Louis Blanc, the kinship and even identity of ethical spirit with that of Christianity are unmistakable.

In their revolutionary impatience the anarchists have avowed their hostility to all the existing political forms except the free commune, which alone will be left standing amid the general wreck they contemplate. The Marx school, as represented by its ablest living exponent, Friedrich Engels, also look forward to a period in the evolution of society when the state will become superfluous, and, having no longer any function to perform, will die away. The state they regard as an exploiting institution, an organiza­tion of the ruling classes for retaining the workers in economic subjection. The International was an attempt to supersede the exploiting states by a combination of the workers of all countries without distinction of creed, colour, or nationality. When the workers in the name of the whole society seize political power and take over the con­trol of production, the rule of classes, their conflicts and the excesses of the struggle for existence among them, will cease. Instead of a government over persons we shall have an administration of things and the control of pro­ductive processes. Obviously the Marx school reserve the realization of this idea till the evolution of society has prepared the way for it. In the conduct of the Inter­national they insisted on a strongly centralized form of organization as against the free federalism and the rejection of all authority maintained by Bakunin and his followers. This opposition between centralization and federalism does not concern us here ; it is a question common to theoretical and practical politics. It is necessary, however, to say a word about the opposition between the national tendency of the Lassalle school and the international socialism of Marx. As we have seen, a compromise was effected in the Gotha programme of 1875, in which the importance of the nation as an existing form of human society is amply recognized. The question is still discussed in the organs of the social democrats ; but the international tend­ency is decidedly the prevalent one. “ Want of patriotism ” is one of the current epithets of reproach cast at them. It is needless to point out that as most new movements of importance have been revolutionary, so also have they for good or evil been international. In becoming international the labour movement has only followed the example set by commerce, finance, diplomacy, religion, philosophy, art, music.

We have now reviewed the most important aspects of the socialist movement. As we have seen, socialism is a new form of social organization, based on a fundamental change in the economic order of society. Socialists believe that the present economic order, in which industry is carried on by private competitive capital, must and ought to pass away, and that the normal economic order of the future will be one with collective means of production and associated labour working for the general good. This principle of socialism is cardinal and fundamental. All the other theories so often connected with it and so im­portant in relation to religion, philosophy, marriage, patriotism, &c., are with regard to socialism non-essential. Questions of method, though supremely important, must also be distinguished from the essential principle. At the same time it will be seen that an economic change, such as that contemplated in socialism, would most powerfully affect every other department of human life. Socialism, in short, means that in industry, in the economic arrange­ments of society, the collective or co-operative principle shall become normal or universal, that all who are able should contribute to the service of society, and that all should share in the fruits of the associated labour according to some good and equitable principle. In such a condition of things the noblest field for ambition will be in the

service of society,—an ideal which is already partially real­ized in the democratic state. It is in this fundamental sense that J. S. Mill declared himself a socialist.@@1 It is in this sense also that Albert Schäffle, one of the first living authorities on economics and sociology, has, after long years of study of the subject, come to the conclusion that “the future belongs to the purified socialism.”@@2

Scientific socialists strongly insist that this economic order of the future cannot be realized by utopian schemes or arbitrary legislation or mere revolutionary disturbance. If it come at all, it must come as the consummation of the dominant tendencies of modern social development ; it must be realized under the conditions prescribed by our nature and environment. In discussing the doctrines of Marx we stated that the central point of the question was this—do the strongest forces of the social development of our time really tend towards the superseding of the present economic order and towards the establishment of a new and wider order based on collective capital and associated labour? Socialists maintain that they do, and that there is at present going forward a double process of dissolution and reconstruction,—the dissolution of individualism with a constructive tendency towards collectivism. From the socialist point of view the following may be signalized as indicative of such a process. (1) The tendency towards economic anarchy already explained in treating of Marx’s views. Over the whole industrial world we see great crises succeeding each other, resulting in stagnation and depression which now threaten to be chronic and permanent. While the productive forces of the world are enormously increasing, they only tend the more to intensify national and international competition, and to render labour super­fluous, precarious, and dependent. Under this system the worker has neither freedom nor security. All this variety of symptoms are only a sign of the break-down of the present economic order both in principle and method. They are the necessary results of the competitive system, which has thus finally revealed its real nature and tendency, —economic and social anarchy. (2) The constant and inevi­table tendency towards concentration in industrial opera­tions, which began with the introduction of steam and of the factory system, through which the small producer has been superseded by the capitalist, the smaller capitalist by the larger. And now the single capitalist is being absorbed in the company, a growing proportion of the world’s busi­ness being so large that only a great company can provide the requisite capital and organization ; whilst in the large companies there is a tendency, in case they cannot drive each other out of the field, to bring about a fusion of interests. In all this we see a great constructive process inevitably going on as the result of the inherent tendencies of industrial development. Thus the control of industry will be concentrated in a few colossal companies and their chiefs. It is obvious how this process could simplify the transference of the whole to a collective management by society. (3) This leads us to a third important point, the growing tendency towards state control of industry, and the growing sense of the responsibility of society for all its members, observable in German politics, not less than under the more democratic conditions of France and Eng­land. It is apparent how under this influence the existing state might absorb one by one all the large social functions, as has already happened with regard to education, means of communication, &c. Naturally this could be accom­plished only through a most comprehensive development of local and subordinate bodies of every kind. Socialism by no means implies that such an enormous burden of

@@@1 See his *Autobiography* ; also his *Pol. Economy,* chapter on the probable future of the labouring classes.

@@@2 *Bau und Leben,* vol. ii. 120.