

Platonic dialogues. It is thus useful to see if there are any similar opinions in the works of Xenophon: In his *Banquet*,²⁰ Niceratus boasts of knowing all of Homer: "My father, wanting me to become a good man, compelled me to learn all of Homer's works. . . ." Antisthenes says, "Are you unaware that every rhapsodist knows these two poems by heart? . . . Do you know any more inept breed than the rhapsodists?"

Antisthenes has hardly done more than exaggerate Socrates' ideas. The philosopher, moved by the brutality with which the Cynic spoke and wanting to console the young man, speaks: "It is evident that they do not understand the meaning of the verses, unlike you, who have given a lot of money to Stesimbrotos, Anaxamander and several others, in order to know the best passage." Then, so as not to prolong the discussion of this subject, he addresses Critobulus and asks him of what he is proud.

The thought of Socrates is not in doubt. In order to make it clearer he stresses the price paid to the masters, and we know of his contempt for the lessons of paid teachers.

In the following chapter each one develops the reasons for his preferences and Niceratus is asked to justify his admiration for Homer. The author has him present childish arguments. Niceratus²¹ declares that anything can be found in Homer, and as proof he cites verses of the *Iliad* which teach that one should lean forward in a chariot race when approaching the finish line, and that onion seasons wine well.

Xenophon obviously wants to prove that the supposed practical lessons, drawn from Homer and so praised by the ancients, really do not amount to much. Antisthenes, always ready to attack, says to Niceratus: "Do you also know the art of ruling?" The young man cites a verse in which Homer celebrates Agamemnon as a good prince and brave fighter. The Cynic makes it clearly understood that Homeric ways are too ancient to be able to draw practical lessons from the poem, which is now valuable only as an artistic work.²²

There were many reasons for the new men abandoning the study of the old poems. The way in which religious questions are presented offended them. The Anaxagoreans found the excessively naïve anthropomorphism of Homer absurd. For them, divinity was alien to the world. Socratic providence was like the counterpart of the ancient gods—entirely concerned with the passions. The aristocratic temperament, conservator of the old poets, displeased the philosophers, who admitted no superior qualities other than those of talent and knowledge. . . .

The Socialist Future of the Syndicates¹

I New ways of posing the question of the syndicates according to the doctrine of historical materialism.

II Difficulties for modern socialism presented by the political problem. Economic bases of the political hierarchy: manual work and intellectual work. Illusion of the supposed superiority of the latter.

III Observations of Karl Kautsky on the intelligentsia. Disaster of the intellectuals after a proletarian revolution. The worker against the authority of those outside his profession.

IV Formation of the working class according to Marx's schema. Esprit de corps. Importance of strike funds in trade unions. Cooperation: its juridical role.

V Moral authority of selected bodies. Governing the working class by its syndicate. Gradual shrinking of the state to the benefit of the trade organs.

VI Durkheim's ideas on the moral utility of corporations. Moral influence of English trade unions. Conclusion.

I

Contemporary socialist writers are far from agreeing on the future of professional syndicates. According to some, syndicates must play a very secondary role and serve as a base for an electoral organization. Accord-

ing to others, the syndicates are called upon to lead the major battle against capitalist society by means of uncompromising strikes. These two theses have been rather improperly designated "political system" and "economic system." I do not want to enter into the argument. I only want to call attention to several theoretical points of view and show that Marx's historical materialism greatly illuminates these problems. Later, when the French public has the complete works of Marx and Engels at its disposal, I plan to treat the theory of the revolutionary proletariat extensively.

First of all, it is necessary to be careful not to confuse Marx's theories with the programs of the parties that quote the author of *Capital* as their authority. "Marxism is and remains a doctrine," says Professor Antonio Labriola. "The parties cannot draw their name nor their reason for being from a doctrine."² Even in Germany, from the Congress of Gotha to the Congress of Erfurt, from 1876 to 1892, the Social Democracy wrote into its program proposals whose error Marx had pointed out.³ Neither should one believe that all the fruits of Marx's labor can be summarized in a few sentences gathered from his works, connected in a dogmatic formula and commented on as the evangelical texts are by theologians. For a long time, Italian socialists have been liberated from any literal restraints: the editors of *Critica Sociale* write easily that Marx's work needs to be completed, that the historical laws of *Capital* can no longer be applied in every instance nowadays. "The moment has come," one of the frequent contributors to this organ of "scientific socialism" recently wrote, "to submit these fundamental principles of socialism to examination. The *Devenir Social* of France contributes rather well to this task of renewal and discussion, as it were, to the tasks set for our scientific equipment. . . . Is it not the mission of Latin peoples to modify, develop and illuminate the content of German thought without altering the substance?"⁴ I believe that for the question at hand it suffices to remain faithful to Marx's spirit.

In Marx's doctrine perhaps the most characteristic point, the one that best justifies the name of historical materialism, is this: the development of each system provides the material conditions to execute effective and lasting changes in social relations, in the midst of which the system appears stabilized. We know with what energy the Marxist school insisted on the impossibility of attempting the social revolution so long as capitalism was not sufficiently developed. It is because of this thesis that the school could be accused of fatalism, because it markedly limits the power of will, even when the material force is in the service of an intelligent will.⁵

It seems that too often Marx's thought is not sufficiently probed: all of his disciples say that the revolution can only be the work of the

proletariat and that the proletariat is the product of big industry. But they do not see clearly enough that Marx also believed that the working classes would have to acquire juridical and political ability before being capable of victory.

The history of Christianity has often been compared to the history of modern socialism; there is much truth in this comparison, at least in certain respects. If the Church had been merely a school of philosophy preaching a pure morality, it would undoubtedly have disappeared like so many other groups. The Church was a society working to develop new juridical relationships among its members and governing itself according to a new constitution. The day the Edict of Milan proclaimed tolerance, the Emperor gave his blessings to the existence of a hierarchy stronger than the imperial hierarchy and instituted a state within a state. The barbarian invasion did not consist of simple destruction. Today it is generally agreed that the Germans brought juridical systems which were already developed enough to have an influence on institutions, notably on familial organization. Finally, the French Revolution gives us a very clear example of this juridical continuity. What is most striking is not so much its great noisy turmoil, but the preservation of a system which was long developing in the bosom of the bourgeoisie.

It is not a sufficient response to the opponents of socialism, when they ask what the proletarian revolution will be, to ask rhetorically: "On the eve of 1784 could anyone have said what society would be?" Scientific and mechanical prediction is not in any way the province of any social science; for it is not a matter of calculating what will become of particular customs. It is a matter of knowing whether or not the *preparation is sufficient* for the struggle not to end in a destruction of civilization. Paul Deschanel pronounced an incontestable truth when, in his speech to the Chamber of Deputies on July 10, 1897, he said that in 1789 the bourgeoisie had carried out this work of preparation. We should know where the proletariat stands and determine the means that it is using at the present time to prepare itself.

The utopians sought to create a perfect society. The problem is changed; "research no longer relates to what *society should be*, but to what *the proletariat can do*, in the current class struggle."⁶ We will now ask what the consequences of syndicalist organization are, as it is now practiced, and consider them from the perspective of preparation.

II

Sociologists confront socialists with the evidence of all known revolutions and ask how one can accept a hypothesis which is based on no historical example. Marx knew the answer very well for he wrote: "All

social movements until now have been carried out by minorities for the benefit of minorities."⁷

This empirical law is easily explained when we recall what state ownership has been in modern history. Moreover, the state has played a substantial role in the formation of present industry: "The emerging bourgeoisie could not do without the constant intervention of the state."⁸ The thinking of bourgeois socialists is dominated by the statist prejudices of the bourgeoisie.

In a recent book, the most gifted sociologist of the universities, Emile Durkheim, proposes that the organization of corporations and professional federations be subject to the "general action of the state."⁹ In the conclusions of his speeches of June 19 and 26 and July 3, 1897, on agriculture, Jaurès proved to be less favorable to associations than the professor from Bordeaux. He declared that henceforth one can form a rather exact idea of what the socialist world will be: "We know that in the property of tomorrow, in the society of tomorrow, the four essential forces which are beginning to form and appear today will combine and function. The first force is the individual—the right of the individual to develop freely without any other limit except to prevent him from exploiting others in any way. . . . There is another element . . . the emerging syndicates, reactionary today, socialist tomorrow, but in any case . . . the first units, in certain respects, of a more collective organization of labor. Then above these agricultural or worker syndicates, or professional groupings by trade, there is the town which, in certain respects and in spite of the division of labor among the diverse parts of the territory, is the first complete unit—richer than the professional organizations, which include only an exclusive and limited element. And finally, above the town, there is the nation, the central organism of unity and perpetuity."¹⁰ It will be noticed that in replacing professional federations by the commune as a middle ground between the local corporations and the state, Jaurès markedly increases the economic power of the state.

I will not stop to discuss in detail this idea which I do not understand clearly, so much is this language devoid of any precision. Besides, is all this really new? Are they not old theories dressed up in beautiful new clothing? The unification of trade associations in the commune seems to be a pure replica of medieval history. If the word "nation" is changed to "kingdom," this becomes a traditional conservative idea. I simply want to call attention to the difficulty which the most intelligent people have in delineating a plan that is independent of traditional political forms.¹¹ Not only does Jaurès not exclude the state, but he makes it the regulator and master of industrial life!

We are told in response that the future state will be entirely different

from that of today; but all we hear are promises of this wonderful change without any other guarantee. Very often we hear the eighteenth-century principle according to which the government would become simply an administrator. My, how advanced! An abstract principle, like the one here, is devoid of any precise meaning as long as it is not fulfilled by revealing its principal motives. We know that economists of the last century greatly admired China: "This imbecilic and barbarous government," said Tocqueville, "seems to them to be the most perfect model for all the nations of the world to emulate."¹² The Saint-Simoniens, who spoke much about the "administration of things," often praised Austria; and it was the Austria governed by Metternich! Michel Chevalier in 1840 rated China above France.¹³ The true meaning of this famous administrative principle is thus perfectly clear.

In a knowledgeable and perspicacious article, Georges Platon wrote: "*Revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat!* It is well said. But as Shakespeare said, words are female and only acts are male. . . . In as much as it figures as a passive subject in the very precise economic relations of production, the proletariat emerges as a perfectly distinct notion. The moment it becomes a question of coming to action, of exchanging the passive role which it had in political economy for a politically active role, we see the clear idea gradually becoming blurred. It is imperative that the proletariat organize itself in order to exercise its dictatorship. . . . Could not its organization infuse into the proletariat relations of political dependence, and put its existence as a unified and distinct body directly in danger? Could it not also lead, by means of new inequalities, to a certain covert re-establishment of injustice and economic exploitation which would have to be suppressed? In fact, *all* democratic or proletarian dictatorships have never led to anything—directly or indirectly—but to the restoration of social inequities."¹⁴

The men who head the syndicalist movement in France are certainly not very great philosophers, but they are men of judgment and experience, who can be inept in the art of translating their impressions into scientific terms. But is it not truly curious to observe that their mistrust of political organizations reproduces—in a sentimental and obscure form—the distrust which G. Platon's profound study of philosophy and history inspires in him? Besides, this is not an isolated phenomenon, and several times again we will see that the "pure syndicalists" have more to teach us than they have to learn from us!¹⁵

Our century has been rich in political experiments; almost always the expectations of the reformers have been disappointed; all the attempts to constitute an administration independent of the interests of political parties have been useless. In France, administrations become more corrupt as politics becomes more democratic. It is possible that this is sim-

ply a coincidence; but then again we must explain the reason for this progressive corruption.

The behavior of political professionals in all countries is such that many people hope to see all political organization vanish. This is a noble dream which has enchanted religious souls and utopians; but it is not enough to recognize an evil and to want to make it disappear to be rid of it.

It is here that we should interject the materialist conception of history: the study of politics does not allow us to recognize fundamental causes and does not enlighten us completely. This hierarchy, which the proletarian revolution boasts of abolishing,¹⁶ corresponds in some respects to an economic differentiation; and it is this which must be fully exposed. This differentiation has not always been the same; the struggles have not always had the same goal. It would be very wrong to believe that classes existed in ancient times identical to modern classes. Outside the limits defined by a very conditioned mode of production, historical materialism does not lend itself to being included in the general empirical laws discovered by science. Thus this distinction must be sought in the present.

The contemporary hierarchy has as its principal basis the division of labor into intellectual and manual categories. It is too bad that in 1847 Marx did not examine this question in detail. This explains why the *Communist Manifesto* remains rather vague on the composition of the proletariat; but later, after he had delved deeply into economic problems in an original way, Marx stressed forcefully the importance of this separation.¹⁷ It is thus that industrial economics came to the aid of history and philosophy.

With the energy of desperation, bourgeois democracy clings to the theory of ability¹⁸ and strives to utilize the people's superstitious respect for learning; it uses the most unscrupulous means to heighten its prestige; it multiplies diplomas and strives to transform the slightly educated person into a mandarin. Parasites stand out by an immoderate and deceptive enthusiasm for knowledge, ride the coattails of great scientific pontiffs, serve them as heralds, and demand fat pensions for them.¹⁹ These parasites hope to obtain the esteem of naïve people and to profit from it.

I do not want to enter into a detailed study of intellectual work here; we must apply to this question Marx's reflections on other distinctions in work. He says,²⁰ "The distinction between skilled and unskilled labor is often based on pure illusion, or at least on differences which have long since ceased to have any reality and only live through tradition." It is useless to fight prejudice, but at the present time a change is taking place which tends to spoil the prestige of the intellectuals. Observation

teaches us that a profession rapidly loses its prestige when it undergoes feminization. Laboratory research, scholarly work, the patient and laborious pursuit of mathematical solutions are things particularly appropriate to the feminine genius: those who doubt this have only to refer to the experience of American schools. It is with good reason that so many intellectuals attempt to separate women from the liberal professions; but undoubtedly truth will conquer and then all the subterfuge of "talent" will come into full view.

This does not mean that all differences in places of work will disappear; for every right makes distinctions²¹ and there will be, as today, people who are more skillful and faster than others, but *the differences will be judged in quantitative terms*, all tasks having become of the same kind and consequently measurable. Socialism will not abolish "general functions which originate from the difference existing between the movement in unison of the productive body and the individual movements of the independent members of which it is composed."²² But experience shows that there is nothing exceptional in qualities of leadership and that they are found very commonly among manual workers, perhaps even more than among intellectuals;²³ the great trade unions of England easily found capable leaders in their own membership;²⁴ the leaders of French syndicates have strongly confirmed the conclusion that I have drawn here: they have seen that the domination of the public powers was founded on the supposed superiority of the intellectuals; in combatting the dogma of intellectual capacities, they have directed the workers onto the path pointed out by Marx.

III

In order to understand the full import of the problem at hand, we should examine the objections which are usually made to the syndicalists: they are reproached for being at times too absolutely exclusive: has not Kautsky shown that the Social Democracy cannot reject the intellectuals who come to it? He says, "This question is already settled in the *Communist Manifesto*, and also by the fact that the founders of the German Social Democracy, Marx, Engels and Lassalle, were members of this class. Those who accept the theories of Social Democracy and take part in its fight for freedom are welcome to its ranks."²⁵ What Kautsky says cannot be heedlessly applied to all countries. Conditions are not the same everywhere. In Germany there is a socialist organization which forms a sort of bureaucratic state within a state,²⁶ with paid functionaries. In order to have effective propaganda in the press, it is necessary to seek out professional writers just as one asks a good lawyer to plead a trial. A situation must be created for these writers "which cor-

responds not to a proletarian life, but to a modest bourgeois one."²⁷ In France, intellectuals claim that their true place is in the parliament and that dictatorial power would come to them automatically in the event of success. It is against this "representative dictatorship of the proletariat" that the syndicalists protest. They rightly think that it would not produce the happy results the theorists imagine would be engendered by the dictatorship of the proletariat.²⁸

Marx and Engels²⁹ are not convincing examples of this parasitic intellectualism; they are the exceptions to the rule, because very superior men escape the limits of class. In the *Communist Manifesto* Marx notes that a part of the nobility used to identify with the bourgeoisie. He says that likewise "nowadays a part of the bourgeoisie passes into the proletariat; and that this is especially true for a certain number of bourgeois ideologues who have risen to the theoretical level of the whole historical movement."³⁰ It is necessary to discount the ideologues, who, by their temperament, can hardly play a political role, seize power and become the masters. Marx does not say that the proletariat will do what the bourgeoisie did in 1789; he knows well that the situation is very different: the Third Estate could offer ambitious nobles "political dignities," for it did not intend to destroy hierarchy; it intended only to improve it for its own benefit. Today the Social Democracy can offer only employment to the bourgeois who come to it.

Kautsky has examined very carefully the common interests between the intelligentsia and the proletariat; he recognizes that on an all-important point—the dissemination of education—"the interests of the proletariat are diametrically opposed to those of the intelligentsia. Already from this point of view, if we disregard all the others, an appeal to interests is not the best means of making this class as a whole come to socialism."³¹

The intellectuals have professional interests³² and not general class interests. These professional interests would be injured by the proletarian revolution. Lawyers would undoubtedly find no place in the future society and it is not likely that the number of doctors will increase. Progress in science and the better organization of assistance have already had the effect of diminishing the number of doctors utilized. In big industry many high-level employees could be eliminated if large stockholders did not need to place clients. A better division of labor would allow, as in England, the concentration of the work (now done badly by too many engineers) in a small group of very learned and very experienced technicians. As the character and intelligence of the workers improve, the majority of the overseers can be eliminated.³³ The English experience abundantly proves it. Finally for office jobs, women compete

actively with men; and these jobs will be reserved for them when socialism emancipates them. Thus, then, the socialization of the means of production would mean a huge "lock-out."³⁴ It is difficult to believe that the intellectuals are unaware of a truth as certain as this one!

These badly paid, discontented or idle intellectuals have had the truly inspired idea of introducing the ill-fitting term "intellectual proletariat." They can thus easily slip into the ranks of the industrial proletariat. Kautsky points out that they are like members of a medieval guild.³⁵ They also strongly resemble workers working at home, having all their equipment, but often idle due to insufficient clientele. They are attached to the petty bourgeoisie and strive to direct socialism onto paths favorable to their interests; their "socialism is at the same time reactionary and utopian," like that of the petit bourgeois.³⁶ Further, they could be compared to Romans of the period of the decline (so different from our proletarians) living off society, while modern society lives off the proletariat.³⁷

While the socialization of the means of production will usefully employ all the forces of the work of the producers—that is, of the true proletarians—it will eliminate the work of the great majority of false proletarians. A more incisive opposition would be difficult to imagine and this opposition must appear especially glaring to those who are used to dealing with historical materialism.

The true vocation of the intellectuals is the exploitation of politics. The role of the politician is very like that of courtier and does not require any industrial aptitude. We need not try speaking to them of eliminating the traditional forms of the state: in this respect their "ideal" is reactionary, however it seems to "good people."³⁸ Intellectuals want to persuade the workers that their interest is in bringing them (the intellectuals) to power and accepting the hierarchy of ability, which subordinates the workers to politicians.

The syndicalists are rebelling, and rightly so. They sense very well that if the worker accepts the command of "*people outside of the productive corporation*," he will always remain incapable of governing himself and be subject to external discipline.³⁹ The words may change,⁴⁰ but the thing will not: the exploitation of the worker will continue. Marx has described in excellent terms this state of insufficient development of the proletariat. "The tie between their individual functions and their unity as a productive body is found *outside of them*. . . . The coordination of their work seems to them ideally to be the province of the capitalist,⁴¹ and the unity of their collective body seems to them practically to be *his* authority—the power of a foreign will, which subjects their acts to his goal."⁴²

IV

In the last pages of the *Poverty of Philosophy*, Marx traces the development of the proletariat, such as it appeared to him in 1847, in the midst of the English disturbances. He himself says that he points out only "several phases" of this development. We should notice especially in this description that the proletariat is at first regarded as a class *for* the capitalists, against whom it puts up its organizations of resistance and that, only later, does it become a class *for itself*. "The interests which the proletariat defends *become* class interests. But the struggle between classes is a political struggle."⁴³

These brief statements have not sufficiently attracted the attention of socialists. It is quite regrettable that language permits confusing the various meanings of the word "politics" with an ease often abused by polemicists. It is applied sometimes to the party agitators who seek to capture state power for the greatest profit of themselves and their co-members in order to exercise vengeance or in order to impose religious (or irreligious) ideas. It is also applied at times to measures of a general order with the object of modifying, in a notable way, the existing juridical system. Thus to change the mode of dividing inheritance, permitting trusts, augmenting the freedom of bequests, authorizing the creation of "homesteads," giving more liberty to women—these are all called political measures.

In order to transform the chaotic mass of the proletariat into a class for itself, an immense work of decomposition and recombination must be accomplished. Marx believed that this work should be accomplished beginning with the organization of societies of resistance. But in 1847, his thinking was not yet perfectly precise; besides, he believed the world was going to enter into an extremely long period of revolutionary agitation, in which nothing could be foreseen with any degree of success. When he wrote *Capital* his thinking was more developed and he said in his preface: "Abstractions are made from loftier motives, while their own interest commands the present ruling classes to get rid of *all the legal obstacles which can hinder the development of the working class*," so that the social revolution does not take a barbarous form. In his *Critique of the Gotha Program* in 1875 he asked that the state not be charged with the education of the people, but that it only endow the schools.

Marx's thought leaves no doubt: the transformation must come about by an internal mechanism: the new right must be created by an internal mechanism in the bosom of the proletariat, by its own resources. What must be asked of the public powers is to give the facilities to proceed to this transformation of the people by itself. It is with this goal that the

workers enter into the electoral arena. The reason for the political struggle is thus well determined: there is no longer an arbitrary "ideal" end in view, such as that sought by political revolutionaries.

Now let us examine in a more precise way what experience teaches us about this formation of the proletariat into a class for itself; that is, let us ask what are the new juridical aspects under which economic relations presently appear to the workers. Like Marx, we take the resistance as a starting point: we must question whether the coalition does not give rise in the worker's soul to juridical principles in contradiction to those consecrated by tradition.

Law, as it is formulated by liberal codes, hardly recognizes anyone but the isolated worker; each individual can quit work; workers can have an agreement to abandon the factory together, but the multiplication of an individual fact does not change its character.⁴⁴ Each striker can take up his work anew when he judges it suitable; the boss can deal with other wage-earners, and this contract contains nothing reprehensible or blameworthy. Such is the theory applied by the courts in the name of the "freedom to work."

For syndicalists these propositions are false. The sum of workers forms a body; the interests of all are the same; no one can abandon the cause of his comrades without being considered a traitor. It is solidarity that characterizes the strike in the consciousness of the workers, and Marx defines this cohesiveness very well in saying that "the coalition has as a goal to end competition" among employees.⁴⁵

The French law of December 27, 1892, on conciliations implicitly recognizes the existence of this solidarity. Indeed, taken strictly from the individualist point of view, there is no conciliation to be attempted; the strike has broken every lawful connection between the employer and each of his workers.⁴⁶ Before the strike there were only individual contracts; how can they be transformed into obligations which would bind the employer and a *body* with which he had never dealt? It is for this reason that very often industrialists do not wish to appear before the conciliation magistrate: they do not want to recognize the existence of a body which would have a monopoly on the manpower in their factories, just as, formerly, a guild used to have a monopoly on production in our cities.

Legislators have not dared to go very far in this direction; they are instituting a procedure in which delegates, nominated by the workers, take part, but they accord no authority to the agreements reached. The delegates cannot even impose on their constituents the agreement which they signed. A bill was introduced by Jules Guesde on February 8, 1894, to give a constitution to the workers' groups, which should be compared "in the management of the interests of their members to the capitalist

stock companies." The authors of the proposal drew from this principle rules related to the exercise of the rights of the majority to impose a strike on the minority; but they did not concern themselves with the conditions of the normal life of this corporation. It is not very likely that this idea will soon result in something practical.⁴⁷

The workers believe that all strikers should be allowed back, and they do not hesitate to make the greatest sacrifices to obtain the reintegration of their excluded comrades. I find this principle expressed in a very concise way in a transaction which occurred in Limoges. "The undersigned recognize that in the matter of strikes, when the conflict is over, the workers on strike without exception should resume their original work."⁴⁸

The inquiry on trade unionism which Paul de Rousiers has made furnishes us very valuable information on the degree to which the *esprit de corps* of English workers has been increased. Thus in 1897 it was thought that "blacklegs" (strike-breakers) would rapidly disappear.⁴⁹ Collective bargaining becomes more and more the rule: employers and workers submit to rules which are as binding as if they were based on law. Collective bargaining is, for Paul de Rousiers, necessitated by the conditions of modern industry.⁵⁰ Finally, in the regions where the syndicates are well organized, discussions on the application of pay scales no longer take place between workers and agents, but between officials of the unions and employers.⁵¹

This constitutes a whole system of new rights which developed in the midst of innumerable battles and difficulties; the workers needed to have above them an authority divided into parts; consequently, however, it was uncertain in its plans; at times it was a violent authority and at times it was more benevolent.⁵² The influence of the political conditions in England is undeniable in the history of trade unionism, but this influence has been indirect. Judicial obstacles have been raised, concessions have been granted to the syndicates to act and popular education has been developed; but workers can boast of having won their case themselves, of having produced a new organization in the bosom of the unorganized proletariat and one independent from all bourgeois organization.

Usually the syndicates have maneuvered skillfully to bring public opinion to their side. It is indeed a political struggle—what takes place between enemy groups in order to obtain public favor. It is a political struggle often more effective than the one in parliamentary assemblies, for laws are inoperative as long as public opinion does not support them. The unions have gained universal respect: they have proved to employers that they are "well-organized and responsible associations."⁵³ Thus they have won effective recognition of their *ability*. They have

come of age by demonstrating their power. In England, the union movement is very far from having attained full maturity. More than once, unions which seemed very well launched have dissolved, or at least declined when the members no longer felt the urgent necessity for the union, when they believed that the goals had been attained, or when they found the obligation for constant payment too difficult.⁵⁴ One must have "intelligence, a certain breadth of ideas or public spirit, as the English say; that is to say, that these interests, though collective, are no less immediate so as to convince the worker to repeat the weekly deduction . . . [from] his wages."⁵⁵ Therefore, all observers agree in recognizing that the trade unions have been an excellent school for workers whose morality has been transformed; the syndicates are everywhere composed of the best elements of the whole trade. Experience has shown that there is no advantage in multiplying memberships to the detriment of quality. "In absorbing weak elements, one becomes weakened," said one important member of the mechanics' union to Paul de Rousiers.⁵⁶ Hence the result that many workshops by preference hire unionized workers who seem to offer guarantees which one ordinarily expects to find in men who have been selected by criteria of a moral nature; even for dock work, employers find it in their interest to deal with union men.⁵⁷

In several fields in which industry has not become completely modern, for several exceptional professions, corporative aspects are still found in the unions. Paul de Rousiers believes that these vestiges of the past will disappear.⁵⁸ In general, the syndicalists do not pursue a selfish goal intended to give them privileges. They pursue a general goal, the realization of a settlement from which all workers will profit—even those who have made their struggle more arduous by their apathy or cowardice. An intelligent evaluation of their particular interests in the course of industrial conflicts leads the big unions to assume the protection of all the workers whose lives are affected by work stoppage. Thus the mechanics, during the Clyde strikes in 1893, not only sustained their own members but also gave help to non-unionists and to members of organizations too weak to stand heavy expenses.⁵⁹

English unions have been very divided for several years on the question of "benefits": the oldest ones collect assessments and give help to members in case of sickness, unemployment or accident; they even give pensions to the aged. They are simultaneously societies of resistance and societies of mutual assistance. This system has shown excellent results as long as it has been confined to unifying elite workers receiving high wages; thus, the union of mechanics requires a levy of 2 fr. 50 a week, the carpenters, 1 fr. 25. When the old syndicates gradually opened their ranks to auxiliary workers, to the "unskilled," few of these workers could

profit from the new order because their resources were too feeble. When the attempt was made to form syndicates with badly paid workers, such as agricultural workers or dockers, the difficulty was much greater, because levies of a penny per day were already high enough to discourage many workers. Thus the idea spread that it was necessary to limit the role of unions to resistance, and to eliminate benefits.

The tactics of the new unions are justified perfectly by the exigencies of the situation. But people have tried to give it a theoretical basis—wrongly so, in my humble opinion. Experience having shown how difficult it is to keep workers in syndicates, it seems strange to abandon the mutualist idea. Besides, even in the dockers' union, which was at first conceived in a spirit entirely opposed to that of the old trade-unionism, it was very quickly recognized that it would be useful to give family aid of 100 francs in case of death.⁶⁰

In this question, as in all practical questions, we must keep our sense of proportion. The rules of the old unions were not flexible enough; dues for all benefits should not be made obligatory, so as not to alienate the less fortunate; only unemployment or health insurance need be mandatory, but types of assistance vary according to circumstances. If quality is an essential element of success in social struggles as well as in battles, numbers must not be neglected entirely. The question of principles does not appear to be in doubt: to reduce the syndicates to societies of resistance only is to pose a formidable barrier to the development of the proletariat; to open the workers to surrendering to the authoritative influence of bourgeois demagogues by reducing the importance of economic forces which can contribute to maintaining the autonomy of the working class;⁶¹ to prevent it from elaborating new juridical principles in accordance with its own manner of living; in a word, to refuse it the possibility of becoming a class *for itself*. The mutual societies founded by the syndicates do not function on the same principles as bourgeois banks; instead of being inspired by capitalist models, they maintain an appearance of proletarian solidarity.⁶²

The more there are distinct connections in the unorganized and confused milieu of workers, the more one is sure new elements of social reorganization are being carefully prepared. There is much talk of organizing the proletariat: but to organize does not consist in placing automatons on boxes! Organization is the passage from order which is mechanical, blind and determined from the outside, to organic, intelligent and fully accepted differentiation; in a word, it is a moral development. It is reached only by long practice and experience acquired in life. All institutions are formed in the same way; they do not result from decisions by great statesmen, any more than by scholars' calculations. They are made by embracing and condensing all the elements of

life. On what grounds would the proletariat then escape the necessity of "developing itself" by this method?

One thing has always astonished me: the aversion of many Marxists to cooperatives. They maintain that the workers, once occupied with minute details of grocery and bakery, would be lost to socialism and would cease to understand the class struggle. From this desertion would come, at least in Italy, the increasing influence of the petit bourgeois mentality in the Socialist Party.⁶³ What is the evidence for this lamented desertion? Only one thing: the bad composition of the Italian Socialist Party, and this bad composition has led to numerous articles in *Critica Sociale*. The test of practice is the true test of ideas: if the workers perceive that their leaders are not capable of directing them, they abandon them as soon as they leave the realm of vague manifestoes and come into contact with economic life.

The leaders of the Socialist Movement are supposed to serve men, just as theory exists for practice. What would happen, then, if, after the social revolution, industry should be directed by groups who are today incapable of managing a cooperative?

I do not think that the social revolution could resemble a scene from the Apocalypse. At times the old idealists who believed in the supreme influence of education are scoffed at, and it is very seriously proclaimed that men will be transformed under the influence of the new economy! But has great progress thereby been made? How do we know that this change will take place within the boundaries in which we hope to see it take place? How do we know that a new economy will be able to function by itself? Is not the force behind all this education being hidden from us—the "benevolent despot" imagined by so many philosophers? In any event, the idea is very utopian. It is in the bosom of capitalist society that not only the new productive forces, but also the relations of a new social order—what can be called the moral forces of the future—should develop. Before these moral forces have attained a certain maturity, when they are still indistinct, we live apparently according to rules of the past; but in pushing these rules to their limit, in putting them to new and unexpected uses, they are worn out and gradually destroyed.⁶⁴

Undoubtedly cooperatives are not specifically socialist institutions; they can even be directed with the aim of combatting socialist propaganda. But all institutions present the same *formal* character: they are only worth what is put into them; but they can more or less lend themselves to socialist influence. They can facilitate or indirectly hinder the proletarian movement.

If the cooperatives resulted only in making material life less harsh for workers, wouldn't this already be an enormous accomplishment? Experience had already shown Arthur Young, the celebrated agronomist

of the eighteenth century, that the best paid workers were the most inclined to agitation.⁶⁵ All writers now recognize that poverty is a great obstacle to socialist progress. But cooperatives have a still more direct effect in that they steer the worker away from the mentality of the shopkeeper, that great constituent of bourgeois democracy; that is no small result.⁶⁶

Syndicates can have a great influence on the cooperatives by underwriting them, especially at the time of their formation: it rests with syndicates to infuse the cooperatives with the proletarian spirit, to prevent them from being transformed into simple overseers, to make everything that recalls capitalist association disappear. The essential objective is for the cooperative to develop new juridical notions in the working class: the concepts of seller-buyer, lender-borrower are those that dominate the lives of workers in their relations with shopkeepers. These concepts should disappear in order to make way for ideas deriving from mutuality and solidarity.

In a book by Georges d'Avenel there is an item which will seem trivial to more than one reader, but which I find very important. "In the statutes [of the *Moissonneuse*] voted in general assembly, 'free union' enjoys the same respect and confers the same rights as 'legal marriage.' At the death of a member, says Article 15, his widow, his 'companion,' or his children can effect the transfer of his stock to their name."⁶⁷ That is indeed a new law promulgated and applied, in opposition to the old law, and in opposition to the parts of this law which are ordinarily considered fundamental. It is useful to recall that one of the first manifestations of early canon law seems to have been the decree of Pope Calixtus authorizing "Christian unions" in cases where imperial law forbade "lawful weddings."⁶⁸

V

The English trade unions are far from comprising as large a proportion of the working class as is commonly believed. A director of a docks company said to one of Paul de Rousiers's collaborators: "Trade unionism includes at the most a sixth or seventh of all workers; there is no cause to worry too much about what this minority can do." But, points out the author, how does it then happen that employers are so troubled during strikes?

"The moral influence of trade unionism extends well beyond the approximately 1,500,000 men who represent its numerical strength; these 1,500,000 men are like a peacetime army of laborers; in times of war the voluntary enlistments rise. . . . It is fortunate that the non-unionists are gradually acquiring the habit of lining up behind the union leaders,"

because the leaders generally succeed in preventing the mob from committing excesses.⁶⁹

Many people believe that the remarkable results obtained in England justify the idea of restoring the obligatory guilds. I have already said that Paul de Rousiers considers the guild an outdated economic form, incompatible with the conditions of large, modern industry. Because excellent results have been achieved by the organization of a fair number of workers, we must not conclude that things would go even better by organizing them all: sophisms of this sort are frequent in the social science practiced by beginners. The success of trade unions arises from a certain selectivity in the trade bodies; this selectivity justifies, according to Paul de Rousiers, certain acts which we are in the habit of condemning and of ascribing to the "tyranny of the syndicates." In the building industry the unions seek to exclude the non-unionists from the great building sites and they generally fare so well that they succeed in taking in the great majority of workers. Thus our author evaluates these measures inspired by guild traditions: "Brought back to its true proportions, the tyranny of the syndicates . . . loses this terrifying quality which certain imaginations readily attribute to it; above all, it is not general and it is always exercised on an extremely limited group of little interest."⁷⁰

At the present stage of development attained by many workers' societies, the new principle is not yet entirely detached from guild traditions; therefore, I am not citing the example of the building workers as an irreproachable example. I only want to show that rather questionable acts can seem justified by the superior ability of the syndicalists. The syndicalists give their time and their money without hope of purely personal rewards; thus they acquire the incontestable right to govern their group. It does not seem like a very good idea for the proportion of syndicalists to become extremely high in a trade, not only because selectivity is diminished but also because then the closed shop mentality develops. Obviously one cannot make a hard and fast rule; the most advantageous proportions vary from one occupation to another, according to a thousand individual circumstances.

We are faced with a truly new principle which upsets all the ideas theoreticians have tried to popularize for a century. "Government by all citizens" has always been a fiction, but this fiction was the last word of democratic science. No one has ever tried to justify the extraordinary paradox whereby the vote of a *chaotic majority* brings about Rousseau's infallible "general will." Often, socialist writers, in spite of their contempt for eighteenth-century utopians, reiterate Rousseau's idea: they say that the state will no longer exist because when classes have disappeared there will be no more oppression in society, and then public administration will truly represent the whole people. These are

declarations without a hint of proof.⁷¹ Besides, as a condition of his paradox, Rousseau posed the disappearance of all intrigues and factions: but that is an extremely improbable hypothesis. For, in fact, history is the story of the political factions that take over the state and exercise their predatory craftiness within it.⁷²

What we find here is not a novelty in the strictly formal sense. The novelty resides in the mode and the aim of selection. The old groups were, above all, political—that is to say, constituted principally for the conquest of power; they welcomed all men of daring who were very poor at working for a living.⁷³ The new groups are professional. They have as a base the mode of production of material life and they have industrial interests in mind. According to the principles of historical materialism, they are capable of supporting the socialist structure.

These explanations were necessary to justify a resolution of the Congress of the French Workers' Party held at Romilly in 1895: "The congress pronounces itself in favor of a law binding all workers in the same occupation, syndicated or not, to the decisions of the syndicates in the matter of wages or prices and, in general, in all working conditions." This resolution passed almost unnoticed,⁷⁴ and its importance has barely been understood in France. It tends to legitimize what has become practice in English unions; it sanctions the principle of government by selected professional groups; that is, the new political principle of the proletariat. An organized equality⁷⁵ which is just and real would be substituted for a purely ideal and utopian one.

But principles of this kind do not pass into practice simply by decree. The unions must prove their juridical ability. The fact that the principle can by this time be recognized is already a step in the right direction; better yet: the unions have entered into battle in order to conquer new powers piece by piece. In this struggle, they find themselves in agreement with the established powers by virtue of the principles of bourgeois democracy.

Democracy hardly values *freedom to work* as economists define the term; coercion does not frighten democracy; in general radicals rather like to control authority; they have a taste for policing things and their hand is not light. It seems simple to them that economic difficulties be regulated by the decision of public powers. Thus they would willingly accept compulsory unions regulated by the commune; the municipal authority would make general rules in order to establish the conditions of collective bargaining.⁷⁶

Many people believe that employment bureaus should be municipalized: at present they are not free enterprises; they are "offices," just like the offices of assessor, transport agent in Les Halles, etc. In order to promote the interest of the workers as well as to avoid immoral abuses,

one wonders if it would not be preferable to change the operating method of these offices and have their work done by municipal employees. In many cities, free placement bureaus have been established. The expansion of this measure is not the kind that displeases the radicals. But the unions have understood very well that if they could take over the administration of employment bureaus, this conquest would be very important for them, not only because of the authority that they would have over the workers in the trade, but especially because they would have seized from the traditional political authority a bit of its power.

Several years ago, minor delegates were created to make up for the inadequacy of administrative surveillance; the old democratic tradition was followed for their designation; the unions were left aside. It was the same when it was necessary to organize pension funds and relief; direct election was called for instead of giving the syndicates a new field of activity. In fact, the syndicates are striving to conquer this power of surveillance indirectly, by influencing the voters; when they have acquired this power in a general and indirect way, the legislator will be forced to acknowledge them and to suppress the fiction of a useless vote.⁷⁷

Everyone complains of surveillance of industrial shops; the inspectors are too few and their good will (when they have it) is destroyed by administrative inertia or even curbed by public powers. The radicals' solution is very simple: multiply the bureaucrats in order to give employment to intellectuals out of work.⁷⁸ The socialist solution is simpler and more economical: charge the unions with inspection; one would thereby be assured that it would be serious and practical.

Finally, is it not obvious that the unions should be much more qualified than municipal employees to be concerned with all questions of assistance? Here again their involvement would be more efficient and less expensive than that of established bodies.

Such are the first conquests which the unions can pursue in the political domain. They must gain these powers little by little, by demanding them constantly, by interesting the public in their efforts, by denouncing abuses unremittingly, and by showing the inability or impropriety of public administration. Thus they will succeed in taking all life out of the old forms, preserved by the democrats, and will leave them with only the negative function of supervision and repression. Then a new society will have been created with completely new elements and with purely proletarian principles. Societies of resistance will have ended by increasing their field of action so much that they will have absorbed almost all politics.

Here, according to the materialist conception of history as I under-

stand it, is the definitive struggle for political power. This is not a struggle to take over the positions occupied by the bourgeoisie and to assume its mantle; it is a struggle to drain the bourgeois political organism of all life and to transfer everything useful that it contained into a proletarian political organism created along with the development of the proletariat.

VI

A very difficult subject remains to be treated and one that I would not perhaps have attempted if I had not found some propositions in a recent book of Durkheim's⁷⁹ which are of such a kind as to consolidate historical materialism. The weak part of socialism is the moral part: it is not that many socialist writers have not written eloquently on this subject; but oratorical amplifications are easy when it concerns morality. The same things are repeated almost always, and up till now all the homilies had little influence on men.

It would be criminal to encourage a social revolution which would result in imperiling what little morality exists. In a speech which has been quoted frequently by French newspapers, given at Montigny-sur-Sambre, E. Vandervelde said: "If the workers triumphed without having accomplished the indispensable moral development, their rule would be abominable and the world would be plunged anew into suffering, brutality and injustices as great as those of the present."

Undoubtedly it is inexact to say that the social question is a moral question, as understood by certain philosophers. But, we must also say that economic transformations cannot be realized if the workers have not acquired a superior level of moral culture.⁸⁰ The very notion of the interdependence of phenomena, which creates the basis of historic materialism, makes this obvious: however, we often see Marx's disciples showing astonishing carelessness whenever a question of morality arises. This is due to the fact that they have recognized that the principal remedies proposed by the philosophers are ineffective. Durkheim writes, quite correctly: "When it is said of an individual or social malady that it is completely moral, it is usually meant that there is no effective remedy for it, but it can only be cured with the help of exhortations and methodical objurgations and, in a word, through verbal action. . . . No one sees that this is tantamount to applying to the mind the beliefs and methods that the primitive man applies to the physical world. Just as he believes in the existence of magical words having the power to transmute one being into another, we believe . . . that with appropriate words, character and intelligence can be transformed. . . . We think that if we fervently proclaim our desire to see a particular revolution accomplished, it will happen spontaneously."⁸¹

Molinari appeals to the religious influence;⁸² Durkheim believes it to be ineffective: "When it is no more than a symbolic idealism, than a traditional but debatable philosophy *more or less estranged from our daily preoccupations*, it is difficult for it to have much influence on us."⁸³ He believes also that education has only a very limited influence: "The artificial environment of the school can only preserve the child for a time, and feebly at that. As real life influences him more, it will come to destroy the work of the educator."⁸⁴

We understand that more than one socialist, after having noted, with Durkheim, the impotence of the methods advocated to moralize people, has reached a skeptical conclusion and has written that the future world would take care of itself. Undoubtedly we do not have to determine what will exist later on; history has no means of predicting. But the question is asked for the present and it is urgent. However, we must recognize that it is badly posed. It is not a matter of knowing what is the best morality, but only of determining if there exists a *mechanism capable of guaranteeing the development of morality*.

Durkheim, asking what mechanism could halt moral disintegration as revealed by the continuous increase in the number of suicides, sees hope only in professional groups. "In dispersing the only groups that can steadfastly rally the individual wills, we have destroyed with our own hands the designated instrument of our moral reorganization."⁸⁵ "Since [the corporation] is composed of individuals who perform the same work and whose interests are similar, or even identical, there is no more propitious ground for the formation of ideas and social feelings."⁸⁶

From the renaissance of the corporative regime, modern society would obtain that moderate integration which, according to Durkheim's interpretation of the statistics on suicide, would be so beneficial for the citizen.⁸⁷ But the professional association in which the administrative spirit tends necessarily to dominate is definitely inferior, in this aspect, to the union in which are grouped workers who have given proof, to a particularly high degree, of productive capacities, of intellectual energies, and of devotion to comrades. In such a syndicate, liberty is encouraged and, by reason of the necessities of economic struggles, the will to solidarity is always firm.⁸⁸ We have then good reason to think that syndicates could be powerful vehicles of moralization.

Paul de Rousiers's collaborators, in the book already frequently quoted, have given us numerous examples of the moral progress realized under the influence of trade unionism. Concerning the dockers, changes have been very remarkable although their association is not the most prosperous. Many have abandoned their intemperate habits and several have even become "teetotalers."⁸⁹—The union leaders spend a great deal of time combatting drunkenness. Knight, the secretary-general of ship-

builders, does so all the more commendably as his comrades have the reputation of being inclined to drink.⁹⁰

Experience has shown that laws and police are powerless to halt alcoholism: in Belgium the Workers' Party understood that it was a question of life or death for the proletariat, and it has begun a very energetic campaign against alcoholism. With the help of constant surveillance by comrades it does not seem impossible to succeed: today one goes to the carbaret as a point of honor, in order to do as the others and show oneself a "good fellow." Instead, the bistro bar should be abandoned as a point of honor. This is not something beyond the strength of the unions: but in order for them to fill this role, they must be stronger and more disciplined than at present.

Two other serious problems are posed today: the protection of the wife against her husband, and the protection of the child against his father. I have no faith in legislation, inspection or the police; the workers should carry out their inspection and policing themselves. This is relatively easy since the woman is an industrial worker and can thus be a member of a union which will help her when her husband treats her in a way that he himself would not want to be treated by his boss.⁹¹ Through the woman, the union watches over the child, the hope of the proletariat, who should be introduced very young into socialist groups.

Here again we see the importance of the benefits of the old trade unions. The woman who has retired from the shop remains a member of a workers' group, still takes part in its deliberations, has interests in the relief funds instituted by the syndicate, and consequently always has power to back her up. The child can be engaged at an early age if the union has various forms to aid its members, to watch over him at school and during his apprenticeship.⁹²

Thus the syndicate is revealed as one of the strongest pedagogical institutions which can exist, however undeveloped it is.⁹³

CONCLUSION

This study gives us a beautiful illustration of Marxian doctrines; the leaders of the syndicalist movement were unacquainted with his theories and usually even had but vague notions of historical materialism. Their strategy was at times open to criticism because they were obliged to learn by practical experience and no one could give them advice. Today things have developed enough to make it possible to understand the role that the unions have been called upon to play.

Today we see very clearly that the proletariat cannot be freed from all exploitation by modeling itself after the old social classes, by sitting at the feet of the bourgeoisie as they did at the feet of the nobility, by

adapting the old political formulas to its new needs, or by seizing public power in order to profit by it, as the bourgeoisie in all countries has done.

If, as Marx said, the proletarians can only take possession of productive social forces by abolishing "the methods by which they gained a part of the revenue and consequently . . . the whole existing system of revenue sharing,"⁹⁴ how can it be asserted that they can preserve the quintessential bourgeois means of appropriation, that is, the forms of traditional government? Such a conclusion would be the negation of all historical materialism. Finally, how could the division between the governed and the governing disappear if society did not contain forces, developed over a long period, capable of preventing the return to the past?

Concerning the state, the action of the proletariat is twofold: it must struggle within the existing framework in order to obtain social legislation favorable to its development. It must use the influence it gains either in public opinion or in the structure of power to destroy the existing political organization: one by one, seize from the state and the community all their powers in order to enrich the budding proletarian institutions—especially their syndicates.

The proletariat must work henceforth to free itself from everything except inner direction. It is by movement and action that the workers must acquire juridical and political ability. Its first rule of conduct should be: *to remain exclusively worker*, that is, to exclude the intellectuals whose leadership would have the effect of restoring hierarchies and dividing the body of workers. The role of the intellectuals is an auxiliary role; they can serve as employees of the unions.⁹⁵ They have no role as leaders now that the proletariat has begun to be aware of its *reality* and to form its own organizations.

The development of the proletariat includes a powerful moral discipline exerted on its members: it can be exercised through its syndicates, which are supposed to remove all the forms of organization inherited from the bourgeoisie.

In order to sum up my thinking in capsule form, I say that *the whole future of socialism rests on the autonomous development of the workers' syndicates*.

to follow it, since punishment is always at hand . . . ? For, in such a case, if one refuses to follow good advice, one makes mistakes and these mistakes entail punishment" (*Memorabilia*, Book III, chap. IX, sect. 10).

11. Curtius, after having summed up the teaching of the Sophists, says: "with this outburst of egoism, no constitution, and above all no republican constitution, could exist . . . Thus the greatest service that a Greek could give to his country . . . was to combat Sophistic thought, which compromised the people's most precious possessions . . . and to replace this exclusive education of the intelligence . . . by investigation to reveal the foundations of moral life. That is what Socrates did." (Curtius, Vol. IV, p. 123).

We believe that from the political point of view Socrates' influence was almost as bad as that of the Sophists. The Socratics were submerged in the theory of the absolute; they did not recognize the importance of historical law; this made them revolutionaries.

12. Proudhon said of Condorcet: "The only man who kept sight of equality in '93 was made an outlaw, captured by the tribunal police (of Robespierre), and was forced to poison himself." (*De la justice dans la révolution et dans l'église* (Paris: Garnier frères, 1858), 3rd study, sect. XLI). Proudhon judged Robespierre the same way as did Taine, who has so well proved to us that the great theoretician of the Convention was a perfect cad.
13. At this period the infamous cult of Cotys flourished in Athens. Eupolis wrote the comedy (Curtius, Vol. III, p. 319) against the participants in these orgies. This brings to mind Juvenal's lines about the sodomist debaucheries of the Romans of his time: "Solis ara deae maribus patet. 'Ite, profanae,' clamatur, 'nullo gemit hic tibia cornu,' talia secreta coluerunt orgia taeda Cecropiam soliti Baptae lassare Cotyton" (*Satire* II, v. 89).

Curtius said, "On the outside Athens was powerful, but on the inside the strength of the republic, which rested on civic virtue and patriotism, was in full decline" (p. 323).

14. Curtius, Vol. III, p. 322.
15. Ibid., Vol. V, p. 202.
16. Renan says: "The Roman Empire, in demoting nobility . . . increased, on the other hand, the advantages of wealth. Far from establishing effective equality among the citizens, the Roman Empire, in opening wide the doors of the Roman city, created a deep division between the *honestiores* (notables, the rich) and the *humiliores* or *tenuiores* (the poor). The proclamation of political equality for all introduced inequality into the law" (*Marc-Aurèle et la fin du monde antique* (Paris, C. Lévy, 1882), p. 598).
17. Curtius, Vol. II, p. 98.
18. *Gorgias*, sect. LXVII. *Oedipus at Colonus* was played only two years before the death of Socrates. Tragedy was thus still in its heroic period.
19. *Philosophie de Socrate*, Vol. II, p. 401.

20. *Banquet*, chap. III, sect. 5.

21. Ibid., chap. IV, sect. 6.

22. A work of this kind, being no longer definitive, no longer has value according to Socratic theories.

Chapter 2

THE SOCIALIST FUTURE OF THE SYNDICATES

1. [This work first appeared in *Humanité nouvelle*, March and April, 1898, was reprinted in various editions and included in *Matériaux d'une théorie du prolétariat* (Paris: Marcel Rivière, 1919)—ED.]
2. Antonio Labriola, *Essais sur la conception matérialiste de l'histoire* (Paris: Giard et Brière, 1897), French translation, p. 37. The first of the two essays which make up the volume is particularly important because its text had been submitted to Engels; it extends from p. 21 to p. 117 in the first edition, which I quote here.
3. In a letter of 1875, published only in 1891 by Engels.
4. *Critica Sociale*, July 16, 1877, p. 215, col. 1. This review was regarded at that time as a very reliable mouthpiece of socialist doctrine.
5. It would be very useful to add here a few explanations in order to clarify the meaning of this idea. I take them from the preface which I wrote in July 1898 to a book by Saverio Merlino: *Formes et essence du socialisme* (Paris: Giard et Brière, 1898). "What is essential in Marx's theory is the conception of a *social mechanism formed by the classes*, which serves to transform modern society from top to bottom, under the influence of ideas and passions which dominate today" (p. v). "By the sole fact of the introduction of a social mechanism, Marx avoids all the purely intellectualist sociology and *separates himself from the utopians*. There cannot be any usable mechanisms in science unless there are stable formations, largely escaping the manipulations of intelligence, forming solid parts of the system. There must be unconsciousness, blindness and instinct in society for these parts to resist a certain length of time with their forms and their laws of observed development" (pp. viii-ix). "We see only men grouped in classes, acting under the influence of 'observable feelings.' Daily we can verify the movement of phenomena, ask how conditions are transformed, and correct our ideas about the future as the facts become more numerous" (p. vii).
6. Preface to the first edition of the French translation of the *Essais* of Antonio Labriola already quoted (see note 1, above). On the preceding page I said: "The problem of the modern future—considered from the materialist point of view—rests on three questions: one, has the proletariat acquired a clear awareness of its existence as an indivisible class?"

Two, does it have enough strength to do battle against the other classes? Three, is it in any condition to overturn, along with the capitalist organization, the whole system of traditional ideology?" This preface was not reproduced in the following edition, Antonio Labriola having decided that I was not a sure enough companion for an orthodox socialist.

7. K. Marx and F. Engels, *Manifeste communiste* (Paris: G. Bellais), trans. by Charles Andler, Vol. I, p. 39. In all revolutions there have been two elements: a *conquest of power*, which gives advantages to a minority, and a *capture of legal process*; according to Marx the first element will disappear in the proletarian revolution; it is for this reason that Marxists have so often said that the state will no longer exist.
8. Marx, *Capital*, French translation, p. 327, col. 1 (Modern Library ed., p. 809).
9. E. Durkheim, *Le Suicide: étude de sociologie* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1897), p. 439.
10. Jean Jaurès, *Socialisme et paysans* (Paris: La Petite République), pp. 118-19. This propaganda pamphlet reproduces Jaurès's three speeches on the agricultural crisis. It will be seen that the orator gives all his declarations as belonging to the accepted doctrine of the Socialist Party. Collectivism goes by the board in this sketch of "property of tomorrow." Paul Deschanel, answering the socialist orator on July 10, 1897, accused him of calling socialization a re-establishment of eminent domain.
11. Professor Espinas said to Andler, in supporting his lovely thesis on state socialism in Germany: "But these are old things which masquerade under new names!"
12. Tocqueville, *L'Ancien Régime et la révolution* (Paris: Michel-Lévy Frères, 1866), p. 241. A curious experiment in philosophical economy was carried out by King Ferdinand IV of Naples in the model manufacturing concern of Santo-Lucio. Thinkers of the period thought that finally the problem would be resolved of knowing if men are always destined to be enemies or if there is a means of making them friends and therefore happy (Benedetto Croce, *Studii storici sulla rivoluzione napoletana del 1799*, [Rome: E. Loescher, 1897], p. 18).
13. Georges Weill, *L'Ecole Saint-Simonienne* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1896), pp. 191-92, 199.
14. Georges Platon, "Le socialisme en Grèce" in the *Devenir Social*, Oct. 1895, p. 669. Cf. G. Sorel, *Réflexions sur la violence* (Paris: M. Rivière, 1910), pp. 250-56.
15. Generally socialist theoreticians have believed that their doctrines depend much less on the customs of workers' organizations than the physical sciences depend on industrial technique.
16. The explanations given by Antonio Labriola are immensely obscure. "Scientific socialism . . . has understood [the state] because it does not rise up against it in a unilateral and subjective way as did (more than once in other times) cynics, stoics, epicureans of all kinds, utopians, visionary ascetics, and finally our contemporary anarchists of every

sort. . . . Scientific socialism has proposed showing how the state rises continually of itself against itself in creating the conditions of its own ruin by means of its own indispensable institutions; for example: a huge system of taxes, militarism, universal suffrage, the development of education, etc. . . . With the disappearance of proletarians and the conditions which make possible the proletariat will disappear all dependence of man on man under whatever form of hierarchy" (*Essais sur la conception matérialiste de l'histoire*, pp. 227-28). But could not that which Labriola claims should lead to the downfall of the state by introducing the proletarian revolution, on the contrary, contribute to making worker agitation end in a bureaucratic, militarist democracy, one which is favorable to financiers?

17. "Large mechanized industry achieves separation between manual work and the intellectual powers of production, which it transforms into the power of capital over work. The skillfulness of the worker appears weak before the prodigies of science, enormous natural forces, the greatness of social work, all incorporated into the mechanical system, which constitutes the power of the master" (*Capital*, French translation, p. 183 [Modern Library ed., p. 462]).
18. That is what explains the revival of Saint-Simonism in our universities. Jaurès, in a speech of January 25, 1897, on sugar, bid the government to use the talents of young bourgeois who lacked money, by transforming them into industrial bureaucrats. This certainly is an echo of Saint-Simonism.
19. Until now, great scholars have almost all been modest people, having no need for large salaries or rich appointments. The interests of knowledge are not always identical with the interests of scholars and the intellectual parasites who surround them.
20. Marx, *Capital*, French translation, p. 84, col. 2 (Modern Library ed., p. 220).
21. In his *Critique of the Gotha Program*, Marx thus defined the rules to be followed after the revolution abolishing capitalism: "The worker's right is proportional to the work done; equality consists here in the use of a uniform yardstick, work. . . . This very equal right is an unequal right for unequal work. It ignores distinctions of class because all men are workers by the same right; but it tacitly recognizes as natural privileges the inequalities of individual gifts, consequently, abilities in production. Thus it is an unequal right, like all rights" (*Revue d'Economie Politique*, Sept.-Oct. 1894, p. 757).
22. Marx, *Capital*, French translation, p. 143, col. 2 (Modern Library ed., p. 357).
23. This is why often industrialists prefer as a director a former worker rather than a technician who came out of the schools. The Greeks were already well acquainted with this principle; they said that obedience was the school of command. Elsewhere I have pointed out the influence that the military system seems to have had on ancient ideas of equality.

- Le Procès de Socrate* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1889) [see chap. 1, above—Ed.].
24. Paul de Rousiers, *Le Trade-unionisme en Angleterre* (Paris: A. Colin, 1897), p. 42.
 25. Karl Kautsky, "Le socialisme et les carrières libérales," in *Le Devenir Social*, May 1895, p. 107. The term "liberal career" does not exactly translate the German term *intelligenz*: by this word the Germans mean the professions that have a certain character of artistic or literary culture. Thus Kautsky more recently tells us that social democracy has gained for its cause sculptors, employees in commerce and musicians (*Le Marxisme et son critique Bernstein* [Paris: P.-V. Stock, 1900], p. 250).
 26. G. Ferrero, *L'Europa giovane* (Milan: Fratelli Treves, 1897), pp. 65–72.
 27. Kautsky, "Le socialisme et les carrières libérales," loc. cit., p. 108. It is, moreover, especially because of salaries that the question of the relationship of the *intelligentsia* with the Socialist Party has been discussed in Germany.
 28. In the part of the book which had been submitted to Engels, Antonio Labriola writes these excellent sentences: "Critical communism does not manufacture revolutions . . . It is not a training school in which the chief of staff of the leaders of the proletariat is formed; but it is solely the consciousness of this revolution, and above all, the consciousness of its difficulties" (*Essais sur la conception matérialiste de l'histoire*, pp. 70–71). "The mass of the proletariat no longer holds to the commands of a few leaders, any more than it regulates its movements on the prescriptions of captains who could raise another government on the ruins of the old . . . It knows, or is beginning to understand, that the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' which will have as its job the socialization of the means of production, cannot be the result of a mass led by a few" (p. 77). But, in order for the leaders to conform to these principles, there must be some mechanism capable of limiting their ambitions. "It is a constant principle," says Laboulaye, "that every time you give power to a man he will draw all that he can from it" (*Histoire des Etats-Unis* [Paris: A. Durand, 1877], Vol. III, p. 305).
 29. The example of Lassalle is not fortuitous; thus I ignore it.
 30. Marx and Engels, *Manifeste communiste*, Vol. I, p. 37.
 31. Kautsky, "Le socialisme et les carrières libérales," loc. cit., p. 115.
 32. Ibid., p. 113.
 33. Yves Guyot believes that production would function in better conditions than those of today if industrialists would entrust the execution of work to corporations of workers, who would exercise more effective discipline over their members than the employers' discipline. This system has excellent results in the composition of Parisian newspapers (*Les Conflicts du travail et leur solution*, pp. 279–82).
 34. [Sorel, who uses the English term "lock-out," means here that the workers will expel many of the managers from the productive process—the reverse of the normal meaning.—Ed.]
 35. Kautsky, "Le socialisme . . ." loc. cit., p. 114.

36. Marx and Engels, *Manifeste communiste*, p. 60. By "reactionary" we should understand that this socialism seeks to hinder industrial progress.
37. Sismondi, cited by Marx, preface to *Le Dix-huitième brumaire de Louis Bonaparte* (Lille: Impr. ouvrière, 1891), French translation [*The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*]. We must also add that the intellectual proletarians rebel at any spirit of solidarity; they see only their *personal and immediate* interest and sacrifice the general interest to it; they bring disorder everywhere by their intrigues and whenever they can, they fight among themselves. Like Caesar, each one of them aspires to be the first in a small group.
38. The intellectuals assimilate the attitudes corresponding to the class struggle, what one of them calls "creative hatred." The ferocious jealousy of the poor intellectual, who hopes to push the rich speculator to the guillotine, is a bad sentiment containing nothing socialist.
39. The above text, written in 1900, was inspired by an article I published in the *Devenir Social* for Jan. 1896; today I would have some reservations on the theses that I presented in this article.
40. On the power of denominations, consult Gustave le Bon, *Psychologie des foules* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1895), pp. 94–96 [*The Crowd*].
41. What is said here about the capitalist can be applied to any other leader who does not belong to the body of workers.
42. Marx, *Capital*, French translation, p. 144, col. 1 (Modern Library ed., p. 364).
43. Marx, *Misère de la philosophie* (Paris: Giard et Brière, 1896), p. 241 (*Poverty of Philosophy*).
44. This is from the point of view of abstract law, which alone is considered by professors, lawyers and judges in their arguments. The function of these arguments is to apply to questions discussed in the courtrooms a logic which can satisfy subtle minds; but the philosophical jurist is aware that quantity can have a decisive value for the determination of quality (cf. Marx, *Capital*, French translation, p. 133, col. 2; Modern Library ed., pp. 337–38).
45. The ideas that I put forth in 1898 are related to a juridical theory which I have sketched in *Science Sociale* (in Nov. 1900, pp. 433–36). The workers believe that they possess a right to work in the factory where they are employed.
46. This is what the Supreme Court of Appeals has decided many times.
47. One wonders if Jules Guesde was really thinking of achieving a proposal for the regulation of strikes; in the *Socialiste* of Dec. 2, 1900, an extract of an article by Parvus appeared which reduced Jules Guesde's proposal to a display intended to agitate people.
48. Office du Travail, *Statistique des grèves et des recours à la conciliation et à l'arbitrage pendant l'année, 1894*, p. 164.
49. Paul de Rousiers, *Le Trade-unionisme en Angleterre*, p. 193.
50. Ibid., pp. 11, 67, and 333–37.
51. Ibid., pp. 246, 322.
52. It has often been said that the proletariat has before it a "reactionary

- mass"; against this opinion I quoted in 1848 an article that Turati had just published in the *Critica Sociale* of September 16; I added: "In the hypothesis of the division into two opposing camps, the emancipation of the proletariat would depend on the conquest of power by political revolutionaries; but this hypothesis being false, the emancipation and education of the working classes can be realized by the workers themselves." The difficulty which the conception of the dichotomy of society would seem to present will not appear great to people who have read the last pages of the *Reflections on Violence*. They will see there how proletarian activity can at times conform to this dichotomous idea, and at times be mixed with bourgeois life. (*Réflexions sur la violence*, pp. 428-32.)
53. Paul de Rousiers, *Le Trade-unionisme en Angleterre*, p. 26.
 54. *Ibid.*, pp. 154 and 300.
 55. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
 56. *Ibid.*, p. 93.
 57. *Ibid.*, pp. 132 and 272.
 58. *Ibid.*, pp. 44, 51, 67, 94, 334. Paul de Rousiers's opinion seems debatable to me now. We must distinguish between two classes of enterprise: in those which have an unlimited field of action practically speaking (such as the textile mills of Lancashire), the work is open to anyone; in those whose expansion is generally limited (building), measures of guild protectionism seem destined to be maintained. Paul de Rousiers's inquiry has pointed up a very narrow guild spirit in the shipbuilding workers (pp. 248-51).
 59. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
 60. This measure was adapted on the proposal of Tom Man and Ben Tillet (*ibid.*, p. 168). The leaders of this group seem to have been wrong in believing that they would maintain solidarity by constant agitation; they experienced serious failures (pp. 171-73). From 1890 to 1895 the number of dockers included in the two unions of London and Liverpool fell from 90,000 to 25,000 (pp. 161-62).
 61. Mutualism is obviously conducive to upholding this instinctive life, without which the social mechanism could not have stability, as I have indicated in note 5 above.
 62. One of Paul de Rousiers's collaborators was quite impressed by the rules followed by mechanics. Their union is divided into branches, each of which administers its own finances; but the central committee requires that credit always be given in equal proportion to the number of members. That is why from time to time it institutes a levy on the funds of rich branches to endow poor ones. "Such is the spirit of solidarity and, let us say also, the clear idea of their true interests that each feels instinctively: that the strength of the group depends on this mutual assistance" (*ibid.*, p. 268).
 63. *Critica Sociale*, Sept. 1, 1897, p. 262.
 64. This is one of the most important laws of the history of social trans-

- formations, one which is nearer to Marx's materialist conception. Old judicial relationships, before disappearing, regulate new life patterns for a long time.
65. Thorold Rogers makes the following observation: "He does not perceive that only people who enjoy a relative well-being can allow themselves to show their discontent, and that its expression is rare whenever despair and misery reign." *Work and Wages in England since the Eighteenth Century* (*Travail et salaires en Angleterre depuis le XIII^e siècle* [Paris: Guillaumin, 1897], French translation by E. Castelot, p. 359).
 66. Radicals and bourgeois socialists do not seem to be very fond of cooperatives. In a paper distributed by André Lefebvre's Electoral Committee in 1896 (*Journal de Neuilly-Boulogne*, Dec. 27) we read the following declarations of this socialist candidate—supported by the socialist group of the Chamber and a millionaire son of Zion: "The candidate declares that he is not an advocate of cooperation, because it is often fatal to the cooperators themselves and only profits big bosses. The first result of cooperation has always been very quickly to provoke the lowering of salaries." The president of the grocery syndicate upheld André Lefebvre in the following terms: "Since the socialists are the only ones who want to take up our cause, it is up to us . . . to go immediately and frankly to them. Vote for citizen Lefebvre. . . . In him you will have a worthy representative, a faithful agent and a devoted defender."
 67. Georges d'Avenel, *Le Mécanisme de la vie moderne*, Vol. I, p. 211.
 68. The matron could not even contract *concubinage* [under Roman law, a kind of inferior marriage] with a slave. In Marcus Aurelius' time it was decided that a *Clarissime* [title of honor in ancient Rome—Ed.] woman would lose her title by marrying a man of inferior rank to her own. Calixtus allowed Christian women of dignified mein "to take for a husband either a slave, or a free man in any station, and to consider him as a legitimate husband even when, according to the law, they cannot be legally married" (Paul Allard, *Les Esclaves chrétiens* [Paris: Didier, 1876], 3rd ed., pp. 288-94).
 69. De Rousiers, *Le Trade-unionisme en Angleterre*, p. 193.
 70. *Ibid.*, p. 93. This skillful observer says that in England one thinks about liberty according to "a rule of common sense which could be translated thus: the honest and capable man must not be hindered in his action by the incompetence of others. It follows that if the negligence, laziness, incompetence or ill-will of inferior or dishonest men creates an obstacle to this action, it is considered legitimate to strike at their liberty" (p. 95). It is evident that Paul de Rousiers implicitly likens trade unions to "social authorities" which are at times obliged to disturb some individuals in order to assure conditions of general prosperity.
 71. In 1898 I did not yet understand the true function of so-called democratic institutions in the old Swiss cantons of which Rousseau so often thought instinctively (that is what prevented so many readers from understanding his theories, whose real bases remain hidden). "Social

- authorities" play a preponderant role in these theories. There is a very similar system of government in Berber villages; everything is decided in a general meeting, but only the notables give their opinion.
72. Sometimes the government of the organized party is cruelly laid bare, as happened for the Guelfs of Florence and our Jacobins during the period of revolutionary government.
 73. "Do we see on a man's card that he is a deputy? Immediately, we are forewarned against him; we assume that he must be a failure, run aground there for lack of succeeding in his chosen career. And sometimes this is unjust. . . . Politicians and men of letters, the former occupied in exploiting us and the latter in amusing us, live equally outside of the nation" (R. Doumic, *Débats*, Sept. 21, 1897).
 74. In part probably because of the numerous articles in which Jules Guesde formerly declared that his party did not seek so much to achieve reforms (in the manner of the "possibilist" party) as to show the workers that there is an absolute contradiction between their aspirations and bourgeois legislation. According to Malon, Jules Guesde had a lot of trouble in making Marx accept the article of the program of 1880 relating to the establishment of a minimum salary (*Revue Socialiste*, Jan. 1887, p. 54). This article was obviously conducive to agitation.
 75. The syndicates appear here as being very like "social authorities" which exercise control over the normal conditions of work.
 76. This is just what has been attempted in Paris.
 77. And which can be harmful due to the intrusion of politicians.
 78. When there is a railway accident, the strengthening of control and the naming of new officials is quickly demanded; control does not cease deteriorating, in proportion as it is reinforced and reorganized.
 79. It seems to me that Durkheim has made his investigation into suicide in order to furnish scientific arguments to writers who denounce the abasement of present-day habits. Indeed, usually it is accepted as obvious that the multiplication of suicides is a very sure indication of grave moral troubles: it is well not to take such a connection too seriously. Durkheim has been very justly reproached for having abused statistics when, for example, he thinks that he has found in them evidence suitable for showing legislators the drawbacks of too easily obtainable divorce and the inadequacy of the education of girls (*Le Suicide: étude de sociologie*, pp. 442-44). Economic causes seem to Durkheim insufficient to explain the rapid aggravation of what he calls suicidal tendencies. "It is certain," he says, "that for all levels of the social hierarchy, the average well-being has increased, although this increase has perhaps not always taken place in the most equitable proportions. The malaise from which we suffer does not come, then, from the increase of the objective causes of our suffering; it testifies not to a greater economic misery, but to an alarming moral poverty" (p. 445).
 80. According to G. de Molinari, this moral culture has remained below what is needed for the present industrial regime (*Science et religion* [Paris: Guillaumin, 1894], pp. 188-94).

81. Durkheim, *Le Suicide*, p. 445.
82. Molinari, *Science et religion*, p. 94. He says: "It is religion which, in the infancy of humanity, raised the edifice of morality; it is religion which upholds it and can alone uphold it." He hopes that Catholicism will accept the essential ideas of modern progress that it had condemned at the time of Pius IX (pp. 207-8).
83. Durkheim, *Le Suicide*, p. 431. The author has followed perhaps too faithfully the opinion just given by Théodule Ribot in *Psychologie des sentiments* (Paris: F. Alcan, 1896). According to this professor of the Collège de France, "religion is tending to become a religious philosophy" by losing its effective values and by leaving its faithful to give to its rites a symbolic meaning, which puts them on the same level as metaphors (pp. 307-10, 313-14). In this period Catholicism seemed quite lured by innate forces to undergo this decomposition, which liberal Protestantism had realized completely; but it would be bold today to assert that Catholics tend no longer to believe in the virtue of the sacraments.
84. Durkheim, *Le Suicide*, p. 428.
85. *Ibid.*, p. 439.
86. *Ibid.*, p. 435.
87. *Ibid.*, pp. 222-32 and *passim*. The facts brought out by Durkheim require a more psychological and consequently more profound interpretation than his. In very serious crises of will, the individual needs to feel that he is upheld by a force which inspires respect around him: he can receive effective aid from "social authorities"; he can equally receive it from a group in which there exists a powerful *esprit de corps*. Thus we arrive at recognizing, like Durkheim, the good influence of professional associations, but we are better able to determine the causes of this good influence.
88. By this quality of constant tension of the will, the syndicates strongly approximate "social authorities," which do not fulfill well their censorial functions unless they are dominated by a passionate sentiment of the duties imposed by tradition. When this psychological state degenerates, they are transformed into an oligarchy against which the men whom they were supposed to protect revolt.
89. De Rousiers, *Le Trade-unionisme en Angleterre*, p. 189.
90. *Ibid.*, p. 239.
91. Already quoted speech by Vandervelde.
92. The working girl, almost always in workshops, is very naturally included in unions and can find in them a protection that bourgeois society is unable to give her. One of the things that most astonished the Romans of the decline was the life of the German barbarians, who abhorred houses of prostitution. There are socialist municipalities. Have they suppressed the policing of morals and prostitution? I don't believe so. Along the same lines, what have those municipal officials done who are devoted to religious interests and always have the word "morality" on their tongues?

93. It is obvious that, in the various kinds of activity that we have reviewed, the unions play the roles that Le Play attributed to "social authorities."
94. Marx and Engels, *Le Manifeste communiste*, Vol. I, p. 38.
95. Since 1900 experience has taught me that intellectuals almost never accept such a role, unless they have the idea of utilizing the workers' organizations to facilitate their own political career. More than one syndicalist lawyer has become a deputy and aspires to become a minister.

Chapter 3

THE ETHICS OF SOCIALISM

1. Lecture given at the *Collège libre des sciences sociales*, Feb. 20, 1898. [Reprinted in the *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, May, 1899—ED.]
2. Saverio Merlino, *Formes et essences du socialisme* (Paris: Giard et Brière, 1885), p. 4. [The maxim might be reversed as regards Sorel but it appears to mean here that economic practice is more important than doctrine.—ED.]
3. *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali e Discipline Ausiliarie*, Rome, Jan. 1899.
4. See below, pp. 145–46.
5. [Rudolph Stammler (1858–1938), German philosopher, applied neo-Kantianism to law and stressed a pure, universal theory of law.—ED.]
6. If one attempted to deduce law from economics, one would be committing an error similar to those so frequently committed by scholars who claim to be deducing the natural sciences from theorems on force, matter and evolution; they do not see that they have introduced rediscovered cosmological hypotheses in the course of their studies. These hypotheses have been made more precise; but their nature has not been changed as a consequence of their passage through applications.
7. This opinion has been expressed notably by Croce and H. Cunow.
8. [Jacques Flach (1846–1919) was a comparative legal scholar at the Collège de France, author of *Les Origines de l'ancienne France*, 1886.—ED.]
9. I think that I was the first to propose this interpretation, full of the Marxist spirit, in *Sozialistische Monatshefte* (Sept. 1898); in this article I indicated also the necessity of completing what is ordinarily called "historical materialism" by systems in which developments of religion and the public life would be placed.
10. It is this "justice" that Proudhon wanted to consider the essential element of law [i.e., justice derived from family life. See the introduction, above, pp. 17–22.—ED.]
11. The theater and the novel have used this difference extensively.

12. [Achille Loria (1857–1943) was an Italian economist who regarded the abolition of rent and the diffusion of property as solutions to the problem of capitalist exploitation.—ED.]
13. *Capital*, French translation, p. 129, col. 1 (Modern Library ed., p. 297).
14. *Ibid.*, p. 101, col. 1 (Modern Library ed., p. 259).
15. Often reforms that will act as a revolutionary ferment later are passed along with practical reforms desired by the majority.
16. Good will can intervene in order to render opposition less noticeable in circumstances when conditions are not too tragic. The necessity of tempering the rigidity of laws by good will had been recognized by the ancients.
17. *Histoire du peuple d'Israël* (Paris: C. Lévy, 1887–93), Vol. III, p. 251.
18. *Ibid.*, Vol. V, p. 421.
19. In Germany a lot is said about "returning to Kant"; that is a good sign.
20. Le Play had the honor of having recognized the prime influence of familial sentiments on the general direction of societies; the structure of the family can determine whether we have misonist societies or disturbed and agitated societies having no concern for the future. Progressive societies hold the middle ground; Le Play claimed to be defining this middle ground exactly.
21. Woman is the great educator of the human race, less perhaps of the child than of the man; love transforms man and disciplines his instincts; it is woman who raises our moral standard; therefore respect for woman-kind is a very essential element of the march toward socialism. Now is the time to recall a courageous speech by Vandervelde to Belgian socialists. "How many of you would be justly outraged if you were grossly mistreated, bullied and brutalized by an overseer, and how many of you make your wives and children submit to the rude treatment that you would not stand for from your boss!" (Destrée and Vandervelde, *Le Socialisme en Belgique* (Paris: Giard et Brière, 1898), p. 252.
22. In order to be thorough, we should have examined the middle stage, which is interposed between the system of desires, protests and hopes of which I have spoken and the mission of the proletariat. This middle stage has been almost exclusively considered by anarchists and neglected by socialists. From the point of view of education, it is necessary to consider man in the presence of himself and to study his moral formation; socialists have too often believed that the environment acts in an automatic way and, as I said earlier, they have been concerned hardly at all with the conditions necessary to perfect moral sentiments. There is a serious gap in the socialist ethic.
23. An excess of logical zeal is among the causes of the opposition that theorists have for so long made to institutions; no institution is simple; imperfections and contradictions are always found in them. It cannot be otherwise, since in an institution law and morality must coexist and thereby manifest their contradictions.
24. The kingdom of heaven is given to the one who gives a glass of water in Jesus' name.