every measure possible, that would tend to terrorize the enemy and strike him with fear.

Through the activity of Bakunin in the "International," the Anarchist tactics developed into its now prevalent form and the impetus was simultaneously given to a live and widely extended Anarchist movement in many countries, especially in France, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Austria and Russia.

KROPOTKIN'S DOCTRINE.

Among those, who during recent decades, have exercised the greatest influence on the Anarchist movement, Kropotkin is the one whose doctrine predominates. It is a further development of the ideas his countryman Bakunin gave expression to.

Kropotkin, as Bakunin, announces the elimination of the existing forms of the state as the only condition for the birth of the ideal society; once the state with all its institutions is overthrown, mankind with automatic exactness will find the best and most adequate means, by which to arrange their mutual economic intercourse.

Kropotkin has a firm belief in the perfection of human nature, the only question with him is to break the bonds now hindering its free development; "Let the people have free elbow room and in the course of a week the supply of the necessities of life will go on with wonderful regularity!"

The single individuals will have no duties, any one may work as short or as long a time as he pleases at whichever profession or trade he chooses, and any one can take from the common storehouse all the necessities and luxuries he desires, without offering anything in return.

Driven by an inner moral force, every one will seek to his best ability to make himself as useful as possible for everybody else.

COLORED BY MODERNISM.

When Kropotkin, however, attempts to further characterize this future society, which he thus imagines will be brought about by the free play of individual forces, he does it in a somewhat different form than the majority of the earlier Anarchists. The social development of the 60-70 years, gone by since Proudhon's essays were first published, has made its impression on the Anarchist ideal society. Yet the train of reasoning of the petty bourgeois still remains as the foundation of the Anarchist interpretation, but even his mode of reasoning is gradually being influenced by economic progress, by the mighty advance of organized industry and modern forms of production and by the wonderful results arrived at through this advance; he begins to realize that he stands face to face with a social current impossible to turn back or even to stay, and that he can save himself only by following the current to a certain extent and seeking to take the advantage offered by it.

Just as the middle class gradually abandons the idea of maintaining the absolute isolated small enterprises that are relics of the time before the advent of machinery and in its place lays stress on a certain common course of action through joint purchases, co-operative workshops and stores, etc.—just as the ephemeral politics carried on by the petty bourgeois are being remodelled, so the social ideals created in the form of Anarchism are being remodeled.

FROM PROUDHON TO KROPOTKIN.

Proudhon fancied the absolute disintegration of society into its smallest ingredients, the single individuals, who each make their appearance as isolated producers, completely independent of one another; the exchange of commodities would be the only economic tie between man and man within society; he conceived of co-operation in production only as an occasional exception, an emergency, when impossible to go ahead in any other way, such as in construction of railroads, canals and the like.

Bakunin sees this picture less plainly, individual and collective enterprise here mingle together, making it impossible to distinguish where one form of production ends and the other begins.

Kropotkin, on the other hand, emphasizes with great force that co-operation is the normal form of production with the highly-developed labor-saving and profitable machinery of the present day; is the form of production to which free men under most circumstances quite naturally will adapt themselves when released from all outward bonds; he approaches thus the Socialist viewpoint of the mode of production under future social conditions, but he is sharply distinguished from it by his terror of conscious, systematic organization and by his religious-fanatic faith in the unerring certainty of human instinct, where the question is to organize the gigantic organism of production.

On still another point Kropotkin marks a step in advance of the earlier Proudhonism. He abandons

all ideas of the commodity-exchange which in the eyes of Proudhon was the particular axis around which all economic life in an Anarchist form of society should revolve. He regards wealth production as the production of things for the immediate consumption of society, in a purely communistic spirit; but here he is again sharply distinguished from the Socialist interpretation by his contempt for all systematic organization; let everyone take from the common supply whatever he pleases and bring back what he chooses, and everything will be in the most beautiful order!

STILL BOURGEOIS AND UTOPIAN.

In spite of the transformation which Anarchism has thus passed through, the spirit of the petty bourgeois still dominates it as it has done from the very outset. It is not the proletarian viewpoint which is gradually being approached; it is the utopia of the petty bourgeois influenced little by little by social evolution. Anarchism is and remains, not the expression of the revolutionary class interests of the working class but that of the reactionary class interests of the middle class.

The shopkeeper's property right in and full individual control of the tools of wealth production, are well in harmony with Anarchist thought, for humanity thus attains the economic independence in question.

When the Anarchists dream of a society to be brought about by the complete, planless destruction of all existing social conditions, it is in fact not a future society—they only aim to revive the conditions of the days of pre-capitalistic handicraft in a purified and glorified form. When the Anarchists appear most revolutionary, they are in their innermost tendency deeply reactionary; they do not wish to hasten historical development but instead aim to turn it back.

In the next article a brief analysis of the peculiar tactics developed by Anarchism, generally known as "the propaganda by the deed," will be given.

4 The Propaganda by the Deed.

Conclusion.

In the preceding articles we have endeavored to gain a general knowledge of the Anarchist doctrines and their historical development. "The propaganda by the deed," however, has contributed far more than any doctrine towards the great and sad renown of Anarchism.

Although this method of propaganda is employed by but very few Anarchists, and although a great many within the Anarchist movement strongly disapprove of it, it is nevertheless a natural outcome of all Anarchist teachings.

For when the state, with all other existing social institutions, is the absolute Evil, the devil in the paradise of humanity, so to speak, is it not just to attack it in every way and by every means, thus causing it all the trouble within one's power? And when the highest and only law is the unlimited liberty of the individual to act as he pleases, is the individual not justified in displaying his hatred and wrath against the injustice of society in any way he sees fit? And when he acts with the avowed purpose of combating the existing social order, in order to assist in its destruction and thereby in the providing of the new society with its absolute happiness and justice, is not every such act a beautiful and praiseworthy deed, regardless of how many innocent human lives it may cost and of how much unhappiness and suffering it may cause? If death on the gallows or in prison is awaiting the perpetrator, is this not the death of a martyr for a good cause?

ARGUMENT FOR THE "DEED."

The doctrine of the isolated individual's act of revolt against society was first formulated in 1869 by Netschajef, a Russian, and one of Bakunin's agents, who was traversing Russia to secure followers for the Anarchist wing of the "International."

He rejected the thought of mass insurrection, in which the Anarchists hitherto had seen the universal means of overthrowing existing social conditions; the state, controlling the army, the police and the courts, would as a rule be in a position to suppress a rebellion without any difficulty and quell it in torrents of blood, and a doubly fearful tyranny would be the result. The rulers on the other hand would not be able to defend themselves against the scattered attempts of the single individuals. True, every man might get caught and made harmless after having performed his task, but his example would bring new fighters to the battlefield; unsuspected and unanticipated they would come forth in ever increasing numbers, armed with poison, dagger and fire, emerging from the darkness, spreading terror about them—fright and despair would seize the ranks of the rulers, they would vacillate, become irresolute and despondent and ultimately, in the general panic, society's walls would crumble and fall.

All thoughts of the Anarchist must be directed towards this goal, his whole life must be consecrated to the guerrilla warfare against society, he must sacrifice his own self, renounce all personal joy, all enjoyment, all family life and only think about the revolution. The revolution was his religion and he worshipped it with as blind a fanaticism as the one animating the oriental self-tormentor.

GROWTH OF TERRORISM.

In the beginning this horrible doctrine gained but a small following amongst the Anarchists in Europe. It did not found a school until 1880, and it was in the beginning of the nineties, that the great period characterized by individual acts of revolt began. It was a natural outgrowth of the development taking place in the different Capitalist countries. About that time the Anarchist movement was fast retrograding; workingmen in increasing numbers turned away from Anarchism and went over to Socialism. A general uprising was unthinkable with the small mutilated groups that were left; the general strike, the old, ever-present thought of the Anarchists, changed in the hands of the Social-Democracy into a demonstration for the acquisition of certain political and civil rights, which to the mind of the Anarchist was mere trumpery. The isolated assassinations thus became the only means whereby Anarchism could manifest itself.

"The propaganda by the deed" reached the height of its flowering during the earlier half of the nineties in Paris—after some Anarchist journals, supported by the treasury of the police department, had excited the minds of their followers; for here as everywhere was a close connection between the police and extreme reaction on

one side, and the Anarchist camp on the other. In 1892 Ravachol's bomb exploded in a private house, the following year Vaillant threw his bomb in the chamber of deputies, the year after Henry committed the same deed in a very popular and much frequented cafe and at about the same time a great number of either wholly or partly unsuccessful attempts were made. In 1894, the propaganda by the deed commenced to take another direction. Instead of throwing bombs at random, planlessly, the weapons were being directed against royal personalities and prominent statesmen. In 1894 President Carnot of France was killed, in 1897 the Spanish statesman Cavañas del Castillo, in 1898 the Austrian empress Elizabeth, in 1900 the Italian king Umberto and in 1901 the American president McKinley.

DECLINE OF TERRORISM.

Since then the individual acts of revolt have become less frequent—the complete fruitlessness of their efforts has gradually cooled the blood of most of the Anarchists and besides their ranks are in a state of fast advancing decay. Anarchist clubs are still found here and there, advocating the propaganda by the deed as the only means of regenerating humanity, and glorifying in every attack on existing legal conditions, as the just course by the individual against society; theft, fraud, and forgery are nothing but the isolated expropriations of a part of the riches which in fact belong to society, a forerunner of the great social expropriation. The professional criminal and the Anarchist thus coalesce in a remarkable manner through this insane logic.

CAUSE OF DECLINE.

The cause of the fast waning power of Anarchism lies in social evolution.

The Anarchist teachings germinate only where large remnants of pre-capitalist conditions still prevail, where a numerous and impoverished petty bourgeoisie forms the predominating stratum of the population and where the working class, about to be developed, has not yet evolved into the modern proletariat, but is still living in the traditions of the stage of handicraft.

That is the reason for the considerable growth of Anarchism in such countries as France, Spain, Italy, Austria and Russia—these are countries, which only recently have entered on the stage of Capitalism. That is also the reason that Anarchism has exercised so great an influence in a city like Paris; it is a city of the petty bourgeoisie, as but few other large cities, and it contains besides an extensive "Bohemia" of writers and artists, people who by birth and education belong to the bourgeoisie, and to whom the moral views of the proletariat are strange and unintelligible, but who in their blase existence need strong stimulants to keep up their spirits—Salon-Anarchism is as much a natural outgrowth of the degeneracy of the bourgeoisie as spiritualism, as satanism, as mysticism, as all the other spiritual distortions which in our days thrive so well within Capitalist circles.

SOCIALISM DISPLACES ANARCHISM.

But gradually, as the development of Capitalism advances, as organized industry and modern machinery of production gain territory, Anarchism more and more loses its significance. The workers become conscious of their position in society and turn their backs on all middle class propositions, in short, become Socialists. Anarchist doctrines no longer thrive in the working class.

Countries like Italy and Austria are typical of this transformation. About ten years ago the Social-Democracy was weak in both of these countries while the Anarchist philosophy dominated the great majority of the workers who at all occupied their minds with the social problem. Also in France, Holland and Russia is Anarchism strongly on the wane; only in the most backward countries, such as in Spain, can it still exercise any considerable influence.

ANARCHISM AS A FAD.

Only within circles belonging to the bourgeoisie is Anarchism enjoying an increasing growth, especially as a fad among persons of literary and artistic pursuits.

The very utopian character of Anarchism, which in the long run deprives it of all foothold within the proletariat, is instrumental in giving it access into the bourgeoisie. For this as well as any other class which sees its own dissolution before it, is apt to be inclined towards utopian dreaming. To clearly acknowledge the social evolution in which it is itself a factor, would be to acknowledge its coming ruin and it has not the courage to do this. Instead it creates ideas that to a certain extent will soothe its diseased mind and pacify its excited nerves.

While the proletariat is building its conception of the future society on the iron laws of historical evolution, the bourgeoisie and its retainers fumble with "human nature" as a basis on which to construct the ideal form of society.

Just as the active industrial Capitalist, uses the frailty of human nature in defending the existing social form, which permits him to live on the exploitation of the labor power of others—"man is of nature lazy and extravagant, and were it not for the lash of hunger, were it not for the deep chasm between rich and poor, and did not the Capitalist ownership of the means of production stand before the worker as an awe-inspiring power, the entire society would perish in penury and barbarism"—in the same manner the Idealists who through environment either wholly or partly belong to the Capitalist and middle classes, but who nevertheless have seen the deformities of the present social order, in the same manner they utilize the absolute perfection of human nature, as a weapon against society, and as the basis on which future social life will adjust itself, and explain their action in about this manner: "Man is of nature equipped with none but good characteristics; it is oppression and tyranny alone which breeds base instincts and vulgar conduct; the entire present social life is pure idiocy; just give human nature complete freedom of action and all injustice, all misery and all vice will disappear as by magic and the fullest possible measure of happiness and culture will at once enter."

REAL HUMAN NATURE.

Both of these conceptions of the absolute human nature and both of the diametrically opposed consequences drawn from them, are equally false. Man is of nature neither a wretch nor an angel, he is, on the average, what social surroundings make him. Capitalist society has developed certain characteristics, Socialist society will develop other characteristics, nobler and higher characteristics, as truly as the Socialist form of society marks a higher stage in social evolution.

Ideal characteristics of human nature will not create an Anarchist society but a Socialist society will create a higher and more ideal human nature.

