
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE IV.

THE EVOLUTION OF ANARCHY.

BY THE REV. JEAN FREDERIC LOBA, D.D., EVANSTON, ILLINOIS.
FORMERLY OF THE MAC-ALL MISSION, PARIS, FRANCE.

IN the House of Representatives, one year after the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, Mr. Garfield, moving an adjournment of the House, said, with reference to the assassination of the great president, "It was no one man who killed Abraham Lincoln; it was the embodied spirit of treason and slavery, inspirited with fearful hate, that struck him down in the moment of the nation's supremest joy." A few weeks ago a madman brutally assassinated Sadi-Carnot in the streets of Lyons, also at the moment of his greatest success. To the casual observer this seems a random stroke, unconnected with anything in history or in the national life of France. But the words of Garfield with reference to the murderer of Lincoln are equally applicable to this act, and we may say, It was no one man who struck down one of the noblest, calmest, and best presidents France has had. That blow was connected historically with a long line of social and political events. As an act it was connected with those acts which, like it, have been perpetrated by similar unbalanced and fanatical minds. Santo is the brother of such men as Guiteau, Prendergast, and others, who, without judgment and infuriated by imagined wrongs, have blindly struck at one whom they supposed to be the author of their misfortunes.

The movement of which the assassinations of Lincoln, Garfield, Harrison, and Carnot are the fruit, goes back to that mighty social and political upheaval known as the French

Revolution. This was the historical birth-place of all these acts of violence.

No one studying the evolution of society and the development of man can for a moment fail to see that the French Revolution was the mighty protest of humanity against the domination and despotism of a class. It was the breaking away of man from the rule of Feudalism; that was the enfranchisement of what the French love to call the "third estate," but it was but a partial movement, and the "third estate," having attained the power of the two estates, simply paved the way and set the example for a social upheaval which by social adjustment, by political revolution, and by individual violence was to bring the "fourth estate" to the surface. We are very apt to think that because these movements have come through violence, disruption, and social discord, that, therefore, they are born simply of the spirit of hate and anarchy. But if we go back to the inception of the upward movement of society and consider the names and the characters of the men who have been the most potent factors in this movement, we shall be impressed with the seriousness, earnestness, and general intelligence of those who gave the movement its first impulse and directed it in its earlier stages.

The first great name is that of Saint-Simon, born in 1760. Saint-Simon was a French nobleman of one of the illustrious families of that country,—not an anarchist, not a revolutionary, but a man whose heart was early stirred by the wants, the needs, and the sufferings of the French poor. So sincere and honest was he, in his confidence that the lot of the poor and of the toiler could be vastly improved without disturbing the equilibrium of the state, that he went so far as to appeal to Louis XVIII. to co-operate with him in ameliorating their condition; but with the exception of a few works little read and a very small number of followers, Saint-Simon left nothing behind him, as the result of his labors, but his example.

Fourier, born in 1772 and for a time the contemporary of Saint-Simon, was a man of humble origin but splendid ability. Of an almost puritanic life, temperate, moderate, thoughtful, he devoted his slender means to the dissemination of the principles of social improvement. He, too, aimed at uplifting the laborer without disrupting the state. But Fourier, dying in 1837, left behind him almost no traces of his work.

Louis Blanc, who, born in 1811, took up the work laid down by his two eminent predecessors, was a man of different character, and set about, in a measure, to associate the state with the uplifting of the downtrodden. Passionate, eloquent, enthusiastic, utterly devoted to the cause of the poor and the suffering, he gave himself unremittingly to the great cause that he had at heart; but, lacking in that intellectual and moral balance which give weight and efficiency to enthusiasm, his efforts also proved abortive.

The last great name of the eminent French socialists is that of Proudhon. A native of Besançon, the birth-place of his predecessor, Fourier, Proudhon was the son of a very poor family, but endowed with a brilliant genius, and it is related that he came home from the college, laden with honors and prizes, to find that there was nothing in the house for him to eat. He early espoused the cause of the poor, the unfortunate, and the suffering. But he, unlike any of his predecessors, was the real father of anarchy, and was convinced that the only way of improving the social and moral condition of the laborer was by a complete revolution of the state. The life of Proudhon, covering the period between 1808 and 1865, spans that epoch in French history and, we may say, in the history of Europe, which comprises the greatest and many of the most violent social and political revolutions and upheavals which have characterized the first half of the nineteenth century. It was, therefore, a most favorable seed-time, and the doctrines of these social revolutionaries were sowed broad-

cast, and found a ready soil not only on the Continent, but also in Great Britain.

If now we turn to Great Britain, we find the great name of Robert Dale Owen. Born in 1771, at an early age he left his native Wales and came to Manchester, where still in his teens he, by his intelligence, industry, and executive ability, became the director in one of the great mills of that manufacturing centre. Here, he, too, felt his heart drawn out toward the lot of the poor and the toiler. Even at this distance it is not to be wondered at that the heart of the sympathetic was roused by a contemplation of the monstrous inequalities, injustice, and cruelties which characterized the lot of the poor. Women and children were condemned to toil in the mines of Cornwall and Wales, seldom seeing the sun or coming up to breathe the fresher air. Women, almost nude, with great leathern belts about their loins, were made to draw the small cars of coal in their run-way to the foot of the shaft until their knees and hands were calloused and grown hard and horny as a horse's hoof. Children at the age of five and seven were made to toil in the dark, dangerous, and noisome mills. The hours of labor were almost unlimited, not even the limits of endurance being observed. It was these conditions which roused the heart of Owen, and led him to apply his splendid genius to the question of emancipating the white slaves of England. But this he did at first in the most practical and common-sense way. Seeking no great political enfranchisement nor any political adjustment, he gave himself simply and resolutely to improving the environment of the toiler. Finding his efforts cramped by established customs and the conservatism of property, he moved to New Lanark, on the Clyde, and there, with an old mill and two thousand workmen of the poorest and the most wretched class, with all the iniquities and cruelties of their class in full force, he attempted to give them conditions which should make morality and decency at least possible. He at once in-

stituted schools for the children, the first schools for the children of the poor established in England. He shortened the hours of labor, he protected woman from overwork and temptation, introduced sanitation, better homes, better houses, cleaner streets, reading-rooms,—in short, he simply lifted the two thousand operatives under his hand into the sunshine and into the air. The history of his movement in America need not be repeated. Suffice it to say that, with a hope of accomplishing more by establishing a community in the new country, where he could have a larger field, a broader liberty, a better opportunity, he found that even in the New World the old character of man was unchanged. In brief, it may be said, as Kirkup, the historian of Socialism, has shown, that all efforts at social improvement have failed to reckon with one factor in human development. Recent science has shown us that there are two factors,—native character and the environment. Given a pure and noble character, it is yet susceptible of degradation and vice under the unfavorable surroundings of poverty, hardship, and filth. Given, on the other hand, the best of surroundings, even a garden of Eden does not seem to succeed in keeping out the viper; and Robert Owen's community, upon a new soil, with fresh and wholesome surroundings, with the direction and devotion of his heart and brain, found itself a prey to animosities, discords, and strifes that soon rent it asunder and made the entire effort a failure. Owen returned to England only to exhibit the weakness which so often mars great characters. Led astray by his irreligious and unwholesome social views, he so wounded the conscience and alienated the good-will of the English that his influence seemed entirely to have waned.

If we turn now to the brilliant, violent, and sad chapter of socialism in Germany, we shall find here two facts. First of all, greater genius and devotion, with a wider intelligence, but also singularly enough a spirit of growing violence and anarchy. Lassalle, born in 1825, was the founder of German

social democracy. Bringing to his work the gifts both of the writer and speaker, he succeeded in 1864 in rousing the common people—the toilers—in the Rhine country. But his violence, his passionate appeals, his revolutionary methods, his antagonism to the state, so well organized, stirred up great opposition. And, notwithstanding this, Lassalle was not strictly speaking an anarchist, at least not in the modern sense of that word. But he did not limit himself to peaceable and social measures for the improvement of the lot of the poor; rather he hoped and strove for political advancement which should put the German common people on a level with the noble and privileged, and enable them so to adjust the relations of labor and capital as to give, what he considered, the fair share of capital to labor.

To understand the entire movement at this stage, we must go back to the political economy of Adam Smith and Ricardo. The orthodox political economist of that day and school based his entire system upon the declaration that capital was wholly the product of labor, and Proudhon and Lassalle, taking these principles as bases, carried the premise to its logical conclusion; uttered in the words of Proudhon: "Private property is robbery, Capital belongs to labor." It was this extreme and revolutionary view which characterized the entire work of Lassalle. But Lassalle, who had a brilliant future before him, again reveals to us the sad, partial, and one-sided character of the would-be reformer. After his triumphal march, crowned with flowers and received with ovations throughout the Rhine country in May, 1864, he is drawn into an ignoble quarrel about a woman and falls in a duel in October of that same year.

The work is now taken up by Karl Marx, whose life covers a long period from 1818 to 1883. With a better training than Lassalle, a more wide and brilliant genius, a larger grasp of the situation in Germany, and broader plans for the federation of all the proletarians of the world, Karl Marx

brought to his task the most splendid equipment and an unfaltering devotion. But, too turbulent and dangerous to the political conditions of Germany, he was obliged to spend his years in exile. He was the founder of the "International," which represents more perfectly his idea as bodied forth in his compendious work "Capital." His influence was sufficient to change and mould anew the plans and the qualities of Lassalle. But a careful study of the history of social movements and an impatience for immediate results led him to feel that the poor could come to his rights only by the use of violence. We have covered this historical epoch of social effort simply to give a conception of the roots out of which the baneful fruit of anarchy and assassination in Europe and America have grown. It should be observed, as Mr. Kidd in his recent work has maintained, that much of the social disturbances in the United States is due to conditions in the old country which gave them their birth here.

From this brief and imperfect review three things are to be inferred. First of all, the movement is a human and humane movement. It had, at its inception, the broadest sympathy for man, and called forth intelligence and endeavor. Nothing could be nobler than the self-sacrifice, the utter self-forgetfulness which is characteristic of many, if not all, of the contributors to the social evolution. When the Nihilists were withdrawn from the Swiss universities in 1872, where they had been imbibing the free and social notions of the West, these sons and daughters of the noblest Russian families gave themselves willingly to the lowliest services—to becoming house-maids, nurses, cobblers, tailors, common toilers, that they might, side by side with the toiler, kindle his heart with hope and with aspiration. And this was the character of most all of those who have wrought at the regeneration of society. The movement is, therefore, to be considered not as mechanical, forced, or unnatural, not as anarchistic in its

purpose, but rather as a slow, gradual, and more or less steady movement upward and forward which has its genesis in the heart of the oppressed and depressed classes. It is an historic movement for the enfranchisement of the "fourth estate."

Secondly, it is to be noticed that the movement has been hindered, if it has not failed, through the one-sided character of its leaders. No movement in society, state, or nature, can be permanent, and therefore successful, which does not take into consideration and adjust itself to all the laws of nature. The early movement was optimistic. It had a too unbounded faith in man; believed him capable and willing to achieve the highest and noblest destiny; believed him ready to exercise that prudence, moderation, self-denial which are prerequisites of any advancement; believed that if his circumstances were improved, his virtue would be insured. But the history of Owen, Fourier, and Proudhon has shown the fallacy of this attitude. The springs of human goodness lie not outside of man but within him. He is the maker and the moulder in the world. The most tremendous factor in the regeneration in society is, after all, *personality*, the character of the individual. It goes without saying that this character is itself moulded and inspired by spiritual influences which come from on high. But in vain shall we struggle by merely improving the house, the town, the state, the government, by giving men books or ballots, in uplifting and purifying the character of man.

It is clearly the oversight of this great central fact which has caused so much of the failure of socialistic movements, on the one hand, and has led to the third fact which we must here observe, namely, that violent political disruption, anarchy in the state and in society, have been due to the violence of individual characters, and have not entered and do not enter naturally into the principles of the reformers. We may think that to-day we have reason for condemning and opposing the social advancement of the lower classes in the violence and

destructiveness,—the recklessness of life which individuals have shown; but a calmer study of the entire movement in its breadth and in its history will convince us that these outbreaks of violence are but eruptions, but monstrosities which are foreign to, though they spring out of, a long, serious, and continued effort of man to be free from the repression, the oppression, the limitation, the disabilities, which have been imposed upon him by the fortunate and the strong.

The two fundamental principles which we must not forget, are, that if the advancement of humanity is indeed, as we believe, a growth, an evolution and not a revolution, it is a truly natural and vital process. Every step forward prepares the way for the next which must necessarily follow, and which can no more be prevented or repressed than violence or storms will hinder the advance of spring. The second principle, which is of the most vital concern to both the reformer and those who may be terrified at the onward march of events and the breaking up and disappearance of old forms of society, is that violence is not a part of the divine economy. The Gatling gun and the torch will not advance or retard the onward march of man. Indeed, so true is this, that the misdirected efforts of foolish men accomplish the very reverse of what they desire. The Fieldens, Schwabs, Santos, and Vaillants are the worst foes of the cause they profess to advocate. And the oppression of the rich and strong are not so baneful to the cause of the poor as the mad and murderous strokes of these anarchists. On the other hand, we must not forget nor ignore the fact that there is a mighty movement upward and forward on the part of the depressed classes which can be only precious to every lover of his kind; and, instead of seeking by any form of violence to repress or throttle it, we must recognize it and even foster it, and by wisdom direct and fashion it to the highest and noblest results. The one lesson which we must learn is the lesson of the Golden Rule, the lesson of the Ser-

mon on the Mount, which teaches us that we are brethren, that man is to help his fellow-man, that society is bound together by bands of affection, sympathy, and co-operation; that its interests are mutual interests. We are to remember that man is the one great value in the world, that the coming of the Son of God into the world is to rescue man, to save his character, and that he began this renovation not by changing social and political conditions, but by regenerating the individual heart; we are to remember that the rich and the strong and the cultured are such, not for their own good or enjoyment, but for the protection and for the benefit of their fellow-men;—that this entire struggle upward is a struggle in behalf of humanity, of man; that God says to the strong, Shelter the weak; to the rich, Share with and uplift the poor; to the cultured, Enlighten the less fortunate; and so the entire society of man shall be bound about with the strong bands of the divine love which shall protect, shelter, and help equally each and all. The one message of the church to the age is simply this: One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.