work should be thrown on the central government. Most socialist schools have contemplated a vast increase of com­munal or local autonomy,—a course which, on the other hand, does not carry with it the subversion of the central government. (4) In England during the last half century we have seen a long succession of efforts, partially success­ful, towards a new organization of society rendered neces­sary by the changes due to the industrial revolution. In economics as in other spheres the watchword of the new era has been freedom, the removal of restraint. But it has been found that positive measures of reconstruction were also necessary. Factory legislation carried in oppo­sition to the prevailing economic theory, trades unions, employers’ combinations, industrial partnerships, boards of conciliation, the co-operative system,—all these are real, if partial, endeavours towards a new organization of society suited to the new conditions. Socialism claims to be the comprehensive scheme of organization which embraces in a complete and consistent unity all these partial efforts. (5) But the great social force which is destined to work out the vast transformation consists of the human beings most directly interested in the colossal struggle,—the modern democracy. This democracy is marked by a combination of characteristics which are new to history. It is being educated and enlightened in the school and by the cheap press ; it is being drilled and organized in large factories, in the national armies, by vast popular demonstrations, in the gigantic electoral struggles of the time. Thus it is becoming conscious of its enormous power, and able to make use of it. It is becoming conscious also of its unsatis­factory social and economic position. The democracy which has become the master-force of the civilized world are economically a mass of proletarians dependent on pre­carious wage-labour. Having transformed the political condition of things, they are ready now for an economic transformation. But the inevitable process of concentra­tion of industrial operations already referred to is entirely against the continuance or restoration of the small producer, whether workman or peasant proprietor. Such efforts of continuance or restoration are reactionary; they are econo­mically unsound and must fail. Production and distribu­

tion ever tend to larger dimensions. The only issue out of the present economic condition is concentrated collect­ive industry under the control of the new democracy and its chosen leaders. On the irresistible momentum of these two inevitable and ever-growing forces—the concen­tration of industry and the growth of the new democracy— socialism depends for the realization of its scheme of trans­formation.

Such are the tendencies to which philosophic socialists point as already working towards a transformation of society of the kind they expect. It is essentially a question of the future, with which we have no concern in this article. Our duty has simply been to point out the forces which socialists believe to be actually at work for the realization of their theory of social organization ; and here we must leave the subject.

*Literature.—*The literature of socialism is enormous and rapidly growing ; besides those named under the special articles we now give a list of some of the leading works which are in whole or in part devoted to it :—Karl Marx, *Das Kapital* (1st vol., 3d ed., Ham­burg, 1883 ; 2d vol., 1st ed., Hamburg, 1885) ; Friedrich Engels, *Eugen Dühring's Umwälzung der Wissenschaft,* a controversial work, but containing a remarkably clear and able exposition of the Marx position by its best living exponent (2d ed., Hottingen-Zurich, 1886) ; Albert Schäffle, *Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers* (Tübingen, 1878 ; the third vol. of this work supersedes his *Kapitalismus und Social­ismus,* Tubingen, 1870), *Quintessenz des Socialismus* (7th ed., Gotha, 1879) ; Adolf Held, *Sozialismus, Sozial-Demokratie, und Sozial­politik* (Leipsic, 1878) ; Von Sybel, *Die Lehren des heutigen Social­ismus und Communismus* (Bonn, 1872) ; Lujo Brentano, *Die christ­lich-soziale Bewegung in England* (Leipsic, 1883) ; Von Scheel, *Die Theorie der sozialen Frage* (Jena, 1871) ; Alphons Thun, *Geschichte der revolutionären Bewegungen in Russland* (Leipsic, 1883); Rudolf Meyer, *Der Emancipations-kampf des vierten Standes* (2d ed., Berlin, 1882); Franz Mehring, *Die Deutsche Socialdemokratie, ihre Geschichte und ihre Lehre* (Bremen, 1879) ; Laveleye, *Le Socialisme Contem­porain* (2d ed., Paris, 1883) ; Paul Janet, *Les Origines du Socialisme Contemporain* (Paris, 1883) ; Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, *Le Collectivisme* (Paris, 1884) ; *Le Procès des Anarchistes* (Lyons, 1883) ; John Rae, *Contemporary Socialism* (London, 1884); Stepniak, *Underground Russia* (London, 1883) ; Hyndman, *Historical Basis of Socialism in England* (London, 1884). See also the relative chapters in Roscher’s *Grundlagen der Nationalökonomie* ; Adolf Wagner’s *Lehrbuch der politischen Oekonomie* (vol. i., *Grundlegung,* 2d ed., Leipsic, 1879) ; Mill’s *Political Economy* and *Autobiography* ; and Sidgwick’s *Prin­ciples of Political Economy.* (T. K. )

SOCIETIES. Under Academy will be found an ac­count of the various bodies of which that word forms part of the titles, usually denoting some kind of state support or patronage. The present article is restricted to scien­tific, archaeological, and literary societies, chiefly those founded and carried on by private collective effort. Cer­tain academies omitted in the previous article are, how­ever, referred to. Governmental, collegiate, and univer­sity institutions do not come within our scope, neither as a rule do endowed societies, nor yet institutions which, although they bear the name, carry on no kind of joint literary or scientific work. With a few exceptions here and there, the societies mentioned are still flourishing.

In their modern form learned and literary societies have their origin in the Italian academies of the Renaissance ; but private scientific societies have arisen chiefly during the 19th century, being due to the necessity of increased organization of knowledge and the desire among scholars for a common ground to meet and compare results and collect facts for future generalization. These bodies rapidly tend to increase in number and to become more and more specialized. Many efforts have been made from time to time to tabulate and analyse the literature pub­lished in their proceedings, as, for instance, in the indexes of Reuss (1801-21) and the Royal Society (1867-79) for physics and natural science, and those of Walther (1845) and Koner (1852-56) for history. A further development

of the work done by societies was made in 1822, when, chiefly owing to Humboldt, the *Gesellschaft deutscher Naturforscher und Aerzte* first met at Leipsic. This inau­guration of the system of national congresses was followed in 1831 by the *British Association for the Advancement of Science,* which has served as the model for similar societies in France, America, and elsewhere. The merit of intro­ducing the idea of migratory congresses into France is due to the distinguished archaeologist, M. Arcisse de Cau- mont (1802-73), who established the *Association Normande,* which since 1845 has held a reunion in one or other of the towns of the province for the discussion of matters relating to history, archæology, science, and agriculture, with local exhibitions. From the same initiation came the *Congrès Archéologique de France* (1834), which was organized by the *Société Française pour la Conservation des Monuments Historiques,* the *Congrès Scientifique,* which held its first meeting at Caen in 1833 (directed by the *Institut des Provinces),* and the *Congrès des Sociétés Savantes des Départements,* which for many years after 1850 held its annual sittings at Paris. The idea received the sanction of the French Government in 1861, when a *Congrès des Sociétés Savantes* was first convoked at the Sorbonne by the minister of public instruction. In Italy Charles Bonaparte, prince of Canino, started an association with like objects, which held its first meeting at Pisa in 1839. Russia has had an itinerant gathering of naturalists since