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SOCIALISM AND ANARCHISM.

It is almost two years now since Lola Ridge, on behalf of the executive board of the Francisco Ferrer Association, honored me with the proposal that I become the teacher of the Ferrer Modern School. I remember very distinctly part of the conversation we had.

"But you are almost all Anarchists here," I said; "are you sure that you want a Socialist to come and take charge of your school?"

I do not remember that Miss Ridge was entirely sure of this. But she was quite confident on another point.

"I'm sure," she said, her eyes all aglow with her own firm faith, "that when you get to know more about anarchism you will become an anarchist too."

It was then less than a year since I had escaped from a Catholic seminary (I had almost said cemetery,—which would have been a very trivial error); and I could forgive Miss Ridge for implying that my ignorance of anarchism was quite encyclopedic. Touched to the marrow of my egotism, I resolved that so far as my work should permit I would study anarchism and anarchists until blue in the face. I proceeded at once to make the acquaintance of anarchist theory from Zeno to Kropotkin, and revelled for quite a year in the exhila-
rating iconoclasm of Stirner and Nietzsche, Tolstoi and Whitman. Incidentally, I made the acquaintance of anarchist men and women, and found them, for the most part, actuated by such honest revolutionary ardor as went straight to my heart (not to my head). Some of them were narrow-minded in their attitude towards socialism, just as some of us—let us tell the truth and shame the devil—have been narrow-minded in our attitude towards anarchism; but I found others, too, who were sincere students and who met my scepticism not with the futile reiterations of bigotry but with the earnest discussion of the honest seeker after truth. I owe much to these men.

Now, after two years of listening and reading and thinking, I feel that I may warrantably set down my conclusions,—not with any delusion as to their permanence in the face of further mental acquisition and development, but with the hope that this brief self-expression will help to clarify my own thought, and incidentally, perhaps, to clarify if only by disagreement the thought of such friends as may care to read.

II.

Fundamental with me is the conviction that anarchism, like socialism, has roots deep down in biologic fact. They are both of them factors in the new evolution,—the evolution that has become self-
conscious, the evolution that takes in hand, so far as it can and will, the forces of merciless nature. The frightened conservative who, after a day's dalliance with a primer of biology, tells us that we radicals are trying to interfere with "natural selection," is quite right; we are trying to do precisely that. We think that the laisser-faire policy with regard to Mother Nature (let us personify for convenience sake) has gone far enough, and done sufficient harm. We are not convinced that this "survival of the fattest," this elimination of the uncrafty in the "struggle for existence," is really making for that kind of evolution which we should be willing to call progress. Nature needs ethical culture. She has had free rein these many thousand years; and what has she done? To begin with, she has used the most ridiculous methods,—not to apply a more anthropomorphically ethical adjective. She has subjected her creatures to more or less rigorous conditions, and decreed that all organisms unable to meet these rigors shall die a premature death. Not content with that, she has fitted out her creatures with elaborate apparatus—claws, talons, horns, trichocysts, poison-glands, etc.—for attack or self-defense,—i. e., for fighting. It is, one might say, a cock-fight evolution, mitigated only by that biologic socialism which Kropotkin has called "mutual aid." And its results?—the product of its aeons of prolific wastefulness? We call the result "civilization."
Civilization. It is a comforting word, but what does it mean?

Something like this: 2,000,000 children working in the factories and mines of the United States; 1,000,000 married women ditto; 6,000,000 (sometimes 12,000,000) unemployed in the United States,—the city of Chicago forced to use its armories to shelter the unemployed homeless; 13,000 suicides in this country in one year; men with $500,000,000, $600,000,000, $700,000,000 and $800,000,000, and more coming out of workersqueezing dividends faster than it can be spent; that new disease—alcoholism—creeping generation by generation into the very vitals of the race; insanity increasing so rapidly that sober scientists predict the speedy extinction of the white races by less degenerate rivals; the age of marriage being further and further deferred (in England, in one hundred years, from twenty-two to twenty-six) by young men too insecure, financially, to care to "groan and sweat" under the "holy bonds" (it is a good word!) of matrimony; marriage itself becoming more and more a commercial matter to women forced to do the work of men in the industrial world; 65,000 prostitutes flourishing in New York City alone under the efficient management of men viler than any type of man the world has ever seen; several Chicago factories paying their women employees $1.50 a week (and making over $2,500,000 profit in one year) while the lowest prostitute in Philadelphia, says Goodchild, makes $20 a
week; 90% of all prostitutes diseased; 20% of all men sexually diseased before the age of twenty-one, 60% before twenty-five, 80% before thirty; 60% of all men in New York now suffering from gonorrhea, 80% of the men in Paris now or formerly afflicted with the same disease; 200,000 syphilitics in New York City; 10,000 of our 60,000 Philippine troops sexually diseased; 1,000,000 married women in the United States who have been infected by their husbands; 2,000 women in England and Wales forced to resort to excision of the sexual organs,—and this in one year; 45% of sterility in women, 70% of sterility in men, due to gonorrhea; 20,000 children dying in France every year because of syphilitic infection; 15% of all infant blindness due to gonorrheal infection; 100,000 children dying every year in this country alone before they have lived a twelve-month, and from preventable causes; and—but surely this is enough?* You may say the foolishness of men has caused all this; but if you do you forget that I am arguing not against a supposedly benevolent deity, but against a lais-
sez-faire evolution. And there are elements in it not traceable, methinks, to the vices of men; an earthquake in the "evil city" of San Francisco is followed by an earthquake among the Pope's "beloved people" of Calabria. And you tell me,
perhaps, that I have sketched only one side of the picture; that there are still good things in the world, still green fields, beautiful women, and good beer. It is true; but are there as many good things as there might be if laisser-faire were not for most of us the sum and summit of our thinking?

Let me quote from Galton:

"Now that this new animal, man, finds himself somehow in existence, endowed with a little power and intelligence, he ought, I submit, to awake to a fuller knowledge of his relatively great position, and begin to assume a deliberate part in furthering the work of evolution. He may infer the course which it is bound to pursue form his observation of that which it has already followed, and he might devote his modicum of intelligence, power and kindly feeling to rendering its future progress less slow and painful. Man has already furthered evolution very considerably, half unconsciously, and for his personal advantages; but he has not yet risen to the conviction that it is his religious duty to do so deliberately and systematically." ("Inquiries into Human Faculty," p. 196.)

Now socialism, as I understand it, is born precisely of this conviction that to a certain extent evolution can and should be humanly controlled. Consciously a protest against the laisser-faire attitude towards industry, it is, even if unconsciously, a protest against the laisser-faire attitude towards nature. For it is nature
that has evolved the type of man whose only religion is the worship of commercial success (meaning thereby a new fast auto and a new "fast" mistress every year or so), and whose "free" unhindered monopolization of the land and its products has brought about that immense enrichment of the rich and comparative impoverishment of the poor which more and more passionately cries out to heaven for revolution. It is nature which has made a man's success depend, other things equal, on the elasticity of his conscience; so that an honest man, "noblest work of God" though he be, is doomed from the beginning, unless he mend the goodness of his ways, to contumely, futility, and ultimate "elimination." And, therefore, it is nature which produces the "white slave," the "white slaver" and the syphilitic; the intellectual "white slave,"—lawyer, preacher, teacher, editor, dramatist, publicist of any kind; the "wage-slave," the "efficiency" sweat-shop, and the idle, profit-gobbling wage-slaver. Such a prostitution-slavery civilization, given the spread of intelligence which the printing-press and the increasing facility of transportation have made possible, was bound to engender its antithesis (forgive the phrase; it is recovering from Hegel!), was bound to produce the aspirations by which it is condemned. That antithesis, those aspirations we call socialism,—that larger socialism which includes the sanities of anarchism and of eugenics. And this larger socialism, recognizing the biologic bases of capitalism, makes a series of pro-
posals which amount to a reform of nature. We are accused of trying to "change human nature"; —and it is true; we are trying to change human nature. Nature makes dishonesty a "favorable" "character," a condition of survival and success; socialism would eliminate, step by step, the dishonest man, the exploiter, the parasite; it would make honesty an indispensable condition of survival, it would give the honest man a fair chance for the first time since the twilight of private property enveloped the world. It knows that socially, as well as biologically, parasitism makes for degeneration.

And I say that socialism has its roots deep down in biologic fact, deep down in the realities of the evolutionary process, because self-conscious intelligence interfering with unconscious nature is a new factor in evolution and is produced by evolution itself; it is a factor coming more and more into selective power, just as the selection of the craftiest is a factor that with the relentless advance of socialism must lose day by day its present dominance. Biologically, then, socialism might be defined as self-conscious intelligence interfering with unconscious nature for the elimination of social parasitism. Which, to be sure, is no new idea to the socialist, but is only my pretentious way of putting the standard definition,—that socialism is a plan for the elimination of exploitation.
III.

Now just as socialism is a protest against that natural process which we call the survival of the fittest, so anarchism is a protest against that natural process whereby, both in the evolution of animal life and in the evolution of society, the cell, the unit, the individual, tends to be ever more and more subordinated to the animal or social organism. Animal life begins with such unicellular animals as *Ameba* and *Paramecium*, in which a single independent cell performs the many diverse functions involved in metabolism and reproduction. Ascending the scale we find in *Volvox* a "colony" of cells held together in a gelatinous matrix which the cells themselves have secreted. Says Dendy ("Outlines of Evolutionary Biology," p. 43):

"The cooperation of a larger or smaller number of cells to form a colony at once opens up new possibilities with regard to differentiation and division of labor. If a sufficiently good understanding, so to speak, can be established between the different members . . . of the colony it will no longer be necessary for each one to do everything for itself. At the expense of becoming mutually dependent upon one another they will be able to specialize in certain directions, some identifying themselves with one necessary duty or function and some with another. As a result of this speciali-
zation the various functions may be much more efficiently and economically performed, but a
no less important result will be that the different individuals will no longer be able to lead inde-
pendent lives—if separated from one another they will perish because unable to perform for themselves individually all the functions which are necessary for their existence.”

In Volvox this differentiation and this division of labor, have hardly begun: physiologically the cells remain “almost, if not quite, independent.” But in the lower Metazoa we find that “the component cells of a colony gradually ‘become’ integrated to form an individual of a higher order.” Integrated: they cease to be independent individuals, they become the subordi-
nated parts of a whole. The whole later process of organic evolution involves an ever greater sub-
ordination of the cells to the organism as a whole; it is a progressive de-individuation of the individual.

The social analogy is obvious. One may pro-
ceed cautiously, remembering that what we call the “social organism” is not as perfect an analogy as it might be; and yet even with the modifications which such caution might dictate, one sees at the outset that the evolution of society, animal or human, has entailed, with possible exceptions here and there in the process, a progressive subordination of the individual to the social whole. Primitive peoples—so far as we can make out their mode of
life through that mist of errors, omissions, obscurities and lies which we call history, seem to have lived in a condition of such individual freedom as has since been seen only among "savages" and "barbarians" who still refuse to become "civilized." The development of private property, of slavery industrial and matrimonial, and of the "state," have bound the individual components of society more and more closely one with another; and though the society so evolved has achieved greater efficiency in the mode and the amount of its production, it has done so at the cost of forming a leisure class at one end of the socio-economic scale and a slave class at the other. The comparatively brief period which has elapsed since the establishment of the Greek and Roman states has seen no essential changes in this system; there has been a supersession of one leisure class by another, but each in turn has existed by force of a state (a good phrase!—since the state is really nothing but the military power) maintaining the subordination of the helot, the serf or the slave. The almost simultaneous advent of machinery and steam destroyed practically all that was left of the worker's industrial autonomy; it bound him to the shop, it made him the slave of the machine; and the inevitably consequent "speeding up" of the machine subjected him to conditions more destructive of mental and physical health than any system yet devised for what one might call the greatest possible happiness of the smallest possible number.
History, then, is not, as some of our anarchist friends maintain, a growth in freedom. Taken all in all, I am convinced that the producing individual is less free to-day, industrially, than at any corresponding age of the world before. History shows, not a growth in the amount of individual freedom, but, as Hegel more properly taught, "a development of the consciousness of freedom." Bit by bit, as the growing interdependence of industries has brought with it (it need not have brought with it!) the progressive limitation of the worker's industrial liberty, there has grown, in power and in volume, the cry of the worker for freedom. (I speak of industrial liberty: it may well be that political freedom—the freedom to vote—has increased, though it has hardly brought with [can never bring with it, so long as it is not coupled with wide-awake solidarity on the part of the workers] any increase of real freedom; it may be that liberty of speech and of the press has grown, though I am not sure that Fred Boyd or Alexander Scott would admit it; and it probably is true that freedom of thought—and not only "free thought"—has grown since the overthrow of scholasticism, though I am not sure that the rebel in economics has much more chance of intellectual preferment to-day than the rebel in theology had when theology was king.) Essentially, then, there has been a growth not in liberty but in the thirst and the demand for liberty. And anarchism, so far as it sounds this 'battle cry of freedom,' is, like socialism,
a revolt against a tyrannously dominant tendency of organic and social evolution. Nature—evolution over which we exercise no directive control—is making us mere cogs in the "world-machine"; we are beginning to revolt against that, and anarchism, mingled as it is with much that verges on 

*la asse *-fai re and social fragmentation, is essentially the voice of that revolt. As socialism is intelligence become a conscious factor in evolution for the elimination of social parasitism, so anarchism is intelligence become a conscious factor in evolution for the mitigation of the subordination of the social unit to the social whole. Both the socialist and the anarchist, then, are, as their common enemies charge, attempting to interfere with normal biologic processes, attempting to overcome certain natural tendencies of evolution.

I said, awhile ago, that the producing individual is less free to-day, industrially, than at any corresponding age of the world before. Why did I emphasize this word corresponding? Because social evolution has proceeded not in one line but in several lines, in different places and at different times. There have been, as we say, several distinct "civilizations," each with its own origin, development and decay; each affected by neighboring civilizations moribund or nascent, but each fundamentally independent, each sui jurus, each working out its own damnation in its own characteristic way. So Egypt—not to go farther back—had her day, Greece hers, Rome hers;
and now it is our turn to try our hand at the problem. And this is the problem: to combine individual liberty with corporate efficiency; to so cooperate as to produce and equitably distribute sufficient necessaries for all, and at the same time to make room for that freedom of the individual to vary from the norm wherein lies the very essence and potency of evolution. It is a problem which, as we all agree, no previous civilization has solved; and our chance of solving it, our own chance of averting social deliquescence, depends on our ability to merge the two great ideals that together make up and inspire the forward movement of today,—the ideal of corporate efficiency and the ideal of personal freedom. The old socialism which Bismarck moulded to his purposes, and which was the bogey of Spencer’s old age, saw only one of these ideals; and it reared its utopia on a sort of omnipotent officialdom which in truth deserved all the bad names flung at it by the great prophet of evolution. That is the kind of socialism which is eulogized to-day in the capitalistic press, for it is the kind of socialism that offers the rich idler of to-day the chance to remain an idler almost ad infinitum (certainly, so far as we are concerned ad nauseam), as the interest-receiving creditor of a bureaucratic state that will have bought out, with compensation fixed by his own legislative agents, his stolen and swollen stock. But it is a socialism which no longer satisfies the socialist, it is a socialism which the real socialist now knows is
his most formidable foe, it is a socialism that is almost diametrically opposed to the second of the ideals for which the new socialism stands,—the ideal of individual freedom. As the exponent of that second ideal, anarchism plays a valuable rôle in the drama of revolution. “The price of freedom is eternal vigilance;” and in many ways it is a good thing that one of the branches of the party of revolution has devoted itself almost entirely to a guardianship of what freedom we have and the passionate demand for more and more and more until every shackle of our bondage is broken and man stands, for the first time in history, absolutely free.

IV.

I can hear some coldly logical reader breaking in upon my ecstasies at this point and asking me,—“What do you mean by freedom?” I mean, if you must have a definition, the absence of external physical or moral compulsion. So far as I can see, each of us is internally compelled in every action and in every thought by that selective complex of inherited and acquired experience which we call “character.” Of course, it is not this internal freedom that I am speaking of; give me freedom from external compulsion and you give me all the freedom there is under the sun. The mistake
which we make—the mistake which the anarchist himself makes in constructing his utopia—is to forget that compulsion may be moral as well as physical; that there are other modes—not less odious—of external compulsion than those which are popular among highwaymen and policemen. Comparatively few of us suffer physical, almost all of us suffer moral, compulsion from without. The lords of the status quo need no guns to point to our heads; it is enough that they should say: "Do this, and you forfeit the respect of the vast majority of your fellow-men; break this precedent, flout this tradition, open up this new road of thought or behavior, and you segregate yourself into boycott and futility. And that is not all: we shall not merely seclude you from our society, we shall shut you out, too, from all avenues of advancement and development. We shall see to it that you fail of success in whatever you may choose to undertake; we shall prevent you from doing the work that you are fitted for by your inclinations and your talents; we shall, so far as we can, make it impossible for you to affect the thought of your time through newspaper, or magazine, or book; we shall close to you all lecture platforms but those from which you can address only such men and women as are already adherents of your doctrine; and we shall make it impossible for you to earn sufficient money and leisure to enable you to pursue your studies to the maximum of your mental efficiency. And meanwhile we shall hold out to you, if you
but consent to admit yourself in error, all the full riches of our life: we shall secure for you a comfortable income, we shall admit you to our innermost circles of élite society, we shall open up to you the equipment and advantages of our costliest universities, we shall write editorials in your honor and herald your speeches and your writings as pronouncements of sterling wisdom, we shall fête you and dine you all the year round; and when you die we shall raise monuments to you all over the land and shall say beautiful things about you in our school text-books of literature and history. Choose!"

Who shall say how many there are who yield, to one that stands his ground? Who knows but that the next year will see you or me or our most trusted leader, handing over his sword?

And so, perhaps, I make my meaning clear. Liberty is no mere "ideological" abstraction with me; it is something whose need I feel as I feel the need of air and food. It is the vital medium of the soul; without it we are not souls but cogs. The anarchist and the socialist of to-day demand liberation from this moral bondage; but while the anarchist accentuates only this ideal, the socialist (who wants food as well as freedom) accentuates as well the ideal of cooperation for efficiency—and accentuates as well the means by which both ideals must be, by our labor and our pain, transmuted into reality.

Here, to be sure, the anarchist will take up arms
against me, and will say that he is misunderstood. But before I advance to meet his attack let me see if there be not another point on which I may admit the essential truth and vast importance of his thought.

V.

I think the great majority of us socialists to-day agree with Kautsky’s statement that we are socialists in economics, but anarchists in almost everything else. We are convinced, with Élisée Réclus, that “there can be no morality without freedom.” Of course for those of us who are determinists there can be morality at all in the old sense of a distinction between “virtue” and “vice;” reinterpreting the term I think we might say, following Spinoza, that morality is deliberate self-expression. So far as self-expression is limited, so far is morality made null; so far as an act follows from one’s reasoned inner desire, so far is it moral. If, being an out-and-out anarchist at heart, one preaches socialism, or, being a socialist at heart, one preaches progressivism,—and this deliberately, on some counsel of expediency,—one is, in our sense of the word, immoral: one is serving as the instrument for the expression of another self, one is failing to play one’s own needed part in human development, one betrays the most sacred thing in any of us—the
uniqueness of one's personality, the very thing in one which can be replaced by no other self, no other mind, on earth. It is of the new ethic that differences are holy things, not to be shaved off the soul by external compulsion, nor allowed to atrophy by concealment. The most different man among us may be the most valuable: he is a mutation, as the biologists say; he may be a retrogressive or a progressive mutation, but it will be well for us to take our time settling our opinion on the point. The man who has no differences, and the man who having differences forever suppresses them, are, for the purposes of human development, mere zeros suffixed to a decimal.

I have laid emphasis on deliberation in self-expression; it is a point which needs emphasis. The anarchist is too fond of saying, "Be yourself," and assuming that in so saying he has exhausted all ethics. From the determinist viewpoint, of course, this "Be yourself" is superfluous counsel: man's character, as Heraclitus said, is his fate; one is oneself, willy-nilly, down to the end of one's chapter. But though one is always oneself, one is not always one's deliberate self. For example, the vast play of direct emotional expression is almost entirely indeliberate: if you are greatly surprised your lips part, your eyes open a trifle wider, your pulse quickens, your respiration is affected; and if I am surprised, though you be as different from me as Hyperion from a satyr, my respiration will be af-
fected, my pulse will quicken, my eyes will open a trifle wider, and my lips will part;—my direct reaction will be essentially the same as yours. The direct expression of surprise is practically the same in all the higher animals. Darwin’s classical description of the expression of fear is another example; it holds for every normal human, not to speak of the lower species. So with egotism, jealousy, anger, and a thousand other instinctive reaction-complexes; they are common to the species, and when we so react we are expressing not our individual selves so much as the species to which we happen to belong. Indeliberate action which is the result of inherited tendency, is, therefore, for the purposes of ethics, not really individual action at all. When you hit a man because he has “insulted” you, when you swagger a little after delivering a successful speech, when you push aside women and children in order to take their place in the rescue boat, when you do any one of a million indeliberate things like these, it is not you that act, it is your species, it is your ancestors, acting through you; your “self,” your individual difference, is lost in the whirlwind of inherited impulse. But subject the inherited tendency to the scrutiny of your individual experience, deliberate,—and then, though you act like a thousand other men, you will be different, and the more different the more you deliberate, the more your action is permitted to take on the color of your essentially peculiar experience. Only so can you learn, only so can you
advance, only so can you be really yourself. If you act without such deliberation, your act, as the old scholastics put it, is not a "human" act, you yourself are not really acting at all, but are merely playing slave to your ancestors; you are, as we moderns say, "unmoral." If, after deliberation, you choose to suppress your own inner desire, and for expediency's sake act out the desire of another, you are, psychologically speaking, still expressing yourself, in so far as your experience may have taught you to prefer expediency to sincerity; but ethically speaking, you are "going back" on yourself, you are "immoral." But if you rise above the instinct that is not you but is the race, and above the will of another human who is not you, to act out, so far as external circumstance will permit, the inner desire that has survived deliberation, survived the scrutiny of your personal experience,—then at last you are truly a "self," invaluably you, and "moral."

So interpreted, the mottoes, "Be yourself" and "Live your own life," take on a slightly different meaning than that which they have usually been assumed to convey. To live our own lives does not necessarily mean to become the slaves of our passions, nor does it sufficiently excuse our orgies to say that we are being ourselves. To get drunk once is an experience; but to get drunk every week or so is—well, inartistic, like all excess. And to indulge the polygamous in us to such an extent that we
crush out of ourselves all capacity for that soul-
possessing, soul-expanding mystery called love (one
must be hardy to use the word seriously in these
days!) is not so much an expression, as a maiming,
of the self. After all, if we aspire to be the expo-
nents of a new ethic we shall be doing our doctrine
immeasurable and unmerited wrong if we interpret
it at the outset not in lives of courageous devotion
to our common cause—not in such a life as Peter
Kropotkin has lived,—but in lives that reek with the
heat of passion and smack of insufficient evolution.

VI.

It dawns upon me that having defined liberty
it might be well to define, to say just what we
mean by, anarchism. It is easier to praise definition-
making than to make praise-worthy definitions; and
there are a hundred and one ways of defining
anarchism wrongly. Perhaps best of all definitions
of anarchism is that of the Englishman, Herbert:
“Anarchism is the rule of each man over himself.”
Briefly, then, it is self-government,—a definition
which makes it clear that men will achieve anarch-
ism only when they have achieved self-control—
the full ability of each man to govern himself. But
I like Herbert’s definition, aside from this implica-
tion of self-control as essential to a workable
anarchism, because it expresses positively that
which is usually expressed negatively,—as when anarchism is defined as the absence of government. Now whether or not this absence of government is a realizable, or even a desirable, ideal, depends, obviously, on the meaning of that troublesome word "government." When Proudhon says, "Government of men by men, under whatever form, is servitude," I think he meets assent from most socialists whose socialism is not state-socialism (state socialism, one is tempted to call it). All the bad things which our common comrade Kropotkin says against the state as it has appeared in history are deserved by the state—as it has appeared in history. When Nietzsche makes Zerathustra say, "The State is the coldest of all monsters. And its lies are cold; and this lie creeps out of its mouth: I, the State, am the people,"—here, too, I think, we most of us give our assent. Every socialist student knows that Marx and Engels took a very similar stand. I hesitate to quote them—they have been quoted almost to death; but briefly: "The existence of the state and of slavery," says Marx, "are inseparable" (Paris Vorwärts, 1844); and Engels: "The essential principle of the state is the coercive power in the hands of a ruling class. . . . State interference in social relations becomes in one domain after another superfluous, and then dies out of itself; the government of persons is replaced by the administration of things, and by the conduct of the processes of production. The state
is not abolished. It dies out.” (“Socialism Utopian and Scientific,” p. 76)

Implicit in these quotations from Kropotkin, Nietzsche, Marx and Engels, is the idea which appears explicitly in Proudhon: the “state” which they are thinking of is a “government of men by men.” That kind of state will die a natural death, as Engels puts it, when men shall have shown themselves able to dispense with it. Or as Thoreau expresses it: “I heartily accept the motto, ‘That government is best which governs least,’ and I should like to see it acted up to more rapidly and systematically. Carried out, it finally amounts to this, which I also believe: ‘That government is best which governs not at all’; and when men are prepared for it that is the kind of government which they will have.”

It would appear from these quotations that orthodox socialists, as well as more or less orthodox anarchists, believe in an administration of things and deprecate a government of men. Unfortunately, that does not settle the matter. Doubts enter one’s mind,—what if the distinction does not distinguish?

To administer things you must have power, you must have authority; and though these be freely conferred upon you by the people, they are authority and power none the less. Now suppose that in virtue of this authority you decide that the working-day for stenographers shall be five hours long, and that the working-day for street-diggers and iron-workers shall be three hours long. Will this ad-
ministration of stenography, of street-digging and of iron-work be also a government of stenographers, street-diggers and iron-workers?

But, you ask, must there be an assignment of hours?

Let us see.

How shall the work of our ideal commonwealth be done? The anarchist answers, by voluntary cooperation; the socialist answers, by voluntary cooperation, as far as possible. Socialist and anarchist alike oppose the state-socialistic idea of a government ordering its citizens about as our present government orders about its civil service employees, —telling Jones to go here and do this; telling Smith to go there and do that, and telling each of them just when he may strike (if at all), and when he must submit or "be hanged by the neck till he die." That, I think we are agreed, would differ from our present condition only in being a more scientific slavery. John Stuart Mill, writing half a century ago, drew a happier picture: "The form of association which, if mankind continue to improve, must be expected in the end to predominate, is not that which can exist between a capitalist as chief and work-people without a voice in the management, but the association of the laborers themselves on terms of equality, collectively owning the capital with which they carry on their operations, and working under managers selected and removable by themselves." That, I think, is a sketch of the
broad outlines of our desires, with which we can nearly all agree; but it leaves us plentiful room for fight about details.

It says nothing, for instance, about the performance of disagreeable work.

No matter how far the invention of machinery may be carried in the future, the various occupations in which human brain or muscle will be required must always remain, some of them more agreeable and attractive, others of them comparatively less so. Indeed, the extension of mechanism must itself bring, in certain fields, an extension of disagreeable work; the monotony of "feeding" or otherwise attending to a machine detracts so much from the interest of the worker in his work that men like William Morris have doubted whether the extension of machinery, even with the shortening of hours which it ought to entail, will be so great a boon as most of us suppose. But granting that machinery will do for us in the future much of the unpleasant work which now falls to human hands to do, the fact remains that even then there will be a difference in the degree of pleasantness attaching to the various occupations: some will be comparatively agreeable and attractive, others will be comparatively disagreeable and unsatisfactory. Now if there should be no supply of human labor to meet the demands of the various and variously attractive occupations, chaos could be averted only on the supposition that the personal preferences of
every worker would direct him precisely to that industry which should happen to require his services. And I think we can most of us agree that that is not a supposition to bank on. Not only is it highly probable that more men would want to work in the agreeable, and less in the comparatively disagreeable, occupations, than would be needed, but it is highly probable, too, that not all who should choose a certain occupation should be so fit for it as to give their labor its maximum value for the community. Hence the two problems to be met by any theory of absolute freedom in industrial organization: the conflict between personal preferences and personal capacities, and the conflict between personal preferences and industrial needs. The up-to-date thing to do in this emergency, it seems, is to forget the difficulties, take "absolute freedom" "on faith," and preach it to the working class à la Georges Sorel. But if I am to preach "myths" to the working class I had rather go back to Mother Church and preach them for a hundred dollars a week; if one must be a villain one should make it pay. And after all, one must meet these difficulties if only for the sake of one's peace of mind.

To my mind these difficulties point relentlessly to some system of regulation. The community would have to appoint some group of men and women to adjust the supply of human labor to the various demands for it by setting up either a wage system or an hour system. The disagreeable work
which should require more men than would offer themselves would have to be made more attractive by arranging that the working-day in that particular field should be less, or the wages higher, than in more agreeable occupations. And whether the hour-system or the wage-system should be established, the worker whose natural preferences and capacities should bring him into the more attractive industries would be bound to his longer hours or his lower wages either by the threat of boycott, or by some other form of moral compulsion. Unless we are to suppose that in the cooperative commonwealth all minds will think alike (a rather dreary Utopia!) it is entirely reasonable to ask what Mr. Brown, whose natural preferences and capacities incline him to bookkeeping, could do in case he disagreed with the community or its "administrative" group, as to the fitness of the working period prescribed for those in his line of work. He might pass to other work, but, by hypothesis, this other work would be unsuited to his preferences; and here, too, he would be dissatisfied. Could he strike? If he did not, he would be constrained by fear of certain consequences; if he did strike, he would incur those consequences—exile or boycott. But aside from the fact that exile is one's high privilege even under present governments, such banishment would merely change the geography of the difficulty; another community would be burdened with his problem,—a community which might even then be sending similar exiles into
community number one. And suppose Brown refuses to be exiled; shall we use physical compulsion with him? No; I am answered; boycott him. But that is government. For to govern anyone is to compel him to do one's will; and we saw a while back that this compulsion may be—is now—moral as well as physical: boycott may be as effective, and as terrible, a means of compulsion as a squad of policemen. You may tell me that the number of such heretics as Brown in our ideal commonwealth would be so small that the community would find it possible to feed them, clothe them, etc., while they should be on strike; but you will permit me to doubt if workers taught to expect the "full product of labor" would be willing to subtract from that full product for the maintenance of healthy non-workers. I see no way out of the quandary but by admitting into our kingdom of heaven some form of compulsion,—the compulsion of fear or the compulsion of boycott—either for workers refusing to work, or for individuals elsewise refusing to abide by the rulings of the "administrative" group. I am told by my anarchist friends that in so picking flaws in their Utopia I am failing to see the sun for its spots; but I am convinced that these difficulties are very real difficulties, arising out of the vital differences of men; and if there are spots on the sun I think we had better be honest about them. The sun is brilliant enough despite its spots, no doubt; and I am willing to admit that the ideal of absolute freedom is a good goal to drive towards,
even if we do not believe that we shall ever realize every smallest fraction of our desire. But the daily tragedy of the matter is that it is their differences about these spots on the sun that keep anarchists and socialists at each other’s throats, and so mar the effectiveness of their war against their common foe.

VII.

So much for the difficulties which the thoroughgoing anarchist must face in the matter of production; there are other difficulties which he must face in the matter of distribution. It is of the essence of anarchism that distribution must be “to each according to his needs.” This is a sound ideal, for it is based upon the psychologic truth (another word that one almost fears to use in these days of delusions that “work,” and, therefore, are “true”) that superior ability in any individual is a social product, like superior “virtue,” and that just as the individual is not deserving of any moral reward for not having an inclination to drink, so he is not deserving of any material reward for having, whether by natural gift or by the fortunate circumstances of his rearing, a greater measure of ability than that enjoyed by his neighbor. Of ten men doing the same kind of work in a factory each has a degree of ability, in this particular work, different from the various degrees of ability possessed by
the other nine; and in order to get the maximum of "efficiency" from each of them it is necessary to pay them according to their output,—i. e., other things equal, according to their ability. No man, who has once understood the doctrine of determinism, would say that this mode of remuneration is based on psychologic fact. We are all of us the creatures, none of us the masters, of our past. But true as this is, and true as it is in consequence that superior ability does not merit superior reward, it is every bit as true that there is not one man among a hundred thousand of us who understands the principle, or understanding it, is willing to apply it so long as others refuse. Until practically all the members of a community give in their allegiance to this principle, there can be no anarchism.

Aside from this fundamental psychological difficulty standing in the way of its realization, the principle of giving to each according to his needs is beset with difficulties arising out of the probable failure of the supply to meet every "need." If the working-day is to undergo any considerable curtailment in our cooperative commonwealth, and if the chief concern in production will be, as I suppose it should be, to provide for all what we call the necessaries of life,—proper food, sufficient clothing, a certain standard of dwelling and of adjoining open space, free transportation, communication (by mail, 'phone, telegraph or wireless) and education, and all facilities for wholesome physical and mental recreation,—then I doubt whether there will be an
over-abundance of certain luxuries which to some of us are even now almost vital needs. I imagine one Utopian "needing" an automobile, another a piano, another an encyclopedia, another a trip to Europe, another a home by the sea. If the demand for these things be greater than the supply, how shall distribution be made? Pataud and Pouget, in their splendid "Syndicalism and the Co-operative Commonwealth," picture the Trade Union Congress, on the morrow of the revolution, wrestling with this problem; and I cannot improve on either the solution or its exposition:

"Two tendencies were shown; one that of the pure Communist, who advocated complete liberty in consumption, without any restriction; the other which, whilst inspired by Communist ideas, found their strict application premature, and advocated a compromise."

"This latter view predominated. It was, therefore, agreed as follows:—

"That every human being, whatever his social function might be, (carried on within . . . limits of age and time . . . ) had a right to an equal remuneration, which would be divided into two parts: the one for the satisfaction of ordinary needs; the other for the needs of luxury. This remuneration would be obtained with regard to the first, by the permanent Trade Union card; and with regard to the second, by a book of consumers' 'notes.'

"The first class included all kinds of com-
modities, all food products, clothing, all that would be in such abundance that the consumption of it need not be restricted; each one would have the right to draw from the common stock, according to his needs, without any other formality than having to present his card, in the shops and depôts, to those in charge of distribution.

"In the second class would be placed products of various kinds, which, being in too small a quantity to allow of their being put at the free disposition of all, retained a purchase value, liable to vary according to their greater or less rarity, and greater or less demand. The price of these products was calculated according to the former monetary method, and the quantity of work necessary to produce them would be one of the elements in fixing their value; they would be delivered on the payment of 'consumers' notes,' the mechanism of whose use recalled that of the check.

"It was, however, agreed that in proportion as the products of this second class became abundant enough to attain to the level necessary for free consumption, they should enter the first class; and ceasing to be considered as objects of luxury they should be, without rationing, placed at the disposal of all.

"By this arrangement society approached, automatically, more and more towards pure Communism." (Pp. 134-5.)
VIII.

The reader will have observed that this progressive communism implies the existence of a board of delegates, an “administrative group,” empowered to fix the prices of insufficiently abundant articles, to fix (see p. 131 of the book just quoted) the hours of work in each industry, and probably to do many other things. There must be, as I imagine, many such groups, each of them directing the industry of a locality small enough to make democracy feasibly real; i.e., to make it possible for all the members under a particular group to meet and instruct their group by some coherent and convenient method of voting,—and small enough to reduce to a minimum that domination of the minority by the majority which all voting more or less entails. But in addition to these local bodies there must be, one feels, a central group, directing importation and exportation, regulating and perhaps restricting immigration, adjusting the vast and complex inter-relations of production and consumption, and controlling the flow of capital. Too many individual syndicalists have set up the ideal of cooperative societies possessing each of them its own capital; but I think that we are coming to see the dangers of any system of industry that does not make all capital a common possession. “It was laid down,” say Pataud and Pouget, “that no Trade Union, no Public Service,—although autonomous from the point of view of management and working,—could have an isolated life, could set
up for itself special accounts, separate itself from the community. If it had been otherwise, if groups had been able, under the guise of cooperative societies, to make for themselves special interests, outside those of the whole community, it would have been the germ of collective privileges, of advantages for special Trade Unions, which would have developed on the ruins of the individual privileges of Capitalism.” (P. 132.)

Now such decisions that this shall be, and that shall not be, founded as they are on the necessities of industrial coherence, and executed by force of moral compulsion, may or may not be “government;”—I shall raise no further quarrel on that score. I wish to pass at once to my last point, and to take up a position with which I imagine very few of my readers will sympathize. I am convinced that the local administrative groups of our future commonwealth must have a power which will involve a very serious “government of men.” They must have the power to prevent—if need be, forcibly to prevent—certain individuals in the community from having children.

IX.

Eugenics. It is a doctrine that is just emerging from the fire of ridicule in which every new idea is given a chance to prove its mettle. Socialism and
anarchism have been misunderstood (in this essay, too, no doubt!), eugenics has been misunderstood. Most people, upon hearing the word, picture a corps of scientists taking the mental, moral and physical measurements of young men and young women, and then joining them, ad majorem Galtonii gloriām, on some arbitrary principle of compatibility. And yet if these good people had read two pages of Galton they would have found the very warnings which they themselves sound:

"We must be on our guard against taking our instincts of what is best and most seemly as a criterion for the rest of mankind. The instincts and faculties of different men and races differ in a variety of ways almost as profoundly as those of animals in different cages of the Zoological Gardens; and however diverse and antagonistic they may be, each may be good of its kind... The moral and intellectual wealth of a nation largely consists in the multifarious variety of the gifts of the men who compose it, and it would be the very reverse of improvement to make all its members assimilate to a common type. However, in every race... there are elements, some ancestral and others the result of degeneration, that are of little or no value, and are positively harmful." ("Inquiries into Human Faculty," p. 2.)

Precisely; and among these are such definitely transmissible traits as epilepsy, imbecility and
tuberculosis. Is the cooperative commonwealth to take no measures against the continued transmission of these diseases? I know very well that the cooperative commonwealth will gradually do away with the filth which contains the sources of these diseases; but no amount of cleanliness, public or private, can prevent the offspring of epileptic, or imbecile, or consumptive parents from being sooner or later themselves epileptic, or imbecile, or consumptive. And it may be that some day medical research will find a cure for these diseases, as it seems to have found a cure for the most terrible of the venereal diseases. But until science does cure them their victims will constitute such a drain on the resources of any future society as will make the phrase, "to each man the full product of his toil," the vainest and emptiest of shibboleths.

Now I do not intend here to plunge into a treatise on eugenics; but it is to the point and to my purpose to say that neither socialism nor anarchism nor any combination of them can ever solve the social problem unless the hand of brotherhood be held out to the new-born science of eugenics. And eugenics is pitiless. If persons definitely affected with a certainly transmissible disease refuse to submit themselves to vasectomy or oophorectomy, or to some better form of sterilization, and force upon the community children diseased like themselves, then medical experts acting with the authority of the community will enforce
sterilization upon these parents and upon their children. I know that these words "enforce" and "authority" are not in the anarchist's dictionary, and I most heartily admire the spirit which refuses them place; we have had so little freedom that it is but human for us to make a fetich of it now. The society of the future will say nothing about a "marriage" certificate; but it will say a rather emphatic something about a procreation certificate. It is true that by such sterilization we "interfere" with the individual; but it is just as true that the individual deliberately introducing more disease into the community interferes with all his fellow citizens, and enforces upon them a continuance of that odious thing called "charity." Convinced as I am that sexual intercourse is absolutely a private affair, over which the community has no authority whatever, I am just as strongly convinced that procreation is a social concern about which the community, which may some day be burdened with the offspring, should have something to say. I am told that such sterilization would deprive us of a genius or two in every generation; but if I may rid the world of consumption, imbecility and epilepsy by sacrificing a few geniuses, I am quite willing to pay the price. I cannot for the life of me conceive a permanently successful cooperative commonwealth which shall not make some such inroads upon the freedom of the individual man.
And so we fling our differences into one another's face, hopeful that out of the strife of ideas shall emerge the saving truth. Indeed, it is in these differences, leading though as they so often do from discussion to dispute, that my hopes of the ultimate revolution lie. I feel that a revolution that shall come before we shall have threshed out our differences and taken, the great majority of us, a lofty common stand, must be an abortion rather than the beginning of a new and healthy life. Nor am I so disheartened as I used to be by the disension that is now so rife among us; for out of it all emerges, day by day, the New Socialism, a socialism that is of clearer vision and of stronger sinew than the pseudo-socialism which our enemies are welcoming as their only refuge from the impending wrath. Around this New Socialism will rally the syndicalist with his wise demand that we begin at once to prepare the industrial bases of the coming society, the political socialist with his steady refusal to abandon the aid which elected socialists can give us in the economic war, the socialist producer or distributor who warns us that we must pay more attention to cooperative distribution and production if we are to have bread in the day of revolution, the "direct actionist" with his determination to use any effective means of attack in his fight against starvation, and the
anarchist with his hunger and thirst for freedom, his age-long passionate cry for the emancipation of the human soul. And when we so unite the revolution will be born.

It is a dream, you say?

Perhaps it will be—until you and I are dreams!
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