



WILEY

Review

Author(s): William Graham

Review by: William Graham

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 13 (Mar., 1894), pp. 86-90

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2955875>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 05:05 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Royal Economic Society, Wiley are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to
The Economic Journal

Unions can permanently affect the market value of the product. He has little sympathy with the miners' and cotton-spinners' argument for the regulation of production according to demand, instead of bribing demand to adjust itself to production. But, accepting as uncontrollable both the 'blind economic forces' which affect price, and the employer's management of industry, he pushes very far the argument that high wages mean low cost of production. The further contention that a strong Trade Union, with an almost inflexible minimum rate, shifts competition from off the worker's standard of life on to the brains of the *entrepreneurs*, does not seem to have been consciously present to his mind; yet the history of Lancashire indicates that there is no better guarantee for steady progress in industrial efficiency among the *classe dirigeante* than inability to nibble at wages. But whether this view will commend itself to the German capitalists for whose edification Dr. von Schulze-Gaevernitz's work was in the first instance specially intended, is not so clear.

This last consideration explains much of the social theory of the book. Dr. von Schulze-Gaevernitz is a politician as well as an economist and historian. As one of the ablest writers of Professor Brentano's school, he is above all things anxious to convince the Germans that a complete organisation of their workmen into Trade Unions would conduce to 'Social Peace.' English economists will have no difficulty in agreeing with Professor Brentano and Dr. von Schulze-Gaevernitz in wishing well to Trade Unionism in Germany, and from a tactical point of view the rapid intellectual changes which the last five years have seen in the English Trade Union world may not be very welcome to these authors. Dr. von Schulze-Gaevernitz himself expresses no fear of the Socialistic future. He quotes Arnold Toynbee's remark that the 'workman and employer parted as protector and dependant to unite as equal citizens of a free state'—a social organism to be characterised by 'the progressive subordination of the part to the whole and the progressive differentiation of the parts into organs' (p. 289). But if the social organism is to be a Democratic State, governed on the basis of one man one vote, will the German landlords and shareholders willingly step down from their present position of rent and dividend receivers, and become 'organs' provided merely with regular maintenance suitable to their actual functions in industrial society?

SIDNEY WEBB

Socialism: its Growth and Outcome. By WM. MORRIS AND E. BELFORT BAX.

THE object of this co-operative work, as given by the writers, is to trace the development of Society from its early forms up to the full expression of the commercial period, with a view of showing that 'the great economic moral and political change which we call Socialism' is the inevitable next and near term in the series of social evolutions;

any further changes thereafter consisting merely in the further development and intensifying of Socialism. So that the prospect is first Socialism and then more and fuller Socialism. We hardly think that the 200 and odd pages of history help to the desired conclusion, even though specially adapted and interpreted for the purpose, while there are certain omissions of facts and phenomena having a socialistic reference that, had they been supplied, would have made us yet more doubtful of the confident assertion that Socialism, as here described, lies before us in the near future. This doubt is increased when we leave the historical part and come to the prophetic. We feel assured that the kind and amount of Socialism here described will not come in the manner indicated, and still surer that, if by any miraculous series of chances it did come it would not long continue.

Though the book is not specially intended to be a history of Socialism, but of society in a socialistic reference, we think it a little strange that there is no mention of the communistic and socialistic speculations of thinkers from Plato to Godwin; no reference to the socialistic writings of Rousseau, or their influence, acknowledged by Laveye and others, on contemporary Socialism and even on Anarchy; no mention of the partial Socialism realised in early societies and afterwards lost; nor of what Maine and others call the 'natural communism' of early and simple social groups. The Anabaptists and Levellers are indeed referred to, but they are not called Socialists or Communists, though the aim of Münzer, which, we are told, was 'the economical and social equality of men,' might surely be described as socialistic, being indeed extremely like that of Babœuf, who is nevertheless called the 'preacher of the first Socialist propaganda.'

What is the reason of the omission? Is it because it might disturb the faithful and prevent converts knowing that essentially the same ideas as here advocated have been twentytimes before the world already? have been tried and found impracticable outside the monastery, and even where only partially put in practice, had to be abandoned through the growth of civilisation? However this be, Babœuf (so we are told) was the first true Socialist. Then come Owen, St. Simon, Fourier, to each of whom some small merit is allowed, but who are all labelled 'Utopists.' So also are Proudhon, Lammenais, and Louis Blanc, who are described as 'transitional Utopists.' They are all merely the feeble forerunners of the great prophet and true founder of Modern or 'Scientific Socialism,' Karl Marx, compared with whose light theirs are but as the faint flickering glimmers of dawn to the full splendour of the risen sun.

We are inclined to think that rather scant justice is here done to the lesser prophets preceding; in particular that the St. Simonian Socialism was far less Utopian than that sketched out in this book, and professedly based on Marx's views. A few further points in the historical part call for notice. There is an apology for the Middle Ages in order to prove that the serf was happier and better off than

the present 'proletarian,' which might possibly be true if the word were applied only to the worst paid class of labourers, but which is absurdly untrue as regards the great class of labourers earning from 25s. to 50s. a week, which is equally included in the extension of the term; and why, we might ask, if the serfs were so well off, did they so frequently rise in terrible insurrections?

There are two long chapters on the French Revolution, intended to show that without violence and the aid of the proletariat, nothing effectual can be done in the desired direction, and a chapter in glorification of the Commune of Paris in 1871, in order to stimulate future proletarians, if need be, to emulate that great example. As for the French Revolution our authors regard it as a failure, a mere 'bourgeois' revolution; as if the peasants gained nothing by it. The English Revolution of 1688 was likewise a bourgeois, or rather a 'middle class' revolution; as if the result of it was not to transfer the ruling power from the king to the nobility and landed gentry until 1832, when the Reform Bill brought in the manufacturers and new rich men who formed the most essential part of the middle class. However, in this work the term 'middle class' is used in such an elastic and shifting sense that the Revolution of 1688 might be called a middle class revolution, for we are told 'that the nobility formed a mere titled upper order of it' (p. 121); and again, that it is extending itself downwards as well as upwards, and that it now includes (in addition to itself) both the nobility and all shades and grades down to the mere propertyless proletarian (p. 173). There are now only two great classes between whom lies the struggle of the future, and the fate of the middle class is to merge itself in the proletarians. This last we think at least problematical so long as there is a well-marked line of separation between skilled and unskilled labourers, and many of the former are not propertyless. There is a chapter entitled 'Scientific Socialism,' containing a long chain of dark extracts from Karl Marx with very slender elucidation from the writers, and as to this chapter we wish the inquiring Anarchist or Socialist joy of it.

As to the steps towards the New Society—sure to come as we are told—they are, first, legislation in favour of the proletarians, including a minimum wage, and a maximum price for labourers' necessaries (an eight hours day is but lightly regarded). Next, the acquirement of control over all industries by municipalities and trade organisations; a work they think well begun and progressing, though one might just here object that the municipalities, being mainly filled by the doomed middle class, might not feel inclined to carry out indefinitely this process of municipalisation aiming at the destruction of that class; while if it was done without confiscation we should not be so very much nearer the required goal after all. But to proceed. The State is to disappear, and two different means to the happy end are indicated; one (in deference perhaps to the Collectivists) is to use, during the transition time, the 'old decaying State,' which has been gradually parting with its

powers to municipalities and local bodies, because, as it is ingenuously admitted, 'the old States are so difficult to attack, and they serve so clearly the end of keeping some sort of society together during the transition period, that we look forward (innocently enough) to the New Society developing itself under the political shell of the old bureaucratic states rather than to any disruption of them prior to the realisation of the new social system.'

This is one way. Others, however, think that the States 'can and should be slowly starved out by the continuous action of two principles, the gradual and increasing delegation of their present powers to municipal and local bodies,' and also, it is significantly added, 'to the industrial organisations,' *i.e.* the Trades Unions and Councils. The 'old political nations (States) would thus weaken into dissolution or rather would become rudimentary.' As for the only remaining function of the State, the regulation of international affairs, this also would become unnecessary with the disappearance of the capitalists, with whom would cease all causes of quarrels between nations. There would be no more wars, as arbitration would render them unnecessary. Such are the means. It is afterwards added, that there must be a gradual shifting of the opinions and aspirations of the masses, and further, which is rather contradictory to the above doctrines, there must be a Revolutionary 'Administration' installed (the word 'Government' is avoided as unpleasant to the Anarchist-Socialist)—an administration 'all whose acts will be of set purpose with a view to Socialism.'

We have now all the conditions necessary to success. First the abandonment of its functions by the State, the municipalisation of industries and control of them by trade organisations, a previous propagandist education of the masses, and a Revolutionary Government. These things will be difficult to secure, and they will take time. It will be difficult to get the masses converted. They are something conservative in their ideas after all. It will be difficult to get a Revolutionary Government up to the required pitch of enthusiasm. If it were established it is hard to conceive it abolishing private property, gradually devolving its powers on subordinate bodies, and then, by heroic self-denying ordinance, at length dissolving itself after destroying so much else.

A British Government, at any rate composed of men presumably sane, and with a World-Empire to control, is not likely to do such things voluntarily. It might, however, be forced to do so as the result of successful insurrection and Civil War. Such a war, our authors think, will be necessary in the end. And here we so far agree with them that we believe a Civil War would be necessary before their aims could be attained even for a day. But even if they were we do not think they would be attained for much longer, owing to the numerous impracticabilities and impossibilities in the scheme.

Let us, however, suppose all difficulties got over somehow, and see

what we are all to expect—the working classes and all others—in the Anarchist Promised Land. There is to be no Government, of course, and no Civil Law, because there will be no property; little Criminal Law, and at last none, because there will be no anger, nor hatred, nor covetousness, nor jealousy, nor ambition, nor avarice, nor pride; all the bad passions that prompt to wrong will be extinguished. We should hardly indeed have expected this blessed state, if the indispensable way to it is to be through the violence and the horrors of Civil War. We should rather expect that without Law life would be insecure and a tranquil life impossible. We have, however, the authors' assurance to the contrary. There will be no law, no property, and the marriage yoke will be light. Art will reign, and Liberty will abound—except indeed in one particular. No one, nor no body, will be permitted to do or to say aught against the fundamental principles of the Socialist Society; for what if people should grow dissatisfied with it, and want to return to the only alternative system, 'the old order with private property'? That must be prevented at all hazards; short of that every one apparently may do as he or she pleases. It will be a goodly time. There will be peace and plenty, and happiness at last will be attained.

The picture is pleasant on the whole, nearly as much so as in any of the numerous Utopias that have been submitted to the world; and the whole scheme is about as practicable, considering the many miracles that must occur before it could be even in a fair way to be tried, and the demonstrable impossibility of its lasting even if it were forcibly tried.

WILLIAM GRAHAM

Die Frau und der Sozialismus. (*Die Frau in der Vergangenheit Gegenwart und Zukunft.*) Von AUGUST BEBEL. Zwanzigste unveränderte Auflage. Stuttgart: J. H. W. Dietz, 1893.

Woman: her Position in the Past, Present, and Future. By AUGUST BEBEL. Translated from the German by H. B. Adams Walthers. Second Edition. (The Bellamy Library, No 15.) London: William Reeves, 1893.

The Rights of Women. A Comparative Study in History and Legislation. By M. OSTROGORSKI. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1893.

The present year is the fifteenth of Herr Bebel's book: possibly its close may witness the number of editions attaining their majority. It is a work with a 'historical history' and one *alias*, yet in its contents it has undergone no change but those of detail and outward form. Brought out secretly in 1879 in the teeth of the Socialist Coercion Act of 1878, the first edition was proscribed and in part confiscated. After four years some emendations having been made it found at length a printer in the Volksbuchhandlung of Zürich-Hottingen, and was brought out under the apparently less treasonable title which appears in the English translation. None the less was it