

THE SOCIALISTIC REVIVAL IN EUROPE.

Contemporary Socialism. By John Rae, M.A. New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. 1884.

THIS century, of all others, has been disturbed by socialistic agitation. Since the great outburst of the first French Revolution, the world has been in a chronic condition of unrest. There have been intervals of peace, alternating with intervals of turmoil and violence. Whatever may be said of the agitation, it is undeniable that it has been instrumental in accomplishing some good for man. The excesses committed by some of the agitators, and the wild theories advanced by others, though they may stain and retard a cause that is good in itself, do not alter the principles of that cause, and should not be permitted to cloud the truth of it. At all events, governments have been materially changed for the better within the century by these great agitations. The whole complexion of the relations between governments and the governed has undergone a change. That change may be summarized as the insistence by the people on a proper representation in the management of themselves, and in the shaping of the laws under which they live, and in the national *acts*, as distinct from the mere personal acts, of royalty or rulers. Not all of this has been achieved, but much has ; and liberties are placidly enjoyed to-day by most peoples, the demand for which, at the beginning of the century, was regarded, and naturally so, under the condition of things then prevailing, as revolution. And now, as the eventful century draws toward its close, socialistic problems of the extremest radical nature are pressing impatiently for solution.

The term Socialism has thus far been used in its broadest possible sense ; in the sense defined by Webster (edition 1880), as " a theory of Society which advocates a more precise, orderly, and harmonious arrangement of the social relations of mankind, than that which has hitherto prevailed." In this sense, all honest men who wish the advance and harmony of the race, the " peace on earth to men of good will," that the angels sang at the coming of Christ, are Socialists.

There is, however, a secondary definition : " Communism ;" and Communism is defined as " The reorganizing of society, or the doctrine that it should be reorganized, by regulating property, industry, and the sources of livelihood, and also the domestic rela-

tions and social morals of mankind; socialism; especially the doctrine of a community of property, or the negation of individual rights in property. (J. H. Burton.)"

This latter comprehensive definition may be taken to cover the more general acceptance of the term Socialism to-day. Yet it should not be forgotten that there is, or may be, much of the first definition embraced in the second. The truest and greatest socialistic agency in the world is the Catholic Church. In attacking it, as is their habit, socialistic agitators attack, at once, their best friend and their invincible foe: their friend in all that is just, wise, and good in their demands; their foe in all that is false and foolish. As a matter of fact, the Catholic Church, in her peculiar institutions, carries out, and has carried out from the beginning, the practice of communism in property and worldly goods. In the great orders and societies, male and female, the benefits of property (as also the pressure of poverty) are shared alike by all the community, and distributed beyond to the people for whom they labor, in the spirit of Christian charity. The General of the Society of Jesus is, personally, no richer a man than the lay brother who waits at the door or washes the dishes. The monk or nun who dies, whether of princely or peasant origin, carries nothing to the grave but the shroud, and leaves nothing behind but the memory and the purity of a good life. It is needless to dilate on the fact, accepted by all thinking men, that the Church is the great Reformer. To her are owing the greatest reforms that have affected the general well-being of man; and to her is owing the structure and formation of civilized Christian society. The doctrine of human equality and fraternity, in the highest sense of children of God and brethren of the Son of Man, emanates from her. From this doctrine necessarily flowed the abolition of slavery, that wicked and cruel institution that converted free and immortal spirits into human chattels or cattle. To the Church woman owes her dignity and freedom, marriage its sacredness and indissolubility, and the family its safety and its pillar of strength. Hers is the doctrine that the laborer is worthy of his hire, and that to defraud him of it is one of the sins that cry to Heaven for vengeance.

The history of the world shows, the history of our own times shows, in many a horrid page, how often, through disregard of that doctrine, the cry for vengeance has gone up to Heaven, has been heard and answered under the free will of man. The Church was the great protector of the people's rights and liberties, when none other dared face the power of tyrants. She has ever been the teacher and the mother of the poor, the conservator of learning, the dispenser of knowledge, and the guide and guardian of enlightenment. Man cannot place his finger on any great reform within

the Christian era that is not traceable directly to the principles inculcated by and the influence of the Church. So that sincere Socialists, if the scales of prejudice and inherited misrepresentation could only fall from their eyes, would see in the Church, not their enemy, but their truest friend, well-wisher and guide, in all the real and possible reforms that they would fain accomplish. Has she not put up countless martyrs to die for the doctrines of truth and justice and Christian charity? Is not her domain full of good works? Is she not forever the preacher of peace among men? But the difference between her and the others is this: that she is content to work patiently in God's good time, by appeals to reason and charity, and by the influence of her own example. She believes in no violent or immediate remedies for rooted wrongs. Evils that are the growth of centuries must be slowly and laboriously abolished. To pluck them up by the roots is to destroy more than them.

In the old days, Rome, that is to say, the Holy Father, was the high court of appeal of subjects against rulers, and, at times, of rulers against subjects. The Protestant Reformation cut off a great portion of Christendom from that court, and thenceforth, in the Protestant section of Christendom, there was no guiding voice outside the State. If subjects rebelled, they rebelled. If princes tyrannized, they tyrannized. There was no one who could cry halt to either party. How much the people gained in individual liberty, in piety, in prosperity, by the Reformation, may be seen in the condition of European peoples at the beginning of this century, and may be seen to-day. That condition for the masses (to use the most convenient term) was wretched in the extreme. In Protestant countries, even more than in Catholic, there was tyranny on the one side, and poverty, impiety, and ignorance on the other. But not from Protestant lands alone was the power of the Church shut off. The rulers and the statesmen of Catholic Christendom entered into a conspiracy against the Church of Christ. In place of Protestantism, they took up the cry of Liberalism, under the mask of which was Atheism. Their pretence was that the Church chained men's souls, and invaded the prerogatives of state-craft. They professed Catholicity, but State Catholicity, rather than Christianity. So they chained the Church when they could, fettered her limbs, choked her voice, broke up her good works, gave free rein to the teachers of irreligion, and inoculated the minds of the ignorant with the idea that the Church was the enemy of the people and of the State, so that it came to be regarded as a badge of servility and unpatriotism to be a sincere Catholic. Thus Protestantism on the one hand, and Liberalism or atheism on the other, drew away from Christ great masses of people who ought

to be Christian, and educated them into impiety or indifference to religion. So that at the beginning of the present century Europe was to a very large extent atheist, and the one institution most hurtful to its eyes and hateful to its soul was the Roman Catholic Church.

Meanwhile social problems were secretly evolving themselves. On minds thus prepared to look into a godless future, the atheistic literature of the eighteenth century fell like sparks on powder magazines. The magazines flamed up, and the first explosion was the French Revolution. The cry for liberty, equality, and fraternity is a most noble one; but the world with horror saw what it meant in mouths that pronounced the name of God only to blaspheme it. Within a short time not only government, but society, was disorganized. A dreader tyranny than France had ever known fell upon France. The cause of liberty was pushed back instead of forward; but the rulers had received a startling shock.

This cry for an ideal liberty, equality, and fraternity, under impossible human conditions, is practically the cry of the Socialists to-day. Instead of being confined to one state or nation, they are now everywhere. They are regarded as a danger to the state, to the Church, and to society. Some of them openly proclaim their antagonism to these three necessary institutions of human life, and, with them, to property and to the family. Socialists carry on a vigorous propaganda, and it would be foolish to deny the fact that they are gaining numerous recruits. They go under different names in different lands; but, under whatever names they go, their general purpose is the same. That purpose may be described, in brief, as the overthrow of the existing order of things, and the establishment on its ruins of a Socialistic Utopia, where property shall be common, where all shall be equal, where there shall be no poverty and no riches, no rulers and no ruled, no laws, no law-makers, no law-breakers, no nothing, in fact.

This would seem the idle dream of fools, were it not that the lot of the majority of mankind is a very hard one, that governments still are far from perfect, that the question of the laborer and his hire is forever pressing to the front, that many millions of people are weighed down under heavy grievances, not to say wrongs, and that the spirit of Christian charity, that would go far to regulate the questions between employer and employed, is dead over a great portion of the world. So, to-day, Socialism stands up as a menace in the face of nations, and all the bayonets and prohibitory laws in the universe will not and cannot put it down.

It is well, then, to scrutinize carefully this latest of the isms; to see of what it is composed, and who compose it; what it aims at, and what it is actually doing. For now Socialism, in some form or

another, is a factor in every state ; though this republic is at present freer from it than other states for the sole reason that here is liberty and that the conditions of life here are more favorable than in most lands. In Russia, Austria, and Germany, Socialism is treated as treason against the state ; in the countries of the Latin race it is a constant fomenter of public disturbance ; in England it is a daily growing power. It has become a name of dread in the councils of the nations, and all sorts of expedients are adopted, either to hush it up or to get rid of it. But there it stands, fast and firm and grim, gathering to its fold all the disturbing and distressed elements in human society. The only true safeguard against it is a return on the part of governments, and of those untitled governments of capital that control vast masses of labor, to Christian principles ; to dealing just judgments, and to endeavoring to undo the work of the past three centuries that alienated the people from Christ and from His teachings.

Perhaps the completest study in English of this most important subject is that of Mr. John Rae, on *Contemporary Socialism*. The work is admirable in spirit ; very close and logical in analysis ; sufficiently full in detail ; calm in temper and tone ; and presenting the Socialist views in the clearest and most unbiassed manner, to refute them at the end. Socialists themselves could not find fault with Mr. Rae's exposition of their theories ; and in its honesty of statement and comprehensive grasp of a most diversified subject, Mr. Rae's instructive and interesting volume finds its chief value. It is impossible within the limits of a review article to go into the minutiae of the work, which is a large one. On such matters readers must satisfy themselves, and those who read Mr. Rae will be well rewarded. Only one or two salient points will be treated here, as illustrating what the Socialism of the day really is and means.

Mr. Rae confines himself to the broader phases of his subject ; for, though there are many petty groups and coteries among revolutionary Socialists, " they differ only on minor points of future government or present policy." All adhere to one or other of the two main types, " the Centralist, which is usually known as Communism, Socialism, or Collectivism, and the Anarchist," which, though like in kind, " is generally known as Anarchism, or Nihilism." Mr. Rae calls attention to the wonderful spread of Socialism throughout Europe within the last twenty years. At the English International Exhibition of 1862, " it was a common topic of congratulation that the political atmosphere of Europe was then entirely free from the revolutionary alarms which overclouded the first Exhibition in 1851." This shows how little the course of events is turned by these international symposia, as they may be

called, or by the meetings of royalties to arrange among themselves the world's affairs. Treaties of Tilsit are out of date. "It was in 1862 that Lassalle delivered to a club of workingmen in Berlin his address on 'The Present Epoch of the World, and the Idea of the Working Class.'" This was published shortly afterwards under the title of "The Working Man's Programme," and has been called by Lassalle's friends "The Wittenberg Theses of the New Socialist Movement." It was even at the same Exhibition that the germ of the International was laid, in the mutual relations established between delegates of the English and French trade societies.

This latter movement started a new order of things, conducive towards an international fraternity among workingmen. There were many able men among those workmen-delegates, who met from time to time in their own parliaments, not only to discuss questions of mutual interest regarding their various trades, but problems of a deeper kind, the relations of employers to employed, of the unprivileged classes to governments, of all the demands made by governments on those classes, of the money they earned, the taxes they paid, the representation they had in their governments, the improvement of their homes and ways of life, the education of their children, and other such matters, that had hitherto been placidly relegated to the chance good will of parliaments and governments. This, and what came from it, was not at all like the revolutionary movement of 1848 and the Socialistic schemes that disappeared with that revolution. "The communities of Owenites, St. Simonians, Fourierites, Icarians, which multiplied for a time on both sides of the Atlantic, are extinct," says Mr Rae, with truth. Those dreams and dreamers, more or less amiable in themselves, but with the most unpractical and, sometimes unconsciously perhaps, immoral theories regarding the reform of society and the regulation of the life of man, have passed away, laughed out of very existence. "The Socialists of the present day have discarded all belief in the possibility of effecting any social regeneration except by means of political authority; and the first object of their endeavors is, therefore, the conquest of the powers of the state."

Here, indeed, is the whole case stated as far as the ultimate object of Socialism goes. The aim of the Socialists is no longer to serve, to argue, to appeal, but to seize the power and rule. It was said of Lord John Russell that, so great was his self-confidence, he was prepared at a moment's notice to take command of her British Majesty's fleet or to lead the government. Your dyed-in-the-wool Socialist is ready at a moment to draw up laws for the governance and the well-being of the world. Mr. Rae states a truth worthy of attention when he says: "Out of the several sorts

and varieties of political Socialism, only one has revived in any strength, and that is the extremest and most revolutionary." Child's play is over. "It is the democratic communism of the Young Hegelians; and it scouts the very suggestion of state help, and will content itself with nothing short of state-transformation." This we see illustrated to-day in Germany. Prince Bismarck, who thinks "any stick good enough to beat a dog with," utilized the Socialists against the Catholics, when he entered on his anti-Catholic campaign. After having petted them, he found them growing dangerous. He tried to chain his hound; but the effort was useless. Socialism flourishes mightily under a rule of blood and iron, and despite all the efforts of the German Government to repress it, there were more Socialists returned to the Reichstag at the late elections than ever before. So the Government, wishing to steal their thunder, started a system of State-Socialism, in which the State plays the benevolent paternal part to the workingmen; but this, as was shown at the recent opening of the Reichstag, the Socialist deputies vehemently reject.

In France the working classes to-day hate the Republic more than they did the rule of Napoleon III., which at least gave them *panem et circenses*. "As a rule," says Mr. Rae, "the Socialists of France at the present day, like those of Germany, put their faith in iron rather than paper." In this the Socialists only take a leaf out of Prince Bismarck's own book.

"What they want is a democracy of labor, to use one of their own phrases—that is, a State in which power and property shall be based on labor; where citizenship shall depend on a labor qualification, instead of a qualification of birth or property; where there shall be no citizen who enjoys without laboring, and no citizen who labors without enjoying; where everyone who is able to work shall have employment, and everyone who has wrought shall retain the whole produce of his labor; and where accordingly, as the indispensable prerequisite of the whole scheme, the land of the country and all other instruments of production shall be made the joint property of the community, and the conduct of all industrial operations be placed under the direct administration of the State. Furthermore, all this is contended for as a matter of simple right and justice to the laboring classes, on the ground that the wealth of the nation belongs to the hands that made it; it is contended for as an obligation of the State, because the State is held to be merely the organized will of the people, and the people is the laboring class; and it is contended for as an object of immediate accomplishment—if possible, by ordinary constitutional means, but, if not, by revolution."

This presentation has a startling show, and yet it is only the other day that we heard many of these doctrines promulgated by a candidate for the Presidency of the United States, an able lawyer, a man who has occupied great positions of trust in his State and in the Congress of the United States, General Benjamin F. Butler. Not that he presented the new theory of government in this bald, simple, concrete form; but much of it was in his thought and in

his theory as expressed. In other lands and at so exciting a time so able a man would have drawn to him a large following, and created vast disturbance. Here, in this nation of workers, he is laughed at and avoided by the workers, and his assumed candidacy was one of the ridiculous features of a most important and harassing political campaign. Some of what General Butler advocated under an American veneer, posing distinctly as the candidate of labor against capital, Mr. Rae calls "Revolutionary Socialist Democracy," which he divides into two main branches—German Socialism and Russian Nihilism, the difference between which he considers rather local than founded on matters of principle. There is a division of principle between modern democrats, that which classifies them as Centralists, and Federalists, titles which fairly well explain themselves. The Centralists wish the democratic republic to have a strongly centralized form of government, while the others would leave the local communes comparatively independent and sovereign and free, if they chose, to unite in convenient federations.

Bearing in mind that Socialism is the same substance in many forms and in many places, Germany may be taken as one of its strongest and most out-spoken centres to-day. And it is a fact not without significance that Socialism in its most dangerous forms is strongest under the two most despotic of European powers—Germany and Russia. German Socialism is set down by Mr. Rae as "the creation of Lassalle." He it was who gave the vague substance shape, coherency, and a voice, and changed it from a theoretic dream into a living and working organism.

Ferdinand Lassalle was the son of parents who were strict Jews. It is singular to note how many men of Jewish descent have allied themselves with the Socialists; for the Jews, as a race, are conservative. In Russia, for instance, there is scarcely a band of Nihilists captured that has not its Jewish members, men and women. Lassalle was possessed of great natural gifts, which he cultivated and developed in the universities of Breslau and Berlin. He was taken up and seems to have been made a pet of by the literary society in those cities. Humboldt called him a *Wunderkind*. He went to Paris, and there formed a close friendship with Heine. He began his public career by taking up the question of woman's rights, or woman's wrongs, with characteristic force and vehemence, and with some success. He was a strange mixture: at once full of noble and of ignoble passions; a man of thought, of intellect, of labor and of pleasure. "Lassalle," says Mr. Rae, "would have been a great man if he had had more of the ordinary restraining perceptions, but he had neither fear nor awe, nor even—in spite of his vein of satire—a wholesome sense of the ridiculous—in this last respect

resembling, if we may believe Carlyle, all Jews." He was, he proclaimed, "revolutionary on principle," explaining that by revolution he meant transformation, or a substitution of an entirely new principle for the existing state of things; whereas reform merely meant a logical development of the principle of the existing state of things. Revolution might be carried out either peacefully or by force of arms. Like all Young Germany at the time, he was a pupil and admirer of Hegel, and was indoctrinated with the ideas of that philosopher. He took part in the revolutionary movement of 1848, and suffered on its collapse. He was brought to trial and imprisoned. He defended himself boldly, and the trial brought him fame. He was banished from Berlin, but was afterwards allowed to return. He was a strong advocate of the unity of Germany, with Prussia as the centre, and probably this may have first brought him in contact with Bismarck; but the unity of Germany was to his mind a prime necessity for the establishment of freedom and democracy. In this he may not have been far wrong.

He wrote extensively, from tragedies to pamphlets on social and political subjects. He believed in power and not in paper, and ridiculed the constitutionalism of modern Liberals. Might was right to him. He was again prosecuted and imprisoned. He now (1863) turned his attention to the congresses of workingmen which were beginning to organize into a power. He sketched a political programme for them. To elevate their normal condition political agitation was needed rather than the establishment of savings banks, benefit societies, and so forth. Universal suffrage was requisite to enable them to achieve their elevation. Workingmen were ground down under the existing economical *régime*, and especially by "the iron and cruel law of necessary wages." Their only cure was in coöperative production, the substitution of associated labor for wage labor. But this system must be introduced by state help and on state credit. The state should do for the people what it does for the large and wealthy corporations and monopolists. Ninety-six and a half per cent. of the population are ground down by the "iron law" and cannot by their own power lift themselves above it. So the State, which is themselves, must step in and help them; and universal suffrage alone can enforce State help.

Such was Lassalle's programme for the working classes. Strange to say, at the time it was received with indifference even by the workingmen, while it was universally condemned by the press. The Leipzig workmen alone received him with favor, and to Leipzig he proceeded and organized there (May 23, 1863) the General Workingmen's Association for the promotion of universal suffrage by peaceful agitation. He went on with the work; lecturing,

writing, agitating, moving from place to place. But in spite of his energy his success was small during his life-time. He was killed in a duel on August 31st, 1864.

His very death seemed to lend wings to the cause he advocated, though that death was owing to a purely personal quarrel. To-day the working classes of Germany are to a large extent impregnated with his doctrines. It is not necessary to go more deeply into them here. They had enough of surface plausibility and reasonable cause to appeal to crude intellects which could grasp rough facts and grievances, and see no serious attempt at reform on the part of the government, or of assistance on the part of the privileged classes. What is the fourth estate? asked Lassalle, and the answer was nothing. What ought it to be? Everything. The First French Revolution was a revolt of the third estate against the Crown and privileged classes. The third estate, the *bourgeoisie*, conquered, and converted itself into a privileged class; plutocracy took the place of aristocracy. The revolution of 1848 was the beginning of the revolt of the fourth estate, the working classes, against the privileges of the third. "What is the State?" asked Lassalle of the workmen. "You are the State," he told them. "You are ninety-six per cent. of the population. All political power ought to be of you, and through you, and for you; and your good and amelioration ought to be the aim of the State. It ought to be so, because your good is not a class interest, but is the national interest."

Of course, if right and wrong be a matter of count by noses, this argument is irresistible. The greater good of the greater number is a much-used but specious phrase, one of the multitudinous cants of the day that ignorance, whether lettered or unlettered, erects into a popular dogma. Good is absolute; and as has been nobly said, "one with God is a majority." Votes do not decide goodness or badness. The only standard of good is the law of God as given through His Divine Son, and guarded and expounded in His ever-living body, the Church. Morals are founded on the doctrines of Christ, the Prophet, the Priest, the King of God's human creatures. Either this is so or Lassalle's argument is true; and the only means of demolishing the force of his argument is to reconcile as far as possible the human with the divine law, bringing a wise Christian charity to bear on the development of the human race and the afflictions of various kinds that by its very nature and constitution it is bound to labor under. Adam, after the fall, with all the world before him, was compelled for very existence' sake to labor as severely as was the fictitious Robinson Crusoe on his solitary island. The old monk's saying that Carlyle loved—"labor is prayer"—sums up the life of any well-organized Christian. All

that can be hoped from laws and human institutions is not to create a universe of idlers and impossible communists, but to assist as far as is possible to insure man's living honorably and in security by the sweat of his brow or the sweat of his brain. Place Lassalle's ninety-six per cent. in power, give universal suffrage as in France and in the United States, and is the condition of things very materially altered as affects the general status of the ninety-six? Call them by what name you please, the other fraction will rule, if for no other reason, for convenience' sake.

There is no argument here for or against universal suffrage; simply a statement of indisputable facts as affecting the millennium expected by many from the carrying out of Lassalle's ideas and of all those who advocate similar plans for the reformation or regeneration of society. Adam had to delve, and Eve had to spin, and the answer to the question of that fourteenth century Socialist, John Ball, "Who was then the gentleman?" is that Adam was the gentleman and Eve the lady. Labor, though a burden, is an honorable one; the burden of human life, in fact, of which there is no evading. If there be what are called drones in the human hive, those drones have uses as well as abuses. The idea of reducing all human beings to a dead level is alike against nature, man, and God. Let any nation or people try the experiment and level itself to-day. The levelling would be simply a process of beheading and a social disruption and suicide. It is perfectly legitimate, and right, and wise for the ninety-six per cent. to labor with all honest effort for their own improvement and advancement and for necessary reforms in the State, for the curtailment of class privileges that oppress them and hinder their progress, and so forth; but it is simply foolish for them to call upon the State, by the issue of an edict, to work social miracles and change the purgatory of centuries into the paradise of a day. Moreover, are the working classes themselves wholly without blame, and do they set no obstacles in the way of their own advancement by lack of thrift, lack of industry, lack of obedience to the mora! law, and drunkenness?

Lassalle's theories sufficiently illustrate whatever there is of logical scheme and common aim and purpose in Socialism. But Mr. Rae does not stop here. He follows up all the main branches of the system,—for a system it has now become,—getting at the heart of each, and dissecting it with the disimpassioned skill of a competent surgeon, exposing in the process the disease, and, as far as possible, its cause. To follow these branches in detail is impossible here. Mr. Rae has been most conscientious in his work, and seems not to have left a stone unturned that might help him in discovering the truth. He is familiar with all the chief writers on Socialism, and with the methods of the workers in their various geo-

graphical limits. After dealing with Lassalle, he proceeds to discuss Karl Marx, his labors and his writings. From London, that European headquarters of all kinds of international agitation, Marx exercised an immense influence by his publications alone. Marx was one of the leaders of the International, the chief aim of which was the concentration of associated labor. It had accomplished much in this direction when the Franco-German war broke out. The International was bitterly opposed to the war, for its leaders foresaw the divisions in its body that would inevitably result from that war. It will take many years, and an entire new order of the universe, to eradicate nationalism out of the heart of man. At the close of the war came the uprising of the Commune in Paris. "The leaders of the International," says Mr. Rae, "were undoubtedly heart and soul with the Commune." What became of the Commune we know. Its explosion killed the International. The English members at once fell away, and what was left of it was, later on (1872), rent by a schism at its congress at the Hague. As Mr. Rae well observes: "A Socialist organization always seems to contain two elements of internal disintegration. One is, the prevalence of a singular and almost pathetic mistrust of their leaders and of one another. The law of suspects is always in force among themselves. . . . The other source of disintegration is the tendency to intestine divisions on points of doctrine. A reconstruction of society is necessarily a most extensive programme, and allows for the utmost variety of opinion and plan."

One of the most interesting of the chapters is that on Russian Nihilism, a branch of Socialism with which we are all familiar from the series of desperate deeds that have marked and continue to mark its course. Nihilism, perhaps, might be set down as the last development of Socialism; and wild, terrible, and hopeless as it is in its aims and methods, if such a lost cause, a cause that is lost in its very essence, could be ennobled, that has been in the barbaric sense ennobled by the marvellous devotion and self-sacrifice of so many of its adherents, women and men alike. It is barbarism fighting barbarism, and Mr. Rae's analysis of it is close and keen. Especially interesting, and to most of us novel, is his exposition of the part played by woman in Russian society. Just here it is well to remark that the decadence of the Russian priesthood has destroyed a potent influence for good among the people, more especially in an autocratic and bureaucratic government such as Russia—the state yoked the church to its car; the result, as invariably happens, was that the priesthood became a degraded profession, and religion fell into mere superstition, or into gross disrepute. Bakunine is one of the prophets and leaders of Nihilism. In 1857 he was condemned to exile for life in Siberia by the

Czar Alexander II. After twelve years he escaped, more devoted to the cause than ever. Pandestruction is his leading principle in revolution. "Admitting no other activity than that of destruction," he says, "we declare that the forms in which that activity ought to express itself may be extremely varied—poison, poniard, knout. The Revolution sanctifies all without distinction." And again: "Pandestruction is a series of assassinations and audacious, or even mad, enterprises, horrifying the powerful, and dazzling the people till they believe in the triumph of the Revolution." With what zeal and devotion the Nihilists have taken up these wicked and foolish doctrines, the world has seen. They were, also, the doctrines of Mazzini, at one time the pet of London drawing-rooms and society, and to whose memory a statue has been erected in the New York Central Park. As matters stand even to-day, Russia is staggering between two terrorisms—the terrorism from above and the terrorism from below.

But, as has been said, it is impossible to go into all these matters within the limits of an article. Each chapter in Mr. Rae's book is worthy of study by those who look at the later and, on the surface, more ominous movements of the age. The air is certainly clouded and charged with dangerous elements. There is a moral dynamite abroad that needs very careful watching. It should not be forgotten that deadly explosions are as often caused by the over-confidence or carelessness of the guards as by the attempts of miscreants. In either case, the wreck to the victims is the same. Sometimes, too, these disasters are caused by over-timidity or ignorant handling. It is for statesmen to deal with these problems, and deal with them in a wise and just spirit.

How to reconcile the malcontents, who are daily increasing in numbers, and who, it should not be forgotten, are being constantly wrought upon by the most evil agencies, is really the great social problem of the age,—greater than all your canal questions, colonizing questions, boundary questions, treaty questions, and other questions that come up for international arbitration in these days of much palaver. Mr. Rae devotes one chapter to "the Christian Socialists," and it ought to be suggestive to those who are vexed by the problem before us. "The Socialism of the present day," says Mr. Rae, "is not of a religious origin. On the contrary, there is some truth in the remark of a distinguished economist, M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, that the prevalence of socialistic ideas is largely due to the decline of religious faith among the working classes. If there is only the one life, they feel they must realize their ideal here; and realize it quickly, or they will never realize it at all." This, of course, is essentially materialism, or that mode of mind that sees "the be-all and the end-all here," and that is

preached by the favorite social scientists and philosophers of the day in all lands. How this mode of thought came to capture the minds of such multitudes has been shown in an earlier portion of this article. "The fact is certain," says Mr. Rae, "that most contemporary Socialists have turned their backs on religion." And just here it may be as well to dispose of a specious objection that is often put. It is said in substance: You Catholics are always talking of the Church and of her influence for good. Had she not all these people, or their forefathers, in her hand once, when, as you claim, all Christendom was one? Why did she not do better for them, then, and why should they desert her now?

Again, this objection has been partially met earlier in the article. These worthy objectors forget that even in Catholic days there was always a conflict, more or less stubborn, between the temporal and the spiritual powers. This conflict necessarily interfered materially with the work of the Church in the advancement and development of the human race. This was true up to the rupture at the Reformation. Since that date, as already shown, the Church has been conspired against and hampered by both Catholic and Protestant powers, and the people, as far as possible, educated into hostility to her influence and her teachings. They not only try to keep her out of the school, but also out of the land.

Thus governments to-day have to fight Socialism more or less single-handed, and they fight it with the only weapon they know,—the sword. The cross they have either deserted or rejected. This atheistic movement, says Mr. Rae, is looked upon by the Church "with a natural and justifiable suspicion." Nevertheless, he adds truly: "Some churchmen, however, scruple to assume this attitude; they recognize a soul of good in the agitation, if it could be stripped of the revolutionary and atheistic elements of its propaganda, which they hold to be, after all, merely accidental accompaniments of the system, at once foreign to its essence and pernicious to its purpose. It is in substance, they say, an economical movement, both in its origin and its objects, and so far as it stands on this ground they have no hesitation in declaring that, in their judgment, there is a great deal more Christianity in Socialism than in the existing industrial *régime*."

It is safe to say that this well describes the attitude towards Socialism of a large body of Christian believers. Indeed, had not Church and State and people been antagonized by infidel statesmen, it is highly probable that by this time governments and the governed, nations one with another, and class with class, would have been moving in fair harmony under the common bond of Christ. The rich would not have looked upon the poor, nor the poor upon the rich, as natural enemies, while secret societies

would have known from the beginning that they were under the ban of the Church, and, consequently, of the whole Christian community. Thirty years ago the Christian Socialists were established in England under the lead of Frederick Maurice and other earnest men. They did excellent work, but the society finally fell through. In Germany a similar work has been taken up by Protestants and Catholics. "The Catholic group," says Mr. Rae, "deserves to be considered first, because it intervened in the discussion much sooner than the Evangelical, and because it originated a much more important movement, larger in its dimensions than the other, and invested with additional consequence from the circumstance that, being promoted under the countenance of dignitaries, it must be presumed to have received the sanction of the Roman Curia, and may, therefore, afford an index to the general attitude which the Catholic Church is disposed to assume towards continental Socialism." Germany is strong in Catholic clubs. In 1863, when the Socialist agitation assumed distinct and formidable form, Dr. Döllinger recommended the Catholic clubs to take the matter up. "These clubs," testifies Mr. Rae, "are societies for mutual improvement, recreation, and benefit, and are composed mainly of workingmen." Father Kōlping's Society of Catholic Journeymen, founded as early as 1847, had in 1872 a membership of 70,000. There were affiliated clubs, numbering from fifty to four hundred members each, in various German towns. There were also Catholic clubs of apprentices, peasant clubs, benefit clubs, young men's clubs, credit clubs, literary clubs, and so forth. Indeed, the Germans, as is their fashion, seem to have converted the club business into a science, and the result of it is, to some extent, seen in the Catholic party in the Reichstag, which, under the pressure of persecution, sprang from nothing into the leading place. In 1864 the great Bishop Ketteler took up the matter and published to the world his views on the labor question and Christianity. In 1868 the Catholic bishops of Germany, in their conference at Fulda, discussed the relations of the Church to the labor question. They approved of the formation of associations of Catholic labor. In the same month there was a general meeting of the German Catholic clubs, and the result was the formation of the Christian Social Associations, or, as they are called from their patron, St. Joseph Associations. They are composed of and managed by workingmen, with clergymen and men of property and prominence as honorary members.

It would take a special article to go into the great practical work accomplished by these Catholic workingmen's clubs in Germany. Mr. Rae recognizes the worth of that work, and his general comment is, that "the Catholic movement goes a long way with

the Socialists in their cries of wrong, but only a short way in their plans of redress." The idea is correction, not reconstruction, of the present industrial system. The aid of the State is called for to assist the workman against the overwhelming power of capital, but to assist him in reason. That cry is at our own doors, and must be heard sooner or later,—the sooner the better. Bismarck at one time seemed to fear what he termed "an alliance between the black International and the red." He is a great phrase-maker, as was Disraeli; but phrases are neither facts nor things. Mr. Rae's judgment is, that the Catholic sympathy is "not so much with the Socialists as with the laboring classes generally," and the Catholic labor movement, so far as it has gone, "is meant to take the wind from socialism, whether with the mere view of filling their own sails with it or no."

As for Protestant efforts in this direction, Catholics can have nothing but good-will towards them. And here is Mr. Rae, one of their own writers, telling us that in Germany "no voice was raised in the Protestant churches on the social question till 1878"; and he adds the grim comment: "They (the Protestant churches) suffer from their absolute dependence on the State, and have become churches of doctors and professors without effective practical interest or initiative, and without that strong popular sympathy of a certain kind which almost necessarily pervades the atmosphere of a church like the Catholic, which pits itself against States, and knows that its power of doing so rests, in the last analysis, on its hold over the hearts of the people."

What a world of unconsciously uttered truth and history lies in that sentence, ill-applied though it be! Surely, if we believe in anything at all, we must believe that the most potent agencies in promoting the moral well-being of man are the agencies of religion; and the moral well-being of man, in the broad sense, is the necessary adjunct of his physical well-being. Yet here is Protestantism enslaved to the State, or, where it is not enslaved, a matter of fashion rather than of principle. And here is Catholicity, that really touches and reaches the heart of the people, looked on with suspicion and hostile eyes by the governments of the day. And here is hunger, and thirst, and disease, and all the evils that afflict the mass of humankind, knocking at the doors of government for humanity, asking for bread and getting stones in answer to its prayer. It is these evils that give its life to Socialism, and lead those to despair of help from governments who have been taught to despair of help from God. And the remedy? That is a long question, hard to solve by those who have rejected Christ and His command to love God above all and our neighbor as ourselves.